

ments for effecting the above changes, the sale of National Savings Certificates, Indira Vikas Patra and acceptance of 5-Year deposit accounts are being suspended for a few days from 1.4.1987. These will be resumed as early as possible in different parts of the country, and in any case not later than 15th April, 1987.

14.05 hrs.

[English]

DISCUSSION RE : ENGAGING OF US ECONOMIC INTELLIGENCE AGENCY FAIRFAX GROUP BY MINISTRY OF FINANCE FOR INVESTIGATION OF CASES OF INDIANS HAVING HUGE ILLEGAL FUNDS ABROAD

MR. SPEAKER : We now take up discussion on the engaging of the U. S. economic intelligence agency Fairfax group by the Ministry of Finance for investigation of cases of Indians having huge illegal funds abroad.

Prof. Madhu Dandavate.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT (Arrah) : Before my esteemed colleague begins...

(Interruptions)

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY (Puri) : I am on a point of order.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : What is your point of order ?

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY : Under Rule 193 you have to fix up one hour before. Rule has not yet been amended. The Rules Committee is examining and going into details. Let the rule be suspended and than discussion may be taken up.

MR. SPEAKER : With the permission of the House we have always done. We have never done without the permission of the House.

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY : You get permission of the House.

MR. SPEAKER : Do I have the permission of the House to relax that rule ?

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Bhagat, are you on a point of order ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : No. It is to appeal to the hon. Members. Very appropriate.

This is a very important debate concerning the accumulation of funds to alleged violation.....

MR. SPEAKER : That is what he is going to say.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I will appeal to the hon. Members who raise it, do not bring in partisan views.....

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : There is nothing that they will do.....

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Mehboob nagar) : What is this ? I do not think we are in need of your advice, Mr. Bhagat.

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : What is the partisan view about it ?

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : There is no point of order.

I have over-ruled you. It is over-ruled.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Why do you not hear me ? You do not even hear me ;

MR. SPEAKER : There is no point of order.

(Interruptions)**

MR- SPEAKER : I have already over-ruled. There is nothing going on record.

SHRI KAMAL NATH (Chhindwara) : But has the House agreed ?

(Interruptions)

SHRI KAMAL NATH : The House has not agreed.

For the suspension of the rule you put it to the vote of the House.

MR. SPEAKER : Let this be discussed.

SHRI KAMAL NATH : We may agree. But let it be put to vote. Let us follow the procedure.

MR. SPEAKER : We have been doing it. Let us discuss it now. When we amend the rules, we will see.

SHRI KAMAL NATH : The permission of the House must be sought.

MR. SPEAKER : That is what I have asked for. I am only asking the House in view of the precedents that we have been having for full discussion. May I have the permission of the House ?

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : We cannot do justice in one hour to this subject. So, it is better that we may do it.

SHRI KAMAL NATH : We must follow the procedure.

[Translation]

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY (Midnapur) : I fail to understand is to what is troubling him.

MR. SPEAKER : Choubeyji, it is your effect.

[English]

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF FOOD AND CIVIL SUPPLIES (SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT) : I have to make a submission. We leave it to your sense of discretion and judgment to conduct this discussion for as much time as it is considered necessary. We do not run away from it.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Prof. Dandavate.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) : I am raising a discussion on the engaging of the U. S. economic intelligence Fairfax group by the Ministry of Finance for investigation of cases of Indians having huge illegal funds abroad. Sir, before I express my views on the subject, I must refer to the hon. Members who have made an appeal to me and others also that let this discussion be carried on a non-partisan plane. At the very outset, let me tell you that really the only two sides that are involved are those who have actually illegal accounts outside India and those who are trying to detect it and between these two parties I am not partisan. I am committed to join those who want to unearth blackmoney in the country and outside the country.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Let the whole House discuss it.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : You have got my point. You are intelligent and you are an ex-Speaker.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolepur) : He is an ex-Finance Minister and Foreign Minister.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Sir, as far as this problem is concerned, a great debate is going on throughout the country. There are three issues and three questions that are uppermost in the minds of those who are debating these issues.

The one is that some feel that there is failure on the part of the Government to use its internal machinery in order to effectively apply its own economic intelligence and find out who are the economic offenders. Then, the second question that arises is whether it is proper to appoint the US Agency or for that matter any foreign agency to probe into such matters, whether there were any compulsions to do that. The third problem that has cropped up is the coordination between the Finance Ministry and the Prime Minister, that is, whether there is any mutual coordination or mutual confidence. These are some of the preliminary problems that have come up.

Sir, I will take up the problem of internal investigating machinery. Sir, as far as such probings are concerned, I do not think that any rigid attitude can be taken by any Government. In this very House, I debated the NRI problem, the investment by non-residential Indians and at that time I had pointed out to this House how our internal machinery had failed to undertake certain basic things in relation to these transactions in India. For instance, one of the rules stated that those companies abroad and those non-resident Indians abroad who want to have investment in Indian companies here, must have 60% Indian equity in these Companies. The then Finance Minister said that it was beyond our capacity to undertake this work and for that we had to rely on the machinery of that country and we cannot do it on our own. I remember very rightly that on that occasion I had raised the question. I had placed before this House some of the statements of accounts of certain companies which were trying to invest money in the companies here. I had also said that if their statements of accounts and balance-sheets did not indicate any huge profits nor those statements and balance of accounts indicated that they had borrowed huge amounts in order to invest in Indian companies and if both these options are closed and in spite of that they are having investment in Indian companies—the only inference that we can draw is that some blackmoney belonging to someone must have travelled from India to that country and that black money after having the

'Ganga Jal' must have become white and it must have returned to our country in that form of investment.

Sir, now, this particular point ought to have been investigated. But somehow or other our machinery has failed to do that. Sir, there was also a doubt that probably black money either belonging to industrialists or belonging to some dignitaries might have gone out and it has come back and whether this was properly probed into. But this could not be done. So, in the past also we have observed that our internal investigating machinery is not always adequate to perform their operations that they are expected to perform. And therefore, under compulsions of the situation sometimes to probe into certain irregularities and aberrations there has been a need to take up certain foreign intelligence machineries also. So, I may like to point out to this House that in the year 1975 when Shrimati Indira Gandhi was the Prime Minister of the country and when a complaint was lodged with her Government, of Mrs. Gayatri Devi... (*Interruptions*) No allegation... that some of her jewellery was stolen in the United States, then in that case when Mrs. Gandhi was the Prime Minister of the country, a foreign detective agency was employed to inquire in depth about the assets of Mrs. Gayatri Devi, and at that time I do not think anybody raised the question why the foreign agency was used. of course, we were in jail, but those who were outside, I do not think they raised it in the parliament and outside; and fortunately we have in this House the Emergency Speaker, Sir, He will be able to tell us that at that time nobody had raised that question at all. Therefore, this question did not arise then. There are a number of missions abroad which are supposed to have certain purchases from foreign countries. For instance the Railways have a Mission in Paris, they have a Mission in London, they have a Mission in Germany. They are required to purchase certain equipment from abroad and Sometimes there are financial transactions. Sometimes we find that in collusion with someone in those respective countries, sometimes lot of manipulations go on and corrupt practices take place. If every time our machinery is there to investigate into that,

[Prof. Madhu Dandavate]

probably that might not be adequate. As far as possible, I agree that our internal machinery should undertake the probe, but if we find that sometimes the assistance of other economic intelligence might be of help, there have been occasions on which such help has been accepted.

Sir, there is a lot of controversy about the payments that are made to this particular Fairfax Agency, and I hope and trust that that point also will be clarified by whoever be the Minister or if the Prime Minister is going to reply to the debate. Our information from general knowledge gathered through the press is that as it is done in the case of other private agencies, when certain amounts are probed into and detected, for instance, there are FERA violations. Whatever the amount that has been detected, a definite percentage of that will go to that agency as the fees. That seems to be the general information. We would like to have the reply as to how that is to be sorted out.

The third unfortunate question that comes up is: How the Prime Minister remained uninformed about the appointment of Fairfax agency to probe into the matter? Sir, there are two possibilities. One possibility is that this Government, as many other governments, sometimes takes it for granted that whenever such probe were to be done, in that case the Finance Ministry to keep the matters quite confidential would like to probe into the matters and when some *Prima facie* case is built up, in that case report to the Prime Minister that these are the preliminary findings and take the instructions either from the Cabinet of the Prime Minister as to how further probing is to be done. As far as the payment is concerned, the Finance Secretary has certain jurisdiction to make the payments upto a particular amount. Then, if they exceed a particular amount, it is actually the Finance Minister who is supposed to take the decision and if it is found to be an extremely intricate problem, in that case the matter can be taken up to the Cabinet. Was there any doubt that there might be obstructions from the Prime Minister,

that is why the Finance Minister did not consult the Prime Minister, did not take it to the Cabinet? Or, because there may be any embarrassment to the persons close to the Prime Minister, they being involved in this, probably the Finance Minister felt that 'let us not create an embarrassment at this stage. later on when I get the information, I may put it before the Prime Minister' or whether the routine course was followed.

I think these questions which I raised must be categorically replied. Unfortunately, in the entire episode of probing, as far as CBI is concerned, it has also come under the cloud. For instance, when in that famous case where Shri Gurumurthy was produced before the court and he has sought the bail, his lawyer has sought the bail, some letters were quoted and they were supposed to be the letters written by Vice-President of Fairfax Mr. Gordon Andrean McKay and, in that letter, lot of information was given and the whole issue was made to appear so intricate that if Shri Gurumurthy is allowed to be released on bail, in that case, further probing will become extremely difficult and these documents were produced at the instance of the CBI. It was the argument of the Government on the basis of the CBI report and the document that they produced.

Mr. Michel Hirshman, President of the Fairfax group in an interview to 'India Abroad' which is also partly published in the 'Sunday Mail' in Delhi has categorically said:

"They are absolute forgeries, we did not see them, we did not write them. We are prepared to swear by that."

This has appeared in almost all the important national newspapers on 23rd March, 1987.

It is very strange that agency outside the country has to expose the CBI and that matter has to be placed before the court of law saying that this document that has been produced by the CBI is a forged document. If such forged documents are used for the petty purposes of either

accepting or rejecting the bail, in that case, we will be setting up a very bad precedent and that will also destroy the credibility of the progress. I think this particular issue was brought in only to side-track the issue.

I would like to go to the investigations and their scope.

Was the scope of investigation restricted only to enquire into the affairs of the Reliance Company ?

Did the investigations include probe into the FERA violations of various companies and also influential individuals ?

Whether huge illegal funds deposited in the Swiss bank and were they also to be investigated ?

It is also an important aspect. Reports had come. For instance, I may quote a simple instance in which allegations are not there. 'Sunday' of 29th of March to April, 1987 issue on p. 42 says :

"Nevertheless, Bhure Lal spent over two weeks in the US during and before the last Christmas, ostensibly looking for evidence against Reliance. But was Reliance his only target ? Some highly placed sources in the Government believe that he could be hiding something when he told his interrogators that his sole objective in the US trip was to find out details about Reliance. In fact, it is now widely believed that Bhure Lal got the help of Fairfax to crack open the secrets of Macoy Adol Brothers, a pharmaceutical company registered in Switzerland and owned jointly by Amitabh Bachchan claimed by his brother. Amitabh to be an NRI holding an Indian passport and some Italian nationals with strong Indian connections."

This particular news item, that is agency, is a very serious one. It does not cast aspersions on anyone. But this needs to be probed into and whoever may be the Minister who will be replying to the debate, I have pinpointed on a specific instance and he should be able to give the necessary clarification in this respect.

I would like to say something which on the face of it is very sensitive. That is Finance Minister's report to the Prime Minister and the chronology in which the reports were reported to be submitted to the Prime Minister and the time at which the Finance portfolio was shifted and certain officers were also transferred from the initial postings.

Sir, when the report, which I pointed out to you earlier, when that was published, then the news report appeared : "Bachchan was not available for comments. But even his close friends confirm that Shri V. P. Singh and his men had been planning to raid his houses in Allahabad, Bombay and Delhi for quite sometime, presumably to find some more clues as to where Mr. Bachchan's Swiss operations are, the time-around which the enforcement Directorate had used a foreign ploy serving a notice demanding information in respect of foreign trips from several film personalities who had participated."

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT : Sir, I am on a Point or Order...

MR. SPEAKER : What is your Point of Order ?

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT : The rules are very clear. Professor Madhu Dandavate knows them very well. He says, by implication, he is not casting aspersions on anybody, I want to know from him : Is he casting—as a Member of Parliament—aspersions on anybody or not ? He cannot do it under the rules 352 and 353 bar him completely. He cannot do it. I express that if you are making any reflection on anybody, a Member of this House, you are not correct. This is a very clever device. You are casting aspersions when you are saying that you don't cast aspersions. You cannot do it under the rules.....

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order.

[Shri H.K.L. Bhagat]

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER ; Do't about.

Windy listen with patience. They have committed their point and I have listened to their submission.

[Translation]

Do not interrupt.

[English]

[English]

I will just say for the information. Professor Dandavate also knows everything about this. You know the rules, Professor. We do not have to cast aspersions without any foundation, without any basis, without giving any prior information...

I know what I am doing. I have got it. For your information, may I say..... Look here...If things which are required...

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : That is right. Even with foundation, why should aspersion be cast ?

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Vasant Sathe.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : That can be done, if you want to do. If you want it, I can just spell it out for you. I have got it...

You sit down, do not interrupt.

[English]

(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF WELFARE (DR. RAJENDRA KUMARI BAJPAI) : Please, don't go by the magazine reports...

You are not supposed to intervene. I must say. Things required are (i) the Member should give adequate, advance notice to the Speaker and the Minister concerned ; (ii) the details of the charges sought to be levelled should be spelt out in precise terms and should be supported by the requisite documents which should be authenticated by the member ; (iii) the Member should, before making the allegation in the House, satisfy himself after making enquires that there is a basis for the allegation ; (iv) the Member should be prepared to accept responsibility for the allegation and (v) the Member should be prepared to substantiate the allegations. This is the thing which can be done. I don't object to quoting from the papers because that is already there...

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Don't get heated up.....

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : We can quote from the papers. We have just only to see that allegatory or incriminatory remarks cannot be made.

(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF ENERGY (SHRI VASANT SATHE) : Under the guise of quoting from a newspaper or magazine report, allegations against the hon. Member of this House or against somebody if he is not a Member of this House, cannot be raised.

MR. SPEAKER : You must also know you cannot quote, you cannot name anybody. So simple it is.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : That is what I am saying.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : If you lose temper, that will be of no use. I have to decide it.

[English]

Allegatory or incriminatory remarks should not be made.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : What will be the use if all of you speak at a time ? All are speaking at a time and I am not getting anything.

[English]

I will do it according to the rules.

(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT : The rule is very clear. Rule 352 says that a Member shall not make a personal charge or allegation against a member even by quoting from newspapers unless he takes responsibility...

MR. SPEAKER : No question of ruling. This is a question of interpretation of the rules which I am trying to place before you. When the time comes for ruling, then I will give you.

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Mahboobnagar) : We know the rules.

(Interruptions)

But we do not know the accounts...

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY (Katwa) : How he come to know that you are referring to the Member of the House ?

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : What will be the use if all of you speak at a time ? All of you are speaking at a time and I am not getting anything.

[English]

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY (Katwa) : How did he come to know that he was referring to a Member of this House ?

MR. SPEAKER : That, I am to decide, not you. Please sit down.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Please keep in mind that whatever in defamatory or incriminatory or allegatory against any hon. Member of the House shall not form part of the record.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : Not only Members but citizens also. They have a greater right to be protected. He cannot make any allegation against anybody who is not a Member of the House unless it is authenticated...

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : You should not point out the name of any outsider who cannot defend himself in the House.

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Before I proceed further, I may bring to your notice that, before you brought his rule to my notice, I myself had read it. You will recall... (Interruptions) He will bear me out what I have done, knowing fully well. Please inform the House, Sir, that I had already, as required by Rule 353, sent a

[Prof Madhu Dandavate]

letter to you in writing that I might refer to the following individuals...*(Interruptions)*

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : I have to go through it. You please become your seats.

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I am only standing what I have done. All that I am stating is what I have done procedurally. I have sent a letter. I have mentioned certain names. Then I also received a letter from your Secretariat saying that the following things must be done. I have again sent another letter, ten minutes before we started the discussion and in that I have said, if at all I make allegations, if at all, in that case, I will take the responsibility.

MR. SPEAKER : You should satisfy all the requirements...

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I will keep in mind whatever you have stated.

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Why do you anticipate allegations ? Mr. Home Minister, do not anticipate defamation.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (S. BUTA SINGH) : You referred. That is why we are saying.

(Interruptions)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : I will look into it when it happens.

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Now, Sir, something which is not an allegation

but which actually vindicates a clean attitude. Directorate sources confirm that Mithun Chakravarty was the only one to respond having declared that all his expenses were borne by Bachchan. He admitted. No allegation.

(Interruptions)

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT : He cannot do it. It cannot come on record.

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Sir, protect me from both sides.

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT : Prof. Madhu Dandavate, you say you know the rules. You say that you follow the rules, but you actually break them. You do not want to take the responsibility. You say that you are making no charges, but you are making charges.

(Interruptions)

SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN (Bahraich) : Whom are you defending ?

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : One question put by Mr. Arif Mohammad Khan needs to be answered by Mr. Bhagat.

(Interruptions)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : When there are more interruptions, then there is trouble.

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Now let us come to the factual parts without allegations.

On 22nd January 1987, the Finance Minister—I mean the former Finance Minister—brought some file to the Prime Minister.

AN HON. MEMBER : How do you know ?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I take the responsibility. I have given in writing.. (*Interruptions*)...Is it an allegation ? The Finance Minister taking a file to the Prime Minister—is there any allegation, Sir ?

The then Finance Minister carried a file regarding the preliminary investigations and report to the Prime Minister and he wanted—I am not naming—he wanted from the Prime Minister permission to raid certain houses, certain houses—'certain' is not a name, Sir. But that permission was refused and the former Finance Minister returned back from the Prime Minister's office.

AN HON. MEMBER : How do you know ?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I have taken the responsibility. (*Interruptions*) ...Sir, what is the allegation ? What is the defamation ? Sir, you declare 'Prime Minister' is unparliamentary, I will not use the word 'Prime Minister.'

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translations*]

MR. SPEAKER : You one talking of yourself.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I can only talk of myself. How would I talk of them ?

[*English*]

It is impossible for me.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : It is a free country, he can conjecture anything.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Is there any ruling by which even the imagination can be taken away ?

MR. SPEAKER : You can have a flight of imagination.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : This happened on 22nd January 1987. The Finance Minister returned back without any direction to raid; and on 24th, the Finance Minister loses his portfolio... (*Interruptions*)...I don't establish any connection between the two. There is no cause-effect relationship. These are two independent phenomena in space and time and therefore I am not linking up any cause-effect relationship between the two.

[*Translation*]

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF WELFARE (DR. RAJENDRA KUMARI BAJPAI) : What is the basis for that ?

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : You please see me in my chamber.

(*Interruptions*)

I would like to make certain simple queries from the Minister of State for Finance. Is it not a fact that at the end of January and beginning of February, Shri Brahma Dutt, the Minister of State for Finance—this is not an allegation Sir—is it not a fact that he undertook a secret trip to Switzerland and Italy ?

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : Sir, I am on a point of clarification.

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : You reply to all the points, to gether.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : You reply to all the points to gether you note down the points and them reply to all the points together.

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : According to the parliamentary etiquette, the moment the Minister was on his legs I sat down because in this House we cannot be on the four legs simultaneously. I yielded.

MR. SPEAKER : I agree. There, you are very nice.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : But he was made to sit down. Has he got the freedom to say ?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I will now come to the crucial point. It is the question of a file which the Finance Minister takes to the prime Minister which contains important inferences regarding the probing that have been done. I will also quote a precedent and I will also quote the ruling in the 5th Lok Sabha and who fortunately happens to be a Member of this House even today.

Sir, in the Fifth Lok Sabha there was a stormy debate for days together on the import licence scandal. I myself had participated in that. We were demanding that this our information. We were told that "you are incorrect." We said it is our information that the file contained this and there are certain jottings of the Minister. We insisted that if the file cannot be laid on the Table of the House at least the Speaker should ask for the file.

MR. SPEAKER : Or the Minister should be laid on the Table.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : If the Minister is laid on the Table of the House the Table may break. (Interruptions) Therefore, in the Fifth Lok Sabha we said if possible have the summary of that and lay it on the Table of the House. If that is not acceptable—the Opposition was

extremely accommodative as it is today—Opposition suggested to the Speaker, Dr. Dhillon that we suggest as a via media you ask for the file; you ask the Minister to come to your Chamber and then we will come to the Chamber and we should be allowed to examine the file and the jottings and the remarks". And, Sir, in all fairness the then Speaker, Dr. Dhillon, gave the ruling that the Minister may confidentially in my presence share those files with the Leaders of the Opposition. They may look into it. Nobody should take down the notes. You can only examine the files. You can see all the papers but do not take down any thing. But some of the Opposition members who only examined the file had unfortunately very sharp memory and those who were able to examine the file very clearly built up a clear case and it was established that really there were many skeletons in the cupboard. I am not saying that today in the file there are many skeletons. I am talking of the past and not the present. Therefore, my request to you is that you can direct the hon. Minister of the Prime Minister to bring that file which V P Singh ji had brought to his chamber. Let it come to your chamber and please invite us—Leaders of the Opposition. Be hospitable, Sir, and we will try to examine.

MR. SPEAKER : I have been always requesting you but it is only you who rejected this.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I cannot have access to the file directly. There is also precedent and there is a Speaker's ruling and in this House when you have given rulings umpteen times you have quoted the rulings of the Speakers in the past. Probably you might not be remembering this ruling and, therefore, I just pointed out to you that such and such ruling was given in the Fifth Lok Sabha by the then Speaker, Dr. Dhillon and it is exactly appropriate for this occasion and if this file is brought to your chamber I tell you that you will be doing a yeoman's job to democracy and economic life of the country.

SHRI VASANT SATHI ; First, he was having an imaginary flight and now he wants you should get the imaginary file also.

SHRI SOMONATH CHATTERJEE :
How do you know ?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I
accept whatever you offer.

[*Translation*]

SHRI VASANT SATHE : There is a
saying in Marathi.

Bola chich Bhat
Bola chich Khadi.

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE :
Shall I translate what he has said ?

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : No, it was between
both of you.

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : This
being the precedent, I think, there should
be no difficulty at all in going through these
problems. I know, Sir, that you have been
trying to restrain me that I am taking time
but let me tell you these problems are
important not from partisan angle at all. In
the past on such occasions we sat together
and tried to find out a solution. Therefore,
this particular solution which I am pro-
posing if it is accepted—no matter who-
ever be the person or company or an indi-
vidual who has got Swiss account—pro-
bably we will be able to get the correct
picture and that will give the image of this
Lok Sabha as 'Mr. Clean'. I want that
image for this House not only for the indi-
vidual. In this context I want one infor-
mation. Probably I collected from the
newspapers and it might be wrong. Once
I read in the newspapers that a new legisla-
tion has been brought in Switzerland. And
there they had declared that if the Govern-
ment of any country asked for the total
kitty of the accounts in that particular
bank from that country, they would be
prepared to share the information.

SHRI SOMANTH CHATTERJEE :
Brahma Duttji went there and found out.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE
MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND
NATURAL GAS AND MINISTER OF
STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF
FINANCE (SHRI BRAHMA DUTT) :
The leader of the opposition can go to
assist them...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : It
would be very good. It is non-partisan.

If such a legislation has been brought
about, I would only like to seek a clarifi-
cation whether in that case only the total
kitty of the Indians in the Swiss Bank will
be available or further break-up of that
kitty—companywise and individual—wise
—also will be available.

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : You must be
having a copy of that legislation.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE :
These are my notes.

MR. SPEAKER : He is suggesting.
You can take note of the suggestion.

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : I am saying
it with all humility. If you have a
copy, I want it. Otherwise I will get
it.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : If at all
that is the new legislation in Switzerland
that if any Government were to ask for the
total kitty of the accounts along with the
accounts in the particular country, they
would be made available, I only want a
further clarification whether further break-
up individual wise and companywise will
be available. If that is available, Govern-
ment should secure that information, so
that we would know as to what is exactly
happening.

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : That will definitely be
done.

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Sir, I
will conclude with one appeal on behalf of
the entire House and if it comes through

[Prof. Madhu Dandavate]

you, it will be wonderful. Unfortunately, economic offenders from different parts of the country are accumulating their ill-gotten wealth and black wealth as deposits in the Switzerland bank. Let this House raise its unanimous voice and convey that voice to the world that we do not want the beautiful land of Switzerland to become the refuge for the ugly economic offenders not only of this country but any part of the world. And if we can persuade the Switzerland Government to bring the necessary legislation to throw away this ugliness of economic offenders, it will be a great contribution. I hope on that score at least, the entire House will be united and we will give authority to the Speaker to convey our voice with full strength..

MR. SPEAKER : I think the whole House will never disagree with this.

[Translation]

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI BRAHMA DUTT) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise not to reply to debate. I would like to give clarification regarding one thing which has been said about me. I do not consider it as allegation. Perhaps it has been said unknowingly. In January I visited Italy on the invitation of the Minister of Italian Government. I did not go to Switzerland and even did not touch it (Interruptions) I will present my passport and visa tomorrow to Prof. Madhu Dandavate.

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I accept his word that he did not go to Switzerland at all.

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT : He said that. With what sense of responsibility such allegations are made here;

(Interruptions)

SHRI A. CHARLES (Trivandrum) : He said that. He should apologise for it.

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I said that he went to Italy and...

(Interruptions)

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT : Prof. Dandavate is a very generous and sportive person. I hope he shall apologise...

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Sir, I asked him a question whether he went to Italy or Switzerland? He has told me the time table and he has said that he went to Italy and he did not go to Switzerland. I said, all right. What is there?

(Interruptions)

SHRI VASANT SATHE : You made a most undignified aspersion saying that, it was a 'Secret Mission'.

(Interruptions)

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT : He called it a 'Secret Trip'. He said, he went to Switzerland. In this context, it was an aspersion. He must unconditionally apologise.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT : It only shows as to how much responsible you are in your talks.

[English]

SHRI A. CHARLES : He should not be allowed to escape.

(Interruption)

MR. SPEAKER : Jaipal Ji, what are you doing, everybody is imitating you today.

MR. SPEAKER : If somebody allows, then only we can listen anything. To-day, everybody is behaving like a lion.

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT : He is not apologising for what he had said about the secret mission to switzerland. If he does not want to apologise, let him withdraw it and apologise indirectly.

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down, let me, listen to him.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Let one man speak at a time. It is not possible to listen to all of you at a time.

(Interruptions)

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I said, he went to Italy and Switzerland. He said, that I went to Italy only. That is all right.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : You may please withdraw it.

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Sir, I am not charging him ticket for Switzerland.

[Translations]

MR. SPEAKER : You had said that he had gone on a secret mission. You please say that you are withdrawing it.

[English]

Do you withdraw ?

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : Let him speak.

[English]

Will you sit down, the Home Minister would like to say something ? Nobody will like to listen any blackmarketeer here.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (S. BUTA SINGH) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, when Professor Saheb was making this sort of allegations, I had said only this much that allegations should be made with responsibility. I had said at that time that responsibility should be fixed.

[Translation]

SHRI BASUDEV ACHARIA (Bankura) : So what happened.

S BUTA SINGH : Please, just listen to me. You speak for the entire day in this House. You may please listen to me also. The hon. Minister has given his clarification. As regards other evidences, he is going to present the passport etc. tomorrow.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : It is not required.

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : It is not necessary.

[English]

I do not want his passport. I accept his word.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : Please, listen to me. Do not create a pandemonium. Please sit down.

[English]

Will you withdraw that "to Secret Mission" ?

[*Translation*]

You have said that "He had gone on a secret mission."

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Secret Mission ? What is there in that ?

MR. SPEAKER : All right withdrawn. Okay.

[*Translation*]

S. BUTA SINGH : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have not yet completed my submission.

MR. SPEAKER : It is already completed.

S. BUTA SINGH : Let me complete my sentence please. I had said that allegations should be made with responsibility. Then, Professor Saheb said that he is making allegations with responsibility. Now, responsibility demands that after the reply of the hon. Minister, Professor Saheb should withdraw his allegation.

MR. SPEAKER : It has already been withdrawn.

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I say he has not gone. I do not want to see his passport. When he says he had not gone to Switzerland, I accept it.

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : Why do you shout ? Why do you not allow me to listen ?

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I am not charging him the air journey fare to Switzerland. I have noted that he has gone only to Italy. That is all.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : This is wrong. What does he say ? He makes a wild allegation. Let me explain.

MR. SPEAKER : Now he has withdrawn the words 'secret mission'.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : No, Sir. He accepts the word of the Minister. Who is he to see the passport ?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I do not want you, Sir, to be disciplined by him. He is asking you to do that ; he is asking you to do something.....

MR. SPEAKER : You said 'secret mission'.....

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : That is all right ; that is my contention. That can be the interpretation. I do not think 'secretly' means clandestinely, without a passport. That is not the political connotation of the word 'secret'. It means without tomtomming, and all that. For what purpose they are going, is announced, generally when people go. It is so, when any Minister goes. I was a Minister. When I went, for instance, to a foreign country for the funeral of the President of a country, it was announced that I was going for that particular purpose.

MR. SPEAKER : It is all a question of insinuation, Mr. Professor.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : He has made an allegation against the hon. Minister. Now, he should, like a gentleman, withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER : One minute ; Mr. Professor...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : No withdrawal.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : Like a sportsman, he should.....

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Professor, one minute.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I am not ; excepting the fact that I accept that he has not gone to Switzerland I am not going to withdraw a single word of what I had said. (*Interruptions*) I am not going to withdraw a single line.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Professor, I am asking you one thing.

[*Translation*]

We do not gain anything by doing so. Why do all of you speak together ?

[*English*]

It is unnecessarily wasting the time of the House.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Professor, do you mean to say that you did not make any insinuation ?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : No.

[*Translation*]

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : The hon. Member is quite senior to me. I have great regards for him...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Why do you interrupt ?

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : He has said that the visit was a secret one and I had gone to Switzerland, I shall present the entire programme before you tomorrow... (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER : That he has already withdrawn.

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : Please listen to me fully. I am sending the whole programme, my passport and visa to you and you may please decide if all these things which have been said here just now were justified or not. If these things have been said wrongly and if I actually do not have any document, what will be my position under these circumstances then. I depend on you and entrust the charge of protecting my honour to you.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Sir, did I say that he went without a passport ?

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : Let him have his say. You are doing quite a wrong thing.

[*English*]

It is among us three : the professor, the Minister and myself. I am listening to him. On this side we have the hon. Minister, on the other we have Professor Dandavate. Let us decide the matter.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : There is no question of an insinuation.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : All that was said by Prof. Dandavate was..... (*Interruptions*)

15.00 hrs.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRATAP BHANU SHARMA (Vidisha) : What are we going to discuss here ? He should prove those things. We have to decide about it here. (*Interruptions*)
SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : What is happening in the House ?

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : If you please resume your seat, we will be able to decide.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : I said one thing that no insinuation against the hon. Minister can be tolerated, whosoever makes such an insinuation. Please listen to me, and you may please resume your seat.

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : No insinuation. I want to give a clarification.

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : You may please listen to me.

[*English*]

You did not mean.....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VASANT SATHE : He said, he went as a Minister on a secret mission. If it cannot be an insinuation, what else is it ?

(Interruptions)

]Translations]

MR. SPEAKER : You colleagues do not allow me to listen to your views. What can I do.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Bhanu Pratap, you may please sit down.

English]

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : Was his visit secret or not ?

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I still hold that his visit was a secret one and it was not announced by the political circle. That is no insinuation. (Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : They want to scuttle the discussion.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : Please look, am I interrupting ? You are interrupting.

[English]

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Will the time of the House be not wasted like this ?

MR. SPEAKER : It will not be wasted like this.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : They do not want a discussion.

MR. SPEAKER : The only thing which I wanted earlier also and I want it again is this. I will also draw the attention of the hon. member Prof. Dandavate to this fact that whatever facts they have and they

are sure of them, they should state them. By stating that he had gone there..... (Interruptions) Order please.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : If it is an incriminating remark or an alleged action of a defamation... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Please listen to me. I am saying this Better if you are on a firm wicket when you say something. We know that something has happened. It might be an observation. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

Please do not mistake my words to be an abuse. It is not a good thing.

[English]

If somebody takes it like that, I will not allow that.

AN HON. MEMBER : It may be a general observation.

MR. SPEAKER : There is no question of a general observation. Some people feel offended at a general observation.

[Translation]

Whatever you want to do, please do it in a proper way. Please do not talk in this manner. It is a bad thing. It is not a right thing.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : It is all right. Don't shout.

[Translation]

He will say that allegation is made on one or the other. If somebody feels bad about it, then why should you say this thing.

[English]

I will not approve of this and also I warn other members that what they are saying should be true. I am also asking Prof. Dandavate that until and unless he

is sure, he should not say anything. It might be untrue. I will not approve of that.

(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (DR. G. S. DHILLON) : Prof. Dandavate, while speaking, quoted me as having allowed some files to be called by me and then asking the opposition parties to examine it. I very well remember that so many things have happened. But as a former Speaker, I did not express my opinion any time in this House. But I remember that in the case of Tul Mohan's case or L. N. Mishra's case.....

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Tul Mohan Ram's case.

DR. G. S. DHILLON : Yes, Tul Mohan Ram's case. There was some controversy about a C. B. I. report and I asked both the leaders of the House—and the opposition it happened to be Shri Morarji Desai at that time and on this side Shrimati Indira Gandhi for a meeting in any chamber we discussed the matter and both of them agreed to a certain procedure that the particular point in C. B. I. file could be examined in my presence.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : That is right.

DR. G. S. DHILLON : That was only on agreement on both the sides.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : What is there to shout about in it ? What is happening ? (Interruptions) What is happening to you people ?

[English]

Order, order. Please sit down. Professor Sahib, do you not remember ? I did the same. Prof. Dandavate came to me.

[Translation]

I did the same in the Bombay case, I remember it.

(Interruptions)

Please sit down.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Dinesh Singh.

[Translation]

It is nothing new.

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I fully support what Dr. Dhillon has said.

(Interruptions)

SHRI DINESH SINGH (Pratapgarh) : Mr. Speaker, Sir...

MR. SPEAKER : Remain within bounds, all of you. I will not allow anything to go on record.

(Interruptions)

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Mr. Speaker, Sir, for some months now an impression is sought to be created that there was some kind of an investigation going on, initiated by the Ministry of Finance which touched upon some sensitive nerves and certain consequential actions were taken.

Now, I am very glad that Prof. Madhu Dandavate has brought this Motion before the House and given an opportunity to state the facts so that this kind of wrong information must come to an end and the effort that is made to create a credibility gap about the Government must be stopped. To that extent, we should all thank Prof. Madhu Dandavate and Mr. Jaipal Reddy.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE ; Thank you.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : If you would have a look..... (*Interruptions*) Do you have any objection, Professor ?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I acknowledge with thanks.

[*Translation*]

S. BUTA SINGH : He will apologise to you.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : He will never ask for it. It is the difference between you and him.

[*English*]

S. BUTA SINGH : I am sure, you will do it. You are very honest.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI DINESH SINGH : The discussion today, listed in the Order Paper under Rule 193 reads as follows :

"To raise a discussion on the engaging of the U. S. economic intelligence agency Fairfax group by the Ministry of Finance for investigation of cases of Indians having huge illegal funds abroad."

I had expected the distinguished Professor to bring certain information before the House both about the agency employed and about the possible cases so that this House would have had more information and Government would have had greater opportunity to look into these cases. It is a matter of some regret that, and I hold the Professor in high esteem and always looked forward to getting information from him, but ..

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI AMAL DATTA (Diamond Harbour): Do not confuse him with Fairfax case.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : He is not Fairfax.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I must say I am considerably disappointed.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI AMAL DATTA : The file has not been disappointing.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Amal Datta. Do not disturb. Order, order.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I must say that I am considerably disappointed that the Professor threw no light on the agency concerned, whether the appointment of this agency was desirable or undesirable ; whether this agency was competent to undertake this kind of investigation or not, who are the people involved in this agency. Nor was he able to quote any instance, give any lead which the Government could follow. He talked of some file over which there have been some exchanges on both sides of the House. I do not think that there was any serious information in it because if there was any information... (*Interruptions*) I am merely saying that if there was such a file, if there was some information in it and if the Professor had got to know of the file, I am sure, he would have got to know of the information also. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Then Mr. Dandavate would have been prosecuted under the Official Secrets Act.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I do not regard Prof. Madhu Dandavate as a light Member of this House, who would merely go for something printed in some innocuous magazine or newspaper of somewhere else... (*Interruptions*) I feel that when he comes before this House, he comes with his personal prestige and dignity. But I am sorry to say that that has been lacking this afternoon.

The Professor made out a case that the Indian investigative machinery was not adequate to inquire into the affairs of foreign companies and, therefore, a foreign investigative agency had to be appointed. He quoted some case of Maharani Gayatri

Devi's theft being investigated. I do not think the two link up at all. It is all right for a detective agency to go into the question of theft. But it is entirely a difference question of some agency being asked to go into economic investigation of certain serious matters.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Just to correct, not only theft but following that her assets abroad were also investigated.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I have no knowledge, no information of any investigation of any assets. And if the professor has, then he will, no doubt, inform the House in greater details.

It is customary to undertake these inquiries as the professor himself has said under some Indian agency. I can understand that the CBI or Revenue Intelligence may wish to find out something in any other country for which they may not have adequate machinery. But it should be inquired into by an Indian investigative agency through an outside agency. I think that it is extremely strange that the Ministry itself should appoint an agency without going through an Indian investigative agency. And I would like the hon. Minister to clarify this position whether the Ministry had asked a foreign investigative agency to look into the matter through an Indian investigative agency, the CBI of revenue intelligence or whatever other machinery the Government have or whether the Ministry had gone direct to that Agency, I think, it is a serious matter.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : I am in agreement with you.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I am glad that the hon. Member agrees with me. I have certain fears in cases of inquiry by foreign investigative agencies. Once it is done through our agency, they have an expertise to find out what part of the report that they are getting has credibility. What part of it is disinformation. I do not think the Ministry has this expertise to do so and, therefore, if the Ministry has taken

this step, I would regard it as a very dangerous step and I hope the Government would clarify and assure the House that such steps would not be taken in the future. Why do I say this? Let us look at the picture of Fairfax. What is the Fairfax company? I would like the Government to clarify whether they looked into background of the Fairfax investigative group, whether they found out that it has the requisite competence to go into the economic matters. From what has appeared in the newspapers—and the Professor has, no doubt, read that—this agency was more of a kind of a political investigative agency which had gone into the Watergate and other scandals. This is where my fear comes that all these agencies are linked with their intelligence agencies in their own country. I do not know. I would not wish to make any allegation against any company outside or here, but I would like to know whether their background was looked into, whether some kind of an assurance was sought and obtained that it did not have links with the CIA. If it had links with the CIA, there was serious danger of disinformation being passed on to us which could seriously affect the reputation of important people in this country, including the people on the Treasury Benches...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI : Mr. Singh, why a man who really brought this agency, has now been put in the Defence Ministry?...

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : If he does that in Defence, there, would be more danger to the stability of the country

(Interruptions)

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI : Why that man has now been put in the Defence? Will you kindly explain? ...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Sir, I thought that this discussion was a non-partisan discussion ...*(Interruptions)*.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I agree, Sir, that it is a non-partisan discussion because though their Finance Ministry took the decision, he is criticising. I think it is really non-partisan.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Now, Sir, the difficulty is that Prof. Dandavate, when in Government, regards the Ministry as his own and now he tells me that it is my Finance Ministry. I do not make any claim to any agency of the Government to be mine. I believe, it belongs to the country—as much to the professor as to us or to the Government. It is merely a question of who has the opportunity to work it, and we have all, from time to time, had that to time, had that opportunity.

The point that I was raising was that—I am not making any allegation...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI S JAIPAL REDDY : He is making insinuations.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I am not even making a submission. I am merely stating my fear and I hope Mr. Jaipal Reddy would also only express his fear and not make allegations.

Now, the point is that if a delicate matter of investigation into the affairs of companies, of individuals; is entrusted directly to foreign agencies whose own backgrounds are not quite clear, then what we might get is a set of disinformation engineered by somebody from outside. And what will be the result ? ...

(Interruptions)

SHRI NARAYAN CHAUBEY : What are those delicate matters, will he kindly quote ?

[Translation]

SHRI DINESH SINGH : The problem of hon. Shri Choubey is this that they have got big success in elections. He is thinking of there and not of here.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : That is already over.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : He is still worried because he does not think that it is over.

[English]

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I would like the Government to examine this matter very carefully. Why ? Because certain statements have been made by the Chairman of this Company which worries me.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Which is that paper ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : This is the statement published from your part of the world.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : You accept it.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I am not accepting. I am accepting the quotations that they have made and I hope responsible paper with Headquarters in Calcutta would also...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Which is more acceptable than the others.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : "Our mission was given to us by the Government through Mr. Bhure Lal and I understand was cleared at the highest level by the Finance Ministry."

Now, this shows that this was not processed through the normal investigative agency of the country.

Then, the agency goes into certain value judgment and this is what creates doubt in my mind, It says-

"A terrible injustice seems to have been done not only to Mr. Gurumurthy but to Mr. Goenka and also to Mr. Bhure Lal".

He has already decided that some injustice has been done to them. This is the economic investigation that the agency has undertaken.

I believe Mr. Bhure Lal to be the extremely honest and dedicated law enforcement official. In this country it would be incenceivable that the senior law enforcement official would be removed from his post for doing his job.

He has come to certain political conclusions for which it was not, I hope, employed and yet it has gone into that and it does not stop there. It makes allegation against the Prime Minister and against others. This is what worries me—whether the purpose of this agency was to go into any kind of economic investigation or prepare a political case against the Government, against the Prime Minister, against various other people ?

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : What a wonderful conclusion;

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : This is an oblique insinuation against Shri V. P. Singh.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Unlike the Professor I make no insinuation. Mine is a simple query and a simple statement and I hope Professor will not read more into it than what I have said.

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I accept your contention but the Chair must accept your contention.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Professor has then said—why was the Prime Minister not consulted ? I think that is also a serious matter.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I said—whether he was consulted and if not, why was he not consulted ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : In his usual manner he said something in a different way.

I am only picking up the point where he left it. You do not realise in how much admiration I hold the Professor.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Then you will be divulging secrets, although I know you have been told.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Professor asked questions in his usual insinuating manner that the Prime Minister was not consulted, possibly because it would be embarrassing for him. Now this in itself is a very serious insinuation that he is making. That means that the Finance Minister was doing something behind the back of the Prime Minister which would embarrass the Prime Minister and he would not divulge it at that time but cook up a story at the end and present it to the Prime Minister as a kind of blackmail.

(Interruptions)

SHRI DINESH SINGH : This is a very serious insinuation. I hope that it will be adequately cleared up that there was no such attempt because the Cabinet works as one team. Professor, you know it yourself, although unfortunately, it breaks up at times. But it does function with one voice while it lasts and the Prime Minister is the head and the captain of the team. *(Interruptions)* No member of the capined would wish to do a thing like that because the Prime Minister is the captain. He must be kept fully informed of all action that is taken by any member which is of consequence. His Permission should be sought when it is required—the rules for Government's functioning. But whatever the rules of functioning, the Prime Minister must be kept fully informed because each Minister holds his job.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : At the pleasure of the Prime Minister...

SHRI DINESH SINGH : At the pleasure of the President on the recommendation of the Prime Minister *(Interruptions)* In a serious discussion like this, I am not bringing in any pleasure at all. I am bringing to the notice the duty and obligation and therefore, Sir, I think this kind of allegation is unfortunate and serious and I hope that it will be adequa-

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY . Allegations against whom ? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DINESH SINGH : If I am not able to explain this position to the House in the last few minutes, I am sorry for the hon. Member, Shri Jaipal Reddy. I could not take up the time of the House again to repeat it. Perhaps you could read it tomorrow when the proceedings come to you. (*Interruptions*) Why I am afraid about this is that Mr. Hirshman who is apparently the President Fairfax Group Limited has said that they were also certain letters which were supposed to have been written by the Fairfax, were forged by the CBI. Sir, this is my fear whether the letters were forged by the CBI or whether this Company passed on information to the CBI. This is the kind of fear that one has about.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : They were not saying that they had done so.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I am only referring to what appeared in the newspapers (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Let them show the letters where the Fairfax quoted.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I am not yielding and I do not know why Mr. Jaipal Reddy is taking upon himself to defend the company what connection do you have with Fairfax ?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Sir, on a point of order. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I am not yielding, Mr. Jaipal Reddy. He will have his own time to explain. (*Interruptions*). Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would not wish to take up the time of the House any longer. My fears have been expressed before this House and before you and I feel that the Government will have an opportunity to explain the position. I have only wanted this House to bear in mind that it is very easy to destroy people's reputation and

people's position by such a kind of careless entrustment of responsibility to unknown agency. It is very difficult to rebuild it, Sir. It is very easy to produce any kind of a statement of account from a bank about any hon. Member. All that is necessary is to put his name on a piece of paper over the name of the person whose account it may be, photostat it, and it will take the hon. Member his life time to explain that it is not his account. So these kinds of things happen because disinformation is a part of the foreign Intelligence patently determined to destabilise the Government in other countries and therefore, we should be careful about it. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Madhav Reddi. You take only 12 minutes, Sir. Now I will go by the time.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Vishwanath Pratap Singh will lose Defence portfolio also.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Bhure Lal will be arrested.

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (S. BUTA SINGH) : Your case is being pleaded.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : After that he will join your party ;

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI C. MADHAV REDDI (Adilabad) : Sir, I will not refer to any documents or even newspaper reports which have been very extensively quoted here. Sir, what emerges out of the discussion is .. (*Interruptions*). Pleased let me speak....the typical style of functioning of our Government. I do not make any distinction between the Finance Minister and the Prime Minister.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Order please. Order in the House.

SHRI C. MADHAV REDDI : For me both are same.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : If anybody wants to leave, please leave. Otherwise, sit quietly.

SHRI C. MADHAV REDDI : It is their collective responsibility. If something happens which is wrong in the Ministry of Finance, the Prime Minister is equally responsible for this.

Sir, I was listening to the speech of the esteemed Member of this House, Mr. Dinesh Singh. It was more a selfcondemnation. He was accusing the Finance Ministry of the Enforcement Directorate, that means, the Ministry. If something wrong has happened, the Ministry is responsible. Now it is the Ministry, it is the Government that has appointed the Fairfax Company. Now, today he says, that was wrong. If the Fairfax Company is not trusted because they had connections with the CIA and others and with the American Intelligence firms, then who is responsible for it? Why was it done in the first instance? I do not refer to the so-called file which was taken by the Finance Minister to the Prime Minister. Whether the file may exist or it may not exist we are not concerned with that, but I feel that if the Finance Minister has taken some action or his officers have taken some action, the Prime Minister is equally responsible.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Panika, this is no conclave time here. Don't be irresponsible.

SHRI C. MADHAV REDDI : If the American agency today is being suspected and if they are talking of the Watergate scandal, I have seen a statement that another Watergate scandal is going to be unearthed in India. That is the statement given from the Fairfax United States. Now, if that happens, who is responsible for this? I feel that there is something wrong with the functioning of the Enforcement Directorate, I say this, because.

[Translation]

In Hindi there is a saying which means that one should not befriend a thief to catch a thief.

AN HON. MEMBER : That has to be done.

SHRI C. MADHAV REDDI : No, you take help and not make friendship.

MR. SPEAKER : He is acquainted with the Police since a long time. He know it.

(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI C. MADHAV REDDI : Now this Enforcement Directorate which was handling this affair for the last two years, people think that there was no secrecy at all maintained. All manner of people were associated with the investigation. I do not want to take the names. Why should I take the names? The names have already come on record. At one point of time, one set of people, another point of time another set of people were there. What is this? Why should you have any private people, whether Pressmen or any other businessmen or associated with any type of enquiry of such a sensitive nature. I am simply surprised. What is this type of functioning? Now the point is that these things have happened. Now, we want that whatever investigation has been done by this agency, the record should be placed on the Table of the House. We should know what has happened. We should know who are those persons who have taken the capital from India and converted it into foreign exchange by violating the foreign exchange rules by various means, by receiving kickback or by over-invoicing or under-invoicing. All types of malpractices have been indulged in by several people in this country and this is going on for a number of years and today a lot of our capital is in the foreign country. The flight of capital from this country is a very very big drain on the economy and we are all concerned about it, when these matters were discussed.

[Shri C. Madhav Reddi]

The intention of the Finance Ministry was perfectly right. But then, how to achieve that objective? It is because for a good objective, you must also employ good means. You cannot adopt certain irregular and questionable methods for achieving the same objective. For punishing a person for the violation of FERA, you should not indulge in FERA violation yourself.

Now, a mention has been made about the payment to the agency. Some hon. Members have been telling that the agency was not made any payment at all in foreign exchange, we do not know that. It is surprising that without any payment, the agency was working for the last one and a half years to two years. I do not know how they were meeting their own expenditure. If any payment has been made in foreign exchange, then certainly it is a violation of the foreign exchange regulations unless it has been brought to the notice of the Ministry, unless the Finance Secretary or the Finance Minister has approved the sanctioning of the foreign exchange or the Reserve Bank of India has done so. As far as my knowledge goes, no such permission was given. No payment has been made officially. It means, somebody has made the payment. Who is that man? Why should he make the payment? If such a payment has been made, then naturally, there must be some purpose behind this. These are the points which have to be investigated thoroughly and the Government as a whole and the Prime Minister, should take the responsibility today he cannot say, "I was not responsible for this; the Finance Ministry was doing this without my knowledge." No, I am not prepared to accept this. It is a collective responsibility. The entire responsibility has to be borne by the Prime Minister. And then, a thorough investigation must be made and the report of this agency must be placed on the Table of the House. We would like to know who are those people who are maintaining secret accounts in Swiss banks. It is said that about Rs. 1700 crores worth of foreign exchange is there in the Swiss Banks. Another account says that it would go even to Rs. 30,000 crores

worth of foreign exchange. I do not know. If that is the case, if we go by these reports, then it is an alarming situation and I feel that the House has got the right to know as to who are those people who have violated the foreign exchange rules.

Now, regarding this agency still being in service, I do not know whether they are still in service, whether they are still doing the job. They have not been dismissed so far. They are claiming, "We are their clients". Are we their clients even today, I would like to know. What is the Government doing, if as Mr. Dinesh Singh says, these are the people not to be trusted because of their shady background etc.? I do not know. In that case, where is the case to continue to engage them? I do not think that there is anything wrong in engaging a foreign agency. There is nothing wrong in that. We do not have our own people there. Certainly, a foreign agency can do a better job in a foreign country. But there must be proper job specifications. There should be proper terms and conditions worked out and they should know what are their limitations. They should also know how to keep the secrets and so on and so forth.

I am sure the new Finance Minister is going to look into all these matters and see that nothing wrong is going to happen and there is not going to be any future complication because of this episode and the information collected by these agencies is kept secret and it is not divulged so that we may keep secret the information in our possession.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT (Arrah): Sir, I had expected the debate to follow the noble objective contained in the subject matter, the subject being to unearth, to find out the huge funds which escaped the law of the FERA and were illegally accumulated outside. This was the subject. I had appealed right at the beginning that the tone should be such that the attention of the entire House should be directed and the hon. Members agreed with it. I have been saying in this House again and again that this Parliament always allows all questions where national interest is involved and on all such question we rise as one

party. Why then today, I ask my friend Prof. Madhu Dandavate, for whom I have a special regard, raised the issues whether the investigating machinery is adequate or not, did we hire the foreign agencies and was it in order or not. But he did not go into it except that he mentioned some Swiss law. But if he had given the details, he would have found the answer himself. I would give the details.

The third aspect is coordination and correlation between the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister. He entirely dwelt on this and I was shocked to find that he has even exceeded the limits.

He is the greatest champion for decorum, for observance of rules and regulations. But today he has departed. Why is there insinuation? One thing he said about the Minister. There is a tradition between Members. We are all hon. Members. When a Minister denies things, he says "You made a secret." I am glad that he has withdrawn it.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I have withdrawn Switzerland, not secret.

MR. SPEAKER : Have you withdrawn Switzerland from the Atlas map ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : He dwelt mainly on the aspect of coordination or correlation between the Prime Minister and the Finance Ministry. But there again he departed, I am sorry, from the high norms which he always followed. He said on a particular date, in January or so, that the Finance Minister took a file and the file was not endorsed, approved, and then, next day, the Finance Minister was removed. He follows logic. He must have read it. If the major premise of a logical system is wrong, the conclusion is also wrong. Now, Mr. Sathe has said that it is a wild imagination. He has accepted it. He cannot prove it. There is no file, as it has been borne out. There was no meeting. There was no record.... (Interruptions)

Therefore, now he says that the Prime Minister's removal of him is related to the non-endorsement of his proposals on this matter.

You cannot see what is what if you go astray. I only feel about what my colleague Shri Dinesh Singh said about—Prof. Madhu Dandavate for once—I say for once—he is always very particular, careful marshalls his facts so nicely, comes to conclusion carefully and always follows the national interest, for which he is known now. But today, I am sorry to say he may have some interest to damage some-body's reputation. But in the process, his own reputation for probity his high standards were damaged.....

(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS, AND MINISTER OF FOOD AND CIVIL SUPPLIES (SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT) : He should sympathise with Shri Madhu Dandavate.

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I would say that all should stand in silence for one minute.

MR. SPEAKER : I want this for that date...

(Interruptions)

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : What has happened is this as Shri Dinesh Singh has said that he is a victim of the massive disinformation going in on this matter. If you take any aspect of this matter of disinformation...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Mabbubnagar) : Mr. Bhagat himself is a victim of disinformation...

(Interruptions)

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I cannot reply to what I have not followed.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : He is standing victim of international disinformation...

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Many of us can be victims of disinformation. But we should not use disinformation to bring up charges which are nothing to prove. This is what happened in this case. The major issue is, you know, that there are certain issues about which the whole country want to know, the House want to know about the details. Why a private foreign agency, an investigating agency was appointed? Was it in order or not? That is the point. If you follow the practice, if you see the practice that it has been done—the hon. Member has said that it has been done in the past—even by the Janata Government of which Mr. Madhu Dandavate was a part. I think there is *per se* nothing wrong in hiring a private detective agency which follows the guidelines indicated by our official agency. Our agencies, the CBI or the IB agencies appointed by the House by the Parliament. They have the constitutional stand. If you know it, I had the honour of bringing this Foreign Exchange Act. Under this, he is the investigating officer. Usually, in the beginning when he was a senior police officer of the highest rank, he was appointed as Director. Therefore, under the guidelines, *per se*, it is done.

(*Interruptions*)

He has raised an important question. It needs to be clarified. The Investigating Officer, under the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act, passed by this Parliament, amended and improved, renovated by this Parliament repeatedly since the 1950s, the Director has the power—You may call the Central Bureau of Investigation or the IB, he has got the power. May be it is called the Directorate of Economic Offences. Under the direction, which is authorised by law, by Parliament here, if any private agency is asked to investigate, help in supporting the investigating machinery, there is nothing wrong, *per se*, against it. What has happened in this case is : how he was appointed? It is for the Government to say. I do not know. He has said that it was done in the past. I quote that it was done by the Janata Government. It has been done so. These matter should be absolutely made clear that there is nothing wrong in merely appointing a private detective agency or an investigating agency. It is done under the

frame-work of our laws and regulations. This is one point.

Secondly, about who was this man, Mr. Dinesh Singh has gone into this. He has said so many things. But I will say only one thing. Prof. Dandavate quoted Mr. Hirshman. The other aspect, he has not quoted. (*Interruptions*) He has not quoted him in full. Mr. Hirshman has made certain remarks which are insulting to this country and to which every Indian must object. Prof. Dandavate just ignores it. He says that there will be Watergate in this country, this particular thing should be done or should not be done. He comes from a country where it is the habit to interfere into how the affairs of the Government should be run, how the law should be administered. Will not Prof. Dandavate object to that? Is it in order? I say, it is insulting, it should be totally repudiated. What does he mean when he says that there will be Watergate in this country? Can there be Watergate here? I ask the hon. Members here. So long as we follow our system of Government or for that matter, the system of government in the United Kingdom, can there be Watergate in this country or, for that matter, in the United Kingdom? There can be Watergate in the United States of America. There, the Executive is separated from the Legislature, but not in India, not in the United Kingdom. (*Interruptions*) Yes, come on, if you have the facts, if you have understood the process (*Interruptions*) Nothing can be done here so as to create a condition of Watergate in our system. That is the point I am making. You take the history. We have Prime Minister. Watergate is related to the Chief Executive. It is related to no one else. When he said Watergate, he means the Prime Minister of this country. Watergate is related to President Nixon. There can be a President Nixon to face it. But we have Prime Ministers here, including Shri Morarji Desai, not all of the Congress—Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, Shri Morarji Desai. Now we have Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi. Can you say or can anybody in the whole world say any such thing about our Prime Ministers? Our Prime Ministers have set the highest standards. They never speak

the untruth, they cannot do anything wrong. Why? Because we have a vigilant Parliament where the accountability is not remote. I am sorry, this is one point on which I differ from Mr. Vasant Sathe. He is advocating the Presidential system, but I am not because in the Presidential system the accountability is remote and, therefore, a situation like that of Watergate can be created there. But here the accountability to Parliament is not monthly or weekly, but daily, every hour; the Prime Minister is accountable to Parliament and to the people every day, every hour. Even if he makes a wrong move, he will be caught, he will be hauled up. Imagine in a country...

SHRI VASANT SATHE : Sir, I am on a personal explanation. I have never advocated presidential form of Government. I don't know where my good Hon. friend Mr. B. R. Bhagat got that;

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : This is one of the disinformation.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : I have only said that we should have a directly elected chief executive within the framework of our Constitution.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : What does it mean?

MR. SPEAKER : I will not allow a constitutional debate here.

(Interruptions)

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : My advice to my friends on the other side is that they should reject, repudiate, the remark of the Chairman of the Fairfax that there will be Watergate here. They have got no business to interfere in our administrative system as to which is good here or which can take care of us. Our record is second to none in the world. Therefore, nobody need advise us...*(Interruptions)*

Mr. Madhu Dandavate made a reference that now the House should consider

seriously the law passed by the Switzerland Government. Earlier there was a law. I know, during the Janata Government period, when they wanted to investigate certain accounts, they sent their emissary to that country, Mr. Madhu Dandavate also knows it, but they said nothing. Those people said that you give us the details; but they said that they cannot give it; our law is such that we have no control over our banks. This is what the Swiss Government told them. They should have known it. But ignorant as they were they sent their man there; but they said that who are you, we don't have any control over our banks, they don't function under us and we cannot force them.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : That is why he did not go to Switzerland;

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Since then it is a fact that law has been changed; but changed for what? This is what we should know. This has been changed merely to give information where there is a specific case of a large-scale defraud indulged by a group. The Government will be able to tell you more. For example, the mafia group operating in the US with links elsewhere were collecting huge funds as a criminal activity. They allowed the information to be given to the U. S. Government. The second case on a request the former President Marco's funds which were frozen. Whatever funds were there, they were frozen. If the Swiss Government allows all this, all the money will fly away out of the Swiss bank and they will be bankrupt.

The point I want to focus is that it is a purely economic matter, although economics has turned today political economy and it is not pure economics. So, I don't segregate the politics from economics. But it should not be made, as I earlier began, a partisan politics. It is much too serious a matter on facts. The insinuation that has been brought against high personalities—direct or indirect—they are not true and they should not be indulged in.

Let us emphasize, let us ask the Government as to what are they going to do. This is a fact. Rs. 30000 crores and

[Shri B. R. Bhat]

all that is a wishful thinking. But there is a solid report by the International Monetary Fund which speaks very carefully of fiduciary deposits—not the other deposits—to the extent of Rs. 1325 crores or something in the Swiss accounts.

16.00 hrs.

They have said so. That is one base. There may be other basis, other money and other deposits. Let the House direct the Government or let us all together say that this is a matter of huge proportion and one who indulges in black-market or black money here the House is one in pursuing them whoever he may be. If they are indulging in serious offences let us pursue them but do not bring in all. This is not an issue on which to raise all the insinuations or mud. Let us not indulge in a mud slinging match amongst ourselves. Let us together pin-point how the matter helps the Government in pursuing this so that this matter can be settled boldly and effectively.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur) : Sir, I am unhappy that the Government has not responded with the seriousness which this subject relates to because according to me the debate raises very important questions and serious questions concerning the method of functioning of the Government and also the integrity and security of this country.

Now it is admitted that the Government of India engaged a foreign investigative agency for discharging some function of the Government. There is no dispute on that. But what is of concern to us very much is that a country has been chosen and a concern has been chosen from a country whose imperialist designs are very well known. USA is keen to destabilise the security and integrity of this country. It is very well established and inspite thereof it appears now from Shri Dinesh Singh's speech and Shri Bhat's speech that there was really no investigation about that investigating agency itself. Whether it was a fit and proper concern or what are its connections with the American agencies like CIA

and FBI, it appears, nobody knows. Now, therefore, a concern from an imperialist country like America has been chosen to investigate into very serious matters concerning our economy—economy in the sense that crores and crores of rupees which should be here in our country are being kept elsewhere.

Unfortunately, it seems that Government of India after 40 years of Independence and with so many Ministeries, so many Directorates, so many ministers—three—quarter ministers, full ministers and half ministers—have been unable to find out any agency in India for the purpose of making investigation under an Indian law. This is very important. Today we are being told in 1987 that if we go to a foreign country what does it matter. So there is a clear admission that we have not been able to build up the minimum infrastructure to find out violation of our law by Indians or non-resident Indians in foreign countries. Therefore, I submit, this is a matter of a serious nature and instead of trying to find out whether Prof. Madhu Dandavate has been trying to sling mud at others why don't you search your own heart and put your own house in order and make it clear to the people of this country. For six weeks or ten weeks everyday responsible newspapers, responsible magazines and journals have been publishing stories about this. I use the word 'story' but what is the reaction of this Government? People have been fed on that and I should have thought Government would have welcomed this opportunity to come with concrete evidence and take the people of this country into confidence. You do not do that and try to make Prof. Dandavate the scape goat.

AN HON. MEMBER : We are not making a scapegoat of him.

(Interruptions)

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT : We have the highest regard for Prof. Madhu Dandavate. There is no question of making him a scapegoat... (Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Sir, I very strongly express our opposition to the selection of this type of an agency and for that matter an agency from a country

whose ability to destabilise through diverse means, governments and systems in other countries, specially like ours is well-known. Therefore, this is my emphatic protest against this attempt.

Now comes the second question. You have selected an agency and you have given it an appointment. I would like to know as to when such appointment was made. What were the methodologies of that appointment? Which Ministry decided to make that appointment? Before making that appointment, what attempt was made to find out the credentials of that agency? Has it got the expertise for making investigations into economic offences? Mr. Dinesh Singh pertinently raised this point. It is supposed to be an expert in making political investigations, of Watergate type. Well, we do not know whether there are many Watergates in our cupboards in this country too; Many skeletons may come out of it.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Do not feel so touchy. I only said, 'may come'.

Secondly, I would like to know as to what was the actual job assigned to it. At the time of assignment of the job, were they asked to make inquiries with regard to named individuals or concerns and not generally finding out about blackmoney elsewhere? What were the terms and conditions for making payment for the job to be done? Immediately out of this arises a question as to whether any payment has been made and if so how much, how and when. And 'how' should also include 'by whom'. It is a very important matter. I am sure, you are taking it seriously Brahma Duttji. Please take it seriously. Don't be flippant.

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : I take everything coming from you in all seriousness.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : I would like to know as to the level of the government at which the decision to appoint the agency was taken. Was it at the bureaucratic—Secretaries' level? Or was it taken at the Minister's level? In

the Finance Ministry, was it at the Minister of State's level or at the Union Finance Minister's level? Or, was it at the Prime Minister's level—in the sense, was it a Cabinet decision? Or was there any particular Sub-Committee which appointed this agency? I would like to know all this because it is very important to take the country into confidence. Who were the persons who happened to be the privies with regard to this appointment? At what level of the Government are they functioning?

I would like to know if it was not known to the Government at the highest level, about this appointment until they have started their forays and made considerable progress. I mention this because some publications stated that the appointment was made in September 1985. When was it known to the highest level of the Government in this country? Was the Prime Minister's Secretariat consulted about it? If they did not know about it initially, when did they come to know of it?

Sir, I would like to know whether any information was given by this country, by our Government, to these agencies to make further probe on that basis? Was any classified information given to them to make further enquiries? I would like to know whether I hope, you will please answer this—I am not exhausted as yet, you don't get excited...

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : I don't get excited.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : I would like to know whether any report has been given by this agency to the Government of India, till date? If any report has been given, I would like to know from you, when and to whom that report was given? May I know whether any person—I am sure, you will shield them—or the concern has been named, who has or has hoarded blackmoney in foreign countries? I hope, you will please take this House into confidence and tell us, what is this report about? If the matter rested there, the country would not have been so perturbed as what had happened subsequently. It is

[Shri Somnath Chatterjee]

well-known that in this country large sum of blackmoney is circulating and nobody is disputing that. Not only Rs. 40,000 crores have been said to be circulating with in this country but also the moneys which should have been here, are now being hoarded or utilised for various purposes, say, for, under-invoicing, over-invoicing, purchasing property, giving bribes to officers of outsiders. I do not know, for what purpose. But this is all said to be the purpose and also in clandestine accounts—numbered accounts—in Switzerland. It is well known. As a matter of fact, when the Amnesty scheme was announced by the former Finance Minister for these hoarders of blackmoney, we said, we oppose the amnesty part of it. I say, it is the job of the Government to find out, who is hoarding the money outside and that amnesty should not be there. This is nothing but the Government going with bended knees to give relief by way of charitable disposition

(Interruptions)

Sir, from Shri Brahm Dutt, we would like to know, if that was there, then would he have been less unhappy? What is the situation? We find suddenly that a residence at Sunder Nagar was searched. This search was connected to this enquiry and not connected to that celebrated letter. Therefore, we are proceeding, on the basis, as C. B. I. has said in its Press report...

(Interruptions)

You want to be specific...

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : I just want to know whether have you certified it?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Sir Mr. Buta Singh want to describe that letter.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : This investigation by FAIRFAX agency has resulted supposedly in search of a premises in Sunder Nagar in Delhi and also a house in Madras and some office in Bombay. Some persons have been arrested. For what purpose, you have arrested then? They are supposedly connected with the

purpose of engaging this FAIRFAX groups for investigating these accounts in foreign countries. Who are these persons, who are arrested? They are private individuals. They are not Government officers. Mr. Gurumurthy and Mr. Janakiraman were arrested for this. They are not Government officers. What is this nexus? Nexus is supposed to be through these individuals, but the Government of India had engaged the foreign concern. Just look at the seriousness of this case C. B. I. is opposing the bail application and demanding remand of these two accused on the ground that they were Government of India and the foreign investigating agency—were are the go-between for their appointment and payment. A letter is produced before the court of law, relying on which the remand was asked for. The bail was opposed. During this process, a report came from abroad, that this FAIRFAX letter produced by C. B. I. is a forgery. This is bizarre drama going on. Then, what happens? Another version is produced, of this Letter—"We never wrote this letter."

Mr. Brahma Dutt, please answer how did CBI get that letter which is alleged to be a forgery. Mr. Buta Singh, please don't stop him. He is making a note. You are stopping him from making a note. No; let him note.

How and when did CBI come to possess that letter which is alleged to be a forgery? This is a very serious matter. If CBI is using it for the purpose of the remand of an accused, and relying on that document they are opposing that bail application, when did they get this letter, and from whom? Now, if that is not so, if the contents of that letter are not correct—if they are correct, then it is a more serious matter, when the Government of India is taking the help of individuals for engaging certain persons and making payments through them—and if that letter is not correct, all the questions remain unanswered.

Now what has happened? Why are people becoming very seriously concerned about this? What has happened? On the 24th of January, if the then Finance Minister was supposed to have committed

an indiscretion in appointing Fairfax, be is sent to a more sensitive Department, viz. Defence. Suddenly he is sent to a more sensitive department. And then, something more interesting happens. The Director of Enforcement...

SHRI A. CHARLES : That is all your interpretation.

[*Translation*]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Why have you kept so many ministers tham ?

[*English*]

So many Ministers are there to hold your fort. Mostly incompetent...(*Interruptions*)

I am coming to the end. What has happened ? The Director of Enforcement is peremptorily despatched to the position of total inconsequentiality, as if a midnight *coup* had taken place. One of the topmost enforcement officers of this country is asked to give up charge, at 8 o'clock in the morning, i.e. the next day. Even a grade 'D' employee is entitled to more respect and concern.

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : What is the proper time for it ?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Is it 10 o'clock at night ? Do you function only at night ? Can't you function in day-time ? (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : And the Secretary of that concerned department becomes a cipher.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Mr. Somnath Chatterjee, you have forgotten about the midnight orders, to which they are accustomed.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : We thought those days had gone. Now, there are certain things inherited, more

than others. What we are worried about is this. Mr. Vishwanath Pratap Singh was doing something for which he was getting accolades from the country as a whole, viz his concern to find out black money, bring the guilty persons to book; and the spate of confessions and apologies tendered by big business, showed that Mr. V. P. Singh was right in most of the cases. We supported it. We did not support his amnesty scheme, but we supported his move to unearth black money, to proceed against the financial manipulators who are holding our country to ransom. Crores and crores of rupees which should be here, utilized for our developmental purposes, are being utilized for all sorts of nefarious games by certain business house and some super-stars. This country was all along keeping silent. The mistake of Mr. V. P. Singh, it appears now, is that he had taken the help of an American concern ; he should have done it through his own agency. But what we are apprehending is that his transfer, this change of department of the Finance Minister is all to scuttle the future. i.e. the further investigation into black money and foreign holdings. (*Interruptions*) I would like to know (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order. What is this ?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : I would like to know from the hon Minister, Shri Brahma Dutt, if he is permitted to say by his senior Finance Minister, since Mr. Vishwanath Pratap Singh shifted to Defence Ministry, has any raid been conducted anywhere in India ? So far as the investigation to unearth black money in foreign countries sepecially Switzerland is concerned, has any attempt been made again by your own agency to find out who are the persons guilty of this ? Will you please take the country into confidence and tell us in detail ?

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM (Salem) : I think, at the outset, Mr. Somnath Chatterjee should be told that even those who belong to the Congress Party and are in Parliament would definitely join him to say that black-money will be unearthed and the movement to

[Shri P. R. Kumaramangalam]

unearth blackmoney cannot be stopped; and every single person in this country will support that move and that move is obvious. Let not an attempt be made to be little or reduce the effort.

I am grateful to Mr. Somnath Chatterjee that he has raised certain questions for once after a long time which are relevant.

SHRI AMAL DATTA : Why are you...
(Interruptions)

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM :
I did not at all refer to Shri Amal Datta; I did not even refer to him.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Why are you unnecessarily antagonising him? He is trying to give some facts; It is a good thing. What is wrong in it? (Interruptions)

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM :
The first question that arises is whether the Fairfax have been appointed by any authority empowered by law to appoint such an investigating private agency; whether this appointment was in writing or whether it was oral and in what way? The main reason is that the discussion itself is raised on the question of appointment of US agency called 'Fairfax'. Was there an appointment at all is the question; if so, when and by whom? The person who did this appointment, was he empowered to do it? That I think is the fundamental question which unfortunately has not been raised till now, and I think the Finance Minister will be kind enough to inform this House about it. (Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER : Mr. Somnath Chatterjee had raised it.

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM :
There is another very important question that arises and it is this. If an appointment was made, was it not made by a person who did not have the authority to do it? Was it made by a person who overstepped his jurisdiction? If so, under what authorisation? That is another question

which is very important. The reason for the importance is that, it is after a long time, to my knowledge, I think it is for the first time that US foreign investigating agency has been engaged to look into economic offences; an agency that is known to us has been only involved in the political investigation and not in economic investigation; also an agency whose connection with the intelligence agency, the Central Intelligence Agency of America is in question now. How close is their connection, what is their access is an important question raised in this House?

16.25 hrs

[SHRI VAKKOM PURSHOTHAMAN
in the Chair]

Mr. Chairman, Sir, if I may say that, another question that arises is whether this agency Fairfax has been appointed to investigate—the hon. Minister of State for Finance may be kind enough to note that the Members of the ruling party also can ask certain relevant questions.

SHRI G. G. SWELL : He does not bother. You are irrelevant here.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI : He does not listen to you.

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM :
Brahma Duttji, may I draw your attention for a minute here, if you do not mind?

(Interruptions)

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM :
The second Question that arises is whether the Fairfax appointment was to squash certain investigations into specific offences and offenders or whether they were engaged through an external arm of the Directorate of Enforcement.

AN HON. MEMBER : Whether they were engaged at all.

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM :
Whether they were engaged at all has already been raised, I have already raised it.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : The poor Minister cannot answer.

(Interruptions)

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM : Another important issue that arises is whether there has been a method in the collection of information, or whether the Fairfax was the only agency that was considered, if that was so, who introduced the Fairfax to the Directorate of Enforcement, if the Directorate of Enforcement was the authority which appointed it ultimately ?

Mr. Chairman, it is rumoured— I do not know how far it is true— it has come out in certain publications; that a certain investigative journalist was the person who was involved in introducing the Fairfax agency to the Directorate of Enforcement and on this basis if the Directorate of Enforcement and the Government of India and the Ministry of Finance, etc., have engaged, then one is really afraid about the situation that is liable to come into being in the future.

The question of disinformation has been raised and re-stressed in this House already. The beginning of disinformation is available in the *Statesman* newspaper and in other publications. But, Mr. Chairman, the issue is also whether any report at all has been made available to the Government by Fairfax, if so what is the information that is available with the Government ? The House would like to know this.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Wonderful.

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM : Or, is this information only available with Prof Madhu Dandavate, or whether this information about Fairfax is available only with Jaipalji or Prof. Madhu Dandavate, or whether it is available with the Government ?

(Interruptions)

Another very important issue is, whether in December 1986 the services of Fairfax were used, officially engaged by a private textile concern in India and whether that company was responsible for bringing the Chairman of Fairfax to India and through this investigative reporter introduced *(Interruptions)* I do not believe in blaming people— I am asking ; let the Finance Minister reply.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : No running commentary,

(Interruptions)

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM : He wants to become the Minister of Finance,

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : We are supporting him.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Do not support him.

(Interruptions)

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM : Another very important issue is whether there was any Probe,— inter-change of probes— in this matter, whether the Finance Ministry have withdrawn cases against the offenders who through using the services of certain people introduced Fairfax to the Directorate of Enforcement. This is a very straight question which I would like to be replied.

I would like to know whether the cases against certain publishing companies were dropped or withdrawn in return for Fairfax having been introduced to the Directorate of Enforcement. I would like to know this, *(Interruptions)*

Another important question is when Mr. Gurumurthy was searched, was he searched in a case-it came out in the newspapers, it is a well known fact-relating to a missing file of DGTD or was he searched

[Shri P. R. Kumaramangalam]

in connection with this particular Fairfax investigation? This is also important and it is critical because Mr. Somnath Chatterjee has raised this point. The Government should come forward and clarify this.

Enough dis-information has been spread through the media half-truths have been stated, allegations have been made in this House which are baseless for which the responsibility they are willing to take, but no consequence in case found untrue. Insinuations, left, right and centre, have been thrown across the table. But then it is done by very senior people. So one is restrained from making any further comments.

A very fundamental issue arises whether the Fairfax is only a tip of the iceberg. It is true that there is a lot of black money outside. It is true that FERA violations are taking place. They are all aware. But none of us really know what is the magnitude. We do feel that the Government of India should take stronger steps and definitely not go through the process of engaging private agencies like Fairfax. The Government agencies should move and move fast to investigate on this matter. But the point is whether this is part of a global strategy to destabilise our nation. Various angles are on. The Fairfax is known to be connected with international intelligence agencies. Is this organisation, if it is a private investigative agency, going to give its services free of cost? To the best of my knowledge, the information that is available in publications and newspapers, the Fairfax has not been paid a paisa or a rupee or a cent. The hon. Minister may clarify whether they have been paid—of course, whether they have been engaged and whether they have been paid. If they have not been paid, then the question arises: is there any private institution, detective or otherwise, which is willing to spend money from its pocket before being paid anything without any motive? What is the motive that Fairfax had? That is the major question. The statement that has been made by the Chairman of Fairfax to the effect that a

Watergate is possible indicates that it is not economic offence which he was after but political he is searching for. He wants to become an instrument or is an instrument or a tool in the hands of certain de-stabilising forces abroad and in our country. It is time that we seriously, in this country, take note of the fact that the media should not be used—I am not suggesting any sort of curb. I think, it is for the media itself which is very responsible set up in our country to realise that national interest demands that before they start casting aspersions and allegations in their publications, they understand.....
(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : He is not yielding
(Interruptions)

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM : All I am saying is that a section of the press; I am not saying the whole media. The media is a very responsible media. Undoubtedly they have done their job... (Interruptions) But the question that arises is in such cases there are sections of the media, there are certain people in the media who wish to utilise this powerful tool to destabilise the nation. They are part of vested interests. Let it be known that the people of India would not forgive them. They cannot be under an illusion that they can use the power of the news, paper or a publication to destabilise this nation. The people will not forgive them. This very clear indication the nation has given more than once and let it not be a situation where again the nation will have to take appropriate steps.

I would like to end by saying that it is important for this House to know the whole picture. It is not at all proper for either the Government or the opposition to keep information away from all of us.

It is quite obvious that Prof. Dandavate has a lot of information at his disposal which he has not been kind enough to show to us. And it is quite obvious that the Government has some information. This is a matter of national interest. I would personally like to suggest to this House that all of us who have information in this matter, should put our heads together and

solve this problem as this a part of a global strategy. This is only a type of the iceberg that we are seeing. The arms case is nothing in comparison to this when one gone lower down. Let us really apply our mind and go into this issue. It is not a simple of economic offenders at all. It is a much deeper, it is a much bigger issue. It is, in fact, a collusive strategy which many forces put together have adopted to try and bring down the image of the nation, bring down the leaders of our nation and destabilise the nation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me the opportunity.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE (Panskura): Hon. Chairman, Sir, when the debate began, the tremendous uproar from the Treasury Benches reminded me of a Bengali saying. I am sorry, I have to speak in Bengali and then translate it :

*Thakur ghate ke
Ami to kala khaint*

Thakur ghate ke means who is there in the temple. That is the question. From inside the temple comes the answer :

"I did not take bananas" because the bananas are inside and the person is also inside. Somebody from outside is asking who is there in the temple. The person inside first comes out with this expression : "No, no, I did not take the bananas" to absolve himself of the crime that he has stolen the bananas and eaten them. That seems to be the atmosphere...

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE : This is a Bengali saying. Ask your mother, my dear *(Interruptions)*. Ask your mother, Mr. Kumaramangalam that you have not learnt enough.

So, Sir, this is the situation...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI HAROOBHAI MEHTA : Sir, every Member is taking advantage of the absence of Mamata Banerjee.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Mamata Banerjee has since become very quiet, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Order, order. please continue.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE : Sir, I am saying this because points have been raised here as to who is making insinuation, what rules are being observed, whether this can be said, whether that can be said. Yes, Parliamentary procedures have to be observed. I agree. But then, Sir, the fact remains that in the country today—whether our friends here like it or not—many questions have been raised through powerful media, million of copies have been circulated but it has not been replied to. If our Treasury Benches friends would seal our lips, that will not answer that doubt here, of the millions of the people. Therefore, they have to take the responsibility seriously.

Many of the questions which I wanted to put have already been put by my hon. colleague, Shri Somnath Chatterjee. So, I will not repeat all that. I will only emphasise some of those. Firstly, I fully agree that employing this American agency is not to the best interest of our country as it transpires. I do not want to go into the details of it, it has been gone into by many. My question is who really employed this agency. This has created a cloud of mystery around. Would anybody believe that just some officers did it? Nobody did it. Surely without the knowledge of the Minister of Finance it would not be done.

It has also been said in many papers that the Cabinet cleared the employment of the foreign agency. The Cabinet may, or the head of the Cabinet may later on take some other decision, due to the dust that has been picked up by that agency or somebody else. So, this has appeared in the news paper. That has to be clarified.

I am very much surprised—that such an important national debate is going on, dust has been kicked up all over the country and that two principal dramatic persons are not here—neither the former Finance Minister nor the present Finance Minister. This is really funniest thing how seriously is this entire thing being taken up—that will be doubted by the countrymen or that there is something under cover which needs

[Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee]

to be covered, so, both the persons in the drama should be out. That will convince nobody. Hon. Brahma Dutt will bear the brunt. But then this question will remain what ever you may say.

So much is being said about some Swiss Bank Account of some individual who happens to be the relative of an hon. Member of the House, etc. etc. Had I been that hon. Member of the House, I would have been the first to come and say on my own behalf that this is the situation. I would have apprised the House. I really do not understand why an hon. Member of the House though so much dust has been picked up does not come himself and lay things before the House, to all of us, through all of us to the country—that his brother has no Swiss bank account.

[*Translation*]

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : There is something wrong.

[*English*]

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE : Unless that is done, whatever may be said, I am sure this cloud cannot be really shifted. That is my feeling. You may be Somebody may be glad. There are very many currents going on, internal currents inside the ruling party. I can see that. We are not blind people. Therefore, somebody may be angry. Some may be happy. But the fact remains that unless these things done, really nobody will seriously take up all these hullah here. Therefore, I would like to know how this appointment of fairfax was made. Mr. Gurumurthy's arrest is also very peculiar. If that was for secret files relating to Reliance Company, if that was the matter, then he should have been arrested in December/it self.

(*Interruptions*)

AN. HON. MEMBER : He was interrogated and not arrested.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE : He was interrogated and not arrested.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please address the Chair.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE : Normally I look at you all the time.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : The Chair has its own charm.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : You are a charming Chair.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE : If at that time he was interrogated—then it is very—after the quick sequence of events that is taking place in the Finance Ministry, sifting of the Minister to Defence port folio, removing Mr. Bhure Lai, then Mr. Pandey, Economic Affairs taking up Enforcement Department, then Reliance Company long standing things cleared—permission and the raw materials, in the Bombay Port etc. After all this arrest takes place. That creates natural suspicion in people's minds.

I do not know what the antecedents of Mr. Gurumurthy are. What is his earlier action? How did he seem to be go between Government of India and the Fairfax? I do not know how all this thing happened? These are very objectionable things if those thing have happened. Now, keeping all the things in the background, a suspicion is created. Therefore, the entire thing has to be looked into as to how this has happened, who fixed up this agency, what was the mode of payment, whether it was cleared was that at the Cabinet level, etc. All these things should be clearly brought out before this House.

Then, Sir, if the Government decided to engage this agency, whatever information have been gathered in this regard by the Government along with their comments, should be laid on the House. Now it is nobody's property. It is being talked about in the whole country. Therefore, a fair procedure should be established. Otherwise, it will be taken other way round, that is, what is being said now will definitely be believed. This is my point. The mode of payment made looks very strange. It seems that one industrial house wants to take cudgel against another industrial house

who is made to pay foreign agency, etc. We do not know all that. We want to know clearly what was the mode of payment, etc. and how Mr. Gurumurthy was connected in this deal and we should know his antecedents.

Now, what happens to the entire investigation? It seems that this investigation was started against a number of houses like Tata house, Reliance Company, Goenka's House and Mr. Chabaria and Mr. Vijayamulia of the United Group Companies. What information have you got with regard to them? What actions have been taken in this regard? So, all these have to be very clearly stated. Otherwise, we would not really understand what dealings these people have got. The top executive must clear this. They must make their own statement clearly here to dispel all the doubts in the minds of the Members. Otherwise, suspicion will remain and suspicion remains in my mind it will remain in the minds of millions of countrymen. You should allay their doubts. I hope an attempt will be made to answer all the points raised by me as also my friend, Mr. Somnath Chatterjee, and others. Thank you.

PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR (Hamirpur) : Sir, this is a welcome opportunity to the House to discuss an issue that has surcharged the atmosphere and created a lot of confusion. I hope the friends on the other side will keep in focus the main point, that is, eradication of corruption and not shifting the emphasis. In the very beginning, Prof. Madhu Dandavate outlined three objectives of his approach. One was the failure of the Government to guide its own effective machinery for investigation, and the second was whether it was proper or is proper to employ and US or foreign agency and the third is the coordination between the Finance Minister and the Prime Minister. What appears to me is that the main emphasis is shifting now more to the role of the Finance Minister and process is rather not to the main focus, that is, the removal of corruption. Sir, the Fairfax was employed and the Minister of State who is in charge of the discussion at the

moment will be able to tell us the circumstances and the persons through whom this Fairfax was employed.

And about what has been the outcome, he will take the House into confidence. But the moot point here is that the Fairfax instead of pointing out the economic side of the situation or the case has shifted its own investigations and given it a slant to the political aspect of the situation which they perceive is likely to happen. We are aware of an earlier attempt when one book was written in U. S. A. which sought to project chaos in India and threat to the life of important leaders. I think this is an attempt in this direction. When words like 'Watergate' are being used, the only thrust is : What is their wishful thinking regarding this country? Sir, I am told, and the nation is told that this will not happen because just as our friend, Mr. Bhagat was saying that in a parliamentary system of Government, the Government and the Parliament are coordinating their activities, they are helping each other in the task of running the Government, in the Presidential form of Government, it is the other way round, the Congress is keeping a watch on the Government, the executive is totally outside, and here the executive is inside. So, his vital difference being here in our two systems, on Watergate can be here and no Irangate can be here and no bad gate, there will be only good gates, Sir, because these are the gates of democracy which are open to the Opposition, which are open to the Ruling Party...

AN HON. MEMBER : India Gate is there.

PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR : There is India Gate and Delhi Gate, Sir. So, we have all the opportunities to discuss the situation like this. (*Interruptions*). In the U. S. Government, it is not possible to have a similar situation, there coordination is possible, confrontation is possible, and the Chief Executive may come here from there as an accused. Here we have to see the very system provides the safeguards, the safety valves, so that the system marches on and does not crack. So, the various questions which have been asked by Mrs. Geeta Mukherjee and other

[Prof. Narain Chand Parashar]

friends regarding the Fairfax have to be answered by the Minister. But we have to keep a note that a foreign agency was also sought for during 197 on the complaint of Mrs. Gayatri Devi when her jewels were stolen. So, when was it done? It was done during the Janata Party Government. So, if the effectiveness of foreign agencies was utilised and considered proper in those days, what has happened now? I am not defending the appointment of the Fairfax, but I am pointing out the relative situation. It was done earlier, it is being done now, and it is better if it is not done and our old process is developed so as to enable us to investigate these matters.

Sir, the very press reports have appeared, but we are not to go by the press reports. If a certain person is arrested for certain violations of Official Secrets Act, why should that be linked with the investigation of Fairfax? It should not be connected. There are actions of the Government which are done on specific occasions. Then they ask: Why was it not done in December? Why was it done later on? Sir, the answer to this is that first we investigate. If we do it immediately, you say it has been done without investigation, it has been done without any kind of examination, and if we do it after examination, after investigation, after a month or so, then you are accusing us stating that 'this is not because of that, but it is because of the later situation.' Sir, this is not the case. The case of the Government is that there is the situation in which we find that black money has to be unearthed, and some raids have to be conducted, and it goes to the credit of Mr. Vishwanawath Pratap Singh that he conducted the raids. You have asked a specific question from Mr. Brahma Dutt as to whether raids have continued or not thereafter. He will give you instance where raids have continued. I say, this is the commitment of the Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi's Government that all sorts of corruption are to be rooted out. We are the first in this Parliament, when the Parliament began its life; he rooted out political corruption by passing the Anti-Defection

Bill and now he is determined to root out the financial corruption also. Let the Opposition cooperate in this. The attempt of the whole House, of all the sides would be to root out corruption in all its aspects, in all its dimensions, whether some foreigners are in between or whether some Swiss accounts are there. Let nobody be spared. I say. But in this task let us be sure that our country stands united, that would not harm our own system, that would not invite the foreigners who have degraded us, who have slanted us. We do not allow this, we do not tolerate this. Therefore, we want that this action of the Fairfax in giving a political slant to the whole question could be checked effectively.

I would call upon the Minister of State for Finance to give an effective reply to this kind of slant. What is the business of Fairfax? When they were asked to do something specific, why are they departing from that procedure? Why are they doing something which was not assigned to them? And the President of the Fairfax has no business to say that in such a situation in the transfer of such an officer, such a thing would have happened in the U. S. A. In U. S. A., many things happened. I am aware of what happened in the U. S. A. The U. S. Government paid 2 billion dollars to the Contras to overthrow the Nicaraguan Government. But the U. S. Government is not the U. S. people. The U. S. people rose to the occasion; they rose in full amount to fight out the Government of U. S. A. Therefore, if you look to one side of U. S. A., you must also look to the other side of the U. S. A.

I am sure democratic opinion in this great country is very healthy and strong. We will close not only Fairfax but other designs of C. I. A., if they have any in order to stabilise this great country. We will march forward and the commitment of Shri Rajiv Gandhi to root out corruption politically through anti-defection, financially through anti-corruption will be successful one day and the whole House should join in this and laud this attempt.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Amjtabh Bcchachan.

16.56. hrs.

(Interruptions)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION BY
MEMBER

SHRI AMITABH BACHCHAN (Allahabad) : Sir, under rule 357, may I have your permission, to make a personal explanation ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Yes, you can speak.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO : It is not in the course of the debate.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI : Sir, I am on a point of order.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Amitabh, you speak.

SHRI DENESH GOSWAMI : I am on a point of order. (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Order, order. I hear you. Please resume your seat.

(Interruptions)

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI : Sir, I am on a point of order. Shri Amitabh Bachchan has the full right to speak. He is an hon. Member of this House and he has full right to speak. We welcome if he speaks. But there are certain rules of procedure. If he wants to participate in the debate, then of course, he can speak now. But if he wants to make a personal explanation.

MR. CHAIRMAN : That also is permissible.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : As per rules, a Member can give a personal explanation. There is nothing wrong in it.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : Not in the course of the debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN : At any time, a Member can give a personal explanation, as per rules.

SHRI AMITABH BACHCHAN : Hon. Chairman, I was quoted in a certain magazine where insinuations and allegations have been made towards me and I want to quote what Mr. Madhu Dandavate has said :

"That Bhoure Lal with the help of Fairfax to crack open the secrets of Macny Adol Brothers, a pharmaceutical company registered in Switzerland and owned jointly by Amitabh Bachchan claimed by his brother. Amitabh to be an NRI holding an Indian passport and some Italian nationals with strong Indian connections."

The other thing he said was :

"This is something not an allegation but actually which vindicates a clean attitude."

I want to tell him, how unclean this is. "That Mr. Mithun Chakraborty was the only one who responds having declared that all his expenses were borne by Bachchan." I want to say, as a Member of this House and I want to go on record that both these reports are totally false. Nor my brother owned any such company by this name in Switzerland, neither have I paid any expenses for Mr. Mithun Chakraborty abroad. These reports by the Press are malicious. They have been printed to defame me and if I may use some verbal jargon, they are verbal callisthenics with reek of garlic from every pore—they stink.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Order, order.

(Interruptions)

17.00 hrs.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Order, order.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Whether he is prepared to face a House Committee ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Order, order. 17.4 hrs.
Home Minister is about to talk. The Home
Minister is on his legs.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I am on
a point of order.

SHRI S. BUTA SINGH : I am sorry that
for the second time I have to remind Prof.
Madhu Dandavate for owning the responsi-
bility for what he has said on the floor of
the House. (*Interruptions*). If he has any
moral strength or he has any political
dignity and if he holds the parliamentary
democracy in any esteem, he should rise
up in his seat and apologise for being
wrong on the floor of the House.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I am on
a point of order.

SHRI S. BUTA SINGH : There cannot
be a more handsome burial to the debate
which Mr. Dandavate has started today, by
the denial of Mr. Amitabh Bachchan.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I am on a
point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN : What is your point
of order.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I am on a
point of order (*Interruptions*). The Chair
has permitted me.

My point of order is this. Whether a
blatant contradiction is the same as personal
explanation. Secondly, whether Mr.
Amitabh Bachchan is ready to face an
inquiry by the House Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN ; Shri Dinesh
Goswami.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD (Bhagal-
pur) : What for a House Committee
inquiry ? You have been contradicted
already. Now you say House Committee
and all that.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Order, order,
Shri Dinesh Goswami.

DISCUSSION RE : ENGAGING OF
U.S. ECONOMIC INTELLIGENCE
AGENCY FAIRFAX GROUP BY
MINISTRY OF FINANCE FOR
INVESTIGATION OF CASES OF
INDIANS HAVING HUGE ILLEGAL
FUNDS ABROAD-*CONTD.*

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI : Mr.
Narain Chand Parashar who preceded me
spoke in emphatic tones that this Govern-
ment is determined to wage a war against
black money and economic offences. In
this connection, I am reminded that on
14-2-85, the Prime Minister of this country
in an election rally at Jodhpur said that
black money will be wiped out from this
country and when he was speaking, he
knew about the difficulties because accord-
ing Rajnekar Committee, there was
estimated amount of Rs. 18,241 crores of
black money and today according to the
black money report of 1985, the amount
of black money is Rs. 34,740 crores to
Rs. 40,530 crores. I congratulate the
Prime Minister because I think he has
become successful in this war. How a
general becomes successful in a war ?
When you send your enemy out of this
country, you become successful in a work
and the Prime Minister had become
successful**

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK : I am on
a point of order.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI : I am
not yielding.

MR. CHAIRMAN : What is your Point
of Order ?

(*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF PARLIA-
MENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER
OF FOOD AND CIVIL SUPPLIES (SHRI
H. K. L. BHAGAT) : Sir, I invite your
attention to Rule 352 of the Rules of
Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok
Sabha, to the last point which says :

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

"Nobody can reflect on the conduct of a person in high authority unless the discussion is based on a substantive motion drawn in proper terms"...

(Interruptions)

We are not, here, expected to talk on suspicious nature of case He cannot say against the Prime Minister. He cannot say that under the rules. The thing is that you can bring a substantive motion. Therefore, it must be expunged.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : We will examine it. If it is necessary, we will expunge.

(Interruptions)

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI : This is the weapon which every Parliamentarian has got. He is entitled to know these things. If they cannot relish it, I take it that it is their lack of knowledge.

Sir, the Expert Committee of IMF has reported, only in the last year Rs. 393 crores of money have gone out of this country and have been deposited in the coffers of Zurich, Geneva, Hong Kong, New Jersey, Manhattan and Bermuda. Therefore, is it not a fact that you are able to sent out Rs- 393 crores of our black money from this country ? If I give credit to the Prime Minister, they should be happy. I do not know why they are shouting...

(Interruptions)

In spite of the fact that I am totally with the Prime Minister on this. People sometimes ask me. People ask me Some inconvenient questions. I would like to answer them.

(Interruptions)

I want to argue with the people : Look here, the Prime Minister is right. But the people put some inconvenient questions to me.

I have told the people that all the allegations that are coming out in the Press is a global strategy to destabilise the nation. This is all a part of the right reaction. But the people then ask : What is this right reaction ? I say I do not know that Whenever there is an argument or a case put forth by the Opposition to which the ruling party has no answer, always the argument is that this is a right reaction. Therefore, there must be something in it.

The first question I would like to put is this. I am happy that the former Finance Minister Shri V. P. Singh is here. Shri Dinesh Singhji, our esteemed Member of this House, while initiating the debate on behalf of his party has said that the engagement of this foreign agency has been wrong. Therefore, I would like to know about it. It is not that Mr. Madhu Dandavate has engaged this, If Mr. Madhu Dandavate of the opposition would have engaged. The agency it would be a different thing. It is the Government of this country which has engaged this foreign firm. I would like to know from Shri V. P. Singh one thing : Did he do it on his own or did he do it in consultation with the Prime Minister of this country? And, if he did on his own without consultation of the Prime Minister of this country, then is he prepared to take the responsibility for engaging such an organisation, which according to both the sides of this House, seems to be of a dubious character.

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH) : I do share the responsibility.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI : Therefore, I congratulate the former Finance Minister of this country, Shri V. P. Singh.

(Interruptions)

I congratulate Mr. V. P. Singh who, for the last one year showed admirable courage to wipe out the blackmoney and deal with the economic offences He has owned the responsibility.

[Shri Dinesh Goswami]

What has he achieved for having tried to unearth blackmoney? The result is that he has been shunted out and removed from the Finance Ministry. I would like to know as to what is the opinion of the Minister of State of Finance Shri Brahma Dutt. Do you consider that the engagement of this foreign firm by Mr. V. P. Singh, according to the Government, was the correct decision or not? Mr. V. P. Singh has owned his responsibility. We would like to know as to what is the stand of this Government. There are certain points about which I would like to know the details. For the first time Mr. Malgaonkar, the Editorial Adviser of Indian Express, wrote two write-ups on 23rd July 1986 and 27th July 1986—for the first time in a doubtful paper, by a doubtful character, according to the ruling party, it has appeared.

(Interruptions)

This appeared on 23rd July, 1986. If Fairfax was such an organisation which cannot be trusted, why was no action taken from July 1986 to February or March 1987 to correct the situation? Who is prepared to take the responsibility for the default of the Government for not talking action in spite of the fact that a journalist who according to them is a suspect journalist but who according to us is one of the most reputed editors of this country wrote in July, 1986? In this case a lot has been said about a file. On 23rd July, 1986 a write-up had appeared about the file and an hon. Member of the ruling Party, of this Parliament, on 2nd December 1986 took the responsibility saying 'The file is in his possession'. He made that categorical statement in Parliament that the file was in his possession. In spite of the fact that an hon. Member of the ruling party made a statement categorically that the file was in his possession, why was no effort made to trace the file and take it from him if in the opinion of the Government it was such a serious matter? I would like to know this categorically from the Government. This U. S. economic intelligence agency, the employment of which I do not

know whether it was correct or not—I am not the person to judge it; it is for the Government to decide—had this to say:

"No one, including myself or on behalf of the Fairfax Group ever corresponded with your client, Mr. S. Gurumurthy; if any correspondence purports to be from us, it is a forgery."

I would like to know, in spite of this specific denial or specific statement by Mr. C. A. Mackay or somebody that it is a forgery, what is the position of the Government. Can the Government stand up and say, 'No: it was not a forgery and the statement of Mr. Mackay is wrong'? Unfortunately, up till now, the Government has not given any contradiction. I would like to know why, in spite of the fact that Mr. Malgaonkar wrote this on 23rd July 1986 and followed it up on 27-7-1986, no F. I. R. was registered till 16-12-1986. Five months were allowed to pass. I would like to know why, in spite of the fact that the entire matter appeared in July 1986, Mr. Gurumurthy and Mr. Janakiraman were not arrested till the letter appeared in the *Indian Express*, a letter which we cannot discuss today because if we discuss...

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT : It is a case where the proceedings are pending..

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI : This is not pending. (Interruptions)

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT : He is referring to a case where it is a matter for the court to decide...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : If it is *sub judice* you cannot mention.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI ; I want to know why, in spite of the fact that the F I R. was filed in December, 1986, Mr. Gurumurthy was not arrested till the date on which the letter appeared in the *Indian Express*, a letter which we cannot discuss today in Parliament because if we discuss it, the entire democracy of our country which is so brittle that it would collapse.

These are some of the questions to which the House is entitled to have answers. Is it not a fact that on the bail application while giving the order the judge has said that the information does not relate to any defence or sensitive matter? In fact, because the matters come out in the press, Government could really save enough money because according to some reports—the Minister will please clarify that there were a series of unauthorised loans amounting to Rs. 67 crores resulting in withdrawals and floating by a Company of debentures and stock and Government could ban conversion of debentures worth Rs. 360 crores. This poor gentleman, Mr. Malgaonkar, who, according to the ruling Party, is of a dubious character seems to have helped this country in the saving of this amount. Is it a fact or not? Will the Minister clarify this?

Therefore, I congratulate the Prime Minister for once. I cannot support my friend, dubious friend, Prof. Dandavate, for bringing this motion. I am sure the hon. Minister will give replies to all these questions so that I can clear some of the doubts which the people are having—because they are raising some inconvencement queries and I want to clear their doubts.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I do not call that a defamation because sarcastically he has given me a compliment.

SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL (Chandigarh) : Mr. Chairman Sir, I had no idea to participate in this debate. But after listening to the speeches on both the sides, I thought that I should also share my thoughts and views with the House.

It is a very strange spectacle that we are debating a subject without knowing full facts. As a lawyer, having a standing of about half a century, a firm feeling has developed in me that whenever we argue without full facts, then we tread a very dangerous zone. It is proved by the events which have happened in this House.

Two of the Hon. Members—one Minister and another Mr. Amitabh Bachchan—had to give their personal explanations. They

stated that whatever allegations or insinuations have been made against them are totally false. This has been demonstrated.

From the very beginning I thought that we are treading a dangerous path. The reason is this. Even the opposition members did state that only one fact is known, all other facts are not known, all other facts have to be established either by them or by the Government if they can tell them and if they are in possession of full facts.

17.17 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

The only fact known is that one foreign agency has been engaged for the purpose of finding out illegal funds which are deposited in the foreign lands in the name of some companies. They said beyond this we know nothing because whatever else has appeared in the Press that we can understand are either half truths or unbaked facts. And unfortunately while we debate such a serious issue in this House, I beg of the House and I beg of the Members on both the sides to be very very careful because so many insinuations and so many innuendoes are uttered by the Hon. speakers.

AN HON. MEMBER : Not by the Speaker... (*Interruption*)

SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL : Hon. speakers who have been speaking from both sides excluding the Hon. Speaker in the Chair.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : When you refer to us, you say speakers from the floor.

SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL : I stand corrected.

What has actually transpired from the speeches of both the sides is this. Some members have said that this agency which was employed was not a proper agency. Prof. Dandavate from the beginning of his speech raised one question, namely, is it proper for the country to employ foreign

[Shri Jagan Nath Kaushal]

detective agencies? This is the first question that he raised and I categorically say that we should not. There is a danger. And danger has again come before the country. We are doubting the agency itself. We are doubting how this agency came in contact with us. We are again doubting the capability of the company. We are doubting the motives of the agency and ultimately we cannot depend on the report which is submitted to us by such an agency more so when allegations have been made by hon. Members from the Opposition that that agency has its links with the CIA. So, therefore, I would request the Government to refrain from employing foreign agencies for such purpose. If some agency is employed in the past well surely two mistakes may not make one right and I would beg of the Government to develop our own agency because we can depend on that agency, that agency will be answerable to us and that agency will be more responsible and free from bias and motive.

Now this is one query which Prof. Dandavate raised. The other query which he raised was whether this agency was employed by the Finance Ministry. Has anything been paid to that agency? Has that agency produced a report? Well surely I also ask these questions from the Government because we are not in the know of it. Now fortunately Mr. Vishwanath Pratap Singh was here and he said, "Yes, I take the responsibility." So at least we know one thing that he did it. The other thing which is still to be told to us is whether the agency produced a report. We would like to know from the hon. Minister has the agency produced a report and has the agency been paid any remuneration till now? (*Interruptions*)

These are the questions which arise in our mind. Then the other thing which we want to know, is it all fair for the Chairman or Vice-Chairman of those agencies to go on giving statements regarding our own affairs. Have they any right of talking what they are talking and have we here the right to say since that party says it is a forgery, the other party says it is a dependable

document surely can the Parliament debate on such matters? I very respectfully submit in this case that Prof. Dandavate should have waited for more facts to be established. This unfortunate debate has only resulted in insinuations.

(*Interruptions*)

What I am submitting is that any debate which takes place in this House must have a firm base and unless there is a firm base it is not fruitful to have a debate of such a serious character which ultimately may result in the character assassination of people in high authority. Now, if Mr. Amitabh was not in the House well surely the character assassination had taken place.

Character assassination has taken place. But it is really fortunate that he was here and he had come forward to have his say. Otherwise, an impression has been given to the world because he is so and so, because he is close to so and so, a number of things have happened and so on. So, I would beg of the hon. members on both sides not to draw too many inferences...

(*Interruptions*)

The point for the consideration of the House is ultimately to see as to what the policy of the Government is. Well, the policy of the Government, to which it stands committed is to unearth black money. And that policy will continue. The drive will continue. I implore the Government not to relent their effort and Government has assured more than once that the efforts will not be relented.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : But they are doing it only selectively.

SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL : I am afraid, hon. members of the opposite take contradictory stands on more than one occasion. On the one side, they praise the Government saying that a very good job has been done by Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh and that he has done a great service to the nation.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : We stand by that.

SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL : Now, they say again that raids should not be conducted selectively...

(Interruptions)

SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL : Mr. Speaker Sir, on one side we say that raids should not be resorted to indiscriminately. Raids should only be resorted to when there is *Prima facie* believable evidence. On the other side, he says that we select people against whom there is evidence...(Interruptions)

I am thankful to the House that the hon. members are listening to me rather patiently. I support the policy of the Government that raids should be conducted after having preliminary investigations and after obtaining some tangible *prima facie* evidence. I stand by this policy of the Government because no Government can indiscriminately resort to raids. We know the disastrous consequence of such action.

I, therefore, would appeal to the Government to continue their policy. This is a laudable policy and there is no doubt in my mind that it is not going to be relented.

So far as the insinuations that have been made and contradictory statements that have been made, I feel that it is a very unfortunate situation. And I did not expect that highly responsible leaders like Prof. Madhu Dandavate and Shri Somnath Chatterjee would indulge in insinuations and in contradictory statements.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO (Parvathipuram) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to speak on this debate. To me, it seems that it is a continuation of the earlier debate that we had in the earlier Session of Parliament, regarding the unaccounted Swiss money which this House had discussed at that particular moment of time. Sir, then Finance Minister, Shri V. P. Singh had then assured the House that he will also...

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF FOOD AND CIVIL SUPPLIES (SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT) : We said we would go by your judgement. There are enough discussions. So many people would like to speak from this side and from that side. My own feeling is that we started at 2 O'clock and we should finish that.

MR. SPEAKER : After his speech, the Minister will reply.

(Interruptions)

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO : Sir, it was, when we discussed this issue of unaccounted money, in the Swiss Bank at that moment of time, the then Finance Minister, Shri V. P. Singh, had promised this House that he will inquire into these accounts that exist and bring to book those culprits. Today, we are again discussing the same subject, but today, there is a different kind of cloud that has enveloped this issue of unaccounted money. Friends from the other side have stated that this should not be politicised because it is an economic offence and it is an economic matter. The offence is economic, but,—if due to political pressures and political reason, inquiring into or unearthing these economic offences is going to be scuttled or stopped, naturally, we will have to raise it in political forms. If you want to speak the truth and bring the reality to the floor of this House it is inheritable and if there are any political implications or pressures behind it, they will also have to unveil themselves.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I recall reading a report in one of the newspapers, just a couple of days ago, when the Prime Minister—the Leader of this House—addressing his Parliamentary Party Meeting had stated that he will have to unearth the vested interests, the multi-nationals, who are interfering with this country and the money that has been coming here over the years to destabilise the democracy in our country. Now, it is unfortunate that, when efforts are being made to find out, who these multi-nationals were; whom money belong to; and whether they were

[Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo]

actually being used to destabilise this country: the entire process has almost come to a grinding halt. At least this is the impression that we get and we would like the Minister of State for Finance, while answering, to state whether this inquiry which was started regarding the Swiss Bank Accounts belonging to Indians, are you continuing with that or you will stop it? You will have to mention that clearly to us.

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : Belonging to whom ?

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO : Belonging to people of Indian origin.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, then I would like to mention, that several Members on the other side had stated that it was not proper to have engaged this FAIRFAX agency and also several other implications and insinuations have been made. If Members on the other side have not understood what Cabinet functioning is all about, then I would like to remind them that the Prime Minister is the first among the equals. He is not the boss of the bunch of servants. And just by passing the buck to the then Finance Minister by jettisoning him out, don't think that the Government can get away from it. The Prime Minister will have to own the entire responsibility of what the friends have said from the other side.

AN. HON. MEMBER : Have you made any attempt ?

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO : If at all there is any attempt made, it has been made from your side and not by us.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : It is more than a quarrel.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO : It is more than a quarrel. It is not just like that. So, let us be very clear about that and if as many Members have

said from the other side that, it was a wrong decision that was taken by the then Finance Minister Shri V. P. Singh, then why was it that Shri V. P. Singh was shifted to a more sensitive portfolio like Defence, if he was irresponsible ?

Then, I would also like to know from the Government now whether they are continuing to have the raids, after the former Finance Minister has left ? But, I would like to know, whether they are pursuing on the raids which had taken place then, after the Prime Minister had taken over this portfolio or after you have started dealing with it ? I would like to know, how far, you have pursued it on the raids which had taken place, when Shri V. P. Singh was the Finance Minister ? I would like to know whether you have abandoned any of them or have you initiated any action, charge sheeted, booked ? What is the position, pertaining to those cases which were taken up during his tenure ? That is what I am interested about.

It has been said that it is a kind of dis-information that has been sought to be brought by the international agencies. Disinformation about what ? Can we not verify it ? Can we not contradict ? Why is it that there has not been a single contradiction from the Government ? Disinformation can be spread only when there is no contradiction. All of us have that faith in our Government. We have always had.

Some friends said : 'why don't you make use of our intelligence agencies like the CBI ?' Use them for what ? For harassing officials who go into this kind of a case ? This will demoralize the entire backbone of our administrative service. This is not the way to act and behave. After all, Shri Bhure Lal or Shri Vinod Pandey also belong to a particular investigating agency. He was the head of one investigating agency or authority under a particular Ministry. Now, you have the CBI people to go after him, interrogate him and harass him. Is this the way any civilized Government can, and should function ? He is also known to be one of the most upright and sincere officers.

AN HON. MEMBER : Only now you are saying that.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO : Right from the beginning we have thought so and we think so now.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : They are subjected to surveillance.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO : Another thing I would like to mention, It is unfortunate that the Prime Minister who is also the Minister of Finance, is not here. Another thing is the misuse of the Official Secrets Act. This outmoded, antique Act was passed during the British days to protect their interests in our country. We have found this even earlier in this very House when one of my colleagues had raised the issue regarding Thal Vaishet. Several people were harassed in that connection. Even now this Official Secrets Act is being used to harass our own officers, and people who were trying to unearth black money and obeying their seniors—may be Ministers or Secretaries. So, it is high time that the Official Secrets Act was amended; or in any case certainly not allowed to be misused in the manner that it is today, as one of the reminiscences that the British had probably left, only to be misused. It is very very unfortunate. I hope the Prime Minister would have the vision to assure us that the Act is not applicable here.

MR. SPEAKER : We should changed it.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO : I have finished, and there is nothing more that I have to say. All that I would like to say before I end, is that there is another point raised by several hon. Members, that we have not had full facts. What more facts do you need, than the information published by IMF that several thousands of crores of rupees worth dollars have been tecked away after being syphoned in various ways? What more proof do you want, Sir? In fact, there was an article which stated that this has increased by some Rs. 2,000 crores of some such staggering figure during the last few years. That itself was the basis of the

discussion we had, last time. You were wise enough to allow it. That is the basis on which it was raised. Now that the investigation has started, the whole thing is being scuttled. So, I would like the Minister of State for Finance to answer these specific questions.

DR. A. K. PATEL (Mehsana) : Sir I had expected friends from the treasury benches to congratulate Prof. Madhu Dandavate. (*Interruptions*.) Unluckily they have resorted to shouting. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order.

DR. A. K. PATEL : Our young enthusiastic Prime Minister has assured us and also told the public that he is bent upon driving out corruption and black money also. Unluckily, our friends in the treasury benches, instead of helping to drive out and rooting out corruption are behaving in a different way.

I will not take more time. I will put only two questions to the hon. Minister of State for Finance to reply to me. I have also heard some friends from the treasury benches, blaming the then Finance Minister, saying that he has done nothing. Actually, he has done the proper thing, to investigate into the black money which is hoarded in Swiss banks.

I will ask the hon. Finance Minister whether his attention has been drawn to a report in the Hindustan Times of the 29th March about the statement of the Chief of the U. S. Economic Intelligence Agency, Fairfax that perhaps the widespread public controversy in India was due to their getting too close with a 'raw nerve'.

I want to know from the hon. Minister which are the account holders? Also the other day, in the *organiser*, it had been published—April 5, 1987—that 31 accounts of the dignitaries have been found in the Swiss Bank. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether he has enquired about this.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY . I may be permitted to put some questions. I will not refer to any points already covered,

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : Why do you do this ? Why are you becoming stubborn without any reasons ? If we are doing something new, then you can complain.

[*English*]

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I was among those who had tabled the motion. I will put questions ; I will not make a speech.

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : From among the two seconds the hon Members who are at number. Two also stand up. They do not have to go for Kathak Dance practice.

(*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI BRAHMA DUTT) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will divide my answers into two parts. The first part will be in regard to the Fairfax affair which has been a matter of much discussion. The second will be in regard to certain points which have been raised by some hon. Members and in this connection I want to clarify that the entire discussion is based on a very grave misunderstanding. The Fairfax group, which is a detective agency in the United States of America, has not been entrusted with any investigative work. I want to tell you about its status as well. Its position is just that of an informer which gives information and in case that is useful to the Government, then the informer is paid his or her share... (*Interruptions*) you should understand the situation first.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : What are you saying ?

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : What I am saying is based on the information and the records which are true and not imaginery (*Interruptions*) Secondly, the Fairfax has not provided any information to the Ministry of Finance of the Government of

India or to any other Agency which may be considered authentic or significant...

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN : Has any non-authentic information been given by them (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : Shri Arif Sahib, even non-authentic information has not been given.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : May I know whether they have given some information or not ? If they have given some information, what are the details thereof .. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : If the information is wrong, he will be responsible for it. He is speaking in the House, He is not speaking in closed room.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : Choubeyji, they have given you the power of imagination and there is no reason for it with us

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBBY : May I know whether they have supplied you any information or not ?

MR. SPEAKER : You kindly resume your seat. It is a very bad thing. You are on your legs after every one minute.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I am on a point of order.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Why are you trying to be funny ?

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI S- JAIPAL REDDY : The Minister made a conflicting statement...

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Nothing doing. over-ruled.

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Has he a rigat to fight with imagination ?

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : There is no point of order at all.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : I would like to tell their status. Their status was that of the informer only. If an ordinary person gives us any information, we would make him payment. But no information was supplied in this case. Our officers had sought information from some companies and they supplied us with a copy directly and another copy was sent through a courier. It is not our responsibility to make them payment for this. I would like to make it clear that none of our officers, Ministers or the department of the Government made any payment and neither granted to any one the authority to make payment. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : I am junior to all of you.

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : What a story.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO : It was illegally done.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : What has happend to you are in you legs after every minute,

[English]

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Now this Minister says that they were never engaged;

(Interruptions)

You pleased refer it to a House Committee.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Jaipal Reddy, why do you not have the patience to listen, first ? One minute you are sitting, and in another minute you are standing.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Let the whole speech end.

[Translation]

I am observing it...*(nterruptions)*

[English]

*(Interruptions)**

MR. SPEAKER : Nothing goes on record, whatever the hon. Members have said. I have not allowed any of them. It is very irresponsible.

*(Interruption:)**

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Amal Datta, we will discuss this later on.

*(Interruptions)**

MR. SPEAKER : Not allowed. I have not allowed this gentleman.

*(Interruptions)**

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : I fail to understand as to what he is saying, but you should.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Kindly listen to me Jaipal Reddyji; you are giving your judgement without listening to him.

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : If you have right to speak in the House, you should also have patience to listen to us. You should have enough patience to listen to us. You will come to know what will take place here now. My submission is that the hon. Members of the opposition should have courage to listen to us. I would like to create that feeling of courage in them

(Interruptions)

[*English*]

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : You should learn how to listen. You are supposed to listen to us.

You will have to listen.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Amal Dutta, if you are to behave like this...

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translations*]

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : The proceedings of the House can not be conducted in this noisy situation.

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Amal Datta, are you thinking that you are the only person who has something to say ?

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Do you want a statement tailored to your liking ? please sit down. Listen.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Nothing.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : I am speaking with all the authority of the Government. I am speaking with the whole authority of the Government. If you want to listen, it is all right.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I will raise a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER : I can listen to a very sensible point of order, but I cannot listen to something (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Under rule 376 I want to raise a point of order. My point of order is that the former

Finance Minister and the present Minister of State have made contradictory statements. Mr. Singh says: "I own the responsibility of appointment." And he says... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : They do not have the capacity to listen...(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : It is a very bad thing,

(*Interruptions*)

If you do not resume your seat, I will have to ask the leave of the House. You can see rule 115 of Directions by the Speaker. If some point is not taken up, you can resort to that rule. You can raise the matter under that rule. No Purpose will be served by making such noise in this manner...(*Interruptions*)

Mr. Amal Dutta, if you suffer heart attack, what shall I do, I shall have to carry you out of the House.

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : Have some patience (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

Have some patience. You cannot drown my voice by shouting (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : If you do not behave I will have no other recourse. Let him finish. If there is any discrepancy...

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : This is no way

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : What is your ruling ?

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : My ruling is that you should listen to him. It you think that there is something wrong you can raise the matter under rule 115.

[*English*]

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY . You call the Prime Minister ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Who are you to say that ?

[*Translation*]

Kindly resume your seat. Listen to him. If you donot like it you can give notice under rule 115.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT ; Choubcyji, you will have to listen to the truth. Have you got the courage ? They do not have the courage to listen to the truth. This is sheer cowardice. You cannot drawn my voice in the *shorgul*. You will have to listen to me(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : It is a bad thing that you are adopting such a wrong course.

[*English*]

It is deplorable by and any description.

[*Translation*]

Let us listen to him. This is no way.

[*English*]

It is beyond description. It is deplorable. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT : Mr. Speaker, Brahma Duttji had himself been an opposition leader who can cow him down.

[*Translation*]

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : I have more experience of that field.

MR. SPEAKER : Brahma Duttji, do not get excited.

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : My submission is that my point may kindly be listened patiently and you will understand the position. If you have any doubt, I am here to remove it. I am not leaving the House.

MR. SPEAKER : Do not get excited.

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : I am speaking without getting excited, (*Interruptions*) Please listen to me patiently. I would like to repeat that the Government.. ...

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

THE MINISTER OF ENERGY (SHRI VASANT SATHE) : They are finding an excuse to walk out.

[*Translation*]

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : Do not stage a walk out.

I would like to tell under which capacity the services of Fairfax had been asked for. Their status was only that of an informer. Their status was neither at par with our C. B. I and nor at par with RAW. When an ordinary informer tells that so and so person has indulged in evasion of income tax and we apprehend the guilty person and give prize to the informer, this type of arrangement was with them.

(*Interruptions*)

I would like to reiterate that the Fairfax group has not supplied any such information to our Government, Finance department or to any agency as would have necessitated any payment to be made to them.

I would like to say that we sent some questions to the companies of foreign

[Shri Brahma Dutt]

countries. We received replies direct from them and also through Fairfax. But they are not entitled for any payment for that service. I would further like to say that we have strong objection to the statements of the Chairman of the Fairfax Group that have been issued now. If it is true, we will teach them a lesson.

(Interruptions)

You may listen or make noise, but you will have to listen.

We have strong objection to the statements being issued now. They are trying to interfere in the affairs of our country. Since they could not supply any information to us, no payment has been made to them from our side.

When I first came in the House, I thought that I would learn something from such an able person.

(Interruptions)

I am prepared to become your disciple. Why should you have any objection to it.

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : In that company you cannot learn anything.

[Translation]

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : We are your class mates and not disciples. We studied in the same school in which you had studied. You and I know this fact.

I am sorry to say that hon. Prof. Dandavateji submitted three points. The first point is that I went to Switzerland on a secret mission. I would like to repeat again.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : That is already over.

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : It is not over. You would come to know whenever it is over.

I will submit my passport and full authority to you and to Prof. Dandavateji. If I am at fault at any stage, I am prepared to face the punishment.

[English]

I can send you my personal diary, Mr. Ama Datta. Do not worry.

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE : We do not want the secrets.

[Translation]

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : Secondly, on the basis of a magazine, he read out something which concerned a Member, which we have already contradicted. But I would like to clarify that we have not made any enquiry about those Members of their relatives from Fairfax, nor they have furnished any information to us. Whatever has been published in 'Sunday' magazine or any other journal may mislead you, but it can not mislead us.....*(Interruptions)* You kindly listen to us. Thirdly, if you have some humanity left in you, you would have to repent throughout your life for all that you have said. *(Interruptions)*

You have said one thing about the former Finance Minister who is sitting on my right hand side.

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE : Is he still sitting there ?

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : Yes, he is still sitting there and he would always continue to sit there. You might not be there, but he would always be here and as a result you are going to face the difficulty. It is totally baseless that he had gone to the Hon. Prime Minister with a file in which he wanted to seek information about some persons and the Prime Minister did not grant the permission. He had never gone to the hon. Prime Minister with a file and the hon. Prime Minister has never declined to grant the permission. I am saying this in his presence and I do not want to trouble him. I am saying this with full responsibility.

[English]

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : May I state on this point that the Prime Minister has never refused any investigation.

(Interruptions)

[Translations]

MR. SPEAKER : You kindly keep quiet. What are you doing ?

(Interruption:)

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : Sir, hon. Madhu Dandavate wanted to construct the building on three pillars and all the pillars have fallen. Now he has to think about himself.

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I am on the floor.

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : You are not on the floor.

[Translation]

SHRI BALKAVI BAIRAGI (Mandaur) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, he has spoken about the building. I would like to submit to Madhu Dandavateji :—

*' Jis Makan ki neev ye Balu se
Bharenge. Us makan men khwab
inke yun he marenge''.*

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : Two more points have also been said. About a former lady Member of this House it was said that some agency was engaged against her, but we have no information about it. I would like to state a very important thing here. One allegation was made that certain cases were withdrawn. In the history of this country one case was withdrawn and it was withdrawn in 1979. Whatever information I have, I would like to furnish it to you. Whenever I will have full information, I will furnish it to you. One person who calls himself owner of a newspaper and has other professions also had set up a

fake company and Income Tax officers had filed a case against that fake firm and C. B. I. had also filed a cases of forgery againts it. But what happend ? That person submitted an application before the Income Tax Settlement Commission and it was told that he has been grandted immunity. But C. B. I. told that this immunity could be applicable in the matter of income tax and not in the case of forgery. But it is our misfortune that such a person was appointed solicitor general. I am referring to 1979. Hon. Home Minister, it is not concerned with you, it is concerned with the other side. (Interruptions) He gave this opinion at that time and this immunity was granted in the matter of income tax as well as in the case of forgery. We have never seen such a bungling. Such a bungling has never taken place in the past, nor would it heppen in furture. Such a bungling had taken place only in 1977 to 1979. There has not been one such bungling, but there had been many cases of bungling.

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : There was much light in emergency.

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : A point has been repeated have again and again that Mithun Chakravarty furnished some information to us we are fully in the know of it. It is baseless and there is no substance in the case to proceed further and no body has got full right about it.

(Interruptions)

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY (Midnapore) : What was the reply of Mithun Chakravarty ?

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : He had not given any reply. (Interruptions) You have to reply to it. (Interruptions)

Shri Madhav Reddy has said some very important things- He has asked as to what is the method of Government's functioning ? I would like to submit only this much that the method of Government functioning is same which a Government's should have in the Parliamentary democracy. All of us have joint responsibility.

[Shri Brahma Dutt]

He has also asked as to who has made the payment to Fairfax and if no payment was made, how was it working then? I have already told you in the beginning that no payment is made to the informer in advance. But I would like to tell you that in the mean time.....(*Interruptions*) The Chairman or the President or whatever he is, Mr. Hershman came here and a Textile company of the country booked the accommodation for his stay. Payment was made by him in dollars, but it is a fact that the owner of that textiles company had also stayed in Hotel Oberoi when Mr. Hershman was in India. This is a definite connection. If we get any further information, we would furnish it to you.....(*Interruptions*) Why are you in so much of haste?

DR. DATTA SAMANT (Bombay South Central) : What in his name?

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : Look, Datta Samantji, I am not going to give an opportunity to you to our rawe me. If I disclose his name, you would get the change. You should use your imagination.

[*English*]

DR. DATTA SAMANT : You please give the name.

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : Mr. Datta Samant, use your imagination.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : I will tell the name when I get the full facts. But in the mean time, you use your imagination.

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : You continue your speech. You kindly address me.

(*Interruptions*)

Choubeyji, you kindly resume your seat. This is mother tongue and it is not a foreign language.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : Shri Somnath Chatterjee had asked as to what are the credentials of Fairfax, what are their traditions and experience? Sir, these things are asked only when we appoint someone as our servant; we have not appointed them as our servants. We do not ask all these things from an informer. If one furnishes the information, one will get the payment. Therefore, nothing was asked from them. But I would like to repeat that they are crossing the limits, because they did not get any money or any incentive from here. But they will not be allowed to cross the limits.

Then it was asked as to what is the position of Income Tax raids. I would like to make it clear that no leniency would be shown to the persons indulging in the invasion of income tax, custom or excise or the persons depositing the money in foreign countries clandestinely. The most stringent actions would like continue to be taken and these are continuing. I would like to tell you that in January, 1987, 677 surveys were conducted by Income Tax Department...

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

If you do not understand Hindi, I will let you know in English. Otherwise, I can understand Bengali also, but can not speak. I can only understand Bengali.

[*Translations*]

677 surveys were conducted by Income Tax Department in January, 1987 and 566 surveys were undertaken in February, 1987. You are against amnesty being granted, but I agree with the then Finance Minister in principle that he had provided an opportunity to one and all to reform themselves, provided one is prepared to be reformed. It is very unfortunate that people did not make use of the opportunity given to them. Therefore, the time limit for amnesty is expiring today i. e. on 31st March, 1987 at 12 mid-night.

(*Interruptions*)

I am trying very hard to reform the hon. Member, but when I am not succeed-

ding in my efforts, how could Shri V. P. Singh have succeeded? (*Interruptions*) A reference has been made here about the law in Switzerland. Hon. Bhagat has already replied to it. We had contacted Switzerland. They have said that according to the old law, if any such money is deposited there which concerns any crime, then information could be furnished about that. But if the hon. Members use their good offices in the Parliament of Switzerland and get their law amended, I would be grateful to them. (*Interruptions*) I will not take any more time of the House, but I would like to make one thing clear. It has been said again and again that C. B. I. searched some one or harassed some one in the case of Fairfax. C. B. I. had filed a case perhaps in December, 1986...(*Interruptions*) You could also be interrogated.....

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : You should be interrogated, but we should not be interrogated. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : Everybody is equal before law. The some case is pending with C. B. I., but C. B. I. felt later on that at some places very secret information is collected and it is sent abroad. They conducted raids in this regard. As this case is under investigation at present, I therefore, do not want to say anything about it appears that at a particular place, some activities are going on which are not in the interest of the country. (*Interruptions*) One day information was received that some documents are being burnt in a building in Delhi. Therefore, that building was searched and nobody was harassed. But when the mystery would be unveiled, it would come to light that activities of sending documents outside the country in a clandestine manner were going on there. It is very unfortunate that all of you raise issue here believing such people. You raise imaginary things here. The points on which you had raised the discussion, have been clarified now.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATURVEDI : Sir, are you satisfied ?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Are you satisfied, Sir.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Put it before the House. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : I am satisfied with the arrangement. (*Interruptions*) The permission which was given by the former Finance Minister was absolutely correct. There was no obstacle.

[*English*]

SHRI AMAL DATTA : Permission for what ?

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : Permission to get information from somebody and if he gives that information, they can make some payment to him. That is all, nothing more and nothing less.

[*Translation*]

Sir, I would like to submit that this discussion has been raised on the basis of imaginary things. One thing has been repeated again and again to which I object.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI VASANT SATHE : Mr. Amal, you could also have been an informer.

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : No. How do you know, he is or he is not. We cannot disclose the name of informer, anybody he may be. We cannot call anybody as informer.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY : But there are people...(*Interruptions*).

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : No, no. I do not attribute any motive to anybody.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE :
Don't take advice from K. K. Tewary. He
has misguided many and he will land you
yourself into trouble.

SHRI BRAHMA DUTT : Sir, I could
not be misguided by a more senior member
like you. I could not be misguided by
them, what to talk of Mr. K. K. Tewary.
I am not a man to be misguided by any-
body. Even if you try, I cannot be misgui-
ded. But I have succeeded in 'guiding' so
many. Once I remember, in this very
House, Mr. Somnath Chatterjee was there
I decided to put Mr. Somnath off the
track and simply by saying two or three
sentences, I put him off the track;

[Translations]

In the end, I would like to submit that
this discussion has been raised on the basis
of imaginary and baseless things. No
change is being effected in the policy of the
Government and Government would
continue to take strong against the black
money and the persons who keep money in
foreign countries.

MR. SPEAKER : The House stands
adjourned to meet tomorrow at 11.00 am.

18.17 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till
Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday,
April 1, 1987/Chaitra 11, 1909
(Saka).*