

SHRI VASANT SATHE: You ask the Home Minister. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: You can take the matter to the court. I cannot do anything.

[*English*]

SHRI VASANT SATHE: The Home Minister should look into it.

[*Translation*]

A woman has been murdered. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: How can I interfere in a murder case?

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Mahbubnagar): How can you allow this Sir?

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: I am not allowing you.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (S. BUTA SINGH): I can say only that.

[*English*]

I can try to find out the information and bring it to the hon. House.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): It is a matter concerning the State. How can the Home Minister intervene? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VASANT SATHE: It is not a State subject. It is a clear case of murder. It has nothing to do with the State. It must be inquired into... (*Interruptions*) There was not even a postmortem. What are you talking? (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: Professor Sahib, please mind your own work.

12.21 hrs.

DISCUSSION UNDER RULE 193

Commission reported to have been paid by M/s Bofors in Howitzer Gun deal

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Now, we will take up discussion under Rule 193 regarding commission reported to have been paid by M/s. Bofors in the Howitzer Guns Deal.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): Mr. Speaker, you may recall that this House has discussed the problem of Bofors a number of times in different forms. We discussed it under Rule 193; a statement was made by the Defence Minister; and the Prime Minister intervened in the debate and offered certain clarifications. Then again, we had the Joint Parliamentary Committee's Report and after the report was submitted to the House, we again had a discussion on Bofors. Despite that, we wanted to raise this issue in a different form.

At the very outset, let me point this out to you without casting any aspersions on anyone. Sir, as early as on 20th of April 1987, on our insistence, the Defence Minister, Shri K.C. Pant had made a written statement in this House regarding the Bofors deal, and regarding the allegations from the Swedish Radio that middlemen were involved and commission was paid. On the 17th of April 1987, Government had issued a statement and in this very House, Shri K.C. Pant, the Defence Minister made a written statement in which he considered all the allegations as false and mischievous. He denied about the existence of middlemen and the payment of commission. (*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN-
TARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF IN-
FORMATION AND BROADCASTING
(SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT): Will you yield for
Half a minute?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I will
yield for even half an hour.

SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT: If it is neces-
sary, I will take half an hour. Now, I will take
only half a minute. The hon. member himself
has said that we had discussed Bofors
umpteent times. Now, the best thing is to
prove it. Let us not discuss it all over again.
We should not do it. Let him prove it. That is
all. Please confine to the issue. He never
comes to the issue.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: As
desired by you and to fulfil his desire, I will
come to Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh also.
But I will come via Prime Minister. Only the
routes will be different.

SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT: You may prove
the allegations. You run here and there just
like that. You come to the issue.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, let
me tell you how the Prime Minister misled
the House. That is the subject matter. (*Inter-
rptions*)

I allowed him to break my link of my
speech. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT: If you had any
honesty of purpose, then you should have
come forward straightway and said "This is
my proof".

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE
(Bolpur): He is talking about the honesty.

SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT: I said, the hon-
esty of purpose in the debate.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I will
continue in the hope that I will not have to
yield to him after every two minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: I will give you 20 min-
utes.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: You
give me more time because there were so
many interruptions. He had asked me to
yield. I request you to yield and give me more
time. I was telling that on 20th April, 1987,
Shri K.C. Pant, the Minister of Defence made
a written statement in the House and clar-
ified that there were no middle men, there
were no clandestine payments, there were
no commissions, as far as Bofors deal was
concerned. In the afternoon, on some clar-
ifications sought by some members, the
Prime Minister also intervned and by way of
a clarification, he made it clear what exactly
his contention was. He had invoked the talk
that he had with the Prime Minister of Swe-
den. Then he tried to clarify that all these
allegations that had been made were false.
So, on one occasion, he said, "You produce
the evidence and we will try to examine it and
try to come to the House with the truth." This
is the background.

When we found that the Defence Minis-
ter and the Prime Minister made a categori-
cal statement in this House then at a later
stage, we produced certain documents. The
former Defence Minister and the former
Finance Minister, Vishwanath Pratap Singh,
came forward with certain documents; he
released them from Patna and Lucknow. He
gave the account no. 999921 TU. (*Interrup-
tions*)

No, no; only the spelling mistake was
corrected; instead of PU, it was TU, but the
number continues to be the same—999921.
Again, not only that, but he came out with
details; not only did he come out with the
account no. of the Swiss Bank Corporation
and the total amount of the order of 3.2
Swedish Kroners (it is coming to near about
Rs. 8 crores), he also gave a certain break-
up. He gave the invoice no. 1014836 dated
8.12.86 for Kroners 47,29,190; the second
invoice no. is 1010488, dt. 20.3.87 for Kron-
ers 3,53,380; the third invoice no. is
1010496, dt. 23.3.87 for Kroners
2,71,95,139; the total comes to about 3.2

[Prof. Madhudandavate]
crores of Kroners or it comes to near about Rs. 8 crores. He made it clear that he would be producing the documents and the documents are also available. Let me tell you that I have at my disposal not only what has appeared in the Press but also the original copies of the photostat copies of all these documents which the Chairman, President of the Janata Dal has already produced at Lucknow and also at Patna.

AN HON. MEMBER: Were you present there?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: You know it very well. (*Interruptions*)

I wish to make it very clear that after these documents were produced, the authenticity of them has not been challenged. In the past, whenever any document was produced by the members of the opposition party, there was a prompt intervention by some of the members and the professional hecklers that this was the handiwork and the fabrication of the CIA. But this time when the documents were produced...

(*Interruptions*)

There is yet no agency to purchase me. I am not so easily purchasable as it happened in the case of Bofors deal. And Sir, in the case of these documents... (*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (PROF. K.K. TIWARY): I am on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

PROF. K.K. TIWARY: Prof. Dandavate has produced a certain document which he claims, is released by the so-called President or Chairman of the Janata Dal. Since the so-called Chairman is also present in the House, do I expect him to certify the authenticity of the document? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH (Allahabad): Yes, Sir. (*Interruptions*) I will certify the authenticity of the document. Let it be on record and I stand by that. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Look here, Mr. Tewari...

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. K.K. TEWARY: Let him certify that the document is correct, let him also certify that the account number is right, and the recipient is right. Does he certify to all those? (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. Please sit down. Why are you speaking?

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. K.K. TEWARY: Does this document prove anything? (*Interruptions*)

Let me clarify.

Shri V.P. Singh has asserted on the basis of this document, "I prove that the money has gone to the Prime Minister's account". I challenge it. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. K.K. TEWARY: On the basis of this account number, he has to prove that the money has gone to the Prime Minister's account. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order, please sit down. I have heard it. Please listen to me. When I had allowed point of order, in that case also you had objected to it.

[*English*]

He is also a member. I can overrule or sustain it.

[Translation]

It has to be done according to our rules.

[English]

That is my prerogative. What I need is authenticity. Authenticity means what we get from the real source.

[Translation]

I accept neither your nor his authenticity. Even if you certify it, I will not accept it.

[English]

I will not take that at once.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Let me speak first. I mean to say that every person needs that. But we have our rules. They can authenticate, and take the responsibility, but

[English]

the final authentication can only come from the source. That has to be decided later on.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: No discussion.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY: Mr. V.P. Singh has... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: No, no. No discussion.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: Why are you speaking? I am not accepting.

(Interruptions)

[English]

PROF. K.K. TEWARY: Mr. V.P. Singh, on the basis of this document has said that Rs. 8 crores had gone to the Prime Minister's account. I want him to stand by this assertion because he has to prove it.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not allowing you.

(Interruptions)

PROF. K.K. TEWARY: He has to prove it.

MR. SPEAKER: He has already said it.

(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM): Please allow me. (Interruptions)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: It has already gone on record, that I will authenticate it. (Interruptions)

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Please allow me. (Interruptions) Mr. V.P. Singh has said that he will authenticate that document. (Interruptions)...You were pleased to give your ruling that he cannot do that, unless he gets the original document. (Interruptions)

Sir, whether Mr. V.P. Singh will authenticate a document or not, whether you will allow him to authenticate the document, it is your privilege and you will decide. What we want him to say is, he may stand up at his place and substantiate this paragraph which is reported as a statement made by him. "The Janata Dal President today accused the Prime Minister Mr. Rajiv Gandhi for having deposited Rs. 8 crores taken as commission in Bofors gun." Can he stand up and substantiate this statement?... (Interruptions)

PROF. K.K. TEWARY: He is sitting and not rising... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, he is an hon. Member and on his honour, he must stand up and substantiate this statement and not authenticate an imaginary document. Let him substantiate this statement... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: It is a part of the debate...

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Prof. Sahib, let us be clear about this issue which we are facing.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: When the authenticity was challenged, he was ready to rise. But when I am putting this charge, he is not willing to rise... (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: Whatever is brought before me, I shall look into it.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: I will have to see—

[*Translation*]

— what has been authenticated and given to me.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Rai, please sit down. Why are you irritated?

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Regarding the authenticity of the record presented before me, I go into it and see as to what has been authenticated. I treat that authentication as per-

sonal to the concerned member.

[*English*]

He is not authorised on behalf of the proper agency.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please listen to me.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Somebody can say against you tomorrow....

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Chatterjee, you are a lawyer. If somebody levels charges against you tomorrow, what will you do?

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: The question of authentication will not come if the Member is the author of the document. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: If someone levels such charges against you, what will you do?

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Let me ask him a question.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: I will ask you one question. I want clarification for myself on one question. I am asking Mr. Chatterjee. If somebody were to level charges, false or correct, against you, what will you do in my

position...

(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: I will concede that it is for you to decide whether a particular document should be allowed to be laid on the table. But authentication is done only when something is a copy of the original document. Kindly see your directions 118 and 118A. That shows that a member is not the author... *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: How can he be the author?...

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: That is what I am saying...

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: It might be a wrong thing... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Authentication cannot be of his own document... *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: That is what I am saying, Mr. Chatterjee... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Sir, kindly consider it. Kindly look at your directions... *(Interruptions)*

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (S. BUTA SINGH): Sir, what Mr. Chidambaram has brought to your kind notice is an emphatic statement made by one Mr. V.P. Singh who calls himself the President of Janata Dal. And if he is present by any chance in this House, will he now, if he is a member of this hon. House, authenticate his own statement so that the House can proceed with the discussion?... *(Interruptions)*

PROF. K.K. TEWARY: Sir, you ask Mr. V.P. Singh. It is a challenge to him. He should get up and say that it is correct.... *(Interruptions)*

S. BUTA SINGH: If that is not done, I wonder how Prof. Madhu Dandavate can proceed with the discussion.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: I am asking.

[English]

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: First to hon. Minister, Mr. K.K. Tewary's point, he has challenged me to authenticate the document.... *(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. What are you doing? What are you doing, Bhanu Pratap Ji?

[English]

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I will answer that.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: Please answer my question.

[English]

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Let me be heard.

The hon. Minister challenged me to authenticate the documents. He has given me a challenge. I have accepted it. It is not a charge which is to be authenticated; it is a document of proof. It is not a charge.... *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: That means, Mr. Vishwanath Pratap Singh Ji, you do not stick to the statement which you have made.... *(Interruptions)*

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Chair does not participate in the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: I am just asking him.
He can say so.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: I have to ask this.

[English]

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:
I have not finished. You please hear me fully
and do not put words in my mouth.... (Inter-
ruptions)

This is part one—Mr. K.K. Tewary's
point. Now, Mr. Buta Singh and Mr. Chidam-
baram raised a point. You give me time to
reply. I will reply to each point of theirs....
(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot force any
member. It is not in my powers to force any
member.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot force any
member.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE
MINISTRY OF SURFACE TRANSPORT
(SHRI RAJESH PILOT): The House can
force him... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: If he says: "Nothing
doing, I have not said it", what can I do?

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot force you to
say certain things.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: When he has denied,
what can I do?

[English]

PROF. K.K. TEWARY: Sir, since Mr.
V.P. Singh has mentioned my name, you
please allow him to verify.... (Interruptions)

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: He must
stand by his statement, Sir.... (Interruptions)

PROF. K.K. TEWARY: Mr. Speaker,
Sir, Mr. V.P. Singh referred to my submis-
sion. What I have said is that in the document
which has been circulated, he has charged
that this particular account belongs to the
Prime Minister and the money was credited
to that account. That was precisely his
charge. Therefore, we want that when he is
certifying the document, he must also certify
that the account number is correct, that the
account belongs to Shri Rajiv Gandhi, and
that the money has gone to that account.
That is the complete answer and we expect
Mr. V.P. Singh, if he has any sense of
honour, to certify the document, affirm his
charge that yes, he stands by the charges,
because it is on the basis of the document
that he has tabled the charge. Now he must
come forward and affirm that the document
is correct, his charges are correct, the ac-
count number is correct and the name of the
recipient is also correct... (Interruptions)

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, you
allowed me to make a submission. You
allowed Mr. V.P. Singh to respond. He re-
ferred to me. Let me respond to Mr. V.P.
Singh... (Interruptions)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:
Sir, I am authenticating my Press state-
ments and I stand by every word of it...
(Interruptions)

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, we want
him to read out his Press statement. I would
appeal to you let him read out his Press
statement... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Let me see what is
being authenticated... 2

(Interruptions)

PROF. K.K. TEWARY: Sir, he has been making hundreds of Press statements. I want this particular statement to be authenticated... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, please allow me for a minute... (*Interruptions*)

PROF. K.K. TEWARY: Sir, we are asking about his statement dated 6th of November, reported on 7th of November in the *Times of India*, Patna and Lucknow... (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down. Why are you making noise? You do not know anything

[*English*]

You do not know anything. I have allowed Mr. Goswamy...

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMY (Guwahati): On a point of order. Sir, we have started a discussion under rule 193 and it is not that because it is a sensitive and explosive subject, all rules can be thrown overboard... (*Interruptions*)

While Mr. Dandavate was speaking, he was referring to certain documents and you said that the documents should be authenticated... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: Under the rules, there is no procedure by which there can be challenges and counter-challenges. If a particular Member does not reply to the arguments put forward by the other side, the House is entitled to draw its own conclusions. Sir, you must permit me to challenge the Prime Minister now. I am challenging the Prime Minister now. I am challenging the Prime Minister even now. (*Interruptions*) I

am challenging the Prime Minister now. (*Interruptions*) Please call the Prime Minister now. (*Interruptions*) I am challenging the Prime Minister. (*Interruptions*) Let the Prime Minister be called now. Why not the same procedure be followed? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Please let me speak. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, hon. Members on the Opposition side made a statement... (*Interruptions*) Sir, please allow me to speak (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to have a certain clarification.

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: Making noise would not help. Please sit down.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: No, no. There is no rule like that. I have to clarify about the rules of procedure. I can't allow anything that goes against the rules. I can't allow beyond the rules.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: You cannot participate in the debate from the Chair (*Interruptions*) You have only to give ruling.

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Prof., I should know what I am listening to. There is a difference between the statement given by Shri V.P. Singh and the one given by him.

[Prof. Madhu Dandavate]
[English]

I cannot set my rules in the House. Can I? Should I? The rules are laid down by you. Now, they have given some other thing. How do I know which is correct?

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: No, it is not a new statement. All of you are speaking, no one is listening to me. Whatever you have given, he is not ready to authenticate.

(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, you can't allow this thing *(Interruptions)* Sir, I yielded to him. Please allow me to speak. Sir, the whole basis of the debate is the so-called evidence produced by Mr. V.P. Singh in Patna and in Lucknow on the 6th November. The whole basis of the debate is that. Only yesterday they passed a resolution saying that a new evidence has been produced by Mr. V.P. Singh. Mr. V.P. Singh is here. I have got the statement of the 6th November made by him in Lucknow.

The whole structure of the debate and the statement stands on the basis of the report of the 7th November in the *Times of India*. If he can't authenticate that statement, there is no basis for the debate at all. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: No, I can't allow anything. I have allowed this discussion on Bofors deal time and again in this House.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: What can I do? I cannot force him.

(Interruptions)

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, please allow me to make a submission. I only want to make one submission. The whole basis of this debate is the so-called evidence produced by Mr. V.P. Singh and the conclusion that he wants to draw that Rs. 80 crores were deposited by the Prime Minister in a Swiss bank. *(Interruptions)*. He is not willing to make the charge. What is this debate for? They are not willing to make that charge. Hon'ble Mr. V.P. Singh, please stand up and make the charge. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Chidambaramji, when your turn comes, you refute it, that is all. What more can I say?

(Interruptions)

PROF. K.K. TEWARY: Mr. V.P. Singh has gone away. He is not standing by his charge. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY (Nominated Anglo-Indians): On a point of order.

So far as I am concerned, all that I heard is a barrage of noises. I asked somebody to give me even a photostat copy of this document purported to be authenticated.

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS (Mavelikara): Yes, we will give *(Interruptions)*.

PROF. MADHUDANDAVATE: Sir, that is a Hindi document. When he needs, translation should be given. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: Now, I heard my friends say that he is authenticating the note that he gave with regard to the Bofors commission to the press.

MR. SPEAKER: No, no.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: No, he has not authenticated that.

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Mr. Frank Anthony, if he releases a statement to the press, is he expected to authenticate his own statement? (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: That is what you are asking the Prime Minister also. That is what you are asking others also. The same thing you are asking. That is what Prof. Dandavate said and that is what I am getting answered.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: That is what I am going to do.

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: See, this is a futile exercise, it should not have come to such a point. If somebody denies or admits having said something, it is upto him, what can I say about it....

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Why are you making noise? Please sit down. You can place your viewpoint later on. He made his point, you made your point, what can I do?

13.00 hrs.

You will also get an opportunity; you can make your point at that time.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: What can I do in it.

[*English*]

PROF. K. K. TEWARY: Why should we have a debate in this House when Mr. V.P. Singh is retracting from his statement? He does not stand by that statement. Why should we have a debate?

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: You can mention it at an appropriate moment. What is there in it.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

PROF. K.K. TEWARY: He is not prepared to stand by that statement.

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: What are you doing now?

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Don't drag it too much.

[*English*]

I cannot do. I cannot force him.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Not allowed. I am not allowing Mr. Tewary.

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: Now, it is allright. Leave it Mr. Anthony, there is nothing in it. Do not get embroiled in it.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, shall I convey your message to him that his point of order is ruled out?

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Sit down. Nobody is allowed.

(Interruptions)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: Now, let us adjourn for the lunch.

[*English*]

Or, should we carry on in the Lunch House?...

All right, we are adjourning for Lunch and will meet at 2 O' clock.

13.02 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.

14.04 hrs.

The Lok Sabha reassembled after lunch at four minutes past Fourteen of the Clock

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

[*English*]

DISCUSSION UNDER RULE 193 —
CONTD.

Commission reported to have been paid by M/s Bofors in Howitzer Gun deal — *Contd.*

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): Sir, I was trying to point out to the House that whatever was stated by the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister Shri K.C. Pant on 20th April 1987, was really the reiteration of their earlier statement on April 17 denying totally the existence of middlemen and the payment of commission in the Bofors deal. I produced the documents that have been released by Shri V.P. Singh and since the question of authentication came, I once again tried to brush up the knowledge of my rules and the hon. Speaker's Directions. Again, I got confirmed

that in the course of one's speech in the House, if one quotes any relevant documents, one can always insist that those documents might be allowed to be laid on the Table of the House. Therefore, I have with me the documents regarding Svenska, AE Services and Lotus — all quite famous. On the basis of it, it can be clearly established that middlemen were there and in the document the word "Commission" was used, so commission was paid and the amount and dates, everything is there — agreement, receipts and everything is there. Therefore, since I have been quoting these documents, which have been used by Shri V.P. Singh — he has been asked to authenticate — I also authenticate these documents and seek your permission to lay them on the Table of the House. The usual procedure is, Mr. Speaker, you may carefully go through the documents afterwards and then you give the permission to lay them on the Table of the House and if you are convinced that they can be laid on the Table of the House, then they will be deemed as laid on the Table of the House. I follow this procedure. But, incidentally, this is what is prescribed by the Speaker's Direction 118 and Rule 369. I will see to it that I will comply with these rules. [Placed in library. See No. LT—6869/88, 6870/88 and 6871/88]

Incidentally, I may remind you what your predecessors have said regarding the weight that is added by the documents that are laid on the Table of the House. The Prime Minister is not here. But I would like to make a reference to his father, a great Parliamentarian who had followed certain Parliamentary procedures in the Parliament. When he tried to expose the famous Mundra scandal, he actually at the initial stage only produced the circumstantial evidence and the corroborative evidence and only at the final stage he was able to produce the correspondence between the Finance Secretary and the finance Minister. There were vocal Members on the Treasury Benches and some of the veterans objected and they said: "These are confidential documents. How can Mr. Feroz Gandhi produce them and lay them on the Table of the House? Some of them said: "Let

us know what are the sources of the document". Shri Feroz Gandhi then said to the over-enthusiastic Members of the Treasury Benches: "I am not a fool to reveal my source. In that case, it will not be possible for me to expose corruption in this country". But he gave in writing to the Speaker saying: "I take full responsibility for the authenticity of the documents which I am seeking to lay on the Table of the House". Those documents were allowed to be laid on the Table. On the basis of that, the then Prime Minister said: "Accepting the authenticity of the document and the corroborative and other evidence that have been produced by Shri Feroz Gandhi, I will advise my colleague Shri T. T. Krishnamachari to resign from the Cabinet". That is what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had done. I am sure, if Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru were to be here today, alive today, he would have told the Prime Minister — of course, this Prime Minister would not have been there — but if Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru were to be alive and if he were to be office and he were not the Prime Minister and our present Prime Minister were to be the Prime Minister, I am sure he would have advised him with his Parliamentary talent that it would be better that after the production of these authentic documents and after you made certain statements... (*Interruptions*) Our Prime Minister has given on interview to *Sunday*. It has not been contradicted. These documents have been produced at Patna and Lucknow. *The Sunday* interview has already appeared. It has been quoted and re-quoted by a number of papers. I have here with me the *Economic Times*. Here, the heading is: "Genuine Work for Bofors — Commission Unquestionable..". The Prime Minister Mr. Rajiv Gandhi has said that if Commission was paid in the Bofors gun deal for some genuine work for the Swedish Firm then we cannot question it.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY
(Katwa): Two in one.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: In a lengthy interview with the Calcutta weekly "Sunday", Mr. Gandhi explained that genuine work could be industrial espionage such as, gathering information against the French

papers which was also the reckoning factor in the purchase by India. (*Interruptions*)

SHRISHANTARAM NAIK (Panaji): It is a hypothetical example.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE:
What is the meaning of hypothetical? (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: Choudhary Saheb, why don't you let him speak?

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I was trying to point out to you that in building up my case, the Prime Minister himself is my witness against the Prime Minister because what he has stated clearly runs counter to what he has been saying. Here, I may like to draw the attention of the House that the Prime Minister consistently on the Bofors issue has shifted from position to position. Initially, he said: "there are no middlemen." When it was proved that middlemen were there, he said: "no commission." When it was proved that payments were made, he said: "winding up charges." When winding up charges were disproved and it was proved that commission was there, in that case, he said: "it must not be between Indians." When it was proved that it was paid to Indians, he said: "they are not politicians." When everything was said and done, he scored on both sides and ultimately he said that commission is paid for genuine work and industrial espionage is also considered to be a part and parcel of some genuine work. It was accepted. He seemed to be agreeing both sides.

In our House we have on Shri Kaushal. Looking at him, I am reminded of an anecdote of a judge. When a judge was functioning on the Bench, he looked to both the counsels on both sides. To one counsel he said: "you are right. I fully agree with you. There is some substance in what you say." And when the counsel on the other side

[Prof. Madhudandavate] started speaking, he said: "you are right. There is substance in what you say. You seem to be right." And when someone pointed out, how could both of them be right, he said: "what you say is also right." That is what he said. That seemed to be the position of the Prime Minister today. The way he had been shifting position to position, ultimately coming to the conclusion that the commission is paid to the genuine work, he himself has been contradicting what he said on the Floor of the House on 20th of April, 1987.

In this connection, I would also like to tell you very clearly that PM's admission and authenticity of the document which has not been challenged after so many days shows that the PM and the DM, that is, the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister, have deliberately misguided the House. I do not think they have done it innocently. They have deliberately made wrong and untruthful statement in the House. And I remember a parallel. In U.K., when the famous episode of Profumo was going on and Mr. Kristine Keeler was involved, opposition took a very responsible position and they said: "we are not at all concerned about the theft scandal. They cut across all party lines that it might be a global phenomenon. Therefore, they said: "we are not concerned about the theft aspect of it, we are only concerned whether the concerned Minister Mr. Profumo had given a truthful report to the House or misguided the House." When he had to admit that he tried to mislead the House and reveal the facts, in that case, Profumo had to go. On the same basis, Prime Minister and the Defence Minister for having told untruth to the House on 20th of April 1987. (*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI K.C. PANT): I am on a Point of Order. Professor Dandavate knows that 'untruth' is unparliamentary. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: '...' is unparliamentary and 'untruth is parliamentary. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K.C. PANT: I have been listening very patiently because after all he has the right to speak and I must listen to what he says. But he must not say that I spoke untruth. That is not correct.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Deliberately throughout my debate, at no time, have I used the word '...' because 'untruth' is a parliamentary equivalent of an unparliamentary word '...'. Therefore, I have always been using the word 'Untruth'.

SHRI K.C. PANT: What I say is that you are deliberately trying to use the word '...' in a more sophisticated manner. If you think that is all right, Okay.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Any number of times through the ruling of the Speaker it has been established that '...' is unparliamentary but 'untrue' is actually parliamentary and therefore I am using that word deliberately.

There is no path left open to the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister on this issue because of the breach of privilege. You are not admitting my notice; of course you have not said that you are rejecting it, you have said that you have written to the Prime Minister and since you have written to the Prime Minister you must have felt that there is a prima facie case and there is something to be enquired into and therefore you have rightly sent the notice of privilege which was sent as early as 7th November to the Prime Minister, sought his clarification; you must have sought the clarification also of the Defence Minister.

I am sure in your own wisdom you will decide whether the Privilege notice is to be admitted or not. I have got great confidence in your judgement.

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: Whatever is there is coming before you.

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: After the production of documents and their publication in the Press, it is very clear now why this Government was so keen to bring the Defamation Bill so hurriedly. Not in retrospect, but in prospect now I understand why the Anti-Defection Bill was sought to be brought hurriedly. Because they found that every time they met in a session, some investigative agencies not necessarily the newspapers, tried to do a lot of research and tried to bring out some authentic documents and they become very embarrassing to the Government and to the Treasury Benches. Therefore, rightly the Prime Minister said that they were prepared to sit upto the late night and go through the Bill.

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK: We also now know why you opposed it.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Yes, the Hon. Member who is trying to heckle should know that after going through the Parliamentary procedures right from 1952 he will find that on the floor of the Parliament if we are given certain immunity, it is because what the Press cannot do we can do. They cannot proceed only on the basis of circumstantial evidence but we Parliamentarians can proceed on the basis of circumstantial evidence to be followed by corroborative evidence and ultimately to be crowned by the documentary evidence and then we can establish a particular case. That is why the freedom of speech and expression given to us is not ordinary freedom given under the fundamental rights; but we are given this under Article 105 so that there is no constraint and restriction excepting those framed by the rules and provisions of the Constitution.

Therefore let me point out to you, it is now very clear and explicitly that the way the Defamation Bill was sought to be gone through, it was to be a protective shield for the treasury benches from seeing that in the inter session period no document could

come out which tried to dig out the skeletons from the cupboards of the members of the treasury benches.

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: The way I was harassed in the morning you should allow me a little more time. You were having trouble, I was also in trouble in the morning.

MR. SPEAKER: You are having free time now, you carry on.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: You were harassed, I was also harassed I will also give you a little more time to make comments from the Chair, you please give me a little more time to speak from the floor.

In the entire process, Mr. Win Chadha, Bofors Officials and in a way the entire JPC on Bofors also come under cloud.

I don't want to cast aspersions on the integrity of individual members; but the manner in which the witnesses were examined — those who were to be in the docks were called as witnesses; Bofors in the docks, Bofors in the witness box; Win Chadha in the docks, Win Chadha in the witness box... (*Interruptions*)

I have a right to differ on the floor. That immunity is always there.

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK: You cannot charge the JPC.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: That immunity is there. If we can challenge even the Prime Minister and any other member here, we can challenge the collective body also and the collective wisdom of the Committee. There is nothing wrong. We are not rubber stamps.

As far as the JPC is concerned, I would like to point out... (*Interruptions*)... It is very relevant in this connection Sir.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: All these things are old now.

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE: No Sir, it is relevant. That way Bofors also is very old. After some years it will be a historical specimen; so also will be the Prime Minister.

Anyway I have referred to them. Bofors had not used any middlemen — that is what they said. This is the extract from the JPC Report.

"Bofors had not used any middlemen, representative or agent to represent the company with the Indian authorities in order to win the Howitzer contract and negotiations took place directly between the Ministry of Defence and Bofors."

Further on page 167 of the JPC report it is said:

"Bofors had never paid or conspired to pay any bribes in connection with the Howitzer contract."

Further it is said on page 191:

"There is no evidence to show that any part of the winding up cost was paid to any Indian either resident in India or abroad."

Sir, in our country non-resident Indians and non-Indian residents both are creating problems for our country. I hope that will be taken note of.

Then on page 162 the Report says:

"During his examination Shri Win Chadha further affirmed as under: He was never middleman or an agent of Bofors in so far as he never performed any functions of a broker or commission

agent and was not engaged in any selling activities."

Sir, I have read these extracts for the simple reason that not only the Defence Minister tried to misguide this House, not only the Prime Minister tried to misguide the House but in all humility I may allege that even the JPC because the powers were not available to them inadvertently also misguided this House and came to the conclusions which are inconsistent with facts.

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK: Sir, you mark the words 'inadvertently misguided the House'. Can we tolerate it? I am giving a notice of breach of privilege against him. *(Interruptions)*

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE: There was a debate on the findings of the Joint Parliamentary Committee and when there was a debate in the House on the recommendations of the Committee we mercilessly attacked the findings of the Committee. Nobody can shut our mouth even in criticising the findings of any parliamentary committee because we sit here not as bonded labour of the Treasury Benches. We sit as full-fledged members of Parliament. I would like to point out to you in the end that Government totally failed to inquire into the matter.

[Translation]

SHRI K.D. SULTANPURI (Simla): He has used the word 'bonded labour'. He is a senior Member. He should use parliamentary words.

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE: It is going above your head.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: Should I ask him to take off his cap?

(Interruptions)

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE: Since I am taller that is why what I say goes above his head.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY: Sir, it is a very serious matter. The hon. Member has tried to insult him by saying that the matter is going above his head. The imputation is that he is not understanding anything. As a senior member he should observe certain norms. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE: Sir, I would like to tell him that I did not want to hurt him.

As far as investigations are concerned the Swedish authorities have gone on record that they were prepared to help investigation processes but we have not taken advantage of that. Again the Swiss Government has categorically said that we are prepared to give necessary assistance to find out the facts in respect of payment of commission in the Bofors deal. I do not know why we did not take advantage of that. We know in Philippines a big fraud was perpetrated by the ruler there. We find that Marcos's entire wealth that was hidden as black-money in the International financial institutions was actually dug out and the facts came to light not only before Philippines but it came to light before the entire world. In this case, V.P. Singh's behaviour throughout has been exemplary. (*Interruptions*) Here it has been exemplary. I know that they feel embarrassed. I know, our experience has been the general experience that if one is extremely vocal on the side of the Treasury Benches, one becomes a Cabinet Member. After becoming a Cabinet Member, if he keeps his mouth shut about the sins and omissions and commissions, in that case, he continues to be the Cabinet Minister. That is what is our experience.

Even when V.P. Singh was sitting on the Treasury Benches, Sir, he acted on the dictates of his conscience. And when the time came, he spoke out his mind. He threw

away the Defence Ministership and he tried to tell the truth to the people. In the history, V.P. Singh's name will go on record as a clean man who had given vent to the conscience to maintain his image in public life. (*Interruptions*)

They may try to attack Vishwanath Pratap Singh but I shall conclude by saying the manner in which he conducted himself when Bofors episode took place, when he was on the Treasury Benches and when he quit the Treasury Benches and joined the Opposition, his behaviour has been exemplary, moral and ethical. And so long as these standards are maintained in the country, men like V.P. Singh will be able to mobilise public opinion in the country. Once it is mobilised, there will be no other alternative for the Prime Minister but to quit his post, go and seek the mandate of the people and get rejected by the people. That will be the fate that the Prime Minister will have to meet. I am sure this will happen, Sir.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: One point, Sir. You had asked me to authenticate the newspaper reports. I have done it.

MR. SPEAKER: Which one?

PROF. K.K. TEWARY: No, Sir. I am on a point of order. Since I had raised this matter, you please allow me to make a submission. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: It is a very serious matter on the integrity of a Member. You should allow me.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: Not like this.

[English]

PROF. K.K. TEWARY: I had referred to Mr. V.P. Singh's speech at Patna on 18th. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I was given something else.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Now in fairness, I will request you that the Prime Minister also authenticates his statement in Bangalore that, "We have never denied the commission that has been paid to Bofors. We are looking into it." (*Interruptions*)

PROF. K.K. TEWARY: You permit me one minute. Let him also authenticate the report of 7th November in the Times of India. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: He has not authenticated. (*Interruptions*) Mr. Tewari, you are just forcing me. I cannot force that hon. Member to sign or give me anything. You gave me this one. This is the *Times of India*, November 7, 1988. Isn't it?

PROF. K.K. TEWARY: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: But he is not ready to sign it. I cannot force him to do it.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: If the Prime Minister also likes to authenticate it, I will not stop him.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I only asked him. I did not ask him to authenticate. I never said it. I will not say it. I am on record.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: What I am saying is simple and straight. I did not and I will not force any Member to do that. I will not.

[*Translation*]

Why don't you listen to me?

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

PROF MADHU DANDAVATE: Will you at least find out from the Prime Minister

whether he is prepared to authenticate the report..? (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: If he wants to do it, I would not stop him either, but I will not ask him to sign it; I will not force him. I am not going to force him; I cannot.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I am not going to force him.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): Sir, I am on a point of order. The precedent laid down in this House as per the Rules of Procedure has been that when a Member, private Member as distinct from a Minister, quotes from a document, or when there is a demand in the House that it should be laid on the Table, he shall be allowed to lay it on the Table provided he authenticates it. There is no question of anything else being laid on the Table. There is no question of any speech... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Where is the disagreement?

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: People think that you had asked him to authenticate the speech.

MR. SPEAKER: I did not.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN: There is no question of authenticating anything unless he quotes.

PROF MADHU DANDAVATE: I quoted and he has authenticated.

MR. SPEAKER: He was writing it down; I saw him. I asked him whether he was going to authenticate it or not. He said: "No".

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY (Katwa): Minister gave you a paper and you sent it to him... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I did not ask him.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Why do not you enquire from the Prime Minister whether he is prepared to authenticate it? *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: If you listen to me properly, everything will be all right. Now, please listen to me. The question is, for me, everybody in this House is a Member, whether he is a Prime Minister or a Minister or even the Opposition leader.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY: You sent the papers to Mr. V.P. Singh at the request of the Minister. Now, we demand that the Prime Minister must authenticate it. Why don't you direct him to do so?

MR. SPEAKER: You please listen to me properly. I did not ask him; I did not force him and nor will I do it.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY: You sent it to him. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Why did I send? Because I wanted to know....

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You can send any paper to anybody. Is that a crime?

(Interruptions)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Will you send it to the Prime Minister?

MR. SPEAKER: You are free to do it, Sir. I am not going to do it. You are free to ask the Prime Minister.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: What is wrong in it? I will send your paper also.

(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN-
TARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF IN-
FORMATION AND BROADCASTING

(SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT): Sir, the Prime Minister made a very categorical statement in this House itself. He said it in the House itself. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: If there is time and if there is anything concerned with this, we can do the same thing. I do not mind it. I did not force him; I did not ask him.

(Interruptions)

PROF. K.K. TEWARY: Let me clarify, Sir. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT: Sir, the charges cannot be merely laid on the Table of the House. The charges have to be proved. Every time you make charges and then run away. You should prove what you say. The Prime Minister has categorically refuted all these things. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: You ask the Prime Minister also. It is not a fair thing. I have given the Press cuttings also.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Singh, as I said;...

(Interruptions)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Prime Minister is not above you, Sir. Justice is above you. Let him say, I will sign it. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Tewary, will you please sit down?

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I will make it clear for you. What stands for you also stands for the Prime Minister.

(Interruptions)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: The whole House has witnessed.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not know what cuttings you are sending.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: They were demanding it and I sent it. What is wrong in it? It is up to you. I did not force it upon you.

(Interruptions)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Injustice cannot be done like this.

(Interruptions)

PROF. K.K. TEWARI: If you have the courage, please respond to me. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: You send me papers; I will send it to him. You give me any cutting; I will send it to him. What is there?

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: It is a question of debate.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: It was at the instance of Mr. Tewari and some other Members that you asked him to authenticate.

MR. SPEAKER: I did not ask him.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I will not ask him. I can send it. Neither did I ask you nor would I ask him.

PROF. MADHuDANDAVATE: Are you only a messenger of the Members of Parliament to the Prime Minister? Don't say that. Your dignity is involved. That will not do. If the Prime Minister is interested in the discussion, he should reply to our charges. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: I may inform you that I am not here to press or force the members to do anything.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Gadgil...

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I did not ask for authentication. I asked a question...

(Interruptions)

SHRI K.C. PANT: I would like to say only this. In my view, this is highly unfair on the part of my friends opposite to charge you in this matter. It is not a technical matter. *(Interruptions)*

Listen to me. *(Interruptions)*

Listen to me. There is a certain amount of intolerance in the opposition. Why should you be intolerant. I have been listening to you very patiently. I have been listening to all the epithets that have been hurled at me by Prof. Madhu Dandavate. I have heard them quietly.

The point is that Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh made certain statements. Those statements appeared in the Press. In the *Times of India*, we read about what he said in Allahabad. Now here, the whole House would like to know whether he stands by them or not. He can get up and say that those charges are wrong. he can say that he does not stand by them and nobody is going to force him to do anything. Is it not our right? Is it not the right of the Members to ask whether he stands by the statement? He authenticates certain documents. We want to know whether he stands by them or not. If he does not stand by them, he may withdraw... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Mahbubnagar): In the morning, Prof. K.K. Tewari wanted Shri V.P. Singh to authenticate his statement. Then, when Mr. V.P. Singh got ready to authenticate, Mr. Chidambaram and Mr. Buta Singh wanted him to authenticate some press item. But the Chair was quite indulgent and quite generous.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He is referring to your tolerance!

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: I congratulate the Chair on its flexibility with regard to application of rules. (*Interruptions*) I am sure the rules of parliamentary procedure have been stretched upto a permissible point. But you asked Shri VP Singh to authenticate the newspaper report. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Don't misquote me. You are taking too much of liberty. You are exceeding your limit. I did not ask him to authenticate it.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I must explain this once for all that I did not force any member to do so; I do not force any member to do so; I will also not force any member to do so.

(*Interruptions*)

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

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SURFACE TRANSPORT (SHRI RAJESH PILOT): We have all the right to ask him whether what he had said was correct or not.

MR. SPEAKER: No. I had heard you before, Mr. Goswami.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: You give me a chance.

SHRI A.K. SEN: I agree with Shri K.C. Pant that this is not a technical matter; it is a fundamental matter. Mr. V.P. Singh has quoted a certain press statement in which the Prime Minister was reported to have said something which completely torpedoes the foundation of the JPC's Report in which it was found that there was no commission paid. If this is a matter of fundamental impor-

tance, if it has to be authenticated, then, I think the House, as a duty, to be informed by the Prime Minister and through you what the position is? He must either own the statement or repudiate it.

PROF K.K. TEWARY: I am on a point of order in response to what Shri S Jaipal Reddy has said. In the morning I raised this matter that Shri V.P. Singh, as a responsible member of the House — he is present here; he is a man of honour — had made a certain statement alleging on the basis of a certain paper report with him, a document with him; he had alleged that Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India, had a particular bank account and he had deposited Rs. 8 crores into the bank account. I put this question to Shri V.P. Singh. As a member of this House, does he stand by this? I challenged him to re-assert it on the Floor of the House to which he did not respond; he continued to sit in his seat. (*Interruptions*) Even now I assert that Mr. V.P. Singh has made a malicious charge. He has no courage to use this Floor to affirm that charge. Therefore, if you agree that whatever he had said, is wrong, then it is all right.

MR. SPEAKER: I have heard everybody.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: I think the rules regarding authenticity of the documents have been thrown overboard. What can be authenticated is a document; a newspaper report is not a document. If there is a Press release on which a newspaper report is made, then the Press release can be authenticated. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I agree with you. But had there been a document, I would have asked him to authenticate it, because that is what the rules say.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot hold them responsible for what they wanted to say or what you wanted to say.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY: Don't you think that justice was done properly? (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I have done it with the best of my intention and everything is done in the best intention of this House and traditions. I would not go back on my word.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY: All right. We are satisfied.

MR. SPEAKER: I have never gone back. I will leave this Chair but never go against my conscience.

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

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: Let it continue.

[English]

SHRI V.N. GADGIL (Pune): This debate is to be understood in the context of the paper, the person and the performance. The paper is the *Indian Express*, the person is Mr. V.P. Singh and the performance we saw in the morning. After his inglorious retreat in the the morning, there is very little for me to say. The issue is very simple. The issue is of the whole Bofors debate. Whether the best gun was bought, the answer is 'yes'. Whether the best price was paid, the answer is 'yes'. The third question is whether any Indian was involved or in any way the decision making was influenced. The Bofors Committee found that there is no such evidence. Then, there was a Session in May. In the last session nothing was raised, on the basis of the documents which were published in the *Hindu*. Therefore, why is it raised now? The reason is obvious. The whole edifice of the National Front that he tried to create is crumbling. People are getting disillusioned with him. The cart of Opposition unity is not proceeding. Therefore, whip the dead horse; and that is Bofors.

Whipping the dead horse.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): This is not AICC session.

SHRI V.N. GADGIL: What are these documents? I will analyse them, I will show that Mr. V.P. Singh has tried to mislead on the basis of the documents, through these things.

Now, the first allegation he had made about payment into the account LOTUS synonymous with Rajiv, made in account number which Mr. Dandavate has quoted. It is significant that the account is of Svenska and not LOTUS. The first allegation is about payment into accounts synonymous with Rajiv. Now, the linkage to Rajiv you can see the motive. Such an absurd argument!

Sir, you are a great Sanskrit scholar. You know *Amarkosh*. *Amarkosh* starts with *Amara, Nirjala, Deva*, — for everything there are synonyms. So, there are number of synonyms for LOTUS. You can link with anybody. And, why stop at LOTUS? What is deposited in the lotus? Honey. What is honey. Honey is Madhu. You can connect. (Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: It should be available to me.

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot allow my member to be hidden somewhere.

(Interruptions)

SHRI V.N. GADGIL: Therefore, such kind of arguments are advanced to link up with the Prime Minister.

Then again, the second point is, the bank was instructed that — if possible — the name of the depositor should not be disclosed. This was on 19th December, 1986. Now, what do I find from the document? That the payment relates to *Tulip*, not to *Lotus*, the bank is "MANUFACTURERS HANNOVER TRUST" and it is not dated 19th December, it is dated July 1986. So, no connection is

there. But the most absurd thing he has done is, three invoices, dated 8th December, 20th March and 23rd March, are there. The amounts, I will not quote them again, Mr. Dandavate has quoted. And he adds up and makes Rs. 32 million. I should carefully analyse. What do we find?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: And that is part of it.

SHRI V.N. GADGIL: What we find is, actually percentage-wise the amount is on 4729190 and if you add up the commission it comes to 5,48,207 and not 32 million! What he has done clearly is, the total amount supposed to have been put in the account, is shown as the total commission. Actually what is paid is, commission on that amount. That is shown as the total commission. These are the kind of documents...(*interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: But commission has been paid...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI V.N. GADGIL: These are the kind of arguments that are advanced. As I said, I really understand Mr. V.P. Singh. To be frank with you, I sympathise with him. Because his predicament is such that when he talks of moral values, his own colleagues do not believe him. Therefore, I can understand his predicament talking about moral values and making all kinds of wild allegations.

Mr. V.P. Singh is a lawyer and at least he had a degree in law. I am not casting any reflection; only making the statement of fact. Sir, the elementary principle of law is, production of a document is not the proof of the contents of the document. Any number of documents you can produce. What is necessary is to prove the truth of the contents of the document. More production of document is no use. So, he can go on producing any number of documents, that will not lead to truth. He talks about moral values. (*Interruptions*)

SHRISOMNATH CHATTERJEE: What is the truth?...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI V.N. GADGIL: Therefore, he raised it with certain political motivation and when there is no evidence, he brings in whisper, gossip and rumour. This is precisely what was done sometime back in England. This was described by a poet. Mr. V.P. Singh himself is a poet. What he says is:

Actual evidence I have none
But my aunt's maidservants sister's son
Heard a policeman on his beat
Say to a housemaid in Downing Street
That he had a brother who had a friend
Who knew when the war is going to end.

This is the type of argument. Therefore, I will not attack him personally. I will not say anything about his personal life. I will talk about his politics. His politics is this kind of politics. As I said at the outset, I sympathise with him. He is a poor fellow found in a wrong company. When he talks about moral values, my request to him would be, just look at some of your colleagues, new found friends; put your hand on your heart and swear with you conscience, whether there is any link between what you speak and what you practice.

I would not have taken note of his wild and laughable allegations but for one serious consequence. Sir, you know the security environment of this county. There are forces outside which are trying to weaken Indian polity and demoralise the armed forces...(*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: You are using the jargon in the wrong context...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI V.N. GADGIL: I am not saying with any motivation. I say, at least unintentionally what he is doing, by the kind of campaign he is running, he is helping the very forces which are interested in uncertain and unstable India. Therefore, I can understand his desire to become a new J.P.

[Sh. V. N. Gadgil]
15.00 hrs.

I also, like anybody in politics, would have liked it. I understand his desire to become J.P. But I must tell him that a national leadership and a petty mind do not go together. You must rise above this. You must talk about people's problems. You use this forum for people's problems and not for throwing mud at someone. I hope he will not take offense if I say something because I do not wish to be personal. When I was a student, I was fascinated by that classic Col. Todd's *Annals of Rajasthan*, wonderful fascinating book. One sentence there struck me and that sentence I will quote, not add further. Col. Todd says: A true Rajput never betrays his benefactor...*(Interruptions)*. Who made you number two and your performance as number two as such..*(Interruptions)*

Mr. Dandavate talked about some Ministers resigning and going there and becoming leader. I would only like to remind him that a person who was charged and against whom some observations were made in the Mundhra Commission, became a Finance Minister under Janata Government. Then, there was Chimanbhai Patel of Gujarat, against whom *Nav Nirman* agitation was launched and fifty students were killed. His Government was brought down. Then he joined Janata government and has become a respectable leader. One of Mr. Dandavate's colleagues from my home town Poona was asked: "What about Chimanbhai? He was supposed to be very sinful and all that. What has happened now that you accept him as a leader?" His reply was very interesting. He said: "Janata Party is *Ganga nadi*. So, everybody who comes to Janata Party gets purified." So, Sir, let us abolish the Indian Penal Code, let us abolish the Criminal Procedure Code and send all persons to Janata Party to get themselves purified. What kind of politics is this. I can understand your eye on the next elections. You have every legitimate right to ask for people's votes on various policies and programmes. Let for God's sake, for the sake of

this Parliament, do not descend to this level of mud-slinging. Luck, mire and smear will bring no honour to this Parliament.

Finally, Sir, as I said, I do not want to be personal. But although politically we are opposite, still I regard Mr. V.P. Singh as a friend. We belong to the same college and in that capacity I make him one appeal that Mr. V.P. Singh, you have no right to talk on behalf of the people of India...*(Interruptions)*. The nation is safe in the hands of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi. Therefore, with folded hands, my request to Mr. V.P. Singh is that a period of silence on his part will be most welcome. Thank you Sir.

PROF.K.K. TEWARY: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this matter has been debated almost *ad nauseam* in the House. What is important and what prompted my friends on the Opposite side to repeat their past performance again in the House is basically the statement made by Mr.V.P. Singh with utmost definiteness and assertion at his command while he was addressing a rally at Patna. The assertion made by Mr. V.P. Singh was: "I have discovered the truth for which everybody has been groping for the last one and a half years." that is, the payment, the actual quantum of payment, the actual bank account and also the recipients involved in this. And he made the charge, I think, and I say, he is an hon. Member of this House and he also has a sense of honour, personal honour, and honour of this House which is the repository of the sovereignty and collective honour of the people of India. So, the hon. Member Mr. V.P. Singh made the assertion that the Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, has received Rs.8 crores and the account number was given and he has deposited this money in this bank account and from the next day, Sir, ravaging notices were taken, newspapers were full of reports, even international news agencies flashed this news across the world. But the real culprit in this campaign — it has been on for one and half years — has finally been disclosed by Mr. V.P. Singh in the real regal fashion, in the fashion of his Tzar ancestry, that is, he belongs to Tzar, a small feudatory

— I would not call it a kingdom — a small feudatory somewhere in UP and in that tradition, he marched from Patna as a triumphant victor to Lucknow and again, Sir, the charge was repeated. So, today's debate is not about what we have discussed in this House continuously, almost in every Session, sometimes twice for the last one year, but the issue now centres round one question that the country must know about this much wanted national alternative of the non-existent Janata Dal. So, this has been doubted so much.

15.07 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

The people also in this country have started looking to Mr. V.P. Singh although, I say, Charlatan's turncoats, renegades, do not make into a national alternative..., but people rightly or wrongly have been looking to a certain fugitive from the Congress, who crossed over to the Opposition and from the bankruptcy of the Opposition for the last 40 years, they have been asserting to the people of India, promising to the people of India that a national alternative is round the corner and even after 40 years what they have come up with. The national alternative is an instant formation and an instant projection and that too a fugitive from the Congress who till the other day was swearing that only death will part him from Rajiv Gandhi. Sir, he pleaded eternal royalty for Rajiv Gandhi. So, what I want the nation through this Hon. House to take notice of is the mettle of this famous V.P. Singh who makes a statement to the public in the rally of 20,000 persons in Patna and when I get up in this House, I say Mr. V.P. Singh I still believe that you deserve the honourable description of a position. Do you have any sense of odourless? Would you repeat the same charges? Do you stand by your charge that Rajiv Gandhi has taken Rs. 8 crores and he has this amount in a particular Swiss Bank? Mr. V.P. Singh has been dragging his feet since morning and has been trying to look to Prof. Dandavate, Mr. Chatterjee, all of them. He has been looking to them since morning. Sir, I want the

whole of the country to take notice of this charge which has prompted this debate in this House, the charge which has been flashed across all newspapers throughout this country and throughout the world, he does not stand by that. Sir, let us not forget, Mr. V.P. Singh and hon. friends on the opposite, you may not be here, I may not be here next time. But the institution of Parliament, the political system that has been built over decades through the sweat and blood of the people of India cannot be staked for petty personal vendetta and here is a man who is a Member of this House and without any qualm of conscience—because I never suspected him of any conscience at any point of time. Without any qualm of conscience, he comes out in the public and now when I put this question to you, "whether you are prepared to repeat your charge, would you say, "I will stand by that charge which I have made publicly and which has been published in all newspapers and magazines continuously ever since you made this statement at Patna, till date, you have not said that the charge is not correct or you have not said openly and you have not repeated the charge. You are keeping quiet. So, take advantage of this august House and you repeat it again. Let the people of India know that you stand by your charge that Rajiv Gandhi took the money because Rajiv Gandhi has been the target of your attack, of your vendetta, of your vindictiveness. By speaking untruths, by fabricating stories—I would not say anything else, unparliamentary—I would only say by fabricating stories, by fabricating untruths, you have kept yourself in the news, in the limelight. But today I am convinced that V.P. Singh is not only completely devoid of conscience, he is also completely devoid of sense of honour and the prestige of this House. He does not have the courage.

Friends on the opposite were talking about another certification or permission. Now the question is not of anything else. The question is simply of Mr. V.P. Singh's charge which has kept the country agog, which has made the Prime Minister of India suspicious in the eyes of the people. Therefore, I

[Prof. K.K. Tewary]

wanted Mr. V.P. Singh to come forward and take the responsibility and repeat his charge—either own the news-item published or disown it. But still he has been dragging his feet and he did not have the courage in the morning. Even now, he does not have the courage to say that "I stand by what I said in Patna, that Rajiv Gandhi has taken money and the account No. mentioned by me belongs to Rajiv Gandhi." This is the crux of the problem. Other things have been discussed.

Mr. V.P. Singh—your track record—let this country know, what you have been doing, how you operated as a Minister. You had been a Central Minister. All Ministers in the Government of India are supposed to give returns. This is your correct picture, real picture of V.P. Singh, the crusader for a clean public life. But this crusader whom the Opposition took for a Messiah, is a pigmy with feet of clay. He is a pigmy with feet of clay and what he is ultimately! May I know this? You had been a Minister. Tell me with full sense of responsibility, do you own this? Did you ever as Minister both during Indira Gandhi's time and during Rajiv Gandhi's time, give your exact property return as Minister? Here is a man, who was a Minister in the Central Government, who violated the mandatory instructions of the Government to submit property details within three months. And for years and years that he was in the Central Government, he forgot it. He suffers from amnesia sometimes, forgetfulness. So, he did not submit his property returns to the Government. And the properties that he had disclosed, I would like to know from Mr. Chatterjee or Mr. Dandavate, how many Opposition leaders have acquired properties in Delhi? Here is a man, Mr. V.P. Singh, who says that he has only 18 acres of land spread over in three districts of UP and that he gets only Rs. 500/- as the rental income from his two houses at Manda and Allahabad and that with that income, Mr. V.P. Singh has disclosed that he has acquired extensive properties in Delhi including Connaught Place also.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:
The whole Income-Tax Department is there.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY: I do not know how many friends on the Opposition, Prof. Madhu Dandavate or have acquired such properties in Delhi. But how come that Mr. Vishwanath Pratap Singh during his tenure as Minister,—let him contradict it—only from this meagre source of income acquired all these properties which are in Delhi and which he himself disclosed? How did he acquire them?

I would like to refresh the memory of Prof. Madhu Dandavate that there was a memorandum...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Don't mention the names.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY: The problem is that so long as a person is in the Congress, he is accused of all the vices, of all conceivable things. When Shri Biju Patnaik was in the Congress, imagine Shri Chimanbhai Patel has been mentioned. (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No. What is your point, Mr. Tewary? I told you.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY: I am making the point. I am merely addressing Prof. Madhu Dandavate. (Interruptions) Prof. Madhu Dandavate would recall that in this very House when our very very dear friend Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh was Finance Minister of India, then Lok Dal Party led by Shri Bahuguna and Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav and Shri Devilal submitted a memorandum to UP Government and UP Governor accusing Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh of having cornered illegally against all ceiling laws in UP about 4,000 acres of land into his infamous Dhayya Ram Janaki Trust. Prof. Madhu Dandavate has raised this matter in this very House and Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh has been accused of having been responsible for slaughter of 10,000 Harijans and backward people in fake police encounters. I would like to remind you, Prof. Madhu

Dandavate. (*Interruptions*) What has happened to those charges?

Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh is nice, good guide. Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh is willing to go to bed with everybody from Mr. Hershman to Shri Hazi Mastan on the one side and, Shri Vajpayee to Basu on the other. With utmost alacrity, he is willing to go to bed with everybody whomsoever promises power and authority to him, and the ouster of Shri Rajiv Gandhi, if he can campaign for Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh.

This in nutshell is the contribution of Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh. (*Interruptions*). I wanted to avoid referring to many things. Mr. Vishwanath Pratap Singh, if you recall, in this very House and outside, your new-found friends on the Opposition benches will never raise these matters or write about these matters or anything. It was all raised by your now new friends. They had raised this matter when you were in the Congress. They had also said that Shri V.P. Singh owes an explanation to this country as to how as Finance Minister he was guilty of nepotism. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I have made clear everything to the Opposition. Let Shri Rajiv Gandhi do the same which I had done. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. K.K.TEWARY: Will Mr. V.P. Singh make a clean breast of the charges levelled against him? Mr. V.P. Singh, as a Finance Minister; subverted all rules of his Ministry, Finance Ministry. This is the credibility of this man who levelled charges against no less a person than the Prime Minister openly and in public and in the House...(*Interruptions*). How did Mr. V.P. Singh subvert the rules of his Ministry? How did he find a cosy job for his son in an American Bank? Will he explain all these things? How he did it? So, Mr. V.P. Singh owes an explanation to this House and to this country. The person who is throwing mud and dust on others must first explain his own face and explain his own deeds and his own track record. Mr V.P. Singh; as Finance

Minister, subverted all the rules and deviated from all angles. This is the level of his morality, of his commitment to this country, his commitment to the security of this nation. He had approved the entire deal. The entire deal was approved by Mr. V.P. Singh, as a Finance Minister. But, as Defence Minister, he said that these guns that have been purchased are not reliable guns. I repeat that Mr. V.P. Singh is a mere puppet. He is a mere puppet in the hands of those people who are out to destroy this country and this game has started way back in 1986. In 1986 itself, they started this game. Sir, you may recall that in this House during the earlier debates on Bofors, I have stated as to how his highest office in this country was utilised and how Mr. V.P. Singh, an insider, who was previously one of us, was lured away from the Congress and in pursuit of power like Dr Faustus...(*Interruptions*) I think Mr. V.P. Singh knows Dr. Faustus, the famous Greek Myth and based on Marlowe's Drama—Dr. Faustus—about his character. Dr. Faustus wanted all the places of pleasure, wealth and worldly power. In pursuit of his pleasures, he sold away his soul to devil and ultimately he realised that neither places of pleasure nor power, money has satisfied his hunger, his goal. Ultimately he started bewailing his lot. So, I say Dr V.P. Singh will face the same destiny and he will have to face the same lot, as 'Dr. Faustus' faced...(*Interruptions*). This is the entire matter. This is an orchestrated campaign against Shri Rajiv Gandhi. It has been going on for the last one-and-a-half years whether it is Bofors or something else.

Mr. V.P. Singh can change his colour. As has been said, by Shakespeare, he is a poor little leaf of every wind that blows and with every wind that blows, he changes his direction. Like the proverbial chameleon, he changes his colour with every change in the weather. So, this is the position. What damage he has done to use? He has jumped on to the other side. I am only warning my friends on the Opposition Benches to be careful of him. He has now revealed that he has ordered inquiry into the Swiss Bank Accounts of the Opposition leader. He also said that he had ordered inquiries into the

[Prof. K.K. Tewary]

Bank Accounts of Opposition leaders. Now, some of the Opposition leaders are writing letters to him asking him to reveal which opposition leader he is keeping in his mind. He is keeping them on the tenter-hooks. He has not revealed their names. This is the way Mr. V.P. Singh has been acting. Shri Chandra Sekhar, the former President of the Janata Party, in a recent Press Statement has said it is very easy to level charges. He has said that it is very easy to level charges. Charges levelling with this kind of impunity and with this sense of irresponsibility has already polluted the political atmosphere in the country. And it is up to Mr. V.P. Singh to prove the charge. But now we find that Mr. V.P. Singh is putting his tale between his legs and he is running away. He is not prepared to repeat the charge that Mr. Rajiv Gandhi has taken the money. Mr. V.P. Singh, those who live in glass houses, as you do with all your ...how much of the property... (*Interruptions*)

I repeat in this House with full sense of responsibility that Mr. V.P. Singh has revealed only a tip of the proverbial iceberg. Mr. V.P. Singh, in Delhi alone, has acquired property during his tenure as the Central Minister which is worth about Rs. 50.00 crores. And much of that property, Mr. V.P. Singh, have you revealed to the people? Therefore, Bofors debate was brought to denigrate us. Bofors issue was brought again to repeat the same baseless charges. Now it turns out that the man who starts ignited with a sense of drama said: "I have everything in my back". Also like magician he carries an electronic memory bank or something and with that memory bank he applies them to the noses, ears of the opposition friends. After that, their minds charge. Friends, Beware of this Magician. We have nothing more to say except that from Mr. V.P. Singh's background, his recent moves, Mr. V.P. Singh's credentials should be examined. Mr. V.P. Singh, you want to establish. He has promised a new Addis Ababa; he has promised a new Jerusalem in this country. Who are those people? Mr. V.P. Singh came as a prophet and he has

Apostles. Prophet always is accompanied by apostles. Look at his apostles. Hegde—from telephone tapper to land grabber. In between Devi Lal, Arun Nehru. I just want to tell you that Mr. V.P. Singh is a pretender. (*Interruptions*)

Why not you get back to what he has? Therefore, this Bofors debate is another exercise of fidgeting and misleading. Mr. V.P. Singh takes people of India, takes their credibility for granted. He thinks by throwing dust into their eyes, he will manage to take them for a ride and he will immediately grab the chair of Prime Ministership. Mr. V.P. Singh: it is not that easy. The way to the chair is full of difficulties. Therefore, I say the taste of the pudding lies in the eating. I challenge Mr. V.P. Singh on the floor of the House. I want the country to know his real character, his real face. If he has any sense of honour, let him stand by his charge that Rajiv Gandhi owns account in swiss bank. that Rajiv Gandhi has taken money. Let Mr. V.P. Singh stand by his commitment, let him stand by his charge. Obviously, he is not prepared to stand. Therefore, I charge Mr. V.P. Singh for his irresponsibility of being a ** of being a hand maid, being a mere ** in the hands of those who want to destroy the unity and integrity of India. Mr. Singh claims to serve the country. I am yet to come across a statement from Mr. Singh the way Mr. Jethmalani had gone to Punjab and the seeds that he sowed. I was expecting Mr. Singh that he will come out with some statement. Here is a man that he is a man whose only one pursuit in life is the denigration of Shri Rajiv Gandhi and throwing dust into the eyes of people. By this method he thinks that he will be able to mislead the people and take them for a ride. Therefore I challenge Mr. V.P. Singh and charge him that he is deliberately misleading the people of India by floating wrong information. He has no courage and he is not prepared to stand by his own challenge.

With these words I want Mr. V.P. Singh to be censured by this House and also by this country for his utter irresponsibility and betrayal... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, the filth and garbage which is really the substance of the speech of one K.K. Tewary show unfortunately that this parliamentary institution has reached its nadir. In my humble experience of over 17-18 years I have never seen such a disgusting performance coming from a ruling party member. He seems to have thought that personal abuse is the best form of offence of those who are not having any defence. He has indulged in such sanctimonious humbugism inside this House. It is amazing that the Chair has permitted it so long... (*Interruptions*)...

I can understand the nervousness on the part of the party in power. They know, they are now in deep morass. People are awaiting for the day when they will deliver themselves by throwing out the party in power... (*Interruptions*)

We heard a long discourse on the bankruptcy of the Opposition. Let us see the performance of the Government, their leader's performance, and why did Mr. Tewary lose his job.

AN. HON. MEMBER: What about Bengal Lamp thing?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Bengal Lamp is burning... (*Interruptions*). There is a leader who has changed his Ministry only 36 times in three years. It shows the utter bankruptcy of the functioning of this party. He has referred to Mr. V.P. Singh sharing beds with the Opposition. I hope he does not share beds with the Congress people, then he will have AIDS!... (*Interruptions*)...

I have heard so many Hon. Members and eminent people from the ruling party. Mr. Gadgil is much more sophisticated than Mr. Tewary's usual performance. He has got some finesse and now with his new found position as the General Secretary of the Congress, supposed by implementing some programmes of the Congress Party, now the author of Electoral Reforms proposals. I

don't know how long he retains his new found position because General Secretaries' tenure is two to three months. One of our friends Mr. N.C. Chaturvedi was holding a Press Conference as a General Secretary. He was informed by the Press that he was no longer the General Secretary. In the midst of the Press Conference he was removed!

I had invited our very good friend Mr. Sontosh Mohan Dev to come to Shanti Niketan as the Tourism Minister. He fixed the date. We were ready to receive him with big garlands and all that. But the very same morning I saw in the papers that he was no longer the Tourism Minister; he had become the Telephone Minister without a functioning telephone system in this country. This is the way they have functioned.

Why have we raised this question here? None of them has touched on this. The question is, payment was made on what account and to whom. Certain facts have come out. I shall ignore for the time being Mr. V.P. Singh's disclosures... (*Interruptions*)... This is the trouble. They don't understand. I said for the time being I shall ignore. Let us catch hold of a greater culprit. There are two culprits today here we find. One is the Prime Minister and the other is Mr. V.P. Singh. I shall give him much greater importance because he happens to be the Prime Minister, whatever may be the fate of this country. Now the Prime Minister has said and whatever he said is on record.

This is one of the Sarkari news journals in which it has been said that the Prime Minister has admitted that there has been payment of commission. This is the first thing. Now for the first time we see from this journal—Sunday of 13-19 November 1988 at Page 49—that commission whatever was paid in the Bofors matter was commission and on account of commission. This has really created a feeling amongst the people that now some other case is coming out. People are realising that our great Prime Minister has been consistently inconsistent in this matter. That is why we want to raise this matter again on the floor of this House.

(Sh. Somnath Chatterjee)

He has got such competent Ministers! Mr. K.C. Pant with all his suavity never answers a point; he avoids it very cleverly and he will say 'I have never disturbed you, why are you disturbing me?' The way in which you put things, it looks he is the biggest embodiment of all the virtues in this world. This is not the way things are to be done.

What did he say on the floor of the House as to the nature of this payment? What did his leader say either inside the House or outside the House? What did the JPC on Bofors say and what did Mr. Arun Singh say? Did you at any point of time, Mr. Tewary accept or admit that the payment of the order of Rs. 64 crores was on account of commission?

We all know, this is the statement of Mr. K.C. Pant. The first reaction is this, where he quoted verbatim the statement issued by the Government on April 17, 1987. I quote:

"Government categorically deny the allegation contained in a news story based on the report broadcast by the Swedish Radio and Television in connection with an arms order placed on the Swedish firm Bofors. The news item is false, baseless and mischievous. During the negotiations the Government had made it clear that the company should not pay any money to any person in connection with the contract. Government's policy is not to permit any clandestine or irregular payments in contracts."

"Any breach of this policy by anyone will be most severely dealt with."

And then, the famous rider:

"The report is one more link in the chain of denigration and destabilization of our political system. Government and the people are determined to defeat this sinister design with all their might".

Now the time has shown that every word is incorrect in this Government of India statement made by no less a person than the Defence Minister. Therefore, we are entitled to know what was the nature of payment.

After this statement, what did Shri Arun Singh say after his resignation? In fact, he said that attempt should be made to recover it. And he said that it was a breach of faith on the part of Bofors. The result is that he is no longer a Member of the Rajya Sabha and is spending his time somewhere near Almora as far away from his friends as possible.

Then, what did JPC say in its report which has been adopted by this House, the majority in this House. After decimation of the legal principles and after denigration of whatever is based on law and justice, Shri Shankaranand has now become the Minister of Justice. What did the report say on page 191:

"There is no evidence to show that any middleman was involved in the process of the acquisition of the Bofors gun. There is also no evidence to substantiate the allegation of commissions or bribes having been paid to anyone. Therefore, the question of payments to any Indian or Indian Company whether resident in India or not, does not arise, especially as no evidence to the contrary is forthcoming from any quarter."

That was supported by the Government. Shri Pant spoke eloquently in its favour. He said that this was one of the best product that India could have seen. Wonderful preparation, wonderful finding, the truth incarnate!

Now, our Prime Minister is reported to have said that it is commission. Very interesting. Here is an interview with Shri Rajiv Gandhi. The questioner was, of course, a very intelligent person, Mr. Sarkar.

The question was:

"We are not questioning the selection of the equipment. The question is whether

or not money was taken. Even for an ideal choice, say a Mercedes Benz car, there could be considerations. The question is whether a commission..."

The question was not allowed to be completed and the Prime Minister said:

"... was paid. Obviously, how many million Kroner — 319 was the original number — I think it ended up in 60 something crores, 66 crores."

The questioner said:

"64 crores".

The answer was:

"Whatever it was. Anyway, that much money was paid to somebody. That is clear. Nobody doubts that. Nobody argues about that. We don't question that."

Somebody has been paid Rs. 64 crores. The Prime Minister does not question that. Nobody argues about that. It was paid on account of commission. Then, the question was:

"But to whom? Who got the money?"

The answer was:

The question is to whom and for what? If it was paid for some genuine work that was done for Bofors, then we cannot question it."

It was commission paid for doing some work. Then, the next question:

"Oh, yes you can. Your deal with Bofors made it quite clear that there would be no middlemen. So there could be no genuine work, they were paid for."

It was a very intelligent and pointed question. The answer was:

"No, not genuine work in terms of mid-

dlemen. Genuine work gathering information against the French weapon, for example. That is industrial espionage. You cannot grudge them that. You can't..."

This is the Prime Minister of India and the Leader of the country and the Opposition is accused of bankruptcy. Of, course, Sir, Rs. 60 crores is nothing for our Prime Minister. According to him a swimming Pool costs nothing. It is very cheap. All the pilots, most of the pilots in the country have swimming pools. How much does it cost to have a swimming pool, I do not know. Where is Mr. Tewari? I would like to have an estimation from him. Where is our Minister for Urban Development or PWD Minister? Let us find out how much it cost.

Sir, the point is whom do we trust. About Mr. K.C. Pant, I have always felt how he is in that group.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He is here for a long time.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Replying to the debate — If my question is wrong please correct me Mr. Pant — in the Lok Sabha on the 5th May on the JPC Report, Mr. Pant endorsed the contention of the Bofors that they had some consultancy agreement which it had terminated because of the Government's insistence that there will be no middlemen. No evidence has so far emerged, he said, to contradict the Bofor's version. This was given on the 5th May, 1988. I would like to know from Mr. Pant, when did the Prime Minister come to know that it was commission. When did he come to know that the JPC Report is not correct? Was it before that? He did not give that information to the JPC and he did not give that information to the House and he mislead the House. He allowed Mr. Pant to mislead the House. It was not known before the JPC Report or even before the debate on the JPC Report started and he came to know about it later, when and how did he come to know about it and who gave him that information, I would like to know. Which docu-

[Sh. Somnath Chatterjee] ment showed that? Therefore, why these statements have been kept back? Not a single attempt has been made by any of the Hon. Members from the Treasury Benches who have spoken. Shall I not ask myself or shall the country not ask itself or ask the Government to explain how does the Prime Minister come to know about this? He says, "No doubt about it. Obviously it was paid". I am quoting him. There is no denial of this so far although it has come out quite a few days back and this is a subject matter of comments in so many papers.

Sir, our Prime Minister made certain statements, as you would recall, before the Army Commandars. "Sweden had confirmed that there was no middlemen and no money was paid in Swiss Bank." He told this to the Army Commanders on 27th April. During the discussion on JPC Report a theory came from the Minister, one of the Ministers of the Government who is number one of the gang of four, we are told, Mr. Shiv Shanker. His theory is, of course, original theory. We do not find him there. I hope he is still a Minister. He says: "Are you not aware that in many companies in this country, the Directors themselves keep back the money?" Sir, I did not know it. Speaking for myself, I am a very humble person. He said "If they had paid the money, I am sure it must have been ploughed back to the directors, which happens in this country day in and day out." This is what the directors have been doing. Now, why did you not catch hold of those directors? What action is taken when such illegalities are committed?

Therefore, Sir, the point is that at no point of time the House was told that the commission was paid until the Prime Minister admitted. We have got here the Defence Minister, the Finance Minister, the Home Minister; all of them are here. What steps have you taken? Since the Prime Minister is sure that it has been paid on account of commission, what steps have the Government taken for the purpose of finding out as to whom it is gone? What remedial action has been taken? Now, in the course of an

interview in a long statement or rather a rigmarole — if I can use that expression —, the Prime Minister tells as to why this contract with the Bofors cannot be cancelled. It is very unfortunate that the Prime Minister of this country tells about a supplier of arms who is dependent on our good wishes in this way. Bofors were going to wind up and but for this contract, placed with them they had no work and no contracts. As far as we have been able to find out, Bofors was saved by this contract and that was why they celebrated India Day in Bofors when the contract was signed! And our Prime Minister has told that we cannot cancel the contract with the Bofors Company and the people have been told that they have to bear compensation upto the extent of one thousand crores and therefore, we cannot touch them. Therefore, today Bofors knows that its contract is immune from any action by the Government of India. In future, knowing fully well that nothing can happen to them, they may openly pay commissions.

Now payments have been made on account of commission. To whom was it made? Till today, Government of India has not been able to find out anything except the names of some paper companies which have been mentioned in the JPC's report and in the discussion here. Shri Shiv Shanker said that they were hollow companies. To a company which is not worth one hundred dollars, thousands and thousands, may, millions and millions of dollars by way of commission have been paid. This money has been paid to companies which did not have even a table and chair for their office. And this is supposed to be their only business transaction. Does this Government believe that everybody will believe and accept whatever is coming out of them? Instead of replying the question on merits, you go on levelling all personal allegations and making personal abuses like this. What all we heard today!

Sir, it is the incumbent duty of this Government to tell us when they came to know that the amount was paid by way of commission and since then, what action has

been taken by them in finding out to whom it was paid. The CBI is supposed to inquire into this. But, a CBI inquiry is ordered when they want to protect somebody. When the inquiry ends, we see in the newspapers that everybody is exonerated. We have the examples. The property in Switzerland has now been found to be properly acquired! Accounts opened have been properly opened! Now, what has happened to the case against Win Chadha? We would like to know whether it is continuing today. If the case has come to an end, we want to know as to what has happened to the charges? What has happened to the allegations against the Anatron Corporation? What inquiry, what proceedings and what prosecution is going on in this connection? We would like to know all these. Instead of doing that, you are only trying to say that Shri V.P. Singh is a bad man. Let him be bad. If Shri V.P. Singh is a bad man, he will be defeated in the elections. But, for the present moment you cannot ignore or forget the Allahabad verdict given by the people. Here, I am not holding any brief for Shri V.P. Singh. I am charging this Government or deliberately misleading this House. I level a charge against the Prime Minister that he is taking positions which are inconsistent with each other. He has not been candidate to the House. He is guilty of suppression. This is my first charge.

Now Sir, Shri V.P. Singh has come out with certain documents. I personally do not know the truth about these documents. Nor can I vouch the truth of these documents. He has authenticated them. It is for him to prove. I only ask whether these documents are disquietening or not? It is clearly stated that these are paid by way of commission. I am sure the hon. House remembers this.

After the JPC Report, *The Hindu* newspaper came out with certain disclosures. When he came to know of the name of Pitco or Moreco or something like that, I do not remember, or Lotus, etc. or Pitco C/o Sangam, now a connection was established between Hinduja and Pitco - Moreco; but this government gave a clearance; Hinduja

are having property and business in this country, but they seem to be beyond the reach of this government, because Hinduja cannot be touched; Suri cannot be touched; Chadha cannot be touched; Bofors cannot be touched; Sharmas cannot be touched; Bachchans cannot be touched in this country. If you prove charges against them, government will go on shielding them because the government says, the Prime Minister says, yes, he is very much still my friend; any day I can utilise his services.

AN HON. MEMBER: I will bring him back.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: You regret bringing Amitabh Bachchan into politics. On pages 59 of this journal, it reads as under:

"On the subject of friends, do you regret having asked Amitabh Bachchan to joint politics?"

No. Absolutely, not. I don't regret it at all. I might call him back again.

"... Well, it hasn't worked out too well, has it?"

Yes, well I think he got used by all kinds of people.

We are still very good friends. We talk about all sorts of things. No problems.

Why did he ask Hinduja? Why no explanation was given? I am sorry. Why did you ask him to resign?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: To hide his skeletons.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Therefore, this government owes a duty to the people to explain the points that I have raised.

Now, regarding this document, I want to say that a proper attempt should be made to

(Sh. Somnath Chatterjee)
find out the truth or otherwise of this document, not a cover up, not what we saw last time. We want a genuine attempt by the government if they have any faith in the people. You may go on making publicity on the TV. The whole TV is owned by you for making your publicity; it is your own publicity agent in a shameful way you are misusing the TV and the radio. You can go on controlling the media as you like, but the question is that the people will have to be taken into confidence; the people will have to be given a reply. This documents has disclosed this.

Now, if Mr. V.P. Singh demands an opportunity to prove his document before a properly constituted committee, with proper terms of reference, that must be constituted by this government and this House must agree to that. Instead of going hat, the whole approach is that he is a bad man; he is supposed to have hoarded money worth Rs. 50 crores and so on and so forth. What I would like to know from the hon. Finance Minister is this. If he has given a false statement to the income tax authority, what action have you taken against him? You have got unlimited powers. Why don't you take action against him? Instead of doing that, under the protection of this hon. House, allegations are being made. (Interruptions) He may have suppressed his property. I do not know.

AN HON. MEMBER: You attach his property.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Let them take away those properties and confiscate those properties. I would also appeal to Mr. V.P. Singh to gift away those properties if they do not impose any gift tax on those properties.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: But do not give them to a Congress man.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Therefore, this is not a matter to be laughed out; this is not a matter which can be answered by mere personal abuses and allegations; this is not a matter which the government should ignore.

ernment feels that they can get away with it so easily by a sheer brute majority. The country demands an answer from this government and the country is entitled to have a truthful answer, not the way in which it has been done so far to hide the truth and to tell the people all sorts of untruths in the past.

16.00 hrs.

[Translation]

ISHRIGHULAM NABI AZAD (Washim): Mr Deputy Speaker, Sir, my colleagues in the opposition have mentioned in their speeches that we are making personal attacks on them. I would like to say in this regard that whenever out party Members speak truth, the opposition Members take it as personal attack. This has not happened for the first time but whenever the Congress Party has disclosed their black deeds they have taken it as personal attack.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the discussion on Bofors which has been taken up today in the House was initiated at the request of ruling party and not at the request of the opposition parties. The basis of this request was the statement of Shri V.P. Singh which he had made last week. The matter which has been mentioned by my colleague Shri K.K. Tewari, was already mentioned by me last week. I challenged Shri V.P. Singh to prove the allegation in the House the very next day when he made this statement. I asked him to prove it on the floor of the House if he had the courage and guts to do so.

Shri V.P. Singh had levelled charges in a Press conference that Rs. 8 crores had been deposited in the Prime Minister's account. We requested the hon. Speaker to have a discussion on the Bofors issue and the Prime Minister's accounts which had been referred by Shri V.P. Singh. I am sorry to point out that not only the Members of Parliament but the entire country is intrigued about the fact that he makes certain statements outside the Parliament but does not come forward to own them in the House. In

my view, this is the biggest allegation. (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS: There is only one point now. No answer for the deal.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the Commission?

[Translation]

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I have come to know Shri V.P. Singh very well during the last one year. I met him in Allahabad and came to know the real V.P. Singh. He tendered his resignation and I also resigned, but there was a great difference between the two resignations. The resignations tendered by him and me cannot be compared. Shri V.P. Singh treats whole of Uttar Pradesh as his own estate and he was under the impression that he would be able to create a mass base for Jan Morcha in Uttar Pradesh. But I think he will be sad to know that in the recently held Panchayat and Town Area Elections in Uttar Pradesh, the Congress Party has won 85 per cent and 80 per cent seats respectively. (Interruptions)

SHRI RAJ KUMAR RAI (Ghosi): He does not know that Congress has been routed in the Panchayat and the local bodies elections.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: You are not in the Government and therefore, you do not know the Government data. I know more than you. (Interruptions) Even in his constituency Allahabad, Congress has won more than 50 per cent of seats in Panchayat elections.

[English]

We have won more than fifty per cent, including Manda. (Interruptions)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: You have lost Manda Block, you have lost

Bharat Ganj and you have lost Sirsa. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: Sir, as far as Bofors issue is concerned, neither Shri V.P. Singh nor any other leader of the opposition is interested in it. Had they been, they would not have dragged this matter for one and a half year in the Parliament. Wasting its precious time and money which is double than the so called commission which has been paid in the Bofors deal. Can our opposition colleagues return that money which has been wasted during the last one year just to keep Bofors issue alive? One of its reasons is that they have been under the impression for the last one year that the Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi will dissolve the Lok Sabha at any time and will call for the next elections. Therefore, they wanted to drag this matter just to make an issue of it in the General Elections.

From 1977 onwards it has become their habit. During the emergency and upto 1977 the opposition had no point to criticise because the work in offices was going on smoothly, the industrial production was increasing and the law and order situation was improving. The opposition leaders spoiled the atmosphere of the entire country through rumours and they told the public that lakhs of their men have died under family planning programme. The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Railway of the then Janata Government are sitting here. The Health Minister of the Janata Government, who is no more had said that an amount of Rs. ten thousand or more will be given to those who have died in the Family Planning Programme. Today I ask these people that if they come into power will they be able to produce even a single person who is purported to have taken commission? (Interruptions) They will not be able to produce a single person.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, in this way the opposition has used every possible strategy but each of their strategies has failed. They

[Sh. Ghulam Nabi Azad] have met with failure at every step. On behalf of the Indian public and the Congress Party I congratulate hon. Shri Rajiv Gandhi for the Congress (I) 'is success in frustrating the efforts of the opposition. Through agreements and discussions he has strengthened the unity and integrity of the country. Every Indian is proud of the fact that today India is a force to reckon with in the world. Our friends in the opposition cannot digest the fact that the Congress (I) has strengthened the economy of the country in comparison to the big nations whose economies suffered tremendous setbacks in the past four years, the Indian economy has remained stable. The last four years have seen floods and drought. With the result that inflation in other countries has shot up while in India it has remained stable. This is what they are sore about.

When there was drought in the country last year the entire Congress Party and each of its members and units..... (*Interruptions*) They cannot hear the truth. (*Interruptions*) while the Congress Party was collecting funds to provide relief to the people in drought affected areas, V.P. Singh and his cronies were moving around in a convoy of 200 vehicles. At no time has the Opposition ever collected funds for providing relief to the people affected by drought. On the contrary whenever any problem befall the Indian public the Congress Party provides assistance in the form of cash and kind. I want to ask my hon. colleagues in the opposition, be it Shri V.P. Singh or any other, if they have ever spent even one rupee on the people affected by drought. They can spend Rs. 50 lakhs in holding conclaves in Kashmir or Andhra Pradesh but cannot spend even a single penny on alleviating the suffering of the country's masses. What they are sore about is that hon. Shri Rajiv Gandhi and leaders of the Congress (I) succeeded in keeping the nation stable in the midst of drought and flood. So whenever they fail in any of their ventures they hang on to the Bofors issue for support. In the name of Bofors they fling a variety of accusations at the Congress (I) and its leaders. As to Shri

V.P. Singh he thought that he would be the leader of the opposition after winning the Allahabad elections. Unfortunately he has always been a parasite. I do not know what is the Hindi equivalent of parasite, perhaps it is 'Paravlabhi'. As long as he was in the Congress (I) he was second-in-command. At that time he felt that he had reached that status on his own strength and popularity. He used the 'parasite' concept again and thought that within a couple of days of his joining the opposition he would plot the downfall of the Congress Government and become Prime Minister. But we have seen in the past one and a half years that Shri V.P. Singh has not organised a single public meeting on his own strength. Today he is depending on the opposition like a parasite. In Andhra Pradesh his public meetings are organised by N.T.R., in Karnataka by Mr. Hegde and in Haryana by Lokdal.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:

The hon. Member may throw some light on the matter related to payment of commission. The Prime Minister has said that commission has been paid.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: I am sure that when I come to the matter of commission you will walk out of the House. I am gradually coming to that point. All public meetings organised by the opposition have never been on their own strength. In Bombay it was Datta Samant, in Kashmir it was the Muslim United Front from whom help was sought. A juggler makes a monkey perform tricks and later pockets the money given by people for the performance. In the same way, I would ask the opposition to beware, because he shall use them for the fulfilment of his selfish motives. I think Shri V.P. Singh wants me to quickly come to the matter of Bofors. The Bofors issue has been discussed in the House before and my hon. colleagues have spoken on it in detail. First of all I would like to draw your attention towards the declamation made by him a week ago, in which he had given details about his assets and the number of houses he own. I have seen his 'Sheeshmahal' in Allahabad which is also called 'Luxury' Pal-

acc. Raja Sahab, people living in glass-houses do not throw stones at other peoples' houses.

SHRI JAI PRAKASH AGARWAL (Chandni Chowk): Why is he calling him 'Raja Saha b'?

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: Because he is a 'Raja' and lives in a 'Sheeshmahal'. It is important to add 'Raja' to the name of a person who lives in a 'Sheeshmahal' Be it the 'Sheeshmahal' of Allahabad, a house in Manda, a shopping complex in Dehradun or flats in Nehru Place or Connaught Place. He has declared all this himself. We have not said anything. He has also said that from these he has a monthly income of Rs. 2500 or Rs. 2750... I am ready to give Rs. 2750 on behalf of the Congress.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: That building is with the fertiliser corporation. It is with you. I urge you to increase its rent.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: But, Mr. V.P. Sahib, kindly tell us its cost.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: That building is under the control of the Government. I may accept whatever the cost Government decides.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: Raja Sahib, Dahia trust has been mentioned in this House and it has been a matter of debate all over the country. Money was made by selling the trees which did not exist at all. Crores of rupees were realised this way.

I have also been a secretary of my state during my student life but I have neither seen nor heard that land once donated in Bhudan movement has been taken back. This can only be possible with Raja Manda and no body else can do it.

SHRI PRATAP BHANU SHARMA (Vidisha): Raja Sahib kindly clarify how it was taken back.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Please speak something about the commission which has been accepted by your leader.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: During Allahabad election, I had asked a question which I want to repeat. He talks of value based politics, raises his fingers on others, it is easy to raise fingers on others but nobody tries to see into his innerself. Does his own son Shri Ajay Singh have shares? This is a letter dt. 24th December, 1986. Does his daughter in-law Shrimati Shruti Kumar Singh not have shares of Reliance Industries worth Rs. one lakh, thirty thousand five hundred. This is a letter dated December, 1986 and the address is of London. This is about 2 lakh 75 thousand of rupees. This pertains to both his son and daughter-in-law. If it is proved wrong, I am ready to resign from the membership. These accounts pertain to the period when his son resided in London and got ordinary emoluments and he got him appointed immediately in an American bank and shortly after the shares worth Rs. three lakh were purchased. May I ask whether the shares of such a pretty amount can be purchased with such a small salary. Who helped him? What was the source, where from did he get the money and who paid it? I have asked this question from him perhaps tow three times in a year but he has not replied to this question. Did any bank stood a guarantee for him if so, which was this bank? He has not been able to reply this question since last one year. But it appears that he will reply it today. Now I want to say something about Bofor's about which he has given a statement day before yesterday.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Here comes the cassette of your leader, the Prime Minister.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: We have been continuously listening for one and half years about Bofor's. The issue has been discussed ten times here in this House. He has stated, that Lotus is Rajiv Gandhi and its account no. pertains to Shri Rajiv Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India. He should prove

[Sh. Ghulam Nabi Azad]
it otherwise he has no right to defame the
Prime Minister in India and outside India.

Shri Rajiv Gandhi is not only a person
but he is the Prime Minister elected by 80
crore people. He cannot defame the Prime
Minister elected by 80 crore people for his
selfish ends by making statements at differ-
ent places. He will have to prove it inside the
Parliament. If he has got no answer to this,
the way I have thrown a challenge to resign,
he should also say that he will submit his
resignation inside the Parliament.

With these words, Mr. Deputy Speaker,
I thank you very much.

[English]

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH
(Allahabad): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the
issue is of national interest and should be
debated with the same seriousness. Here I
come with the query which is in the people's
mind. They ask, "Where has our money
gone, where has our hard earned money
gone?" And the only answer the Treasury
Benches have is that V.P. Singh is a devil. If
V.P. Singh is a devil hang him but please
answer to the people where has the money
gone. I will start with the proof one has
asked. I will start with only what is provable.
In the JPC..... (Interruptions.)

I will come to it. I will come to my
documents. I will come to Prime Minister's
statement. (Interruptions)

I am entitled to answer. All the day they
were abusing me. Now when I stand up, they
are not ready to listen me. It is your Govern-
ment which has made the statement and
listen to it. (Interruptions.)

On the 17th April, 1987, when the
Swedish radio made this announcement, it
was said:

"During negotiations, the Government
had made it clear that the company
should not pay any money to any per-

son in connection with the contract!

This was the solemn declaration of the
Government that the company should not
pay any money to any person. And what the
Prime Minister has to say is, in his interview
in the *Sunday*.

"Any-way that much money has been
paid to somebody."

While the Government has solemnly
declared that there should be no money paid
to any person, the Prime Minister said, "The
money has been given to some person."
May I ask, if there is such contradiction
between the Government and the Prime
Minister, either the Government must go or
the Prime Minister must go. Both cannot co-
exist in contradiction with each other. The
Prime Minister owes it to the country, and to
this House, as to what is his position vis-a-vis
his solemn declaration and that is what the
country is asking today. Not only this. I am
quoting what has gone on recprd having
been said by the Minister in the Parliament
only. This is policy directive. This is dealing
with commission.

"Defence should not deal with any non-
governmental agent of a foreign sup-
plier in respect of any commercial nego-
tiations. The Prime Minister also di-
rected that the foreign governments
and suppliers should be told unequivocally
about the decision. This policy
directive has been enforced rigorously
by the Department of Defence with
satisfactory results."

This is proven. I do not have to prove it.
But I will related it to what is told.

Again, the JPC report comes to the
conclusion after hearing the Government:-

"It was thus seen there was no doubt
whatsoever in Bofors or in the Swedish
Government about the Government of
India's policy that no commission or any
agency fees should be paid in respect of
contract secured from India."

And further, I do not have to prove but I have to enumerate it in the context of understanding of what has happened to this country.

The JPC has come to the conclusion on P.175

" No direct evidence of documentary proof is available to sustain the allegation that the payments made by Bofors are of the nature of bribes or commissions paid to middlemen."

The Prime Minister told the Army Commander on 27th April last year, as just now Shri Somnath Chatterjee said, that no monies have been paid into the Swiss Bank.

The JPC tells the country that the Committee thus finds that a total 319 million kroners were paid by Bofors to the Agent in the context of Indian contractors' winding up costs. While this is in connection with the Indian contract, the Prime Minister has said — if there is signing of every statement in the newspaper, it was for the Prime Minister either to sign it or deny it — that payment was in respect of agents global commissions. The JPC says regarding Indian commissions, global commissions may not have had anything to do with the Bofors deal itself. This is the Prime Minister. This is the JPC. One is the Government version and the other is the version of the Head of the Government, both running contrary and on documentary proof. They are asking for proof. There are documents.

PROF. K.K.TEWARY : You should not be nervous.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : Mr. K.K.Tewary, you will surely enjoy. This will make you nervous. The Prime Minister has said it and it is recorded in JPC on p.7:-

" And like Pantji has said now, you show us any evidence, we do not want proof. We will bring the proof. You show us any evidence that there has been involve-

ment of middlemen, of pay-offs or of bribes or commissions, we will take action and we will see that nobody however high-up is allowed to go free."

This is the word of the Prime Minister in the Parliament, documented here. He said that there was no need of proof and asked to just give the evidence. We will give the proof. Proof also means disproof. Here, I demand, as a Member of Parliament and a citizen of this country, from the assurance coming from the highest Executive of the country in the highest Body of the land that you bring evidence and we will give you the proof. I can give the proof for payment of commissions. It is this document that I have authenticated. As Proof. Dandavate said, these documents reveal payment of commission. Where does the Prime Minister's word stand now? It is not the question of money what we are losing. It is the very credibility of our country we are losing when we have a Prime Minister who gave such an assurance in this House. Today, as a Member of Parliament in this House, I ask for the Proof... (*Interruptions*). Am I right? I have put my signature on the documents and on every statement. What do these documents show? I am not going through all of the pay-offs. The JPC says that even conceding the theory of winding up — already it is wound up — then the understanding is winding up charges once... once you have gone to assess the whole contract, giving a lumpsum and paid for it. (*Interruptions*). This is what we have been assured by the Prime Minister. He said that he spoke to Olof Palme and ensured it. But now it has been revealed that middlemen were paid off. The whole country understands this. A percentage-wise commission was paid. Document after document has been submitted before you for each supply and they are after 1986. The JPC says that whatever winding up charges were there, final payments have been made within 1986. This has been told to the Parliament and to this country. Here, I come to the House with irrefutable evidence that not winding up charges but commissions have been paid. Commissions have been paid continuously even after what the JPC says — in 1986 and 1987 itself. If

[Sh. Vishwanath Pratap Singh] this be so, then, what has been told by the Prime Minister to the country? What has been told through the JPC to the country? Is it not the right of the person even in the remotest hamlet to ask this House and say find out what these documents are and what the truth is? It has to be judged. Instead, we call names. You hang me. But, you cannot hang this country — the expression of the people of this country. This document is about payment of commission. It says; Commission due to you on materials supplied to the Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Defence dated 19th February 1987. I am not going into the amounts. Again it is said: Commission due to you on materials supplied to the Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Defence, according to your invoice specified. There are five payments— February 1987 and March 1987. Again it says: Commission due to you on material supplied to the Secretary to the Government of India. Ministry of Defence, according to your invoice so and so— 16th March 1987. Again : Commission due to you on material supplied to the Secretary to the Government of India. Ministry of Defence, according to your invoice specified below— two payments dt: 20th March 1987 and 23rd, 1987 . Again: Commission due to you on material supplied to the Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Defence, according to invoice below and there are about eight to nine payments on 20th February 1987. May I ask, can these both go together the assurance of the Prime Minister in this House that you bring evidence and I will give the proof? Here is the evidence and here are the words of the Prime Minister and here is this House. Where do we go from here? This brute majority can squall it. I have nothing much of a hope after the debate. I am very clear about it. But this voice will be heard. This is a question in every working people's mind and it is not only all this. When such things come, people in your chair have to rise above all because what is lost is not only money. What is lost is credibility, the values in public life and also the future fame. After all, the Prime Minister is a focal point of the country and that credibility by his act and

his own deeds is destroyed. He is destabilising the minds of the people and the minds of the country. No one else. He is destabilising the army. When such things come and the brute majority ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRATAP BHANU SHARMA (Vidisha) : You people are demoralising the army. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY - SPEAKER : I have allowed Mr. V.P. Singh to speak. Please take your seats.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : The country has lost hopes, all hopes from the present Prime Minister. But here is this assurance of the JPC which is a body of this very House and it has said: 'no direct evidence or documentary proof is available to sustain allegation for payments made by Bofors which are in the nature of bribes and commission.' Now here is a JPC, a body of this House. I appeal to this House. This body of JPC was made part of this House and it has said that it has no documentary evidence of commission. It has come to that conclusion. JPC or a new JPC. Here is the information that they need for the enquiry. Therefore, in the circumstances, it is now proved and you wanted proof that the Prime Minister has not spoken the truth to the country continuously. For whom was he not doing it? Let me ask. He has now come out to say " I have never denied commission." I want him to deny his statement which is given in Bangalore. And pat comes after two days that the Prime Minister had not said so. And finally he comes out with the theory of genuine commission. The law of the land is that there will be no commission for genuine work. And there will be no commission. This is the law of the land. (*Interruptions*)

S. BUTA SINGH : Which law?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : This is your statement on the floor of the House.

S. BUTA SINGH : You must be knowing certain laws as an ex-Finance Minister.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : I have to go back to all that you have said. The Government on 17th said that during negotiations Government had made it clear that company should not pay any money. Any money means any money to any person in connection with the contract. This is what has been stated and I quote it again for you are asking me to quot. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI. S. BUTA SINGH : Is that a law ? (*Interruptions*)

I am not a lawyer. Mr. Chatterjee can say whether it is law.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: When Mr. Buta Singh will be allowed to exercise this own judgement, let him come to me. I will explain to him. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : Between the policy of the land and Bofors, the Prime Minister has chosen to stand by Bofors rather than the policy of the land. But the country will stand by its own policy and will not stand by Bofors. We were hunting on whose behalf was he acting. We were hunting who the Bofors agent is. The Bofors' agent is identified. That is one who even against the policy of his own Government, protects Bofors and stands by it.

If this breach has been done, then it has been assured in this very House. This is again the JPC's report. That's why I am going only by the recorded matter:

" Defence Secretary further stated that the Government of India would disqualify a firm in case it came to notice of the Government of India that agent has been appointed by a foreign firm."

This is an assurance by the Government for disqualification of the firm. There has been a violation. Commissions have been paid and proven against the policy. I demand disqualification of Bofors according

to their own assurance.

The Prime Minister himself has said that you show us any evidence that there has been an involvement of middlemen or pay-offs or bribes or commissions. I have shown evidence of commissions. He said:

"We will take action and we will see that nobody however high-up is allowed to go free"

I demand that Prime Minister should fulfil his assurance and his word. But he will take action otherwise, I know. Whoever will show the evidence, he will take action against him. If there was any honesty of this Government, then it should immediately declare a new JPC to go into all these documents to see—if it doubts—its authenticity and blacklist Bofors. Why I am saying is not like a mere punishment or one incident of deviation. Once you do it, it will go and project. I am not saying, keep the gun for future. Why can't you blacklist Bofors. Shri Arun Singh demanded it. He was the Minister of State for Defence. he was a patriot. He know Defence and still he could demand it. I make the same demand. (*Interruptions*) That is not penalising the Bofors. But for future, no company will dare to pay commissions or kickbacks because it will know that in India you can be hurt more grievously. Others, who are paying now or might be paying, will also recoil but perhaps that might be with much vested interest with this Government. I doubt very much it can take this challenge. That is one aspect which it just cannot touch.

Sir, the procedure has been laid down about how the JPC would take evidence. And I must say with all respects to the JPC that there was a very important piece of information which is not reflected, at least to my reading. If I am informed, I will be very happy. About the termination costs, Mr. Shankaranand asked Mr. Morberg: Why did you pay it even after the agreement? This is what Mr. Morberg has to say: As Mr. Gothlin has told you, we have to take some natural consideration if there was a contract or not.

[Sh. Vishwanath Pratap Singh]

That means whether they will get a contract or not get a contract. On that, the termination costs depended. We have to pay the termination costs in both the situations—If we have an order and if we do not have an order. Naturally, there have been another termination cost if we had not received an order. This was known. You deny this. This was said by Mr. Morberg. It has not been reflected by the JPC. Obviously, he was saying that this termination cost is nothing. He is saying. If I did not get this contract, it would have been different. If I got the contract, it is different. He is blatantly saying that I am paying a commission for the whole thing. It is on record.

(Interruptions)

SHRI G.G. SWELL : (Shillong) It should be laid on the Table of the House.

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS : This should be known to everyone in the country. Nobody knows about this.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : Sir, the JPC says: It is for the first time in the history of independent India—that's why I feel very sad that it has happened for the first time; it has happened to the body of this House;—that a Committee of both the House of Parliament has been constituted to go into the question of alleged pay-offs in the Defence acquisition, namely, purchase of Howitzer...

For an inquiry of such a magnitude, the committee follows the procedure. Here lies the magnitude. It spells out how it will go about it and each witness has to be recorded verbatim. It is there in the procedure. How did the Chairman go about advising the whole Committee? Mr. Shankaranand is here. You may deny it. I challenge you to do that. The Chairman advised the Members by asking questions: We should not create an impression in their mind. We are cross-examining them. We are not going to create an impression in their mind that we are offending them. We are going to persuade

them and put such questions as they will be pleased to come out. (Interruptions) This is the great document which Mr. Somnath Chatterjee said that it was furnished to us as final document:

I would request the hon. Members that when when you put questions to them, let them not feel offended. Let them not feel insulted.

That is how the JPC went about with it. Even after this great molycoddling, what more came about is not reflected in this. It plainly says that this commission envisages that before the contract, it would have been one termination cost and if the contract was completed, the termination cost would have been different.

I am ready to be prosecuted for using this material.

I may even be sent to Tihar Jail, but I have the satisfaction that I am serving my country....(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE AND MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES (SHRI B.SHANKARANAND): He has taken my name: let me say a word.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : After he finishes.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : Many things have been said. Instead of debate on Bofors, it has become a point for debate from that side only. There is some reflex action and I cannot help it. I would, however, not go into it further. What I would say is that they have got all the investigative agencies and I will cooperate with them to find out the truth..(Interruptions).

PROOF. K.K.TEWARY : Are you a common criminal that you want an investigation against you. You are a public man. You are speaking on the floor of the House. Certain question have been addressed to you and you must reply to them.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : You have got the Almighty Government of India with all the powers; you have got power in many States also and you, a Minister at the Centre, are crying helplessness and beseeching me. I have never come across such a situation.

PROF. K.K.TEWARY: It is your responsibility to prove what you have said (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : You have got all the evidence and the facts with you; you can take action against me. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD : You must give us the proof about the Lotus account you have been talking about(*Interruptions*)

PROF. K.K.TEWARY: This is character assassination. You cannot get away like this. Whatever you have said against the Prime Minister, you have to prove ...(*Interruptions*).

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : The Prime Minister has gone contrary to all the policies of the country. The facts that have come out have shown that he has not been telling the truth...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD : You change your statement every time.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : The JPC has not brought the true facts. The documents which I have authenticated throw a lot of light on the facts and there is need for a new commission. The laws of the land are being violated and Bofors should be blacklisted. We are against corruption, but corruption is a very small word to be used for this. There is a loot by certain unpatriotic people of the interests of the country and that is what we are fighting against ...(*Interruptions*)

PROF. K.K.TEWARY: What have you done in terms of acquiring land and misusing

your position? You do not have the courage to speak truth...(*Interruptions*). You have acquired a lot of land and property. You are trying to wriggle out ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI. GHULAM NABI AZAD : He must give us the proof about the Lotus account number that he has been talking about. Nothing short of that ...(*Interruptions*)

PROF. K.K.TEWARY : We have heard enough of it. Now, you must tell us about the Lotus number. Whose number are they? And how you have been changing your statements every day? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : Sir, on the floor of the House, I have authenticated the documents that have been given to the Chair. About the commission and so on, fresh evidence is now on record and it is before the House and action should be taken on that. I have also authenticated the newspapers' reports and cutting and given to the Chair. And, Sir, I have demanded that the Prime Minister also should authenticate his statement. I have got a cassette also with me. He should authenticate and tell the country whether he tells the truth or not. He should tell as to whether the statement that was made in Bangalore is correct or not and whether he speaks truth or not. With these words I conclude my speech. Sir. Thank you. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK : Where is the proof?

THE GHULAM NABI AZAD : Sir, I have said that I will resign from my Parliamentary seat if my allegations against his daughter-in-law are proved wrong (*Interruptions*)

PROF. K.K.TEWARY: Mr. V.P. Singh should accept this challenge.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I cannot force to respond.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. K.K.TEWARY : What about the charges levelled against him? He does not have the courage. He must respond to the personal charges that have been levelled against him.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is left to the Hon. Member. I cannot compel him.

PROF. K.K.TEWARY : We have given the proof. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: I would like to place the document on record and say that the proof which has already been proved, he should prove (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK : Sir, he has been misleading the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please order, order

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. K.K.TEWARY : Sir, there are rules in the House. Why are you silent? (*Interruptions*)

PROF. K.K.TEWARY : Sir, whenever personal charges are levelled against any Member, he gets up and make clarifications. Now, he is silent. He does not has the courage. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. K.K.TEWARY : Sir, the charges against Mr. V.P.Singh are proved beyond doubt because he has declined to respond. For the last one-and-a -half years he has been declining to respond.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What can I do? I cannot compel him.

(*Interruptions*)

17.00 hrs.

PROF. K.K.TEWARY: Now, should we take it for granted that all the charges about Shri V.P. Singh with regard to land-grabbing and nepotism are all true ? Now, if I say that

he has property worth Rs. 50 crores in Delhi and that he has never submitted any details about his property, will he refute it? Let him refute it.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I am ready to sell all my property for Rs. 5 crores.

PROF. K.K.TEWARY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, when was this property acquired by him ? Is it not a fact that Shri V.P.Singh acquired this property as a Minister and not by giving proper accounts? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Since they have raised the point about the Dehiya Charitable Trust, let me answer it. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: First you answer about the shares

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I will answer it. I am coming to it.

[*Translation*]

I will answer to all the points one by one. Pleased listen to me (*Interruptions*)

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: He want to Mr. N.T.R. , I want to ask him why did he go there? It is a matter of great shame. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. TULSIRAM (Nagarkurnul): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, why these guilty people. who have also taken commissions of millions and billions of rupees, are shouting in the House so loudly? Perhaps they are shouting so Loudly because we did not take bribes. These people should be ashamed of ..(*Interruptions*)

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: It is clear from your words what amount has been taken or better you can ask Shri N.T.R. as to how much amount has been bribed off.

[English]

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:
Let me answer Sir. They raised the point
about the Dahiya Charitable Trust.

[Translation]

Please listen to my reply (*Interruptions*)

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: Answer
my question first about the shares.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:
I am coming to it. I will cover one by one.

Sir, with all the responsibility, I authorise
the Government to forfeit all the property of
the Dahiya Charitable Trust and put the
members of the Trust behind the bars.

.PROF. K.K. TEWARY: How can you say
that?

SHRI S. BUTA SINGH: It is very brave
and generous of Shri V.P. Singh now to offer
the Dahiya Trust for public action when he
has sold even the non-existing trees on the
property. He auctioned five lakh trees when
there is no tree on that land. You can fool a
few people with this kind of Jugglery and this
kind of *tamasha*. But you cannot fool the
country for all the time to come.

[Translation]

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:
You don't worry, I will answer to all your
points one by one. And when you will listen
to this cassette, you will cut but a sorry figure.
(*Interruptions*)

[English]

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO
(Parvathipuram): Sir, I am on a point of
order. What is the debate and what is going
on in this House? Is this debate about the
personal credential of Shri V.P. Singh?
(*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: While

initiating the discussion, the motion was
about the documentary evidence regarding
payment of commission under Bofors gun
deal and the reaction of the Government
thereto. This was the subject matter of the
discussion. (*Interruptions*)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION UNDER
RULE 357 BY SHRI B. SHANKARAN-
AND

17.05 hrs.

[English]

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE
AND MINISTER OF WATER RE-
SOURCE (SHRI B. SHANKARANAND):
Since Mr. V.P. Singh took my name (*Inter-
rptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Ra-
japur): Are you withdrawing your Report?

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Since Mr.
V.P. Singh took my name in the course of his
speech and he threw a challenge at me, I
was simply wondering till today where was
Mr. V.P. Singh when the inquiry was going
on. I never expected this from Mr. V.P. Singh.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE
(Bolpur): Mr. Buta Singh is prompting him.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY
(Mahbubnagar): Mr. Shankaranand was
also prompted in the Committee.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Don't
spoil his case.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS
(S. BUTA SINGH): Because you have al-
ready spoiled Mr. V.P. Singh.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: I fully
stand by the Report which was presented to
this House. (*Interruptions*) Mr. V.P. Singh
never made anything to support his conten-