

16.01 hrs.

[*English*]

DISCUSSION UNDER RULE 193

Situation arising out of the recent publication of certain documents in a national daily in regard to the alleged payment of commission in connection with the Bofors contract

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We shall now take up Discussion under Rule 193. Mr. Narayan Choubey may raise the discussion.

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY (Puri) : Sir, I have a point of order today.

[*Translation*]

SHRI RAMSWAROOP RAM (Gaya) : There are many other very important questions before the country. For how long will you continue with this Bofors. Now please finish it. It has no substance.

15.02 hrs

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

MR. SPEAKER : What are you doing ? Why are you speaking without my permission ?

[*English*]

Why are you doing it without my permission ? Nothing goes on record. Mr. Mohanty, what is your point of order ?

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY : Sir, I invite your kind attention to clause (ii) of Rule 194, which has been recently amended on 30th April 1987 wherein it has been provided; "It is not exceeding two hours, or before the end of the sitting." Either you should start the discussion at 4 O' clock or at 6 O' clock. So, I would welcome the exuberance of Mr. Choubey.

MR. SPEAKER : No point in this point of order. Overruled.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SHANKAR LAL (Pali) : Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER : What is your point of order.

[*Translation*]

SHRI SHANKAR LAL : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to draw your attention to sub-clause 4 of rule 352. It has been mentioned in it :—

[*English*]

"reflect on any determination of the House except on a motion for rescinding it."

[*Translation*]

Keeping this in view, I submit.....

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER : Overruled. No point of order. Please take your seat. Overruled. Nothing doing.

AN HON. MEMBER : It is a maiden point of order, Sir, (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER : Maiden remains a maiden ! Now, Mr. Narayan Choubey.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY (Midnapore) : Sir, salvos have again been fired and the guns have again boomed, but now these guns are from the reporters of the famous paper, *The Hindu*, and these guns have boomed to demolish the castles of the Hinduja's, the Bofors, the Government of India and last but not the least, the Joint Parliamentary Committee chaired by Shri Shankaranand, who was again been inducted in the Central Cabinet as recognition of his service—the cover up. (*Interruptions*). Sir, the *Hindu* document has revealed many important facts. (*Interruptions*). Yes, the document published in the *Hindu* (*Interruptions*).

[*Translation*]

SHRI BALKAVI BAIRAGI (Mandsaur) :

Mr. Speaker, Sir, to Shri Choubey, I want to say this only :—

“Lag Raha Hai Dilruba Ki  
Ladkharati Chal Se, Phir Mara Chuha  
Nikalenge, Phate Rumaal se.”

MR. SPEAKER : Please tell me, from when has he become your beloved ?

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : Sir, it is not a ‘Chuha’ (rat).

PROF MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) : All rats have gone in bye-election.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : It is not a rat, A man saw a pig on the way. All the Brahmins went away from there, Some one told that the elephant had become shorter ; some one told that the rat had grown larger. I wish you may become wiser.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur) : Will they become wiser ?

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : It is wish.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Bairagi, do not tease him, otherwise he will say ‘Punar mushiko Bhay’ (you may again become rat)

[English]

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : Bofors made the payments of commissions. It is clearly established. The payments ranged from 0.96% to 6% depending on the items involved for winning the contract of March 24, 1986, i.e. this gun contract.

Another thing is, the winding up costs story carried out by Bofors and accepted by Joint Parliamentary Committee, the Government of India and the Attorney General as reasonable and legally sustainable, is proved to be wrong. These things have been sustained and proved quite elaborately. It has been proved that Svenska Incorporated registered in Panama and Win Chadha's Anatronc General, registered in India are the same, directly linked to cover the same transactions, services and obligations and worked for the same beneficiaries. That

has been completely proved. In other words, Win Chadha served as a conduit of largest category of Bofors payments totalling more than 188.4 million SEK for gun deal, into secret Swiss account.

AN HON. MEMBER : It is hearsay.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : It is not hearsay. It is in the documents which are not to be relished by you, since you belong to the Party which tries to cover up anything.

Svenska-Anatronc nexus violated Indian laws, made big breach of faith and constituted a massive fraud on the Indian people and decision-making process relevant even to our Defence sector. I beg to submit such is the manoeuvre of this Government that even the Defence of this country is not safe in their hands. It has been proved beyond doubt that there has been link between Pitco Sangam Limited of Hinduja's, on a ‘care of’ basis. It has been proved that Pitco accounts became Moresco-Moineao resulting in payment of 81 million SEK to three highly secret Swiss bank accounts, namely, Lotus, Tulip and Mont Blanc. Who is this Lotus ?

It has been further proved, the Hindu documents established that Bofors spoke lies before the Government of India, the Joint Parliamentary Committee, before the Swedish National Audit Bureau and to the peoples of India and Swedan, when it said that no commissions were paid to any Indian recipient. They spoke blatant lies and the Government of India accepted it that it has no knowledge of Indian involvement, no payments of Bofors-India gun deal were made after December, 1986 and that the payments represented only winding up costs settled through termination negotiations for settlement of pre-existing contractual obligations of Bofors. Yes, you see, how wrong and cock and bull story is this statement, that these payments had nothing to do with Bofors-India gun contract. It is totally a blatant lie spoken by the AB Bofors Limited and the Government of India accepted it and the Government of India accepted it. Documents further suggest but for revelation in the media namely Lwiss Radio 4% of the

total contract value of SEK 8,400 million would have exceeded SEK 319.4 million and that Bofors was well in the process of making payment into secret Swiss bank accounts. All these have been proved to the hilt.

It is further proved that Bofors violated the condition precedent to the conclusion of the gun contract with India that no agent or middleman should be involved in the deal and that no commission should be paid to them. The winding up story is absolutely wrong and has no legs to stand in any court of law not to mention any public forum of common sense.

Bofors concocted the winding up story to explain away SEK 319.4 million relating to March 24, 1986, gun deal. But payment of 6% of contract value continued to Svenska in 1987 an pre-gun military transaction between Bofors and Government of India.

Bofors claimed that no gun related payments were made after December, 1986. But Hindu documents prove 0.96% commission continued to be paid at least up to March 30, 1987.

How this Bofors story started? This Bofors story shook the entire country. You know the whole story and I will be very brief that on 16th April, 87 Swiss radio reported elaborately that Bofors had paid bribes to important Indian leaders for winning contract to export guns to India. The news came in the press. What was the Government's reaction? What did the Government say? May I quote what was the Government's reaction?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE  
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI  
SANTOSH MOHAN DEV) : Cock and bull  
story of the *Hindu*. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : You made such a mess on defence matters that you have been changed. Don't talk of defence matters.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Mahbubnagar) : After the defence scandal, you are inundated by Allahabad scandal.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : Government said the report was baseless, false, mischievous and meant for destabilising the country. Anything about the corruption on the part of Government, if it comes to the press and which shakes the morale of the people, is described by the Government as destabilising. It seems as if that if the Congress Government is destabilised, the country itself becomes destabilised!

You know the story of the Mahabharata. It is stated in the Mahabharata, "Tasmin tuste jagat tuste, Rajiv tuste Bharat tuste" "If Lord Krishna becomes happy, the world becomes happy." It so happened that while the Pandavas were living in the jungles, Duryodhana wanted to punish them and sent Rishi Durvasa with 10,000 disciples to the house of Pandavas to have some food and the story goes that Draupadi could feed any number of people before she herself had taken her food. But she cannot feed anybody if she took any food already. Now when these 10,000 disciples came, Draupadi was having sunbath after taking her meals. The 10,000 disciples said "We want some food." Draupadi become afraid. Draupadi called Lord Krishna. Lord Krishna came and asked : "What has happened to you?" Draupadi told : "Durvasa Rishi will just give me *Abishap*. We will all die." Lord Krishna said : "Don't worry. I am there. Have you saved any one single grain in your pot?" To this question, Draupadi said : "Yes, there is one." Lord Krishna said : "Give it to me." He took it in his mouth and then said : "triptoh." I am *Tript*. My belly is full. The people's belly is full. The belly of dogs, cats, cows and buffaloes etc. is all full.

"Tasmin tuste, Jagat tustah"

Rajiv tuste, Bharat tustah"

SHRI TARUN KANTI GHOSH  
(Barasat) : Please don't make fun of Lord Krishna. That is not right. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : Sir, he has not read Mahabharata. This is not an allegation... (*Interruptions*) Do you think this as an allegation?... (*Interruptions*) I am sorry.

SHRI ANANDA GOPAL MUKHOPADHYAY (Asansol) : Sir, we have got noth-

[Shri Ananda Gopal Mukhopadhyay]

ing to say. We are hearing Mahabharatha from Shri Narayan Choubey.

“Tavat Shobhata Murkhah,  
Javat Kinchit Navashoh”

SHRI SATYAGOPAL MISRA  
(Tamluk) : Please tell it to your Prime Minister.

[*Translation*]

SHRI BALKAVI BAIRAGI : Perhaps you might be knowing that Lord Krishna is an incarnation of ‘Narayana’.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : Then worship me.

[*English*]

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : What did this Swedish Audit Bureau Report say ? It says : “An agreement exists between M/s. ABI Bofors ..and...concerning the settlement of commission...that considerable amount have been paid subsequently to, among others, M/s. ABI Bofors’ previous agents in India”. This is in this report. Only then did the Government of India say that there should be some inquiry. Before that they said that there was no question of inquiry. They said that everything was baseless and wrong and whatever was stated in the Press, whatever was stated in the Swedish Radio and whatever come out in the world Press was wrong. They maintained this stand till the Swedish National Audit Bureau made a report. Then the Government searched here and there and thought that a Joint Parliamentary Committee should be formed and is should inquire into the allegations. They wanted that inquiry be made. But the terms and conditions were such that the Opposition stayed away. First of all, they did not want to do anything. Then they said that inquiry should be made. The point is that the inquiry should prove that they are not guilty. The terms and conditions were so manoeuvred that the Opposition stayed away from the Committee.

MR. SPEAKER : Choubey-ji, I think we reached this stage after quite a lot of discussions. I think we better proceed further. You may make some more points.

We have already said so many things regarding that.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : Then, the JPC was set up. The Committee conducted several meetings. The JPC went from place to place. The JPC was chaired by our hon. Minister Shir Shankaranand. They finally came to the conclusion and said : “There is no evidence to show that any middleman was involved in the process of the acquisition of the Bofors gun.” This is the conclusion. They further said : “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”. So, the conclusion is very broad. These are the conclusions. I do not want to take up your time. This is the conclusion they brought out in this book. Here is the *Moorshika*. (*Interruptions*) Here is the rat.

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI K. C. PANT) : He was right all along... This is what you had in your handkerchief. That is what you say. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : He was right regarding this. How does it stand now ? First of all, there was total denial. Then the Swedish Audit Bureau report came. Then the JPC was set up. Then came JPC’s total denial. Now reports have come in the *Hindu* giving all the details. I thank the Reporters of the *Hindu*. If two or three Reporters of the *Hindu* could publish such documents, could go into such documents, could unearth so many things, I fail to understand why the Government of India agencies, with so many officers, so many facilities, have failed to bring out the truth; I do not know why...

AN HON. MEMBER : They were bribed.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : I do not know whether they were bribed or not. Perhaps, they were requested not to uncover the truth; perhaps, they were prevailed upon not to uncover the truth. I do not think, the Indian officers are so inefficient that they

cannot tackle this problem. Now we find this game :

"Murgi Kair Karaye Kair Karaye anda pare na",

Again the CBI has been asked to inquire, and I am told that the CBI Chief, who is supposed to make the inquiry, has been given one year's extension. The CBI too has come to the conclusion, "Yes; the Chadha Company has taken the commission". It has come in the press on 26th June or so. They have come to this conclusion. So, the Government has been caught. They may deny it, but they have been caught.

[Translation]

I have not eaten the butter...*(Interruptions)*...tell what is it. Please think over what is said in this 'Bhajan' that 'I have not eaten butter, I have not eaten butter, I have not eaten butter.' He has not accepted till now. I have not eaten, I have not eaten, I have not eaten...*(Interruptions)*

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Choubeyji, Lord Krishna had accepted at last that he had eaten the butter...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : They will also accept...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : They have accepted...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : You may deny, but we say that you have taken the butter. On your mouth and on your lips, we find white spots. You are caught. You cannot escape. I again warn you, you are behaving like the flies in the spider's net.

[Translation]

More you try to hide, more you will be trapped in it. That is why you are being trapped despite your every effort to wriggle out of it. One after another disclosures are being made and more is likely to come out. Please do not be upset. *(Interruptions)*

I would like to say...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

If you move more, you cannot wriggle out of it. I again tell you, we want to uncover the Bofors story. The Bofors story is a story more thrilling and more exciting than any espionage novel. It is a story how our ruling class can cheat the Indian people; it is a story how they cheat the country; it is a story how they can cheat the country even at the cost of defence. The story has to be unravelled, the story has to be uncovered. So, we request you again : kindly appoint a Joint Parliamentary Committee...

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK (Panaji) : You will boycott it.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : We will no more boycott it. Do not worry about that.

[Translation]

Make a genuine committee...you should make a Parliamentary committee, not...\*\* committee *(Interruptions)*

[English]

SHRI K. S. RAO (Machilipatnam) : He is denigrating the Member of the JPC by calling them...\*\*...He must withdraw that word.

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK : Sir, - he is casting aspersions on the Members of the JPC. It was a body constituted by the House. Kindly pull him up, Sir. What he is talking is atrocious. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : That Committee should be chaired by a member of the Opposition Group. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : If 'Joker' is not unparliamentary, how is...\*\*...unparliamentary ?

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : If that is unparliamentary, I withdraw that word and I say...\*\*...If ..\*\*is...unparliamentary, I substitute it by the word...\*\*...

MR. SPEAKAR : Sum up.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : I urge upon the Government, please accept it. Allow this Parliament to unravel the

[Shri Narayan Choubey]

truth. Let the entire country know the whole truth of Bofors story for the future of this country so that the people of this country can know how a ruling class having no loyalty to the people can behave. They must learn this for future so that they can be in the Government which will be loyal to the people, loyal to the country, loyal to the defence of this country. Or you can keep your jambo jet ready. (*Interruptions*) For all the people jambo jet ready to fly to some other country as this leader from Philippines Mr. Marcos had to do.

So, I urge upon you and through you to this august body to accept our proposal to again appoint a Joint Parliamentary Committee which should go into details after the truth has come out in 'The Hindu' and that should be chaired by an opposition leader so that we can unravel and uncover the whole story for the benefit of the country and the people of this country. With these words, I conclude.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH (Allahabad): May I say, what Choubeyji has said, the whole story is known only to one person who is absent here.

[*Translation*]

SHRI BALKAVI BAIRAGI (Mandsaur): Raja Saheb, you know everything (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Jumbo jet may be stationed but after getting down from jambo jet, you return that. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Prof. Dandavate to speak.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): Is there no speaker on the other side?

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: They will speak later.

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Mr.

Speaker, Sir, before I come to the various documents, I would like to refer to very important lapses in this House which are closely related to the subject under consideration. The documents that are published by 'The Hindu' on the 22nd and 23rd June, 1988 and subsequent documents—about 70 have been published and also the one which was published earlier on 21st April—you will find that these documents had created a grave situation in this House also.

Sir, I wish to draw your attention to the fact that on the 4th of July, 1988, I submitted to you a notice of privilege against the Prime Minister, against the Defence Minister, against Mr. Win Chadha and I ought to have included some others in the VIP list. But these are two Members and one Mr. Win Chadha against whom I had given a privilege notice. I am deliberately starting with this because they are closely related to the subject under consideration and discussion today.

I wish to draw your attention to the fact that on 20th of April, 1987, the Defence Minister Shri K.C. Pant made a written statement in this House and he assured the House that as far as this Bofors transactions are concerned, there have been no involvement of a middleman and there have been no payment of commission at all. When the debate went on, the Prime Minister intervened, not in the debate but some question was posed and I do not want to repeat that. But in my notice, from the Lok Sabha records, I have quoted what exactly was said by the Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi. He again repeated that there was no question of a middleman and there was no question of any commission or bribe being paid. Sir, at a later stage, Joint Parliamentary Committee was set up to enquire into the Bofors. When the Committee investigated all the matters and report was completed, and as the irony would have it, Sir, almost at the same time when the Report was being presented to this House, we had before us the first important despatch from the Hindu. If I remember right, it was on 22nd April 1988 when there was in the banner headlines 'Bofors-Pitco payments linked to Hinduja—documentary evidence' and the documents were published in Hindu.

When Mr. Chadha was called before the Committee—I don't want to go into the fact as to how he came here, whether he imposed any conditions, whether some concessions were given to him, whether an assurance was given to him that certain arrest will not take place, whether it was assured that he will have a safe exit from the country—he was asked to appear before the Committee. In fact, the tragedy of the situation is that the very main persons who were supposed to be guilty number one and two, though they were supposed to be the culprits, they were asked to stand in the Witness Box and they were given VIP treatment. They made certain statements.

In that very Report that has been submitted over here, we have been told as to what exactly was stated by them. It is stated in the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report on Bofors in Para 7.159 :

“During his examination Shri Chadha further affirmed as under :”

That is what the Report says :

“He was never a middleman or an agent of Bofors in so far as he never performed any functions of a broker or a commission agent and was not engaged in any selling activities.”

(JPC Report, Page 162)

We had to rely on the Report. Categorically he had denied that he has acted as anybody's agent and received commission. As far as Mr. Win Chadha is concerned, the Prime Minister is concerned and the Defence Minister is concerned, two of them are on record in this House and the third one is on record in the Joint Parliamentary Committee which is a miniature of Parliament because all the rights and privileges of the Parliament are enjoyed by the Committee that has been set up by you from this very House. Therefore, in all the three cases when these important documents appeared in Hindu, if you accept the authenticity of these documents, in that case very clearly the Prime Minister, the Defence Minister and Mr. Win Chadha had misguided the House deliberately, committed contempt of the House and committed the breach of privilege of the House. That is

my contention. This House, through this debate, must take a serious note of the breach of Privileges committed by the Prime Minister of the country, the Defence Minister of the country and Mr. Win Chadha. Of course, I do not want to put Mr. Win Chadha on the pedestal of the Defence Minister and the Prime Minister; but unfortunately by their profession they are linked up together. I mean, profession of breach of privilege. I do not refer to any other profession. I am referring to the breach of privilege. Therefore, this is the most important aspect that has to be taken note of.

The question arises and I am sure that when you inquire into the matter to decide whether these is a *prima facie* case, I know that your first argument and premise will be whether these documents of Hindu are reliable and authentic. If they are proved to be reliable and authentic, then these Members have committed a breach of privilege. I think that is perfect logic.

Now I will argue as to why I contend that there is an authenticity to these documents. There are two or three aspects. In the past, whenever any of us from the Opposition side quoted any document that was embarrassing to the Ruling Party and the Government, there was a professional heckler in this House who always said CIA agent, CIA agent. He always said that. (Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER : He has been already elevated.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : He is almost professional; otherwise he could not do that.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I am not referring to him. He has always said that.

THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI M. L. FOTEDAR) : Mr. Madhu, I would like you to withdraw that word about an Hon. Member of this House who is not present here. (Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER : He has not named anybody.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Sir, the unknown need not be identified. I am not referring to anyone in particular. Shouts were there. If it would have been one I could know.

SHRI M.L. FOTEDAR : It does not behove a person like you to mention like that.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : It behoved him to call us CIA agents. At that time I did not find any kind of indignation in you to stand up and say 'Do not call members of the Opposition as CIA agents?' You can call them anything else, I am always surprised by your selective sense of conscience.

Now, Sir, the question is what is the authenticity and I have two points to put forward here to establish indirectly the authenticity of these documents. First, in the past whenever documents were quoted or allegations were made it was said they were fabricated or we are somebody's agents but this time strangely enough when these documents were published not only members of the ruling party did not say that these are machinations of some agents or CIA agents but they said that we are appointing CBI inquiry to find out whether there is a *prima facie* case in the documents that have been published and probably investigations come later on. But the first thing that CBI would have decided whether it is worthwhile going into the material in these documents. If they were to find out at the very outset that the documents are fabricated and they have been engineered in that case straightaway they would have reported to the Government we need not proceed with the investigation. Because there is no *prima facie* case and these documents are fabricated and they would have been thrown to the dust-bin of history. I would like to know from the hon. Defence Minister because we have heard that CBI authorities had told him already that straightaway you cannot reject these documents. There is a *prima facie* evidence. There is substance in the documents. They do not appear to be fabricated otherwise straightaway they would have said no investigation is needed because they appear to be fabricated documents.

Second, in some of the documents that have been published in 'The Hindu' a reference has been made to win Chadha and it has been stated that there are certain evidences against Win Chadha having acted as an agent and certain payments having been made in certain bank accounts. All those documents are there.

You may recollect when Win Chadha came here to appear before the Joint Parliamentary Committee at that time when his work was over he was expected to return back to United States. At that time there were no restrictions. When he came he got the royal treatment and when he was to go away he would have got the similar treatment. There were certain rumours that he was likely to be arrested or his passport is likely to be confiscated but nothing of that type happened. But when the report appeared in 'The Hindu' in that case Government warned Win Chadha that he cannot leave the country at all. Now I could not be told by the Government that I cannot leave the country. None of my colleagues here can be told that they cannot leave the country. Initially they did not tell Win Chadha that he must not leave the country but only when these documents were published in 'The Hindu' in which indictment of Win Chadha was made and there was a stir in the public that this man seems to be having some skeletons in his cupboard, when Government also felt there seemed to be some skeletons in the cupboard of Win Chadha under those circumstances they told him that he cannot leave the country. On analysis of this indirect evidence Government did take cognizance of the documents which were printed in 'The Hindu' in which there was clear indictment that was made. I am sorry for the pronouncement. There is a touch of Maharashtra in that. I am very sorry that such indictments were made. And as a result of that, he was told not to leave the country. I have got all the documents and I need not go through all the documents. Actually, the type of those documents is also so small, it is very difficult to read them. Of course, for that I have brought the magnifying glass. Even then, it was worthwhile undertaking that exercise.

Sir, as far as all these documents are concerned, to my mind, four aspects have



been completely established. Despite the denials by the Joint Parliamentary Committee, despite the denials by Mr. Win Chadha and others, number one, it is established on the basis of the authenticity of the documents that secret agreements did exist and they are available here. I need not lay them on the table of the House because they are laid on every table in every house in the country. It has been clearly established that commissions are paid. Number three, it has been established that Win Chadha is linked up with Svenska payments. And it had been clearly established that all the story of winding-up charges is only a cooked up and a cover-up story. All the documents are there. Some manipulation of the dates is there. I will just make it explicitly clear that there is nothing like the winding-up charges. Some of the documents, which are there, have made these things explicitly clear. Without quoting all the documents, only I will give the reference. There are important extracts from JPC's report on Bofors which clearly conflict with whatever has appeared in *the Hindu*.

I am quoting from the Joint Parliamentary Committee's report :

- (1) "Bofors had not used any middle man, 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."

(JPC report page 167)

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

(JPC report page 167)

- (3) "There is no evidence to show that any part of the winding-up costs was paid to any Indian other resident in India or abroad."

(JPC report page 191)

There are non-resident Indians and there are non-Indian residents. There is reference to both., And

- (4) "7.159. During his examination, Shri Chadha further affirmed as under :—

He was never a middleman or an agent of Bofors in so far as he never performed any functions of a broker or a commission agent and was not engaged in any selling activities."

(JPC report page 162)

Now I will only make a reference to the important documents. I do not want to read them. I see that you are impatient. We are also impatient to expose all corruption. Number one, reference to document giving evidence of Commission, if you look at 'Frontline'—they have just put all together (page 24)—you will get that.

Number two, a wonderful table of concordance : Svenska and Win Chadha's Anatomic (page 25). I have given that. A number of coincidences are given here.

Sir, I shall refer only to the page numbers and all that. Those who have no time, they can refer to the library. Those details have been given here. The third is a very important reference. The internal document of the Swedish Central Bank giving a monthly statement of transactions involving foreign exchange :

"According to the transaction listed 5th, on January 10, 1984 a commission payment (coded '62' of SEK 174, 522) was made to "Pitco Co. Sangham Ltd."

This is from Page 29 of Front Line—A communication from A.E. Services and another document, regarding a single payment by Bofors of SEK 50.46 millions as commission to A.E. Services. The commissions have been firmly linked to payments made by the Government of India to Bofors in 1986-87 against invoiced deliveries or as advances. You can find this on Page 32. These documents leave on doubt that payment of commission had taken place to the front companies. In this connection, I would like to know an answer to a specific question. A.E. Services is, at least, an important institution in this entire House of

[Prof. Madhu Dandavate]

Corruption. There seems to be many transactions. Just now, that is not the matter under discussion but it is reliably learnt that as far as the contract of the Westland helicopters are concerned, it is the A.E. Services which have given the contract. The percentage has been fixed up and all the documents to which I made a cursory reference have been published in Hindu, as of Chitra Subramaniam who has worked out all the details as to what are the details of the contract, what is the amount involved, what is the percentage fixed, what is the amount said and what are the signatures, etc. are given here. Therefore, all these details having been given, it is clear that as far as these details are concerned, clear cut payment of commission has taken place and bribes had taken place. Now, therefore, I would link it up with that and I would like to know from the Defence Minister that as far as the A.E. Services are concerned, is it a fact that they were given the contract about Westland helicopters and what was the percentage of commission that was actually kept? Next, comes Government's failure to investigate.

SHRI K. C. PANT : It is not relevant to this debate.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I think if little irrelevance is there, relevant part will become dominant.

SHRI K. C. PANT : Your speech will not be complete without something irrelevant.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : In that case, I will be waiting for your speech.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : You should use his magnifying glass to find out his relevance.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I would like to know the replies from the hon. Minister to specific queries. I would expect sharp and pointed answers. In spite of the information regarding from companies with their account numbers, commissions paid and the amounts of contracts, no successful enquiry could be made into these front companies. I have gone through the report. They say that some of them were

managed only by women. But that does not stop the mischief. I do not want to make any general allegation against women. I have to go home.

MR. SPEAKER : I was worrying about it.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : So, protect me in that case. Bofors and Win Chadha who were in the docks as culprits were put in the witness box by JPC and their contention was relied upon. Why is it that you rely upon this and especially when these details have come out? No further information was sought from Sweden after issuing of the report of the National Audit Bureau. After the National Audit Bureau had submitted its report, certain names were dropped out or omitted on the basis of commercial confidentiality and because of their commitment to the banks. A news had appeared and a complaint had been made in that country that after all these documents had come up and so many names had been revealed, how was it that the Government of India did not make any reference to Sweden saying : "When you submitted the National Audit Bureau Report, you had already omitted certain names, but now so many names are clear, we would like to know from you whether they are identical with the names which were in the report"? A Committee in Sweden is enquiring into the Bofors issue, that is called the Constitutional Committee. It is a Committee of the Parliament of Sweden. There has been a pressure from Members of both the sides, the Members of the ruling party as well as from the opposition parties—that is the beauty of Swedish experiment—and they are insisting : "Do not try to cover up anyone, let the Constitutional Committee go ahead with thorough investigations". Why is it that, we are not all trying to seek any help from the Constitutional Committee which had already completed a lot of its work? Let the Government tell the House whether one of the front companies mentioned in the documents was the company to which, as I said earlier, Westland Helicopter contract was given and let us know exactly what was the percentage that was given to them.

Now, I come to a very vital aspect of

this entire problem. I hang my head in shame when I read in the newspapers that the Switzerland Government comes out with a statement that "we had unilaterally offered to the Government of India assistance in the investigation of Bofors and other episodes, we do not understand why they are not accepting our offer, why they are not getting our help." They do not know that all helps are not necessarily good helps, some of them are embarrassing. They are, however, feeling that way and therefore, a statement comes from the Switzerland Government that "we had unilaterally offered to the Government of India that we are prepared to assist you in the investigation of these details." I do not know why you are not prepared to accept help. As far as all other spheres are concerned, we have liberalised our imports. As far as this technical assistance for moral purposes is concerned, we will not be opposed to the liberalization of import of all the information from Switzerland. Full information should be sought regarding bank accounts and the issues clinched.

I can very well see, Sir, that you are impatient because others have to speak; other speakers will be impatient; I am not referring to you.

Recently, one event has taken place and with that I will close my observations. Here, we may try to have hair-splitting and some may try to run away with some technicalities and have cover up operations to cover up frauds. You can indulge in such technicalities on the floor of the House, but as far as people are concerned, they are always straight-forward. Recently, 18 by-elections took place in this country. Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh who has become the centre of this issue of Bofors and has been campaigning on the issue of Bofors...*(Interrupts)*. I know it will be embarrassing for you...*(Interrupts)*. During these byelections, I campaigned along with him and the only issue that became the major issue in the elections, specially at Allahabad, was the question of corruption at high places. We said that the Prime Minister himself should squarely take the responsibility of the fraud of the Bofors issue and all the malpractices that have taken place. We said in the public meetings that whosoever may be the candi-

date of the Congress Party, the fight at Allahabad constituency was the fight between Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh and the Prime Minister, of the country, who is responsible for all this. And it was a referendum; the Allahabad election was a referendum on Bofors, a referendum on corruption. The referendum is clear. Peoples' opinion and verdict is clear. Now, all that this Government should do after this referendum is let them quit the Government, face the electorate, hold a mid-term poll and then vindicate their position.

SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL (Chandigarh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I heard with attention the opening speaker Shri Choubey and also my esteemed colleague, Prof. Madhu Dandavate.

With regard to Shri Choubey, I would like to have said a number of things but one thing on which I take serious objection and I want the House to share the anguish and grief with me is when he said, "The earlier or the only Joint Parliamentary Committee which was constituted for going into this whole matter consisted of...\*\*..." If our friend still says it is correct, they should hang their heads in shame for calling me and my other hon. colleagues as...\*\*...I expect them to create better traditions in this House and the traditions they now want to create are to abuse each other.

At one stage Prof. Madhu Dandavate was saying, "The Joint Parliamentary Committee is a mini-Parliament." And at the same time whatever derogatory remarks are in their armoury, they are trying to use. I say, I feel greatly hurt. My experience of these committees emboldens me to say that when we sit in such committees, each one of us including the Opposition Members and ourselves, sits there cutting across the party lines.

AN HON. MEMBER : Not necessarily always.

SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL : I know the calibre which you people are now bringing in this House. I am very sorry to say so. But I do want to say that the credibility of the Parliament lies in the hands of the Members of Parliament themselves

[Shri Jagan Nath Kaushal]

and if they want to tell the world outside that the Members of the Parliament are not doing their duties properly, whom are they denegrating? They are denegrating the Parliament. As I say, I have a sense of grief, a sense of sadness about it and I must share it with the House; otherwise I will not be true to myself.

16.00 hrs.

Now, what did the Joint Parliamentary Committee do; what efforts did they make; how was it appointed; what was the purpose of it and whether anything better could be achieved by the Parliamentary Committee? In order to judge as to where lies the truth; how the matter came to the House; how the House appointed a Committee which then went into the matter, some broad facts have been established. Those broad facts are not being challenged by anybody. When the earlier debate took place, those facts could not be challenged. Some people did try to challenge but those facts just could not be challenged. Now, the matter has again been brought before the House, only because some fresh developments have taken place. Otherwise, one thing is obvious. Earlier, the report of the Joint Parliamentary Committee was discussed threadbare in both the Houses.

I may bring to the notice of the House how the whole situation developed which led to the appointment of a Joint Parliamentary Committee. May I bring one fact to the notice of the House which was taken note of by the Joint Parliamentary Committee itself? The officers of the Defence Services as well as the Defence Ministry stated before the Parliamentary Committee that in the Defence deals there always used to be agents. It was a recognised practice. May I bring it to the notice of the Members? I have every hope that all members have read the report. It was stated both by the Defence Secretary as well as the Deputy Commander-in-Chief of the Forces that it was a known fact. The Ministry of Defence always used to ask them about the commission to be paid and the agent to be appointed, so that they would know ultimately...*(Interruptions)*

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

MR. SPEAKER : Which rule has been infringed ?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : He is referring to the proceedings of the Joint Parliamentary...Committee *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : No please. Overruled. No rule has been infringed and hence there is no point of order.

*(Interruptions)*

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : Why do you lose temper ?

[*English*]

Please sit down. Why are you insisting on it unnecessarily? No infringement of any rule taken place. Please sit down.

*(Interruptions)*

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : Why are you doing like this to each other? There is a good discussion going on. Mr. Jaipalji, let it continue. *(Interruptions)*

[*English*]

SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL : What I have been bringing to the notice of the House is what has already been written in the report of the Joint Parliamentary Committee.

In November 1984, when the new Government came, the Prime Minister said, "Hence forward, Defence deals will not have any middlemen. Defence deals will not be struck through agents. There will be only direct deals." When that situation arose, there were already four firms in the field. It was told to everybody that no middlemen or agents would be needed because the Government wanted only direct deals. It was also made clear to those firms that if they had kept any commission to be paid to any middleman or agent, they might reduce that commission from their offers because the Government would not like to have any commission agent. With that end in view, when the firms were told so, they did reduce their offers. Each firm did it. Then, the

Prime Minister was so insistent upon it that he talked about this matter with his counterpart in Sweden also. The late Prime Minister of Sweden then assured the Prime Minister that I have asked Bofors, "Bofors said, we have no middlemen." Then ultimately the whole thing proceeded. The Contract came into being. Now due to subsequent developments, which everybody knows, it came to the notice of the public that some amount has been paid. That amount was sometime Rs. 30 crores or Rs. 40 crores. Later on, the figure was round about Rs. 64 crores. Now the question arose, what is all this? The Bofors people's explanation is that before this situation came, we had our Consultants. We are running our business all the world over and we thought the Government might even take them as middlemen. So we tried to terminate their contracts. Only three courses were open—either they could straightaway go in for litigation, telling them here we terminate the Contracts, the actual litigation will come or they could terminate their Contracts by mutual agreement or they could go to arbitration. So they thought that if everybody agrees, then we settle, we will pay you so much, whether we pay it today or we pay it in installments but this will be your charges for the services rendered till today or for some services which you thought you could have rendered and got more profits out of it. But then this is the lumpsum which we will pay. That amount they say was paid. The whole controversy is, are those bribes, are those pay offs, are those Commissions or are they winding up charges.

Now Sir, speaking for myself, I am not enamoured of one English phrase or the other. But if that is the situation that there were earlier contracts existing and those contracts were terminated because of the insistence of the Government of India and payments were made, now has any illegality been committed or those payments were made for bribes or those payments were made as Commission as I again say I am not enamoured of any word. They may be commission. They may be winding up charges. They may be termination charges. They may be compensation. But anyway, the amount has been paid.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : That comes to money only.

SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL : We were at that stage. In order to find that out, the Joint Parliamentary Committee, then asked the Bofors to produce the original Contracts and produce the Termination Contracts. Well, they said, we claim commercial secrecy and said our contracts are with the third people and we are not going to disclose and it is guaranteed through all international laws, that commercial secrecy has to be maintained. We were stuck up at that situation. We called the Attorney General. The Attorney General said, "Sorry that is the correct position in law. You cannot compel them." If you cannot compel them, you cannot find out whether these termination charges in fact were compensation or whatever it was. Then what is to be done. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : You said they have violated the laws...

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : Jaipalji, why are you interrupting him? Your other members will also speak, they will raise this point. Please do not do like this. Please do not interrupt.

[*English*]

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : that is the winding up charge. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Choubey, you have been given sufficient time. I have allowed you all that. Don't interrupt now.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Jaipal Reddy, please take your seat.

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : Do not interrupt.

[*English*]

Order please; let me handle it. Don't interrupt.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : Even in the report it is written like that. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : That is what he also has said. Does not matter; it is all right.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : No argument, Mr. Singh. I will give you time to argue your own case. I will allow you. I will allow time and you can explain your point of view. I will allow you. No problem; you are going to speak. There is no problem.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Please order...

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI G. G. SWELL (Shillong) : Repartees are part of the parliamentary debate. Without them, there is no debate at all.

SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL : I am submitting broad facts...(*Interruptions*) I am submitting broad facts, and from those facts any inference can be drawn. Who stops anybody from drawing inferences? The broad facts are as stated by the Bofors. Whether Bofors have said it rightly or wrongly, is to be determined. We were faced with that situation. We were trying to determine it. Bofors said : 'Yes; Rs. 64 crores we have paid.' But they say : 'We have paid it because earlier, consultancy contracts were there, because those contracts had to be cancelled, because cancellation costs had to be paid. 'Whether you call them winding up charges, whether you call them consultancy charges or termination costs, whether you call them compensation or commission paid, I do not know. (*Interruption*) I have a right to make my submissions...(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : There are many names of God. It makes no difference whether you call Him Allah or 'Ram' or 'Khuda' or 'Bhagvan'. Anybody can pronounce any name. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Listen, you are

disturbing the debate. Debate is going on very smoothly, you are disturbing it without any reason. Tomorrow you will tell that everything has been disturbed. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL : I still maintain; I do not know why the House should get so excited. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : Now stop your discussion. Give opportunity to others. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL : We had the patience to listen to Professor Sahib, and to Choubey Sahib although Mr. Choubey today was only telling stories, probably fiction. Probably this is what he wanted to say, that this also is a fiction, as there are lots of fiction and stories moving about (*Interruptions*) But I do not bother.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Carry on with the cover-up story.

SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL : What I was saying was this; I am again saying so. All right; if some topic is very touchy and they do not want to hear me on that matter, I will switch on to the other topic.

Sir, what is the situation which has prompted our friends to come to this House for the second debate? In fact, that is the question which has arisen. And one thing which again I have been noting very clearly is this. They have started by saying : 'This has been proved, this has been abundantly proved, this has been proved beyond a shadow of doubt, this has been proved by the evidence or regarding which indirect evidence is there, this is an authentic document...' So, they have started by saying that everything has been proved.

Proved where? Proved by the *Front line*. And when my hon. friend Prof. Madhu Dandavate was reading *Front line* I thought he was reading some Supreme Court judgement. He said, *Front line* has

said this, *Front line* has compared it; *Front line* has done this; *Front line* has come to this conclusion. Wonderful. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Your Lordship, I cannot read your judgement in your presence.

SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL : Our whole grievance from the very beginning was this. Jurisprudence is being tried to be changed by our hon. friends today in all seriousness, and I am more serious than them. I want to ask them : are you really changing the jurisprudence because the jurisprudence you want to bring about now is this. Allegation levelled is allegation proved. This is your jurisprudence. (2) Allegation levelled need not be proved by the person who has levelled the allegation. The other person must prove his innocence. The third thing which you want to prove is this. Allegation levelled is said to be proved by any evidence on earth; whether the evidence is legal, illegal, hearsay, unproved. (*Interruptions*). I thought we were wedded to rule of law (*Interruptions*) If, according to you this is a matter of laughter, I can only pity you. But I [am telling you that it is not a matter to be taken non-seriously. We only come to know the majesty of law, we only come to know the accepted jurisprudence in all free countries of the world, when we are facing some personal problems and difficulties. Only then we say, will you condemn me without proper evidence; will you come to a decision against me on the basis of hearsay evidence? Then we cry hoarse. But, otherwise, we feel everything is established because some news has appeared in the paper. Good enough. Finished. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI AMAR ROYPRADHAN (Cooch Behar) : Will you take action against the paper? (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : What is happening to them? Please order.

[*Translation*]

Pradhanji, what is happening to you? You raised good points, he is also raising good points.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : I listened to your speech. We enjoyed it.

[*English*]

SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL : What I was submitting was that the accepted norm of coming to a conclusion on any matter is to go by the established norms of society. I could understand my friends saying that some news has appeared and on the basis of that news they say a second Joint Parliamentary Committee should be appointed. Let us examine the merit of this argument. If I remember, a number of friends on the opposite side, said, what is the use of having a parliamentary probe because legal impediments which we cannot surmount will face us. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat) : Who said this?

SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL : Number of friends have said so.

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS (Mavelikara) : The disagreement was on the terms of reference, not on the constitution.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Nobody said that.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Anyway, on law you are the authority.

SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL : I must say, I must again repeat, that any Parliamentary Committee has to move in accordance with the rules framed by the House, the rules framed by the Speaker. Now, those rules framed had to go to what length? Any Parliamentary Committee which may be appointed will again work under the same limitations. Now, question arises, before the stage comes, as the stage came earlier, and at that time also when the House appointed the Committee our hon. friends thought that it was no use to be in the Committee—reasons they may be giving any—but unfortunately they refused to join in the Committee. Ultimately now they feel there has to be a committee—of what type—one member of the Opposition has to be

[Shri Jagan Nath Kaushal]

the Chairman of that Committee. Agreed. (Interruptions) Agreed. On what basis?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: You can put Shri Amal Datta. He is free now.

- SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL: My submission is—kindly bear with me for a few minutes more—as soon as this news appeared in *The Hindu* and *Hindu* tried to publish some documents, what was the attitude of the Government?

The attitude of the Government was, let somebody go into this, and which was that somebody? Those 'somebody' are whose services are always utilised. They are the highest investigating agencies of the State. Their services were utilised even by the JPC. The JPC itself just could not go and ask people here, there and everywhere. It is the investigating agencies who go into the matter; and go into a number of matters, not one matter as Professor Sahib says, whether it is an authentic document or not. So many other things have also been probed and my friend says the CBI in his opinion, indirectly has agreed that these are genuine documents.

PROF. N.G. RANGA (Guntur): No!

SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL: I am nobody to anticipate anything. I am not anticipating anything. I am only saying: Let somebody go into it, and that somebody has to be a responsible agency. That somebody has to be, whose conclusions we can *prima facie* accept and that somebody has to go to foreign lands, to foreign countries, take the help of the other countries to whatever extent they can give the help and then go into all these matters because according to me, as I say, the situation has not arisen when we can come to even a tentative or a *prima facie* decision. Otherwise, till today, one situation stands. For winning the contract, the question arises, the terms of reference were, for winning the contract was some bribe paid? For winning the contract was somebody employed? For winning the contract were some underhand means employed?

On that, may I again submit to the House, that the JPC's report on all these

matters stands till today and it cannot be controverted. It just cannot be controverted. I will draw the attention of my hon. friends to two particular things.

Sir, suspicion can be raised and it was raised. There was one factor which tried to influence the judgement of a number of people.

That factor was all through in the shortlisting, Swedish gun wrs at number two and it was placed at number one. So, then suspicion could arise. Sir, on that matter, you read the just statement of the Commander-in-chief, Gen. Sunderji. He said: "Two prominent things happened and if I had not changed the priority, it would have been absolutely wrong on my part because our perception changed when we came to know that a radar, which we thought, will not come into the neighbouring country for fifteen years; that was supplied by the Americans to Pakistan". Sir, what that radar could do? When the first burst is fired, the radar would trace and locate the gun within a few seconds so that the counterburst could destroy the gun. So, this the perception had to be changed. If in spite of this factor having come to the knowledge of the Army authorities they had not changed the priority, then according to me, they have failed in their duties. So, this factor was dispelled.

Now, the second question arises. "Was there some hanky-panky in the price itself? Sir, a rigorous exercise has been made in this case as it is done in all the cases. It went to the Negotiating Committee; Defence Ministry, Cabinet Sub-Committee; the Finance Minister, the Defence Minister and to the Prime Minister and it was examined at every stage. All responsible people have accepted that the best possible bargain has been struck in the sense that because of two situations—elimination of the agent and generation of keen competition—the prices were reduced by more than two hundred crores of rupees; and that matter went to the then Finance Minister also, who happens to be my neighbour now. He said, 'Yes, good'. The Secretary Expenditure...(Interruptions)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Sir, I have a right to reply him.



**SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL :**  
Yes, you have a right to reply. The Defence Secretary, who Expenditure Secretary—all these people have come and stated, and nobody can run away from the situation that they discharged their duties honestly, including the then Finance Minister. Now, later on the Finance Minister says : "I have been misled, I was not supposed to know this, that and another." It is for him to say.

I assume, this transaction was done in all honesty ; this transaction resulted in getting the best weapon for the country at the most competitive price. So, the question of some extraneous consideration getting in, according to me, did not arise. Gen. Sunderji stated on oath that nobody tried to influence his decision at any stage. Sir, if nobody tried to influence his decision at any stage, best possible has been purchase; and the price has been reduced. Now later on, if some consultancy agreements have been terminated and some compensation has been paid to them, which they term it as 'winding up charges', I would certainly like to know how anything else can be of any relevance for the purpose for which we are debating here. My submission to this House...(Interruptions).

I have not advanced any political argument. But unfortunately, too much of politics is involved in this. They are not concerned with actually what is the truth. They are concerned with to keep the issue alive somehow on one pretext or the other so that they can go on beating their drum and assail. Otherwise, I cannot repeat the pains which the Joint Parliamentary Committee took, the document which the Joint Parliamentary Committee has produced. I can, with all humility, say that nothing better could be done because the confidential commerciality we cannot pierce through, the bank secrecy we cannot pierce through. Then there is no other way. Sweden did their best. It is mentioned in the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report also. The Public Prosecutor was appointed. The Public Prosecutor went into all the documents. The Public Prosecutor then came to the conclusion that nothing hanky panky had been discovered and no bribe had been paid.

**SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA**  
(Bankura) : He never said that.

**SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL :**  
He said so.

**SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY :** He said that he did not get cooperation.

**SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA :** He said that he did not get any cooperation from the Government of India.

**SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL :**  
Sorry, you have not seen the document. He has published the document.

Therefore, my submission to the whole House is this. The pivotal question whether any amount has been paid for winning the contract which was the main term of reference referred to the Committee, on that matter no difference can arise because those amounts which were in lieu of the earlier contract or the consultancy contract, have nothing to do for winning the contract. This contract was given on its own merits and the best possible weapon has been bought for the country at the most competitive rates and there was no hanky panky in that.

**SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE**  
(Bolpur) : My esteemed colleague, Mr. Kaushal, said that there should not be politics in this debate and that we are trying to inject politics into this discussion.

If and when politicians try to make money out of defence deals against the interest of the country, I am afraid, politics cannot be divorced from this discussion.

16.33 hrs.

[SHRI N. VENKATA RATNAM  
in the Chair]

I think the House and indeed the nation owe a debt of gratitude to 'The Hindu', to Mr. Ram and Chitra Subramaniam for their patriotic act in trying to protect the country's interest from the hands of corrupt politicians and financial marauders by exposing some sordid details of defence purchases in relation to the Bofors gun deal. To suppress it, gigantic cover up operations have been made in the past and

[Shri Somnath Chatterjee]

are still being made. But the people of this country are still not satisfied that any really honest attempt or comprehensive attempt has been made by the Government to find out the truth. That is why, we find such defensive postures on the part of the Government and the treasury benches. This House, I am sorry to say, because of its present composition, has not been able to play its due role to go to the root of the matter and unearth the details of what I call a monumental scandal. And the new disclosures have not only thrown considerable light on the happenings which have been attempted to be suppressed but have thoroughly proved that the opposition was fully justified in rejecting the JPC report lock, stock and barrel. It is not significant, as Mr. Choubey has said, in one of the journals it has been pointed out that JPC, representing the House and a miniature parliament as it were, and the great and mighty Indian Government, with all its investigative agencies and diplomatic agencies, could not find out these relevant materials which a newspaper and a journalist in Geneva could find out, could unearth. Then, was there any serious attempt made either by the Governmental agencies or by the JPC if such documents could be found and traced by the newspapers? Therefore, the doubt remains in public mind that no sincere and genuine attempt was made either by the Government or by the JPC. I do not consider myself that the Government's failure was only because of its inefficiency or incompetence. Its failure has been a studied failure because of machinations, because it cannot afford to reach the end of the tunnel to see the light because that will be the end of their own road.

The latest series of disclosures—whatever my friends on the other side may like to say or think have today substantially destroyed the credibility of this Government and its leader, the Prime Minister. We cannot forget the instantaneous reaction of this Government at the highest level, when the first news item came on the Swedish Radio, that whatever allegation had been

made of payment, etc., was all false, baseless and mischievous. Our hon. Prime Minister immediately said that no payment was involved. He reiterated that. Now, when payment was proved, he said, no Indian was involved. And when it was proved that Indians were involved, he said, no politician is involved. And now when politicians will be found to be involved, he says: "I have already said I am not involved and my family is not involved." This is the reaction of the leader of the Government. He is changing his stand from time to time on the basis of the disclosures. When he came, we were waiting with a considerable interest, curiosity to hear the leader, the Prime Minister of the country, that he will make some substantial contribution to the Bofors debate. He only said, Sir, you may recall that "neither me nor my family is involved in this matter or has taken any money." Who do we believe? Because of the shift in the stand of the Prime Minister himself from 'no payment' to 'no Indian', then 'no politician' and 'no Nehru' or 'no Gandhi', is there any doubt in the people's mind? Do you think that they cannot come to their own conclusions? Who is interested in suppressing the truth? Who can at all be interested? Not the Opposition... (*Interruptions*).

AN HON. MEMBER : Not K.K. Tewary also.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : He is a smallest fry there. What are you talking?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (PROF. K.K. TEWARY) : I am a small fry but not a big... (\*\*... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Sir, I withdraw that. Although I know that... (\*\* word should go, but I withdraw.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Lier means one who lies on the ground... (*Interruptions*)

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : Sir, I do not say that the word... (\*\* should go on record

but I want all what he is saying to go on record, and those descriptions that he is giving, will reveal what type of a man he is.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : I am a very bad man.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY : I need not add anything to that. He is self-revealed and self-condemned.

MR. CHAIRMAN : That word does not go into the record, as it is unparliamentary.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Therefore, Sir, the belief that those who are interested in suppressing the truth can only be in the Government and, therefore, in spite of the repeated demands for a meaningful and proper and acceptable enquiry, attempts have been made on the part of the Government to a sort of having an enquiry in a truncated form or unsatisfactory form bringing out the terms of reference which are not meaningful and today the JPC report—whatever my hon. friend Shri Kaushal may feel or think, for whom I have the highest regard—stands totally unacceptable because of the further disclosures on which he has not said one word except giving his view on the question of evidence or acceptability of the evidence. Not a word has been said by him on the merits.

Sir, that is why the people realise and understand that the facts will be in only when this Government will be out.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY : Shri Chandreshwami will support you. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Sir, therefore, we feel that in the national interest, it has become incumbent for the people in this country to get rid of this Government which is today the embodiment of corruption and inefficiency and sooner it is done the better for the future. Sir, I had expected my esteemed colleague Mr. Jagan Nath Kaushal will generally at least comment upon the nature of the disclosures which have been made. Now what do the disclosures show? Prof. Madhu Dandavate has said that really there is no denial and we have found in the newspapers which has not been controverted that the CBI in proceeding on

the basis of the report and that is why action has been taken against Shri Win Chadha. Otherwise action could not have been taken.

Sir, today the latest disclosures establish certain important aspects of the matter, if I may say so almost conclusively which the Government and the JPC had studiously avoided even to look for. Sir, the first finding today one cannot escape, is that the payments which were admittedly made were not winding up charges as Bofors claim and the JPC surprisingly accepted but were commissions worked out on certain percentage basis. But today we hear with some shock when a distinguished Member of the JPC says there today on the floor of the House, there is nothing more special charm in a word. Sir, what did he say? He is a party to this. On page 175, para 7.101, it has stated and I quote here :

“As such, the Committee in the absence of any further reliable information or proof are of the view that while full details of the reasons for payments and names of recipients are not known, 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.”

They say that there were no bribes or commission. Today we hear here that it may be commission and there is a definite finding that these are the winding up charges on the termination of the contracts and because termination of contracts had to be brought about, because the present Prime Minister was so keen that there should not be any middlemen in the defence transaction. Now, today if the documents have proved to show that they could not be winding up charges and they were percentage payments by way of commissions paid regularly from time to time as and when deliveries had been made and payments had been received by Bofors from India, how can you describe this as winding up charges? And these documents are not explained, not a single explanation has come. Then what can they do except what they purport to be showing payments of commission from time to time? No

[Shri Somnath Chatterjee]

winding up charges will be paid on the percentage basis.

Sir, the second important disclosure is that Indians had acted as recipients for themselves and more likely as conduits for others. And this is necessary to find out who these others are. Today it is not the position that no Indians are involved as the JPC said in its report.

Thirdly, Bofors has said that all payments on which strong reliance has been placed by JPC—please look at page 125, Mr. Kaushal. Bofors had said that all payments had been made by way of winding up charges in 1986, but the *Hindu* document proves that these payments continued till March 1987 which totally demolishes the findings of the JPC. Not one word has been spoken.

Sir, the fourth very important thing is that anti-dated agreements had been brought into existence to create false records which has been proved by Bofors' agreement with Svenska in January 1986, which refers to an Indian contract being signed in March 1986. The document of January 1986 refers specifically to a document, agreement of March 1986. Can there be a more tell-tale evidence of fraud? And Mr. Kaushal says, "Nothing, why should you look at them?"

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE :  
Jurisprudence !

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Did they get all the documents proved by calling witnesses before Judges ?

Sir, the fifth very important thing is that these documents prove the closest nexus and connection between the Hinduja and Bofors, and that G.P. Hinduja had been in close touch with Ardbo and Ekblom who ran Bofors when the contract was entered into on the 24th of March. There was a meeting between G.P. Hinduja and Ardbo on 30th January 1987 which was followed by what has been described as "Thank you note" of 5th of February 1987 and which are mentioned in Ardbo's diary now.

Sir, another very important aspect has

come out—the diary entries of Ardbo refer to H, refer to Q and refer to G. H and Q obviously refer to, as many periodicals have also said, Hinduja and Quotrachi respectively. Now, who is this G, the remaining person? Is the Government not making any attempt to discover, Sir, the identity of G? The people are bound to draw their own conclusion, I am not saying anything. But a significant entry in Ardbo's diary is as follows :

"He does not care if Arun Nehru is hurt. He does not mind even if Q is hurt. But G must be saved at all costs." (*Interruptions*).

Another entry suggests, Sir, that there was a meeting later on with G. Sir, I do not know, I want to know who is this G. Anywhere let us find out if it was Goenka. People want to know who is this G. (*Interruptions*). Do you know, Mr. Swell ?

SHRI G. G. SWELL : I am G !

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : How much did you make out of this ? (*Interruptions*).

Sir, there is another important aspect relating to JPC's finding. JPC has accepted—Mr. Kaushal, you are a party, you have accepted the Bofors case that after the Prime Minister wanted that there should be no middlemen, Bofors had to enter into termination agreements and as a result of that, Bofors had to agree to pay 0.75% more to Svenska for terminating their contract. That could only be in 1985, not prior to that. But documents have come—now they are available—which show that this rate of 5.75, which according to JPC's findings on Bofors evidence, was raised to 5.75 only after Mr. Prime Minister's intervention, that this rate was agreed in September, 1984—5.75%, when Mr. Rajiv Gandhi had not even dreamt to be the Prime Minister of this country. Then, how do you explain this? What is the reaction of the hon. and distinguished Members of the JPC who today spoke and tried to support the JPC findings. It is proved from the new disclosures. That is my unhappiness. I know him. I have got the great privilege of knowing him. I request him sometimes to become only Jagannath Kaushal.

Another very important aspect which has come out from this disclosure is the closest link between Anatronics Corporation and Svenska. Now how it is proved. It is by the remarkable similarities in the agreement between Bofors and Anatronics and Bofors and Svenska. It is very interesting to note, in one of the agreements with Svenska, the Bofors says, if there is any failure by Anatronics in carrying out the obligations, we shall not pay any commission or any amount to Svenska. Now for Anatronics failure, how can Svenska be penalised unless Anatronics and Svenska are synonymous. There is no answer from Mr. Jagan Nath Kaushal, although findings are there in the JPC report a bout it.

Therefore, when Svenska receives 36 crores, 1.20 crores are given over a period of one year to Anatronics Corporation, that is, Wm Chadha. But 36 crores given to his Benamdar, Svenska when we do not find them having rendered any service. JPC itself has found that no services were rendered by Svenska within this country. What sort of services were rendered by Svenska, nobody knows. Then, if Svenska had not acted as a middlemen, if they had not rendered any useful service, why were they paid 36 crores? Therefore, in the name of Svenska, Chadha had received this money.

Sir, the simple question is, for whom did he receive the money? Therefore, in the admitted, disclosed name of Chadha's business of Anatronics, this is 1.20 crores. But in the cover-up name of Svenska, it is 36 crores, with no positive evidence, no objective material to show any services having been rendered.

Take another very important thing which has come out from this disclosure. That percentage payments which were made by Bofors range from 0.96% to 6% depending on the items delivered. While 0.96% or 2.24% and other percentage payments were exclusively relating to the contract of 24th March, 1986—it is a very serious matter—these are against delivery it made—but 6% secret payments were made for different contracts prior to the Howitzer deal. That shows Bofors and Indian Government were having dealing in respect

of Defence matters where secret commissions were being paid. Sir, such payments are very serious and establish what has been pointed out in certain shperes, an element of additionality the defence pay-off scandal. There have been several documents of 1982 which show transactions in 1982 with Swiss bank linking Pitco, followed by subsequent payments in Swiss accounts of Moresco and Moineau and this Pitco association with Sangam, one after another document. has been produced.

Who is saying what? Our grievance with the JPC was that they should have waited. When those April documents came out, we had requested them, we had requested Mr. Shankaranand "Don't try to hustle through. Please look into those documents and thereafter submit your report." No, No. They were totally ignored and they forthwith hastened to submit the report and those April documents were not taken note of. Now, they are supplemented by June documents and nothing is said by the Government.

The other thing which has come out is payments have been made to the coded accounts in the Swiss back in the name of Lotus, Tulip and Mont Blanc. I do not know. I want to know. How do I know unless there is a proper inquiry and an inquiry by an agency which is acceptable to us?

The position is, today we have to consider and see what is the Government going to do and what is the Government's attitude.

Mr. Jagan Nath Kaushal said "Well, the Opposition feels that whatever is alleged must be true." When documents have been must produced, I am entitled to act *prima facie*, on that. You are in the Government. You can say 'Yes' or 'No'. You can set up an agency about that. You do not say anything. Can you say these documents are not relevant because I do not like them and, therefore, everybody will keep his eyes shut? Is this the attitude the Government can take? Are we expected that we shall ignore these documents when it is being said they are authenticated by the Swedish authorities and they are not being disputed by the CBI even here?

[Shri Somnath Chatterjee]

17.00 hrs.

Mr. Jagan Nath Kaushal thought that Prof. Madhu Dandavate was reading Frontline as the Supreme Court Judgment. Mr. Jagan Nath Kaushal said this. This dig I did not expect from Mr. Jagan Nath Kaushal but at least I can assure my hon. friends there, that today the people of this country are reading Frontline as Supreme Court Judgment and they want to decide as the Supreme Court of the people of this country. They will decide unless the Government behaves and behaves responsibly.

They have referred the matter to CBI which is nothing but an attempt to stall a meaningful inquiry. I would like to ask the hon. Defence Minister "Why don't you ask the Chief Public Prosecutor of Sweden to look into that again?" I demand that you do that. Prof. Madhu Dandavate has referred to it.

I want you to read out a news item which I do not find has been controverted by anybody here. It says :—

"Switzerland is willing to provide assistance to Sweden for the latter's investigation into the Bofors-India howitzer deal payoff accounts "but the Swedes have to decide whether or not they want this assistance," said Mr. Jorg Kirstler, spokesman, Swiss Federal Department of Police and Justice."

This news item said further that :—

"They sought help on the India and Singapore case—as far as Singapore was concerned, they gave us sufficient information and we were able to give them what they needed."

The Government of Singapore—

"Mr. Kirstler said. He wondered why the Swedes did not follow the leads provided by Switzerland for getting behind the Bofors-India accounts."

Mr. Lars Ringberg, the Chief Public Prosecutor there, did not give up inquiry on his own. He was an unhappy man. Why did he not come to a finding that there was nothing wrong ?

What did he say ? He had stated :

"Through the inquiry, it has emerged that AB Bofors during 1986 disbursed about SEK 319 million to three foreign companies with accounts with different banks in Switzerland.

Admissions of the disbursements in question have been made and also explanations and motives for them given. It has not been possible, however, to obtain details of which persons received payments.

A judicial inquiry similar to our preliminary inquiry concerning possible bribery offences has not been commenced in India.

Thus, neither written nor oral evidence has been obtained through the inquiry undertaken with regard to whom payments were made and the reasons for them."

He has said that in view of this no evidence is being produced and no inquiry has been started.

I further quote :

"In view of this, and since it cannot be expected that information of decisive importance for the matter of prosecution could be obtained by continuing the inquiry, the preliminary inquiry is withdrawn."

Now, it is known and nobody has denied that Mr Ringberg wanted to meet someone from our Indian Government when there was a visit there.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Mr. Kaushal, we had read the report...  
(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE :  
But he was rebuffed. Nobody even bothered to see him—not even a Member from the Indian Embassy or Indian Delegation that had gone there. Now, in the absence of this, the position is that the Swedish Public Prosecutor was forced to give up the preli-

minary inquiry because of lack of cooperation, because of lack of assistance, because of lack of any judicial inquiry or police inquiry in this country, the matter could not be pursued further. Therefore, I demand that he should at least be requested to go into this. Let us ask them, apart from this, even if they are not agreeable to go through another JPC, to do it. What about the CBI Inquiry? The CBI inquiry will not, certainly, satisfy our demand or the people's demand. I tell you why. What has happened to that Ajitabh Bachchan's inquiry? The charge against him is that he is supposed to have acquired a property in a foreign country without the Reserve Bank of India's permission. It requires two questions to be asked from him whether he has got a property and if he has got a property, whether he got Reserve Bank of India's permission and where did get the money from? How long has it taken to come to an end of this inquiry? How long will the CBI take to inquire into this matter. We have seen the CBI's performance when they were utilised by JPC and asked to investigate the matter. With all their resources, they could not find any details about the three front companies about which Mr. Shiv Shankar gave a theory that they were the front companies of the Directors of Bofors to which atleast the JPC has not subscribed.

Sir, Mr. Arun Singh has said: "This is breach of faith. They should be asked to remit back the money". What action is being taken? On the other hand, the ex-Minister of State of Defence at the appropriate time said that there was a breach of faith and the money should be refunded. Now, another Minister stands up—the present Minister—and says. He has to keep his job in mind". He says that no case has been made out asking for refund of money. What sort of tamasha is going on with the people of this country and the people's money of this country. Therefore, we submit that very serious, very important and very relevant documents have come out and the Government should not ignore them. If they ignore the documents, the people will be more convinced that the Government does not what the truth to come out. If the Government to try adopt dilatory tactics like asking the CBI to go on an indefinite inquiry, then people will also be convinced

that there are skeletons in the cupboard which they want to keep concealed. In the name of the people of India, we demand that there should be a proper investigation. Let the Public Prosecutor of Sweden go into it. If necessary, another appropriate Committee should be formed with proper terms of reference.

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS (Tezpur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, honestly speaking, I have failed to understand why the learned Members of the Opposition have given top priority to this issue of Bofors. This is not the first time that we are discussing Bofors. We have discussed Bofors at length last time also in the Budget Session. But still these friends have given the top-most priority to this question and relegated the other problems of the people to the background. My charge against the Opposition, first of all, is that when there are vital problems concerning the day-to-day life of our people, of our nation, they are not bothered about them and they want to give the top-most priority to this question of Bofors. I have very high respect for the press. The press in India has played a very important role and also a very responsible role. Certainly, what appears in the press has to be taken note of. But does it mean that every time something comes out in the press, it should be allowed to dislocate the functions of the Parliament? This is the question I want to pose.

After all, what are the basic issues on this question? The first basic question was whether we were justified in selecting this particular gun for purchase. The second question was whether we paid a reasonable price. The third question was about the delivery schedule. The fourth was whether, in dealing with this firm and in the negotiations, we followed the correct procedure.

There are no two opinions in this country today that we have selected the best gun available in the competitive market. Apart from the views of Gen. Sunderji who was in service at that time—some might say that he expressed that opinion because he was in service then—we have the opinion of experts like Field Marshal Manekshaw and Gen. Arora who have given a high certificate to this gun; they have said very clearly that it is the best available gun in today's world.

[Shri Bipin Pal Das]

that we have purchased. So, one question is settled that we have purchased the best available gun for our country to serve our interest.

The second question is whether we paid a reasonable price or an excessive price. In the last Session I discussed this question exhaustively. I do not want to repeat all the arguments. It has been published that the Price Negotiating Committee, very skilfully, managed to bring down the price of the Bofors gun to the minimum. Two systems were under examination : the Bofors system and the French system. Ultimately we could succeed, and we succeeded, in bringing down the price of the Bofors gun below the floor price of the French system. On this question also we were not losers; we were gainers.

So far as the procedure is concerned, there are records to show that, while negotiating this deal, we followed the correct, standard procedure. We did not budge an inch.

So far as the delivery schedule is concerned, it has been proved and shown that the delivery schedule of the Bofors system was much better than the delivery schedule proposed by the French system. If these things are correct, if we have purchased the best gun available in the market, if we have paid the reasonable price for this gun, if we have followed the procedure correctly, if their delivery schedule was much better than the French system, if all these things are satisfactory, then the question arises why should any firm pay bribes to anybody to get this contract fulfilled. Now, a firm will engage somebody, pay bribes to somebody to get their commodities sold if the commodity is of inferior quality. They want to get it sold by bribing somebody or they want to sell the commodity at a higher price by bribing somebody. If the quality of the gun is all right, it was not of inferior quality, if the price settled was reasonable, where is the question of bribing anybody to get this deal complete? Where is the question? This is the basic question that occurs to me as a citizen, as a Member of Parliament and to any citizen in this country.

They are talking of bribes. Had there been bribes paid to anybody, the question is why did they pay bribe? For what purpose? If I have a firm and my commodities are of inferior quality, if I want to get it sold to Mr. V.P. Singh, I would bribe my friend here and influence him to buy my commodity because I know, my commodities are of inferior quality. He won't accept it otherwise. So, I engaged another friend to sell through bribes. Or I engage somebody through bribes to get a higher price. There are other comparable things, comparable commodities. But these have not happened. This is the basic question I would ask from my learned Members of the opposition. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH  
(Allahabad) : Sometimes one does not bribe; he only gives a gift.

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS : Mr. V. P. Singh, I haven't yet come to you. If you provoke me, I would say that in concluding this deal of Bofors, Mr. V.P. Singh as the Finance Minister was kept in the picture all through. And the Prime Minister okayed this deal only after Mr. V.P. Singh and Mr. Arun Singh recommended this deal. Only after he signed it, the Prime Minister okayed it. Mind you. Therefore, no use blaming anybody. All are there. I am not blaming him. But my basic question is since the quality of the gun was very good, since the price was reasonable, the delivery schedule was all right, why should they bribe anybody? Why this question of bribing anybody comes at all. This is my basic question. And, therefore, we shall oppose this whole matter from this point of view.

Now 'The Hindu' has published some papers. I don't call them documents unless it is established that they are really valid documents. Document has a meaning. Now, Mr. Chatterjee has gone away. He was very eloquent in charging the Government that the Government has done nothing after the publication of these papers. Everybody knows that immediately after these papers were published, the Government took the first action, the prompt action. They asked for investigation. Now, why the Government felt compelled to go for investigation? Mr. Chatterjee has pointed out the discrepancy



regarding the dates. Mr. Chatterjee has also pointed out the similarity of identity between the Svenska and the companies of Mr. Chadha. Because of these facts it struck the Government that there must be something wrong somewhere and that there is something at least to be inquired into. That is why the Government has asked for a thorough investigation.

Now they have said that they have no faith in the CBI. It is a very strange kind of argument. If CBI's findings do not support them, they will not have faith in the CBI; if the High Court or the Supreme Court goes against them, they will not have faith in the judiciary; if the Speaker gives a ruling against them, no faith in the Speaker. Anybody saying something with whom they cannot agree, they will have no faith.

I want Mr. Chatterjee or other Members of the Opposition to tell me what is the agency available in the hands of the Government through which the Government can carry on this investigation. What is the agency? Good or bad, CBI is our agency. If CBI goes wrong somewhere, we will find fault, we will catch hold of them. But we have no other agencies. If there were other agencies, we could have made use of those agencies for a thorough investigation. But there is no other way. Please tell us what is the way out.

They have suggested another Joint Parliamentary Committee. I will come to that. It is therefore absolutely wrong to say that the Government has not taken note of the publication of these papers in the Hindu. The Government is seized of the matter and that is why they have gone for a thorough investigation.

Now they have asked for another JPC. One JPC's work is over. That JPC went into all matters available and they have come to certain conclusions at that point of time. Yes, there were certain matters available at that time coming from Sweden or somewhere on the basis of which that JPC could function. I want to know from the Members of the Opposition on what basis the new JPC will work. Where will they start? Start from where? They cannot obviously start from some publication of some papers in the newspapers. No.

They must have something substantial, something concrete before them, so that they can start functioning. This is why we say, let the investigation be complete, let them come forward with some concrete evidence, concrete materials and then further action will be possible, whatever action the Government takes or the Parliament takes. But before that, until the report of the investigation agency comes before us, I don't think there is any point in appointing another Joint Parliamentary Committee.

Please note Sir, of all those sections of the Press claimed to have some materials at their disposal last time, nobody came forward to the last JPC to place their materials before the JPC for consideration. No Member of the Press appeared before the JPC or wrote to the JPC that this is the material, please examine them. Nobody did that. What is the guarantee that the Press will come forward if another JPC is formed? There is no guarantee. So we cannot rely upon other sources of investigation, other sources of information. We have to rely upon our own sources of information provided by the investigating agencies of the Government or by the Swedish Government, perhaps.

Last time the Swedish Government gave some material and therefore the JPC was formed. This time we have to depend on our own investigating agencies. There is no other way. Therefore, the demand for appointment of another JPC is premature.

It is very unfortunate that last time the Opposition boycotted JPC—not the whole Opposition, but a major part. It was they who demanded a joint parliamentary committee. It was they who demanded an inquiry by Parliament. After making the demand on some pretext or the other with regard to terms of reference or Chairmanship they just avoided joining the JPC. Why? It was because they knew very well that if they joined the JPC and cooperated with the investigation ultimately nothing would be found out. Once they boycotted the JPC. Now they are demanding it and demanding it with a condition. It is very strange. We follow certain procedures. We have got the rules as to who will be the Chairman of the Committee. Ultimately it depends upon

[Shri Bipin Pal Das]

the Speaker. In all the Parliamentary committees the Chairman is chosen by the Speaker. Is it proper to get over all the rules, procedures and practices and dictate to the Speaker that he must choose such and such member as the Chairman? What is the basis for it? After all the fact of the situation prevailing in this House must be accepted. The fact is that Congress party has an overwhelming majority. You may try to get majority in the next elections, but at the moment we are in the majority. By overriding the claims of this majority how can you make such a demand? It is very strange. If I may say so it is a kind of dishonour shown to the Speaker by asking to have JPC with a member of the Opposition as the Chairman. This kind of thing is not heard of in this Parliament and I am very sorry that they have done this. Therefore, I say there is no need of a second JPC unless new facts come up and the report of the investigating agency comes before us with incontrovertible evidence. Only then the question of another JPC may arise. Therefore, I would appeal to my friends in the Opposition to wait for the result of this investigation.

Finally I would like to make a very important point and say that the recent disclosures by 'The Hindu' have raised some suspicions about some Indians being involved. Agreed. But until now nobody has even tried to link up any politician or any bureaucrat with this deal in the so-called bribe. You may call it winding up charges or commission but ultimately in common terms it means bribe. Nobody until now has linked up any politician or any bureaucrat in the case of so-called alleged bribe having taken place in this deal. (*Interruptions*)

No Indian politician or bureaucrat has so far been linked up with the allegations made in connection with the Bofors deal. If there is no political involvement where is the case of the Opposition? If there is no political involvement in this what is your case? If you want to say 'X', 'Y' or 'Z' is corrupt then there are so many corrupt people in the society. Since there is no political link-up alleged or established by

anybody, where is your case? What is the need of the JPC?

Therefore, I again appeal to the learned Members of the Opposition that they have to wait for the finding of the investigating agency engaged by the Government. And once those reports come with incontrovertible evidences, then we shall see what to do.

SHRI V. SOBHANADREESWARA RAO (Vijayawada): Mr. Chairman, Sir, first of all, I congratulate *the Hindu*, one of the oldest national newspapers and its staff, in particular, its reporter from Geneva, to have brought out very valuable information regarding this issue which has received the attention of millions of people throughout the country. This is the biggest scandal that has surfaced. When the efforts of the Government, the intelligence agencies and the Joint Parliamentary Committee, appointed by the highest law-making body—the Parliament—could not come to the truth, at least, *the Hindu* paper through its revelations has brought out very important facts concerning this issue. You know that the Joint Parliamentary Committee did not take the evidence of very important personalities that are connected with this issue—in particular, Mr. Ardbo, the managing director, who was the person instrumental while the negotiations were going on between Bofors and the Government of India. Also, Mr. Ringberg who has done a lot of investigation work regarding the transactions that have taken place between Bofors and our Ministry of Defence. The present publication in *the Hindu* paper has clearly shattered the myth hitherto that is being claimed by Bofors that no middleman are involved and commissions are not paid. The documents published in *the Hindu* have made it crystal clear that commissions are paid. The Bofors company representatives have stated in categorical terms. They gave evidence before our Joint Parliamentary Committee. I would quote only one sentence from page 121:

"No payments based on the agreements have been made after December 1986."

Now we have found that payments were continued to be paid up to the end of March 1987, that is, just a few days before

the news came out in the Swedish Radio on 16th April, 1987.

17.30 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Is it not a deliberate attempt on the part of the Bofors to mislead our Government and the highest Committee that was appointed by the Parliament, that is, the Joint Parliamentary Committee? It is very clear that it is not winding up costs but it is commissions. I will not go into the details because there are matters of facts and as my colleague, Prof. Dandavate told every House does have it. It is clearly stated that .96 per cent commission due to you on materials supplied to the Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Defence according to the invoices' and 'commission due to you according to the contract number so and so dated the 24th March 1986. That is in the agreement in which the Bofors Company and our Ministry of Defence have entered into agreement. It is very clear that Bofors have lied to the nation to the Government and to the Joint Parliamentary Committee. It has paid commissions and it has also said in another line that it did not employ any middlemen. It did not make use of services of any other agency. They have dealt directly between themselves and the Government of India. They have entered into an agreement with A.E. Services on the 15th November 1985. I will read one or two points from that agreement. 'This agreement between the Bofors and A.E. Services shall provide services for the company in connection with the specific project mentioned hereunder, that is, the purchase of howitzer guns.' The subject of the agreement is the appointment by the company of the consultant as its consultant in connection with the execution of the consultancy services related to the possible award to the company of a contract herein called, the contract for provision of 155 mm guns, materials and services to the Ministry of Defence of the Government of India. Any consideration of the appointment made by the company consultant undertakes to perform in the best interest of the company and to provide the company with such advisory consultancy and support services that are necessary to enable the company to

be awarded the contract. I will repeat the words 'to enable the company to be awarded the contract'. What does it mean? Has not Bofors made use of the services of the A.E. Services in winning this contract from the Government of India? Is it for that service rendered by A.E. Services, the Bofors have paid nearly 50 millions of SEK? So, it is very clear that Bofors have lied before the Joint Parliamentary Committee. Now, the point arises that this A.E. Services must have influenced the officials in high positions or the politicians or officials at high pedestals who have the power to clinch the issue, to influence the administration to purchase the guns from a particular country, France, Sweden or whatever it may be. It is for that purpose that AE Services entered into an agreement and we have to think that because Bofors have given 50 million SEK to AE Services, it must have influenced some officials or the politicians. I ask the Government whether this will not attract Sections 161, 162 and 163 of the Indian Penal Code. My suggestion is that let the Government examine and take necessary steps in this direction. This is the biggest fraud on the country. Unfortunately, right from the beginning, when the disclosure came in the Swedish radio, the Government had taken a very long time to take action for reasons best known to it and allowed Bofors to come up with the story of winding up costs. From one of these documents, it is very clear that after the agreement between Bofors and our Ministry of Defence had taken place on 24th March, 1986 there was a secret agreement between Bofors and Svenska which was signed on January 2 and January 13, 1987. This Svenska organisation must be in the know of things that this contract was going to be awarded to Bofors. This Svenska Company played a very important role in clinching the deal. We have to understand from this document that they knew that the contract was going to be given to Bofors and that the Bofors Company had agreed to pay 3 per cent commission. That was the understanding in the month of January when they had already come to know that the Government of India had taken a decision informally to give this contract to Bofors. Later thinking that this would be a hundred per cent secret document, they have put it on paper also that Bofors have agreed to pay a com-

[Shri V. Sobhanadreeswara Rao]

mission of 3.2 per cent of the ex-works value of orders of ordnances received during the time of validity of this agreement. This is how things have gone. Our Government's inaction has given an opportunity to Bofors to like this. Pressure must be applied on Bofors to come out with the truth in the light of these documents. Bofors has not contradicted that these documents are false, they are not true, that Bofors have not entered into an agreement with such and such company.

In view of this factual position, the Government of India should demand from Bofors to pay back Rs. 64 crores paid to Svenska, Moineca, Moresco, Pitoo and AE Services. This is because they have given a solemn assurance to our Government that it will not give commissions to anybody in respect of our agreement and I have just now read that commissions ranging from .96 per cent to 2.24 per cent and 4 per cent have been given. And it is mentioned clearly that these commissions are paid in respect of the material that is supplied to the Government of India in connection with the 155 mm Howitzer gun. Now, this amount which is paid by the Bofors to those companies contravene the assurance given to our Government. The Government should ask the Bofors to pay Rs. 64 crores to our Government.

The International Monetary Fund study report is quite alarming. It has stated :

"We have come to know that the deposits of Indians in Swiss Banks have increased from 788 Million Swiss Franks in 1979 to 1247 million Swiss Franks in 1982. And now by 1984 it has increased to 1987 million Swiss Franks".

Sir, this only show the extent to which our Indian capital is deposited in the Swiss Banks which is clearly against the interest of our country. If this money is made available for the development of this country, like for the construction of irrigational projects or for setting up of industries, constructing roads or giving drinking water facilities to the villagers, the country would have developed much better.

Then I would like to know why the Government is taking so much time in signing a Memorandum of Understanding with the Swiss Government which will enable us to know about the deposits? Through these documents we have come to know the Account No 99921 TU in Swiss Bank at Geneva and another Account No. 18051-53 at Bank of Zurich. Now, these account numbers are known. I would like to ask the Government, since these documents were published in the Hindu Paper, what steps the Government has taken to know as to who are the persons that are connected with these account numbers. How much money is there in these accounts; who is the actual person or has he appointed somebody else? What steps the Government has made to know all these things?

So, Sir, previously I made a suggestion, I respect again and demand the Government to appoint a Parliamentary Committee with the Opposition Member as its Chairman. The Hon. Member, Shri Bipin Pal Das, who preceded me, just now has said that the Speaker has got the power. We are not questioning his power. It is only a convention. You are 400 Members and we are not even hundred in number. Why are you giving the Chairmanship of Public Accounts Committee to a person from the Opposition side even though we are just 20 or 40 people? It is because the ruling party has the power to spend the money. Through the Chairmanship of Public Accounts Committee you are giving an opportunity to the Opposition to scrutinise, to find out whether the money is spent in a proper way, as per the Budget sanction or approval, and to properly judge and find the fault. That is why the Opposition Member is given the opportunity to be the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. Now, this matter is very serious. Never before, the credentials, the integrity and the honesty of the Prime Minister of this country was questioned. This is the first time that this happened. There are very serious apprehensions and suspicions that the Prime Minister and some of the persons who are very closely connected to him are involved in this deal.

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS : It is childish to say such things...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please let him speak. Sit down.

SHRI V. SOBHANADREESWARA RAO : I would like to put a question through you to Shri Bipin Pal Das. He says that if the quality of the gun is good and the price reasonable, where is the reason for paying bribes. I agree with him entirely. But he may please explain as to why the Bofors Company has paid commissions to them.

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS : It is their business. The money is not in our coffers...  
(Interruptions)

SHRI V. SOBHANADREESWARA RAO : Let him explain why the commission was paid according to the contract dated 24th March 1986. Why did they pay this commission and to whom? Please explain. When the JPC was appointed, there was a CBI inquiry conducted. I would not like to go into the details but I would just like to quote one sentence from the report, with regard to the Svenska Company in Panama which was managed by a lady called Mr. Marcela Rozas de Perez. The report says :

"During the last 2 years, she has not received her retainer fees and service charges, etc. from the principals and therefore, she has discontinued the payment to the Post Office for the Post Box. She did not know anything more about the functioning of the company and its activities."

Therefore, we ask who are the persons behind these companies which are going in the name of Svenska, Moresco, A and E Services and Moineac. Who are the real people behind these organisations? What services are rendered by them to the Bofors in getting this contract? And there any services rendered by them? Or, are they used to supply or to carry money to some other persons who happen to occupy the highest positions in this country? Are they working as conduits? All these aspects should clearly and specifically be inquired into. Truth must come out.

Now, my submission here is that the responsibility mainly rests on the Prime

Minister of this country. He must take all the necessary steps so that the truth comes out. Otherwise, Bofors should be blacklisted. They should be warned that their contract would be terminated without any hesitation. They had told blatant lies before the JPC. What obligation do we have to continue their contract when they breached the terms of the agreement and our good faith? If the Prime Minister does not take the necessary steps in this direction, people will certainly be forced to believe that the Prime Minister of this country is very much connected with this deal and in these kickbacks. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the Prime Minister to remove such suspicions. Here I may clarify that we are not against Shri Rajiv Gandhi as an individual. We are concerned with the institution of the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister's institution has great power and respect in this country and every where in the world and it should be preserved. The Prime Minister is elected by the people of this country and therefore, he must come forward and accept our suggestion to appoint a Parliamentary Committee headed by a member from the Opposition to find out the truth.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE  
MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY  
AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN  
THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE  
(SHRIMATI SHEILA DIKSHIT) : May I  
propose that this House be extended upto  
7.00 P.M.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I think it is the consensus of the House to extend the time upto 7.00 P.M.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The House is extended upto 7.00 P.M. Shri V.P. Singh.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH (Allahabad) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the mover of this Motion Shri Choubeyji while addressing the Chair said, "Sir, perhaps, you know the whole story." The Chair knew the whole story. We would not be arguing our case. Perhaps the one person who knows the whole story is not present in the House. He is absent.

[Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh]

Sir, may I quote him ? I quote :

"I would request them to please come out with some evidence because then we can show you how the Swedish Radio has showed the nation and everyone that we mean business and we shall chase if right down to the end and take action. We are awaiting information from the press and well from the Opposition. If you have it, you please give us, we will take action."

These are the words of the Prime Minister and none else in the House.

Sir, he has been true to his words when he said that, "We mean business and we shall chase it right down to the end and take action." Did he ever bring forward any information ? Did he go right down and take action ? It was the *Indian Express* which came out with an information. After that only the action was taken. When I asked for an inquiry into Shri Ajitabh Bachchan's wealth—I have got the letter in my drawer signed below Rajiv Gandhi, "Inquiry is being made."—we were not told the result of that action. But the result of my letter, was that, immediately within twenty-four hours action was taken and that is, I was expelled from the Party. This is the highest body in the country, I mean the Parliament...\*\*...So, action is taken; and these are some of the examples of the action that has been taken when you come up with the information.

Yet, he said : the Government is serious—and the Prime Minister has given his word : "We are awaiting information from the Press." From the Press—and this is from *The Hindu*. It is from the Press. It is his word in this House; and that is at stake. What is painful is this. It is not the loss of money. It is not a few crosses that we are aggrieved about.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Mr. Singh, your reference regarding the Chairman of the Rajya Sabha will not go on record. That is the practice.

SHRI V. SOBHANADREESWARA RAO : It is a fact. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : May be it is a fact; but you cannot refer.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : Your ruling will prevail, Sir.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Someone at the other place...

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : But it is registered throughout the country. What I was mentioning is that this is a promise, viz. "We are awaiting information from the Press and, well, from the Opposition. If you have it, you please give us, we will take action." *The Hindu* has come forth, and has come with very concrete evidence; and if it were so, if this is the assurance, I ask this Government to investigate account No. 99921 TU of Svenska Incorporated in the Societe de Banque Suisse located at 2, Rue de La Confederation, CH-1211, Geneva.

It is a specific demand. Will the Government accede to it ? It is a promise, an assurance. I also refer to payments made to the code name 'Lotus'. These were made into the Societe de Banque Suisse, 2, Rue de La Confederation; and a payment was made also on 22nd December 1986, of SEK 2,550,879. These specific things I am asking for, on the basis of the assurance of the Prime Minister, I want an assurance from this Government that the assurance of the Prime Minister in this House will be fulfilled. There is this specific information in the Press and everywhere. As a Member of Parliament, I ask for it, and I demand and I want a straight forward answer.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH AFFAIRS AND SPORTS AND WOMEN AND CHILD DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA) : You were a party to that in 1986.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : I will come to that also. You will get a full answer.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : The sporting lady will accept it. (*Interruptions*)

---

\*\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair,

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : Then the theory came, that there was a foreien hand, that there is a destabilization attempt. At that time, I remember that the Congress party was asked to go to the district, tehsil and block levels and counter this destabilization attempt by this foreign radio, viz. the Swedish Radio. We have now come here. One-and-a-half years perhaps have elapsed. The country has not been destabilized. *(Interruptions)*

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF COAL IN THE MINISTRY OF ENERGY (SHRI C. K. JAFFAR SHARIEF) : Sir, one minute. Just wait. *(Interruptions)* Why are you shouting ? Just wait. I would like my friend to yield to me only for a minute. I request my friend Mr. Vishwanath Pratap Singh to yield to me for one minute. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Mr. Sharief, take your seat.

*(Interruptions)*

18.00 hrs.

SHRI C. K. JAFFAR SHARIEF : Why are you behaving like this ? I am only asking my old friend Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh to yield. Why are you making a fuss out of it ? *(Interruptions)*

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN- TARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT) : He is doing a mischief. He was in the government a very long time. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : If he is not yielding, what can I do ?

SHRI C. K. JAFFAR SHARIEF : If somebody else is speaking, I am not bothered. When he is speaking (V.P. Singh), then I am bothered because he was a responsible person in the government. He is playing in your hands. What was your attitude when you were on this side ? What is wrong in asking him to yield for a minute ? Why should he not yield for a minute ? I am not interrupting him. I am only putting a simple question to him. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : We will question you.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please order.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI C. K. JAFFAR SHARIEF : I know him better than you. We know each other well. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS : You also come here ; that is better for you. We will welcome you. *(Interruptions)*

THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI M. L. FOTEDAR) : I want to seek one simple kind of information from him. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI G.G. SWELL : All Ministers have become hecklers. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI M.L. FOTEDAR : I am not a heckler like him. I am on a point of information. If Mr. Singh yields for a minute, I have only one point for information from him. It is very serious thing. *(Interruptions)* Whatever he is saying is nothing but untruth. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Are you yielding ?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : No. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI G. G. SWELL : Mr. Fotedar should first get elected to the Lok Sabha. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI M. L. FOTEDAR : If Mr. Vishwanath yields, I have only one point of information.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : Let him fight the election and come to Lok Sabha. He is not a member of the Lok Sabha.

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS : He is not a member of this House. He is a Minister. He is not elected. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please be seated. May I request all the hon. Members to be seated ? Since he says it is his maiden

[Mr. Deputy Speaker]

speech, as a Lok Sabha member, let us allow him to speak. That is all.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI M. L. FOTEDAR : We should allow him to speak. That is what I am saying.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please, order, order. Because we are adjourning at 7 O'Clock, and after him Shri Vasant Sathe has also to speak, please try to be brief. Do not waste time.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : This is his maiden speech ! Let him speak.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : For a maiden speech also there is a limit. A time limit is there.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : I have been on that side and I have always received questions from this side. Now, I am receiving questions from that side. They are looking ahead, Sir. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : We will put a number of questions from the Opposition. Do not worry.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : To be more specific, the Government has been looking up like a child as to where to get the information. We have been hunting here, we have been hunting there. It is just like some times, the Station Officers, we call them 'Thanedars', they do. If he does not know what to report.

[*Translation*]

They have raided this and that place but could not find anything. Final report is being prepared. And now this is the final report.

[*English*]

SHRIMATI MARGARAT ALVA :  
Playing to the gallery !

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : Now, to be more specific, if we are still looking for information, and truly so, then I would request the Government,—not request, demand of it—to write to (1) Skandinaviska Enskilda Banken in Karlskoga, (2) the Riksbanken, the Swedish Central Bank, (3) the Swedish National Audit Bureau and (4) the Swiss Government. Well, as the Swiss authorities say, that, (*Interruptions*) "we have not received any enquiries from the Indian Government" and we are telling the whole world, that we have made the fullest enquiries, we have made all efforts and I remember one speech in the Parliamentary party of the Congress when the Prime Minister said, "We will leave no stone unturned. You name the stone". I am naming the stone. Let it be overturned and find out. And what is still more, now, something in sorrow in grief, in one Parliament Question—subject to correction of memory, I wish I had the answer right here, a question was asked, whether the Government of India has written to the Swiss Government enquiring about any economic offenders.

The answer was 'no'. Then *suo motu* without the questioner asking, says "Enforcement Directorate is investigating about Ajitabh Bachchan". The questioner is not asking. *Suo motu* in the answer it comes. I want to know, because time has elapsed, specifically whether the Government of India has written to the Swiss Government regarding any economic offences or any economic offender including those which are covered by the new documents of 'The Hindu', and if not, why not ? It is the simplest—from Government to Government. There is nothing to hide. You should write to the Government concerned. Why the Government has not been approached straightaway on this issue ? If I get the information, I will be happy.

Then, Sir I am quoting further the speech of the Prime Minister in the Lok Sabha.

"Let me reiterate, we are waiting for information from the Swedish Government. The minute we get information, we will take action and will show you that we have taken action."



Sir, the minute has become a year and it was no mean information that was given by the Swedish Government. The Swedish Government in its note said :

“According to National Audit Bureau Investigation, the agreement exists on the settlement of commission subsequently to the Howitzer deal and information exists that considerable sums have been disbursed referring to this contract.”

Here is the Prime Minister's assurance in the House. Here is the information from the Swedish Government and this is J.P.C. Report. I am not quoting anything from the newspaper. In the JPC Report itself, the Defence Secretary, under his pen and signature, has written in the aforesaid context. I quote :

“M/s. Bofors have not only gone against our explicit wishes but also have violated the solemn assurance given to us by your company.”

Now, this is the Defence Secretary of India writes. He has, on record, said that this assurance has been broken. Today we are being taken round and round. This House, which is the guardian of the national interest just wants to know. It is not indicting anyone. It is not harassing anyone. It just wants to know further. It is really concerned that national interests are being jeopardised. The Government is resisting it. Why? Who is going to be harassed? None, except the culprit. If the culprit is to be harassed by an inquiry, why do you feel harassed? Admit the JPC as per demand and let it be known to people the credibility of the Government will be established, and resisting it, the judgement of the people will not be changed whatever you may be able to pass here by your majority. It is there, you have to cater to, not four hundred here. One hundred and sixty crores eyes are looking and watching at you. Majority will not help you. This is what precisely it is. It is in your hand. The credibility of the House that is precisely *(Interruptions)*. Now, at the same time, I am quoting none else than the JPC and the Prime Minister, your leader *...(Interruptions)*. On April 21th, Rajiv Gandhi told the Army Commanders in

Delhi that the negotiations for the Howitzers had been meticulously handled and Sweden had confirmed that there had been no middlemen.... This is justice from above. When I quoted Rajiv Gandhi that there is no middlemen, lights went off. Darkness befell this House. This is the darkness which is spelt out.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENCE PRODUCTION AND SUPPLIES IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI) : This is not an election meeting.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : Panigrahi, that is the final place where we all have to go. Remember that. Do not belittle the election meetings. *(Interruptions)*

What the Prime Minister tells the whole country is that no money has been paid into Swiss banks. And here we have whole record, tonfull of record of payments to Swiss bank. Now only one thing. *(Interruptions)*

[*Translation*]

One who becomes shameless cannot put others in dock. *(Interruptions)* Let the time come...you will be put in dock.

[*English*]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : They are bad losers.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : If you come to the documents which have been published in “*The Hindu*” and we just see them—Commissions—according to contract number so and so. Then again heading is Commission—“Unless otherwise, specifically agreed, the consultants are entitled to commission as follows : ... Bofors will pay a commission of 3.2 per cent of the ‘x’ work value orders for ordnance received during the time of the validity...” All through it is commission, Only one thing is that when it is written ‘commission’, the Government and the Prime Minister read ‘winding up charges’. I do not know how. In our lower classes we used to read from the textbooks and if we

[Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh]

make mistakes, the teacher used to make us stand on the stool. I think, this Government needs to be...*(Interruptions)*. Wherever it is commission, it reads 'winding up charges'. And what is this winding up charges—this new connotation? It is nothing new. In ordinary practice, even when a bribe of Rs. 5 is given, no one says, take the bribe.

[*Translation*]

It is then said that it is for chewing 'pan' (betel leaves), it is for the sweets for children. These are winding-up charges...*(Interruptions)*

Listen, this winding-up charge is not theirs. This winding-up charge is for that company which is sitting here.

[*English*]

Sir, not only this, it is a question of great concern and of shame that the document that has been pushed for a cover up, in spite of the best cover up also leaves some trace for discovery. This document purported to be signed in January itself, speaks of: "On the contract for sales related to Bofors 135 MM Field Howitzer System, including the supply contract and the licence agreement, both signed on March 24, 1986, Bofors will pay a commission of three per cent." Now, a document signed in January, talks about how exact a date—24th March, 1986!

[*Translation*]

Of course I have heard about foresight but I have not heard about sight with such accuracy. So, in spite of the best cover up, there are slips and this is showing the slips.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : This is precision in correction.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : Then, of course, six per cent is also mentioned. And while the Bofors—Kaushal Ji is not here—made the JPC to believe that the payments were completed in 1986 itself, here is a document which *Hindu* has brought out, of payments up to

as late as March 30, 1987. And when it comes to 'Lotus', extra precaution is taken. I do not know why 'Lotus' is taken extra precaution.

AN HON. MEMBER : 'G' is there.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : Then we can say 'Lotus Ji'...*(Interruptions)*. Here the document shows that instructions were also given. Not only were the names and even account numbers of the recipients withheld, but special instructions were also given to the banks concerned: "If it is possible, do not write who the sender is". That is also there. And if still there is doubt that it relates to anything else, on page 27, it is mentioned: "The commission due to you on material supplied to the Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Defence". This is what the document says...*(Interruptions)*.

[*Translation*]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : It has been reported in 'Hindu'. Hindu and Express are two different publications.

[*English*]

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : Now, with all this coming up, what is being done by the Government? A CBI inquiry is being conducted to find out the authenticity of this! Why can't they go direct to the information that is already there on record? Is there any evidence? I want to ask the Government one specific information that what inquiry is being made directly of the information in the documents themselves? Or is it that only the authenticity of it is being examined?

Sir, I was here, What has been done to *Indian Express*? What was done to me when I asked question about Ajitabh Bachchan? What was that what I referred to when you said: "Don't mention from the other House"? But already I have mentioned that. May be this may be a cover up also to bully 'The Hindu' and I think while paying a tribute to 'The Hindu' and the lady Ms. Chitra Subramaniam and Shri N. Ram this is also to express that these methods of inquiry should not be turned

into bullying for giving this sensitive information and similar service which they are rendering to country.

Now, coming to JPC Report itself, they may not say there is a foreign hand, everything becomes foreign hand. Now, these companies to which payments have been made, what service they have rendered. This is the JPC report. And when the investigating agency went, as mentioned by Shri Kaushal, they reported the functions of this Company, that is, Pitco-Moresco-Moineco. I also want to know whether the Chairman of Bofors supplied the name as Pitco and later on to the Government whether any change was there as also to the JPC regarding the name, Pitco-Moresco-Moineao or anything else. Now, for that company, the JPC report says :

“According to investigating Agencies, the functioning of these companies seems to be mysterious and it appears to be only a front organisation run for persons not residing in Switzerland.”

Now, again the JPC report says :

“It was further declared that the only advice given to the Company prior to 8th March 1986 related to the manner and timing of negotiations and the content of the projected contract and that neither A.A.S. nor any other associated companies had done any work in India prior to 8th March, 1986.”

So, they are not payment for private services and they have done no work. Bofors are not a charitable institution. It is a commercial company. It will not give you a cup of tea unless something we give. How is it that such huge amounts which had been paid to the company who had rendered no service is total inexplicable in commercial terms and makes no commercial sense? There can be only two reasons. Either people behind these companies have clout to have the decisions made in Delhi or the decision-makers of Delhi nominated these companies as recipients. I can draw no other conclusions from what JPC has said.

Further, Sir, a point was being made

about the winding up charges. The contracts had been terminated in pursuance of the wishes of the Indian Prime Minister. In any winding up, cost is involved which was quite natural. Now, it is very clear that this was terminated. The contracts were terminated on the wishes of the Prime Minister. This is the finding of the JPC and it was winding up cost and they did not mention about the commission. So, I need not have their reply. May I ask the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister in how many contracts have they requested for the termination of the contract which has resulted in winding up charges? Why such special favour and attention by the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister in the howitzer deal only? What was the need to remove the middlemen? (*Interruptions*) No. Perhaps it might be the concern that there may be no sharing of the commission. (*Interruptions*). No you will get it begfull.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Try to wind up. You have taken half-an-hour.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : Sir, winding up charges for me ! (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Otherwise you will wind up, that is the problem.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : Further, the JPC said : “Payments in Swedish banks have shown as commission.” This is what the JPC said. They said this on page 173, paragraph 7.187 (ix). (*Interruptions*).

One thing Sir, which is of serious concern is, out of 1700 contracts, half of it is ammunition and spares and here it is on record, and that is the testimony of the Expert Committee Report :

“Though the gun had been developed to fire long range ammunition, it could not perform at long range as the ammunition was not ready.”

About the ammunition, Sir, DCOAS has told the JPC that in case of Swedish gun, this was a major draw back, that is, regarding

[Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh]

ammunition, firstly they did not have all the ammunition, secondly, computers gun control equipment and so on are from various other firms, not from Sweden alone. So, I want to know from the Government one thing. When the contract was signed, Bofors did not have the know-how on ammunition. It made a promise that in long range ammunition it will obtain the technical know-how. Whether that technical know-how the Bofors has got...*(Interruptions)* Please be within limits.

Sir, the point is whether this technical know-how has been obtained by Bofors because our requirement as reported in the press is 80 per cent of the long range ammunition and if this technical know-how has not been acquired by Bofors, how do we stand now? And that would be a part of condition about the transfer of technical know-how and also about protection. So, this is the question with which I am just really concerned.

Now the point was made about jurisprudence and Kaushalji said...

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE :  
Rule of law.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : Rule of law—Majesty of law. I say, 'Majesty of in-law'. Perhaps it would be better term!

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS : That is in ammunition contract?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : But it is also jurisprudence, Sir, that the witness and the judge cannot be the same.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE :  
Culprit.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : Yes, Dandavateji knows it also, 'culprit'. It is also jurisprudence that when fresh things come, then it is jurisprudence *de novo*, that is, *de novo* inquiry but so far as the behaviour is concerned, it reminds me of a boy who came and told his mother, "Mother, I made a bet that  $2 + 2 = 5$ ."

The mother said, "You will lose the bet". He asked, "Why?" She said, " $2 + 2 = 4$ ". Then the boy thought for some time and said, "No, mother. I will not lose the bet". The mother said, "Why"? He said, "Let everybody say,  $2 + 2 = 4$ . I will not admit it; nor will I lose it." The same way they do.

They say, they do not admit it and therefore they do not lose it.

But I would like to ask the Defence Minister one thing.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Wind up, Sir.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : While there may be some compulsion which we can examine or argue separately, I am not bringing in that argument of whether Howitzer deal should be cancelled or not cancelled. Without any commitment to this point, now that the Defence Secretary himself has said, this company has gone back from the assurance, will it harm, if other supplies are blacklisted right, forthwith. No Defence security is involved and if the Government is honest about its action, let it say straight-forward that for future supplies, nothing from Bofors is going to come. I am not going to debate this issue or jeopardise the security of the country on the Howitzer deal but what about other deals. If it could say, let it say straight so. Even the ex-Minister of State for Defence, Shri Arun Singh asked for that the money be refunded. In fact, I also wrote one year back and come in the Press the same demand. But it was not the refund of money, where can the trust of the people be refunded? There is no refund of that and the honour of the country. And this is precisely what I want to say today that here we sit, not on Party lines; it is in the national interest that we are debating today. I would request my friends on that side, not to sit as Congress MPS only but to sit as patriots, for lives have been laid down for the country...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please order. *(Interruptions)*

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI RAM DHAN (Lalganj) : You, the Bofors agents, keep quiet. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI TARIQ ANWAR (Katihar) : You are traitors. Why don't you say clearly. All this does not behove you.

[*English*]

SHRI K.S. RAO : He suspects our patriotism. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : All that I want to say to my friends is, we have fought together and we are always friends. I have all honour to my friends. I just want to say...(*Interruptions*).

[*Translation*]

SHRI TARIQ ANWAR : Stop this drama. Sit down and keep quiet. (*Interruptions*) we have been listening to you for more than an hour.

SHRI RAM DHAN : Don't you feel ashamed of while talking about the party... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI TARIQ ANWAR : You cannot become Gandhi by posing like Gandhi in photograph. Keep quiet. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI RAM DHAN : You had not born at that time (*Interruptions*). You speak first and then do not allow us to speak. What is your moral ?

[*English*]

SHRI M. RAGHUMA REDDY : Sir, what is going on ? (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please order.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : All that I want to say is, for this country and for this land, people have laid down their lives. Just let us only listen to our inner voice and act on this issue by our

inner voice and, I am sure, if my friends on the other side also listen to it, we will have only one opinion, that is to pursue this to the end and appoint a JPC and find out (*Interruptions*).

THE MINISTER OF ENERGY (SHRI VASANT SATHE) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, today we listened to one more (*Interruptions*).

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : There was a personal reference to me that the ex-Finance Minister has seen the file. May I say one word ? When the Finance Minister sees a file, so far as choices are concerned, it is the Administrative Ministry that determines the technical choice. For us, the Austrian gun was the cheapest, from the finance side. But we could not go in for the Austrian gun because the Defence Ministry in its technical competence thought that Bofors gun was better and in the file it is not written that "Rs. 200 crores commission is to be paid out of this; the Finance Minister may kindly sanction it." That is not how the file comes. Underhand deals are done. Underhand deals are not recorded on the file. (*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV) : When I was the Tourism Minister, the Finance Minister used to say what type of liquor we should buy and he could not say what type of guns we should buy. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VASANT SATHE : This debate that was raised today and the final speech which was made by our good friend. (*Interruptions*).

[*Translation*]

SHRI HARISH RAWAT : Satheji you call every wrong person as your friend... (*Interruption*).

[*English*]

SHRI VASANT SATHE : Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh proves one more point, what the entire strategy of the Opposition in this country is today. I have always felt that the Opposition has one-point programme and that is somehow

[Shri Vasant Sathe]

(*Interruption*.) to denigrate the Congress and its leader. They know full well that as for as...(*In'erruptions*). They know full well the simple strategy. The whole country knows about it. Let us not beat about the bush. Both Prof. Madhu Dandavate, and my good friend Mr. Somnath Chatterjee—shall I not call him my good friend?...(*In. erruptions*).

Sir, all these gentlemen agree that the only purpose of all this exercise is to see how Congress can be removed from power... (*Interruptions*) I say there is nothing wrong. It is absolutely fair...(*Interruption*.) It is your right. I say it is the right of the Opposition to except this and to do this. Then, don't cover it up. The objective is simple. Here is the Leader, the young Leader of the Congress. (*Interruptions*)

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Where is he ? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VASANT SATHE : He need not be here. You need not have him physically here...(*Interruptions*) You are scared of him over in his absence. You are so obsessed...(*Interruptions*) The Opposition is so obsessed...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : He is available to all the Parliaments of the World excepting the Indian Parliament. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VASANT SATHE : He is available to all of us. He is available to this country. He is not available to you because you don't deserve him. (*Interruptions*)

Where is my good friend Prof. Swell ? He said that Parliamentary debates consist of repartees and so have some sense of humour. (*Interruption*.) The essence of the matter is, the Opposition feels right from the first day.... (*Interruptions*) They knew that this young Leader has something.

[*Translation*]

There will be some more ideas. Please listen.

[*English*]

(*Interruptions*) I have faced much more

rowdies than you Mr. Narayan Choubey... (*Interruptions*) Sir, knowing fully well that this is the only way they can try to damage the young Leader, they thought that they can have a strategy of denigrating assassinating him in terms of character. This campaign of character assassination was launched by the Opposition particularly when they found a friend from within.. (*Interruption*.) I want to come to our friend. The greatest tragedy is that a person who was trusted so much...this is what is our weakness, if at all there is any weakness. The young Leader trusted the person, trusted so much. He was made the second-man—No. 2—, the Finance Minister, the Defence Minister. At the AICC Session he was given the first chance to pilot the political and economic resolution. Such importance was given. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please order.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VASANT SATHE : Sir, here is the person who was trusted so much. (*Interruptions*) Now, we are reminded of Mir Jafars; we are reminded of Jai Chands..., These are the people. Sir, there is a saying in Sanskrit.

"Ankam Aaruheya hi hatwa kim nam Pourusham" (*Interruption*.)

I will explain it to you simply...(*Interruptions*) That has been discussed. I am talking of the spirit in which Shri V. P. Singh ended and said that we must keep our national interest in mind. Let us talk of national interest.

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS : You were in PSP. You crossed the floor to Congress. Where was your loyalty then ? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VASANT SATHE : Where does the national interest lie ? National interest lies in this. Let us see what the person who was the Finance Minister then has said on this very case. Let us consider that. (*Interruptions*).

Let me now refer to the JPC Report on this very case ; this is from page 83, para 6.20 :

"...The then Secretary, Expenditure, stated :

'...We had held several meetings and crucial recommendations were made by the Committee. One was short-listing of firms and another was recommendations made during October-November, 1985 and March, 1986. These were put up to the Minister. In fact, in the Finance Ministry, apart from myself, the decisions were seen by the Finance Secretary, because he is concerned with the credit aspect also, apart from the fact that he is the senior Secretary in the Ministry and also by the Finance Minister and the Defence Minister ..."

And he has the cheek to say, "I did not know ; I was only dealing with the financial aspect ; the technical aspect was not known to me". (*Interruptions*)

Let me complete it :

".. So far as these contracts are concerned where the powers of the Secretary were very restricted, approval of the Minister in the administrative Ministry and the Finance Minister was taken."

This is not enough. I would quote further from page 100. Mr. V. P. Singh also quoted from the JPC Report. Now, let us see page 100, para 6.61 :

"In reply to a question whether the final recommendation of the Negotiating Committee selecting the Bofors gun keeping in view the technical, contractual and financial aspects, was specifically brought to the notice of the then Finance Minister, the then Secretary (Expenditure) affirmed that after the Negotiating Committee had finished its deliberations, a note was put up by the Defence Ministry as the administrative Ministry on which the approval of the Finance Secretary and the then Finance Minister and the State Ministers ....."

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Let him refer to the disclosures made by the Hindu.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : It was only one sheet of paper. That is all. Let him lay that on the Table of the House.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : This statement which has been quoted now gives a lie to what Mr. V. P. Singh has stated....

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : I want that sheet of paper to be placed on the Table of the House.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : ...that he was not aware of the technicalities and the quality of the gun....

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : On a point of order, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : What is the point of order ?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : The Minister, Mr. Vasant Sathe, referred to the note that was seen by the then Finance Minister, Shri V. P. Singh, and Shri V. P. Singh now says that the file be laid on the Table of the House. What objection can the Government have to placing it on the Table of the House ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : There is no point of order in this.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : The note that was given to the Finance Minister then should be laid on the Table of the House.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO (Parvathipuram) : That paper should be laid on the Table of the House. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : There is no point of order in this.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Mahbubnagar) : How do you dispose of the demand of Mr. V.P. Singh ?

(*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

(SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, you have already ruled out his Point of Order. He is quoting JPC which they have been quoting. Why are the afraid of this ? Truth has come out round their neck, round the neck of Mr. V.P. Singh. Why are they afraid of it ? *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Take your seat.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : I am on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : What is your point of order ?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Under Rule 368...*(Interruptions)* He has quoted from a paper. Rule 368 says :

"If a Minister quotes in the House a despatch or other State paper which has not been presented to the House, he shall lay the relevant paper on the Table."

*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : No, no.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Your ruling cannot be just "no, no." *(Interruptions)*

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT : If you permit me, I want to say one word. Even Mr. Somnath Chatterjee's eminence cannot help Mr. V.P. Singh. I wanted to congratulate Mr. V.P. Singh for his exercise in tit-bits and falsehood. He is quoting only the JPC. Even your brilliant advocacy of a wrong thing cannot save, cannot help him. You know, he is quoting from JPC. Mr. V.P. Singh cannot run away from this *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : No, no. That is not.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT : You are afraid of the truth. He is quoting only what is contained in the JPC Report.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He has not quoted the original document. He is only quoting JPC Committee Report.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI VASANT SATHE : I have not read the report. You were asking for it and I read the report. I am quoting the report. Who is perverse now ? Why are you shouting ? Now take it. I am giving it back to you. Now take it. You all read from the report. Nobody objected. I am reading from the Report then why are you objecting now ? *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Please take your seat.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI VASANT SATHE : This shows that you are so nervous and you are so afraid of truth that you have lost the case at the very face. *(Interruptions)* You have no guts to hear your own admission. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS : Sir, the time is over.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE (SHRIMATI SHEILA DIKSHIT) : Sir, we will sit till Mr. Vasant Sathe completes his speech. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I have not yet adjourned the House. I don't know why are the Opposition Members standing like this. If you want to extend the time of the House, I am ready to extend. If you want to adjourn, I am ready to adjourn. It is for you to decide...*(Interruptions)*.. First let the Parliamentary Affairs Minister say what she wants to say.

*(Interruptions)*

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Sir I am on a point of order. We do not want to obstruct the proceedings; but I am on a point of order. Rule No. 368 is very clear and that rule is formulated for a very simple



reason that if a Member quotes any document even from a Report, in order that it should not be quoted out of context, anybody can demand that the whole note be laid on the table of the House. Shri V.P. Singh has demanded it. The whole note should be made available to the House. *(Interruption)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He is not quoting from the document. He is only quoting from the Report.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : He has quoted a Government document. *(Interruption)*

SHRIMATI SHEILA DIKSHIT : Sir we will extend the sitting of the House till the Hon. Minister Mr. Vasant Sathe completes his speech.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Upto what time ?

SHRIMATI SHEILA DIKSHIT : Till his speech is finished; say upto 8 O'clock.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Shall we extend the sitting of the House upto 8 O'clock ?

*(Interruption)*

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI K. C. PANT) : Sir, may I say one word ?

AN HON. MEMBER : Are you giving the ruling ?

SHRI K. C. PANT : I am accepting the ruling of the Chair. *(Interruption)* May I say one word ? I was only going to appeal to the friends opposite that we have had a useful debate. Now we are coming to the fag end of the debate. You are in the Chair. You have to give the ruling and all of us have to accept it. *(Interruption)*

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Are you giving the ruling ?

SHRI K. C. PANT : I am not giving the ruling. The Chair will have to give the ruling. We will have to listen to him. I am only requesting you to listen to his ruling and then we can get the sense of the House and continue for as long as the House wants

to sit. It is in this context that I am making the suggestion.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Sir, what is your ruling on my point of order ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I have listened to your point of order. He has quoted the Report and the Report has already been accepted by the House. He is quoting from the Report.

I hope it is agreed to that the House will sit upto 2000 hrs. So the time of the sitting of the House is extended by one hour upto 2000 hours.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO : Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : What is your point of order ?

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO : Sir, though the Minister has read from the Report yet what he has read is not the finding of the Report put this Report contains Government document. Now when he quotes that he will have to authenticate that document and lay it on the Table of the House. *(Interruption)*

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY (Katwa) : What is your ruling on the point of order ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I have already given my ruling. I have ruled it out. If there is any new point you can discuss.

*(Interruption)*

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : He was not reading from the JPC report. He was... *(Interruption)*

SHRI VASANT SATHE : I am not reading any other document except the JPC report. *(Interruption)*

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : What is the harm in producing that document ? *(Interruption)*

SHRI VASANT SATHE : If V.P. Singh can quote from the JPC report why not Vasant Sathe ? *(Interruption)*

[Shri Vasant Sathe]

I want to call the bluff on Bofors once for all and through the month of Mr. V.P. Singh himself and nobody else. Kindly read this. V.P. Singh's contention was...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Order. Order. Do not waste the time of the House. Allow him to speak.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : What is your ruling ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I have already given my ruling. Do not discuss about it. It has been ruled out.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI VASANT SATHE : Sir, this is most anti-national and anti-patriotic and you cannot cast aspersions on the quality of the gun which has been accepted by the Army. Any person who casts an aspersion on the quality of this gun is a...*\*\*...to the country. (Interruptions)*

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Army officers have criticised the gun. *(Interruptions)*

AN. HON. MEMBER : He is the only patriot. *(Interruptions)*

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

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : What is your ruling, Sir ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I have given my ruling.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : No, you have not given.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I have already given.

*(Interruptions)*

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : It is a threatening remark : Whoever criticises the gun is a...*\*\*...to the country. (Interruptions)* Many Army officers have criticised. Does it mean that they are *\*\*...to the country ? (Interruptions)*

SHRI S JAIPAL REDDY : Mr. Vasant Sathe made certain remarks regarding the quality of the gun. There can be more than one honest view and the Minister's remark that anybody who questions the quality of the gun is a *\*\*... (Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : If there is anything unparliamentary, I will expunge it.

*(Interruptions)*

AN. HON. MEMBER : You are demoralising the Army. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI VASANT SATHE : Whoever tries to demoralise the Army of this country, what would you call him ? You tell me. *(Interruptions)*

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : In 1962 when the preparedness of the Army was criticised in Parliament by Acharya Kriplani. Nobody challenged it. Everybody has a right to criticise. *(Interruptions)* All are patriots. They cannot be called *\*\*...*

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : In February 1985, the Army Headquarters said that the French gun was better. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : May I request the Members to sit ? If you shout, how can I run the House ? Let him speak. You have already made your point.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : If it is unparliamentary, I will expunge it. Please take your seat.

*(Interruptions)*

PROF MADHU DANDAVATE : In 1962, Shri Mahavir Tyagi criticised the war equipment. He was not branded as a *\*\*Pandit* Nehru respected him. No. Minister branded him as a *\*\* (Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He interruptions please. Please sit down. Do you want me to continue the proceedings or adjourn the House ? Do not obstruct the proceedings. Mr Vasant Sathe, you may please continue.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I have told you that if there is something unparliamentary, I will expunge it. What is the problem now ? What more do you want ?

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I will go through the record. If it is unparliamentary, I will expunge it.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I cannot direct him.

PROF MADHU DANDAVATE : He said that whosoever criticised the defence equipment like the gun was a \*\*to the country. In that case, will you brand Shri Mahavir Tyagi and Acharya Kriplani as \*\**(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I have explained to you. If it is unparliamentary, I will expunge it. I will go through the record.

PROF MADHU DANDAVATE : After examining the record, if you find that he has alleged that those who criticised the equipment are \*\*will you assure us that those remarks will be withdrawn or expunged ? Otherwise, Acharaya Kriplani and Shri Mahavir Tyagi would be called \*\**(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I have explained to you already.

(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT) : They are obstructing the proceedings of the House and defying the Chair, because they know that their case is weak. *(Interruptions)*. Why are they afraid of ? He was only reading from the report of the JPC. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : I did not call anybody a\*\*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Please take your seat.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : On a point of order, Sir. Shri Vasant Sathe has alleged that the commanders of the Indian Army who recommended the French or the Austrian gun are \*\*Except those commanders who recommended the Bofors gun all others are \*\*Kindly read Rule 353 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business :

"No allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be made by a member against any person unless the member has given previous intimation to the Speaker..."

He has made serious allegations...  
*(Interruptions)*

SHRI VASANT SATHE : He is putting words in my mouth. I never said anything about the commanders. Do not say\*\*

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : He has made serious allegations.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : Never *(Interruptions)* I have never mentioned anybody by name. I have never mentioned any commander.

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS : Page 42 of the JPC's Report refers to commanders.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Sir, I am on a point of order. I refer to Rule 363 *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Let me quote Rule 353. Order please.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please listen to me.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : He never said that the commander is a \*\*It is wrong. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please take your seats. Listen to Rule No. 353. It says :

[Mr. Deputy Speaker]

"No allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be made by a member against any person unless he member has given previous intimation to the Speaker and also to the Minister concerned so that the Minister may be able to make an investigation into the matter for the purpose of a reply."

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM. DHAN : He called the Commander a\*\*

SHRI VASANT SATHE : Do not put into my mouth words which I did not utter...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He has never mentioned any person by name. It is a general statement. Even then, if it is derogatory, unparliamentary or defamatory, I will go through the records and I will expunge them. I assure you ..(Interruptions)

(Interruptions)\*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : No please. I cannot allow this to go on. There is no allegation about any person.

SHRI RAM DHAN : He has called the commander a\*\* (Interruptions)  
[Translation]

SHRI VASANT SATHE : One must have the courage to face the truth.

(Interruptions)

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I request him to withdraw those words with grace. I do not think the meant what he said. It is bad for the Parliament to keep such words on record. I request Shri Sathe to withdraw those remarks.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : I will repeat it hundred times. I will do so for your benefit. I repeat what I said for your benefit.

SHRI RAM DHAN : Thousand times, we will not allow you to speak.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : I will repeat it so that you may be educated. Anyone who criticises and thereby memorialises the Army of this country is a \*\*(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Sir, during the debacle in the 1962 war Acharya Kripalani and Congress Member Mahavir Tyagi had severely criticised our war equipment and lack of preparedness in this very House but they were not criticised even by Pandit Nehru aš...\*\*But Mr. Vasant Sathe wants to criticise critics of Bofors gum aš\*\* (Interruptions)

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS (Tezpur) : Sir, I have a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : What is your point of order ?

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS : My point of order is under Rule No. 349, Sub-Clause (ii) it is mentioned that "Whilst the House is sitting, a member shall not interrupt any member while speaking by disorderly expression or noises or in any other disorderly manner."

Here you are obstructing the business of the House. Let Mr. Sathe continue and conclude his speech. (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I am telling you, I will go through the record. If there is anything unparliamentary, I will expunge it.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You cannot insist me like this.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : He cannot insult the Members of the House.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : I have not said anything against any single Member of this House. (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : If there is anything unparliamentary, I will expunge it. How can I insist on him ? It is up to him.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You cannot

\*Not recorded.

\*\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

command me. What do you want? You please tell me what do you want.

(*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE (SHRI P. R. DAS MUNSI) : We have not interrupted any speaker. Why are you interrupting him? (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : In the British days in this very House. Vitthalbhai Patel had warned the Home Member in the British days from the Chair to withdraw his arrogant remarks or to withdraw from the House. These are the traditions of this House to be preserved. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VASANT SATHE : I think the best thing for him is to refer the behaviour of Prithviraj Chauhan.

Sir Prof. Dandavate going back to history should refer to Jai Chand's action in regard to Prithviraj Chauhan inviting Mohammad Gori...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I request all the Members not to cast aspersions on any particular Member.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : He is casting aspersion... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. R. DAS MUNSI : I rise on a point of order, Sir. I want your ruling. If any parliamentarian in this House, without quoting any Member's name, generally and publicly says in this House that demoralizing the Army will constitute an act of a\*\* is that an aspersion? Sir, I want a ruling: is it an aspersion? Please give a ruling. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Already I have given my ruling on this.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS : Sir, in view of your observation, the Minister may withdraw the term he used. Nobody can

question the patriotism of any Member. We expect the hon. Minister to withdraw what he has said.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : We never expected Mr. Sathe to become Prof. K.K. Tewary.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : I did not utter one word to say that the hon. Members of the Opposition are \*I have never said that. Why are you so upset? (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : There are so many scientists, technologists, politicians, Members of Parliament or even Army officers who may differ about the quality of the gun. But on that ground, nobody has ever termed them as \*\*I do not think the Minister has also done that. But inadvertently he has used a term; that is likely to be misunderstood. We have no misunderstanding about Mr. Sathe. But the words which he has used are likely to hurt everyone; and in the best traditions of Parliament, he should withdraw them. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : The 13-Member Mayadas Committee took a different view. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He has not alleged anything against any one individual, personally.

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS : It is likely to hurt the feelings. Therefore, we wanted him to withdraw the remarks. Now he has said that he has not meant it against any Member. It is good. We felt that he was using it against Mr. V.P. Singh. Therefore, we demanded that he should withdraw it. Now he has said that he did not mean it. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He has not said it.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Take your seats.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Sir,

\*\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

[Prof. Madhu Dandavate]

when a Member used an abusive word, that Member was sent out of the House for the whole day by the hon. Speaker. Do not forget it. We do not demand it, and we do not feel that Mr. Sathe means that. But what he has said is bound to hurt the Members of Parliament. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He has not accused anyone.

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS : I felt it. (*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI K.C. PANT) : I would only like to say this. I think all of us, on both the sides of the House, should be sensitive to the feeling of each other. There is no doubt about that. But I would like my friends to put their hands on their hearts and say whether they have not cast aspersions on us. (*Interruptions*) Listen to me. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Mr. Pant, have you ever used these words? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K. C. PANT : I did not interrupt you. Give me a second; I will finish in a very short time. You know I never speak for long. Some of you had named Ministers. Some of you had named the Prime Minister, and you have cast aspersions, baseless, irresponsible aspersions (*Interruptions*) Now if you say that we should not cast individual aspersions, I can understand it. My colleague Mr. Sathe has not cast individual aspersions on any individual.

He has made a general remark, but the point I am making is now that you are protesting so much about it. Please appreciate that members on both sides have sentiments. We can also get hurt when members from the opposite side make irresponsible statements. Please ask your people to be more careful. You were listening to his speech. What he had said may be pleasant or unpleasant. But my point is that you have made your point. It has gone on record. What he said had gone on record. The Chair has said that he will go through the records and if there is anything objection

able he will get it expunged. So, let him continue his speech.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : You kindly see on page 61 and page 62 of this Report. It is dated 24th August, 1984. I reads as follows :

‘Of the remaining two gun systems, our gradings are that the French meets our requirements most of all and the Swedish is the second best.’

Are they...\*\* ? (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Do you justify the terminology he has used? I am sure you will never use those words. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VASANT SATHE : When people can go to the extent of saying so many things...(*Interruptions*) I never said that.

DR. DATTA SAMANT (Bombay South Central) : You called me a *mafia*. Then the Speaker told you to withdraw. (*Interruptions*) This is the arrogance.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : You remember what you were. I never said, so. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please don't waste the time of the House. I am not allowing you. I have already listened to you.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : We are sorry for the Minister if he does not realise that people are hurt when you call them...\*\*...We will never allow people to call others...\*\*...(Interruptions) We may differ. But you must understand the sentiments of the people. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S. DEO : What have you to say about the Maya Das Committee? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VASANT SATHE : While speak-

ing I referred to Shri Somnath Chatterjee speech. (*Interruptions*) He straightway made an allegation and innuendo that the leader of this country, the Prime Minister, is guilty of having taken bribe, I say there cannot be any worse aspersion than this and yet we tolerated it. We have got the guts to tolerate all this because we have faith in the people. (*Interruptions*) They do not have even faith in the people. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : I never said that. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please take your seat.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : It is very easy to ridicule others. If you are called a...\*\*..., will you tolerate it from the Chair ? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : He never said that. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : We never said that 'G' is a...\*\*.. How can you compare it with that ? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VASANT SATHE : You can make allegations that our leader has taken bribe. I never said that any one of you is a...\*\*...(Interruptions) I have not said so. I have not said that any one of you is a...\*\* . I have not said so. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He is saying that he has not called anyone like that. Why are you raising this ? He is categorically telling many times that he never called any one like that. Why are you raising once again the same matter ? He never told. (*Interruptions*)

AN HON. MEMBER : He told his colleague.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He never told his colleague. If at all anything unparliamentary is there, I will expunge it afterwards. I will go through the records.

If there is anything unparliamentary, I will expunge it.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Suppose, I say that whoever demands the withdrawal of IPKF from Sri Lanka is a...\*\*...will you allow it ? (*Interruptions*) you would not like that. That is exactly what he is saying.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He has not mentioned it. He is not calling anyone, he is not mentioning anyone particularly. How can you say so ?

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Has he not used the word...\*\*...(Interruptions)

SHRI VASANT SATHE : I never bring a gun to this House. I do not misbehave like you and then apologise. I do not do it. I say everything with all care. (*Interruptions*)

MK. DEPUTY SPEAKER : No. It is not like that.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT : No, no. What is this ? What is he doing ? This is not the way Parliament functions. (*Interruptions*) What is he saying ? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P.R. DAS MUNSI : What is he saying ? He should withdraw the words. This should not go on record. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : All of you take your seats.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I request hon. Members to behave properly in the House. If you do not behave properly how can I conduct the House ? What is this ? I do not want any gestures here and making mockery of others. This is not the way. How can we run the House ? I am sorry. I feel very sorry, how you people are behaving like this. It is not a good thing.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : We have to keep the dignity of the House. If everybody is making noise, then how can I run the House. What is this? This is too much ... (*Interruptions*) Why are you obstructing his speech? I have already given my ruling and explained to you. In spite of that you are going on making noise. What can I do for that? Tell me ... (*Interruptions*) Upto 8'O Clock the House will go.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHŪ DANDAVATE : You can do it here and now. The Speaker has done it several times and he has expunged it no the spot and sometimes asked the Members to leave the House. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I told you that I will go through the records. If at all any unparliamentary words are there, than I will definitely expunge it. That is all I can assure you.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : I want to know whether you have expunged this word or not. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : ...I told you I will go through the records and if it is inparliamentary, then I will expunge it...(*Interruptions*) I want to see in what context he has said it and whether it is unparliamentary or not. Simply I cannot do it. (*Interruptions*)

19.48 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : We had a very good debate. Now let us come to grips with the situation and we must try to utilise the time we have at our disposal. I know certain words which are not parliamentary sometimes pinch. They should not be spoken in the House. I will see that nothing goes on the record which injures the feeling of anybody. Leave it to me and now we proceed on with what we have got.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Please be calm.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : Sir, the hon. Ex Finance Minister while concluding took some time to clarify a point and he said that as a Finance Minister, he was not aware, nor was concerned about the quality of the Bofors Gun, which was to be decided by the Administrative Ministry and his job was only to approve the financial angle. The question was, his remark was, meaning thereby, that although he had reservation, he could not do anything about it. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : He did not say that. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : The record are there .. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAM DHAN : He is misleading the House. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : I will do. How can I do if you go on interrupting? Your making noise like this creates more trouble.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Ram Dhan, please be seated. I will look into it. It does not look nice.

[*English*]

SHRI VASANT SATHE : Therefore the question is : Did the ex-Finance Minister have any doubts and did he express his doubts about the quality of the Gun? A direct question was asked to the witness, the then Secretary, Expenditure. What does he say?

"Further asked if the then Finance Minister had expressed any reservation, the witness replied :—

Absolutely no. I can say this categorically because the moment I saw the file..." (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : This is from the record. There is nothing wrong about it. He can quote from the record.



(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : You have had your say.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : Then see what he says. This is all from the record...  
(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : I will see the record. If it is out of the record, I will strike it off.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : This is from JPC Report, page 100, para 6.61. I will again quote :

“Absolutely No. I can say this categorically because the moment I saw the file, I immediately sent it to the Finance Secretary saying that the matter was very urgent. It is went to Finance Minister. If he had the slightest doubt, he would have asked the Finance Secretary or me. I was the senior officer in the Finance Department. I was the proper person to have been asked this question. Tiil the moment of my retirement, no question was raised.”

(*Interruptions*)

What greater proof can there be that the Finance Minister knew about it.  
(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Choubey, will you behave ? It is to much.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VASANT SATHE : He is full party to the point of approving the quality of the gun approving its price and giving his cansent as a responsible member of the Cabinet as Finance Minister ..(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : This is his interpretation. It is not your interpretation.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : Now he turns round today and says that he was not aware of this, he did not know of this . (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE ;  
What is the remedy of a member in whose mouth the words are put in ?

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : Why do you say wrong thing ?

[*English*]

I did not stop you quoting from the JPC.

(*Interruptions*)\*\*

MR. SPEAKER : He will not go on record.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : He said that the moment some on the makes the charge of corruption, he is alleged to be de-stabilising the country, I would like to know from this very hon. gentleman as a Defence Minister...(*Interruptions*) It is relevant to the very subject. (*Interruptions*) All the time in his public speeches he went on criticising the forces of de-stabilisation...  
(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAM DHAN : Is it from the document ?

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : What are you doing ? Please keep quiet. Mr. Ram Dhan, why are you speaking ?

SHRI RAM DHAN : I am not going to be cowed down by your threat.

MR. SPEAKER : I am also not going to be cowed down.

[*English*]

SHRI VASANT SATHE : First was the Fairfax. The moment Fairfax was known, a decision was taken in the Political Affairs Committee of the Cabinet to appoint an inquiry committe. What had happened in Fairfax is will-known . (*Interruptions*).

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : What are doing ? Why do not you ask Shri Jaipal to sit down. It is wrong (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

Jaipal Ji, is that your behaviour ? All the time you are interrupting. Let him talk in his time.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : Sir, Bhurelai and Gurumurthy, with a certain newspaper of this country whose owner is well-known—it is a matter of record now...*(Interruptions)*. And, Sir, a person, as a responsible Member of the Cabinet, without informing his leader, the Prime Minister, knowing fully well that a particular...*(Interruptions)*

[*Translation*]

SHRI RAM DHAN : Why do you dismiss Shri Bhure Lal from service.

MR. SPEAKER : Why are you Interrupting ? You are doing a wrong thing.

[*English*]

It is his time that he is taking . *(Interruptions)*

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : Sir, he is referring to Bhurelai and ..*(Interruptions)*

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : You are doing a very wrong thing. You also took names of the persons during the course of your speech who are not present here.

[*English*]

You took names of the persons who are not present in the House. I was there in the Chair. Sit down now.

[*Translation*]

SHRI VASANT SATHE : Such people have become messiahs to-day. These people are raising their voice against the atrocities in the country. I would like to ask the hon. Members in the opposition in this House if they know who is Harshman, who is the ex-official of the C.I.A. If you make such people agents and entrust the enquiry to such people, could you expect country's interest to be served by such people ?  
*(Interruptions)*

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER : Come to the point.

[*Translation*]

SHRI VASANT SATHE : I am making a reference only to those points which he raised here in the House. I am replying to those points only. He said that he was expelled from the party. He was expelled, because he said something against Ajitabh *(Interruptions)*. But the fact remains that as soon as the Cabinet set up a two-judge enquiry committee, he sensed that he is going to be implicated. He then resigned from the Cabinet. After resigning from the Cabinet our colleague tried to form an opposition alliance in the Presidential elections and did everything possible to defeat the party nominee. He was dreaming. *(Interruptions)*

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the man who dreams like that...

*(Interruptions)*

To-day the opposition is in active. There is no leader with the opposition. *(Interruptions)*

To-day he wants to become the leader of that Opposition. *(Interruptions)*

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER : Now come to the point.

[*Translation*]

SHRI VASANT SATHE : Whatever I have said here is in reply to points our honourable colleague raised in the House. I have uttered not a single word out of the context. *(Interruptions)*. He did all these things to become the Prime Minister himself and that is what he wanted.

SHRI RAM DHAN : What is wrong in it.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : Everything\*\* *(Interruptions)*

We never said that the person masquerading Mahatma Gandhi by putting on Gandhian clothes and going to have ideal election campaign sitting back on a motor-

\*\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

cycle could take the help of Haji Mestan, a King of smugglers. (*Interruptions*) He was one who was said to be an advocate of morality? He was the person who claims to have struggled against communalism throughout his life and sought the help of the man like Shahabuddin who raised the issue of Ram Janmabhoomi, Babri Masjid and the man like Maulana Bukhari, who always pleaded Pakistan's cause, we can never say that he is against morality. Sir, the debate which is taking place today... (*Interruptions*)

20.00 hrs.

Arif was side-lined. He apprehended danger that Muslim votes could go against him if Arif campaigned for him. Hence he was prevented from going there. I, therefore, call upon these votaries of morality that by repeatedly saying\*\* you cannot do character assassination of the biggest party in the country. (*Interruption*)

MR. SPEAKER : This is an unparliamentary word. It cannot form part of the record. What are you doing? What happened to you? What you people are doing?

SHRI VASANT SATHE : Sir, the action of Shri Narain Chaudhary and my other colleagues is like taking the situation from bad to worse. It would be more appropriate to call it as "Bandhya Maithun" or a repeated futile action.

[*English*]

SHRI V. SOBHANADREESWARA RAO : Sir, I have a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER : There is no point of order.

(*Interruption*.)

SHRI VASANT SATHE : In conclusion, I would appeal that this should be the last occasion after which they won't refer to this because there is nothing else the Opposition can do. But they want only to denigrate the leader of this country, indulge in character assassination and they will go on *ad infinitum* doing this. But the people of this country are not interested in the bluff. Sir,

I think that this would be the last occasion when the bluff of Bofors had been called. (*Interruptions*)

AH HON. MEMBER : Sir, the time is already over.

MR. SPEAKER : There are four more Members to speak from this side. The speeches should conclude today.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Then, how will you discuss other subjects? If somebody wants to discuss on floods, somebody wants discussion on Johanbad incident, somebody wants discussion on Railway accident, where will you find time?

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VASANT SATHE : Therefore, Sir, if national interest is supreme, I will only say one thing. There are many more important things to be discussed about the country. Let us concentrate on them instead of indulging in character assassination.

AN HON. MEMBER : Sir, the time is over.

MR. SPEAKER : I think we can extend the time of the House. Is it the pleasure of the House to extend the time of the House?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

MR. SPEAKER : I think we can sit upto 9.00 P.M.

DR. A. KALANIDHI (Madras Central) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, on behalf of the D.M.K. I thank you for having permitted me to participate in the discussion on Bofors contract. Sir, I do not want to dig much to bring out the old skeletons which are already in the decomposed stage and I do not want to wash the dirty linen in this august House.

Sir, the Members from the Ruling side have said that the JPC has given details about the Bofors deal. I can point out to them that technical reports submitted to the

[Dr. A. Kalanidhi]

JPC members do not contain 30 pages in which adverse remarks were made by the technical experts about the quality of the Bofors gun and bursting capacity. They categorically said that the SOFMA gun is much superior in quality, bursting capacity, and fuel efficiency, and the difference of Rs. 9 crores between Bofors and SOFMA is usually mopped up by the service, execution in time, supply of equipments in time and the guarantee period and the technical know-how. In spite of this, the Government has brushed aside the Expert Committee's opinion and made a contract with the Bofors, thereby gave suspicion for every one to think that a pay-back or commission has been given in this deal. The JPC member said that the CBI has given a report. I can tell him that the CBI has mentioned three Companies among which one Company was run by three ladies who, on enquiry, informed that they were not aware of any transactions and they are only simply doing the job of typing. This is the type of agency that is existing in our country. Now, once again you want to give the case to CBI to probe further, the CBI who cannot give correct information. On the contrary they are misleading the Ministry.

20.06 hrs

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

One Member from the Treasury Benches said that it is customary for the Defence Ministry to ask for how much commission would be given to the agents who are dealing with the contract. I can tell him that one such occasion arose when Shri C. Subramaniam was the Defence Minister, who in turn, refused to accept the commission, but requested the supplier to give the Defence equipment at a lesser cost instead of giving the commission. He was also a Congress (I) Minister. Perhaps people in this Ministry also belong to the Congress (I). We can see the difference between the two sets of Congress (I) people. That is the state of affairs existing in the Congress (I) party.

On 22nd April, when the *Hindu* published the report, Prof. Madhu Dandavate warned this House and warned the Ministry that you should go in detail about this, but

you ignored his warning. Subsequently, on the 23rd and 26th June 1988, the leading Notional Daily, '*Hindu*' has published 17 documents exposing the Svenska and Anatronnic Corporation and its dealings with Hindujas and Win Chadha. The Ruling Party Members sarcastically mentioned about *Hindu*. I can tell you that it is one of the reputed national dailies coming from Madras. Even to publish an obituary reference, they confirm the death with the death certificate and publish it. So, the authenticity about its publication is well-known all over the world. So, questioning the *bona fides* of *Hindu* is questioning the *bona fides* of yourself. In the Northern States the people usually address the persons with respect as 'Ji' like Gandhiji and Netaji. But here, the 'G' which has been mentioned in the document, which has been quoted by Shri Somnath Chatterjee, is a special 'G' and Mr. Vasant Sathe said that Somnath Chatterjee has cast an aspersion on our beloved Prime Minister by quoting 'G' as 'Gandhi'. We have not mentioned that 'G' represents 'Gandhi'. It is only Mr Vasant Sathe who has confirmed to this House that 'G' denotes Mr. Gandhi and we are casting aspersions on him. We do not want to cast any aspersion on our beloved Prime Minister. What we have said is, in the document note, there is a code word called "G". The people of this country particularly want to know who is this "G". Even in Ramayana, Sita submitted herself to enter into a fire to prove that she is pure, to Rama. Whereas our Prime Minister has to prove. We do not want to cast any aspersion on the Prime Minister. I do not want to accuse the Prime Minister that he is involved in this matter. But at the same time, doubt is there in the minds of the people whether the Prime Minister is involved in the matter. So, the time has now come for the Prime Minister to prove himself that he is not involved in the matter. So, he should commit himself or he should submit himself to a committee. When some enquiry was held in Sweden, the Prime Minister himself gave evidence and submitted himself for the enquiry. So also, our Prime Minister should submit himself to such a Committee. Caesar's wife should be above suspicion. So, I request the Prime Minister to submit himself before such a com-

mittee so that we can prove to the world that the Prime Minister is honest and faithful to the country and even he has not accepted the money. On the contrary, you are accusing the Oppositic Members. Whenever we find some fault, whenever we give some suggestions, you call us as traitors or CIA agents. For some time only, you can cheat the people. The late lamented leader Peraringar Anna said some time back :

"SILARAI SILANAL YEMATRALAM  
PALARIA PALANAL YEMATRALAM  
YELLORAIYUM YELLA NALUM  
YEMATRA MUDIYADHU."

What he said is :

Only for some time you can cheat some people ;

Many a time, many people can be cheated ;

But not all people can be cheated at all times.

You should remember, the time has come now that awareness has come in the minds of the people that they want to know much about the Bofors issue. But you are contradicting everything. In fact, JPC has given completely contradicted version. Even it went out of the way two shield Mr. Win Chadha, Svenska who have been exposed by *the Hindu*. In spite of that, you want to protect them. After all, what is the interest for you? I want to know what is the special interest the Ministry is having to protect the culprits. Is it not a fact that Gandhi was brought independence for this country? Is it for the sake of protecting culprits that he had brought freedom for this country? He should think about it. You think about the common people who are toiling and who are living with greatest difficulty day. You are not thinking about them. You want to even forego the safety of the country. You want to sell the country's safety for somebody. So, before taking a decision on the file, think of the people of this country. The people are looking at you. Be careful. If you are not going to rectify yourself, if you are not going to correct yourself, if you think that the Opposition people are simply making accusation, in the next elections, the Congress will be thrown out of this country and

the Opposition will come to the Treasury Benches and you have to come this side and answer that.

With these words, I conclude.

CHOUDHARY KHURSHID AHMED (Faridabad) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to you that you have given me an opportunity to speak today. This debate has been continuing for quite a long time and most of the documents which has been printed in *the Hindu* have been placed before the House by different speakers and they have quoted them in detail. Without going into the detail, I can only dwell upon certain points which have been debated by both the sides.

The first speaker from the Treasury Benches, Mr. Jagan Nath Kaushal is an able advocate and as an able advocated always defends forcefully in the court even the weakest case, he did it in this case also. He said, we want to change the jurisprudence and we were basing all our arguments on hearsay. Though he is not here now, I have to remind my friends here that it was not the Opposition which was changing the jurisprudence. It was Mr. Jogan Nath Kaushal who was cleverly playing the points favouring them and not mentioning the aspects which go against their case.

There is unimpeachable documentary evidence and that has been printed before the nation. That has gone to every house, not only this House but every member of the public. They have seen through those documents, what have been the transactions, what have been the pay offs, what have been the commissions paid to each and every person in definite percentage, connected with each and every consignment of the equipment which was to be supplied by the Bofors. Such documentary when it comes, it has to be taken as a conclusive proof of fact which is always to be taken as proof of a fact in the courts of law. He was trying to hide that point and highlighting only that we were placing our reliance on only the comments of the people and the press. He argued that the opposition are reading the Frontline as if it was a judgment of the Supreme Court. We are not reading the Frontline as a judgment of the Supreme Court but quoting the

[Choudhary Khurshid Ahmed]

documents which in themselves are the patent evidence for proving the facts of the payment of commission and it was connected with the supply of the equipment under the Bofors agreement. If those payments were made, they were made into the accounts which have been quoted by my friends of Opposition. I need not name all those accounts. When such definite information comes before this House, does it not become the duty of this House to ask for another inquiry and is it not justified to look for fresh investigation into these matters? Some of my friends on the other side have said that they had to this house come with a massive mandate. Even a massive mandate cannot torpedo an investigation into a fact which is under cloud. If the doubts are not cleared, then doubts would continue to lurk in the minds of the people and if they are not cleared by a specifically appointed Committee which has to go into all those cases, then these things would point towards some particular person. I do insist that they only point towards one particular 'G'. As the saying goes, all the roads lead to Rome. Here all the suspicions lead to one 'G'. If all these suspicions lurk on and continue to lead to the same 'G', then it is in the fitness of things that 'G' should come and clean itself of all these suspicions. It is a matter of concern that a huge amount of Rs. 64 crores has gone to companies which have ostensibly rendered no services to the Bofors. Then what is the mystery of that payment to such companies? It is on record shown on the floor of the House by the presentation of documents from the Opposition. In such cases, there is no other alternative but to ask for a new Committee to inquire into the whole details of these allegations and if it is not cleared, then suspicions would always persist in our mind that somebody is trying to cover up. It is not an ordinary cover up but, it is a massive cover up. The Treasury benches came up with all sorts of insinuations against every Member of the Opposition. Every Member was cowed down by hitting at personal level. If the Treasury benches want to be believed by the nation, we must have a Committee. It should have an Opposition Member as the Chairman so that it inspires some credibility. It is very shameful that that they pointed it out many times and this

Bofors deal and discussion have taken too much of time. Who is responsible for this? Those who do not want to bring out the truth are responsible for it. Nobody else. When new documentary evidence has come, why should not we go into those new documents and clear the position if you want to give a clean picture to the whole country? If we want to do this, we will have no other alternative but to appoint a Committee headed by a Member of the Opposition as is the tradition that PAC is headed by Opposition Member. Here also accounting and money is involved. It is not that we are demanding it without any justification. We are demanding it in the right tradition that there should be an Opposition Member who should be the Chairman of a fresh Parliamentary Committee so that you can have the credibility before the nation. If you are Clean, you should be prepared to surrender yourself to a Committee of Inquiry headed by an Opposition Member. If you want to retain your image of being clean or Mr. Clean, then you must be cleared out only by a Committee which is headed by the Opposition and not by a certificate either from Bofors or from Mr. Vin Chaddha or from the Swedish Public Prosecutor. You cannot take advantage of such things and if you want to tell the world that you are honest and nothing is wrong with this deal, you should not be afraid of any inquiry. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I hope the Government would accede to our request for a fresh Parliamentary Committee to probe into this affair. That is all I want to say.

Sir, I am grateful to you for having given me this opportunity to speak.

[Translation]

SHRI C. JANGA REDDY (Hanamkonda) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, just now Shri Vasant Sathe was speaking and he said certain things about Fairfax. But nobody is prepared to say anything on the points that have appeared in "the Hindu." Earlier, they said that there was no middle man in the deal. But later it was accepted that a middle man was engaged. Thereafter, they ruled out that any commission was paid. They said that the payment whatever was made in the form of winding up charges. They said that an agreement to

this effect was signed and it was cancelled later on. These things appeared in the press and it was accepted that no commission was paid to any Indian resident. Later on it was said that no Non Indian resident while living in India was even paid any commission. We were just discussing as to who is 'lotus' and it was revealed that 'G' means Rajiv Gandhi. Shri Atal Bhehri Bajpayee comes into picture when the question of lotus is taken up... (*Interruption*) because lotus is the Election symbol of Shri Bajpayee. They cut jokes on this point and I want to make the position clear. Lotus means Rajiv. Efforts are being made to hush up this issue. This state of affair can malign not the President but the future Prime Minister of India. It has become a matter of discussion in the foreign countries that even the Prime Minister of India can be purchased. It is not only the Indian citizen but also the Prime Minister of India who can be purchased. In order to remove these misgiving, it will be in the fitness of things to set up a committee for the second time, as has been said by my hon. colleague from the Lok Dal. At least you yourself should not award the 'clean' certificate to you. Try to receive the certificate from the people, from the opposition. It will be beneficial to your health. You can face the electorate by wearing this clean certificate on your neck. You can claim that the Chairman, who belongs to opposition has awarded this 'clean' certificate to you. You can request the public to vote for you once more. You can request for vote, not on the ground of mother's demise, but on the ground that you are clean and did a good job during last five years. You can request for votes on the ground that you did not get any chance to receive commission in the Bofors' deal and were awarded a 'clean' certificate. You can make these points. But you are not prepared to receive this clean certificate. Having been a thief, you are appointing yourself as a judge. If any killing takes place in Andhra Pradesh, the charge is levelled on the naxalites. Nothing comes out from the investigation. The S.I. says the killing to be an act of naxalism and thus the case is closed. You indulge yourself in such activities in the name of extremism. It was published in detail in the Indian Express and Hindu alongwith the

photographs. People know what is clean and who is unclean. In order to make the position clear, you should set up one more J.P.C. You should find out who is clean and who is unclean, who is lotus and who is lotus's man. I had also said these points during the last session, what you are saying now. We want that you should try to get it investigated once again by setting up one more J.P.C. you should remove all sorts of doubts from the people's mind. This will help you in getting votes from the people in future.

With these words, I conclude.

[*English*]

DR. DATTA SAMANT (Bombay South Central) : Sir, I rise to make certain observation. For about six or seven times this Bofors issue has been discussed in this House. The Prime Minister who was the Defence Minister then should have been present during all these discussions here and expressed his views on the things that had happened. But, consistently, in all these discussions in this House the Prime Minister remained absent, and this is causing more suspicion in the minds of some Members. He has not attended even a single Bofors discussion in this House in the last two years. (*Interruptions*) This shows the guilty conscience. (*Interruptions*) What I say is this : if you want to clear yourself, please come and explain, and this is the common feeling of everybody here.

A lot of things, Mr. Sathe had talked about. He mentioned about the Finance Secretary having sent a note to Shri V. P. Singh. I am not going into details now. But I am asking this Government to produce all these papers before the House. I am making that demand. Let all those communications and files that passed between the Finance Secretary, Shri V.P. Singh and Shri Rajiv Gandhi be produced before this House. I do not want that there should be a hypothetical discussion. That way, a lot of things can be talked about and the things will go on for ever. If Mr V. P. Singh is guilty in that, let us not spare him. I am not going to take anybody's side. This is the highest forum of the country. It is the Government which does not want to produce any document before this House.

[Dr. Datta Samant]

Mr. Lars Ringberg of the Swedish Government has categorically said that even the Indian Government and the Indian investigators are not prepared to take him into confidence and give the details of their investigations...

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT : Will you quote what Mr. Ringberg has said after the investigation? He has said that he has found nothing. You quote his conclusions, what he has said.

DR. DATTA SAMANT : He has given a statement that the Indian Government has not taken him into confidence, they have not told him the details. Mr. Ringberg has said that the Committee which was appointed by this Government, when he asked them to give the details, had said that this was something secret and that it could not be given to Mr. Ringberg. I can narrate so many things. Mr. Ringberg is the Chief Public Prosecutor of that country. He says that Bofors is not prepared to show him the files, the contract between the Indian Government and Bofors. He says that the Indian Government and Bofors are the accused in his view; he says that they are making a farce of these inquiries, they are not prepared to come forward to give the details of inquiry to anybody. After going through all these things, it is my conclusion—it is not only my conclusion but the conclusion of every Indian of this country that bribes or commission had been paid by Bofors and that all these things like winding up costs or termination of the contract are patent lies. The country has been consistently misled and fooled by the Prime Minister and Defence Minister, and it is really regrettable that the Joint Parliamentary Committee has been used to camouflage all these things. These are my charges. And this is the observation which any common man of this country can make. The Bofors also has consistently misled the people. They did so because they were assured of the support of the Indian Government.

In the report published in 'The Hindu', there are certain observations about the payments made by the Bofors to these three companies which correlate with your signing of the contract and the subsequent developments. Therefore, that shows they are informed

about the payments made to Indians. If you go into all these details—it is talked in the House, I am not going to report it—you will find that Bofors has given a false evidence to the Committee that after the Indian Government toured in December 1986, no middleman should be there. But the record says that the Sevenska has made payment up to March. In all these two false companies, payments have been made and code numbers are there. Code number one shows that it is commission. But in the final payment to all this 'Lotus' etc., all these code numbers have been used but it is not shown on whose name it is there. The secrecy is kept so much that who has paid this money also has been kept secret. Evidence is there. Advocates and lawyers are saying and everybody is saying that Indian Government is avoiding and Bofors is avoiding. All these documents when they come to you for signature with code numbers and other things, is it not the duty of this Government to go into further details? They have appointed the CBI. One Mr. Katre has gone to Sweden. I do not know. He will again come and say that 'The Hindu' is at fault and you will take action against it. You don't want to find it out. You want to hide the evidence.

I will not take much of your time. Payment of six per cent, two per cent, 96 per cent, all this correlate that payment has been done. Some commissions are paid to Sevenska since 1984. I am pointing out to our Defence Minister that in the Sevenska account, payments are made since 1984. But this transaction was done in 1986. Therefore, it is high time that you enquire into it.

Regarding keeping the middlemen, it has been discussed by me. Bofors is saying, "as we have received the information in December 1986 that there should not be middlemen, that is why we have paid the termination cost." But what about Vin Chadra. He is a VVIP in this country. I do not know why Shri Sathe is not here. How they have cheated us. Day before yesterday, I sent my man to the court, when Shashi Bhushan's case was there on 26th July, 1988. But the Additional Solicitor General has said : "We have issued summons. But he is not accepting it and he has not come to the court." This is a pitiable condi-



tion of your Government. Your Solicitor General says that he has issued summons. But Win Chadha is not coming to the court. And Win Chadha's advocate talks in the court: "you may issue summons. There may be FERA violations. But what are the charges against him" But the Solicitor General is not telling the charges to the court.

[Translation]

A very peculiar drama has taken place. I will beat you and ask you to do one thing. You start weeping and complian to me. I shall institute an enquiry.

[English]

Day before yesterday when Mr. Win Chadha disobeyed your summons the Solicitor General was not prepared to say that he had done FERA violation. Mr. Win Chadha says: "what violation I have done. You tell me about my charges" But the Solicitor General has not made the charges. Therefore Shri Shashi Bhushan has not issued the warrant and he has kept the case for 2nd. This shows how the things are going to come. It is going to take time of the House. It is the Swedish Government who has come to the rescue of this Government. Whatever enquiries you have made, they are scrutinising all the bank accounts of three these companies. They have not permitted it under the secrecy act of that country. Under the secrecy act, they are not permitted to scrutinise the account of the people. Therefore, it is the systematic way of hiding the truth that we are witnessing. You are trying to wash the dirty lanin with this Committee. I do not think the 70 crore Indian people will forget the way you are hiding your sins and you have to reply definitely.

There is no use of accusing Mr. V.P. Singh. Mr. Sathe quoted what the Finance Secretary had said that Mr. V.P. Singh had signed. Mr. V.P. Singh signs or does not sign is not the point. We want to know who is the culprit. This House is concerned with that.

You bring all the documents and transactions between Mr. V.P. Singh and the Prime Minister on this subject. When Mr. V.P. Singh was working with this particular status in the Government, he would not immediately come out. But when he found that injustice had come upto the neck, then he had to come out. Passing on your sins to Mr. V.P. Singh now is not the right logic. Therefore, I appeal that let us have an impartial inquiry into this consisting of three judges, one to be nominated by the Opposition, the other by the Government and the third one from the High Court or the Supreme Court to find out the truth. But all the documents and evidence should be made available to these judges.

SHRI K. C. PANT: Sir, does he think that his judge will not be impartial?

DR. DATTA SAMANT: Let there be three judges appointed from the High Court and the Supreme Court and their names will be suggested by both of us.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister will reply tomorrow. Now the House stands adjourned to meet tomorrow at 11 a.m.

20.35 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Even-  
of the Clock on Friday, July 29,  
1988/Sravana 7, 1910 (Saka)*