

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR (SHRI PABAN SINGH GHATOWAR): (a) and (b). The date from which the court's pronouncement takes effect is a matter which may be specified by the court in its judgement or, in the absence of such indication, may be inferred from it. This is as whether the judgement involves interpretation of Labour Laws or any other law or workmen of the Central Public Sector Organisations or Private Sector Organisations

(c) Does not arise.

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on Science

7604. SHRI PRATAPRAO B. BHONSALE: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether India had signed any MOU on Science with China;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) the follow-up action taken by the Government thereon?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS (SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA): (a) Sir, an agreement of Cooperation of Science and Technology between India and China was signed on December 22, 1988.

(b) This agreement provides for:

- Cooperation through exchange of scientists, research workers and scholars;

- exchange of Scientific and technical information and documentation;

- organisation of bilateral scientific and technical seminars/courses;

- formulation and implementation of joint research programmes; and

- establishment of a joint committee on scientific and technical cooperation, to plan, coordinate and monitor bilateral cooperation.

(c) Two meetings of the India-China Sub Committee on Cooperation in Science and Technology (as the joint committee is called) have been held, broad areas of bilateral interest have been identified, exploratory visits of scientific delegations have taken place to concretise themes for collaborative interaction, and some study visits have taken place in other areas of potential interest.

12.04 hrs.

[English]

RE. ADJOURNMENT MOTION

MR. SPEAKER: There is one more thing on this point so that there should not be any misunderstanding, or the hon. Members may not ask as to what has happened to the notices given by them. I have received the notices for suspending the question Hour, Adjournment Motion and privilege Motion also, three kinds of motions.

As far as the adjournment Motion notices are concerned— I am just saying this thing on the floor of the House so that it may not be necessary every now and then to repeat what I am saying now— Rules 56, 57, 58 and other rules are applicable. Rule 56 is very relevant and I am reading Rule 58 (v).

Rule 58 (v) says, and I quote:

"The motion shall not revive discussion on a matter which has been discussed in the same session."

It is one thing. We are not going to discuss it. There is one more thing which I will bring to your notice.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Let me have my say please. The grounds for disallowance of the Adjournment Motion are given in the Handbook published by our Parliament. It says:

"That the matter sought to be raised is mainly based on press reports without being substantiated".

This is the ground for disallowance of the Adjournment Motion. I have given the two grounds -that the matter was discussed in the same session and this is the second ground - says that the matter sought to be raised is based on press reports.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE (Vijayawada): This House has been misled. (*Interruptions*)

SHRIRUPCHANDPAL (Hooghly): This is a totally new issue. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: What is this? You have all the time and the capacity to change my views. This is what I am reading from the book.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please hear me. These are the grounds. The Question Hour is over. Your usual hour is there. You can carry on.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): I have given a notice for Adjournment Motion (*interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Not on this. On the rulings, we do not discuss here.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: We are not discussing it (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Chittorgarh): I am not discussing the ruling. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I have said that these are the two grounds on which the Adjournment Motion cannot be admitted.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Not like this.

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Muzaffarpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, what is your decision with Privilege Motion?

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Privilege Motion? I have to hear the other side also.

[*Translation*]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Then listen just now.

MR. SPEAKER: Not now, I will hear later on.

[*English*]

You gave a notice. It is with me.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am not. Of course, no one in the House can possibly question it. You having ruled that it is.....

MR. SPEAKER: I have just read it from here.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: You have drawn the attention of the House to the existing provisions in the rule book under which ordinarily, on two grounds...(*Interruptions*) You drew the attention of the House to two aspects of the existing provisions under the rule book. Thereunder, ordinarily, an Adjourned Motion

cannot be taken up because if the same discussion has already taken place, then you cannot keep on repeating the very same discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: There are rulings on this point also. If the matter is continuing then also it can be disallowed.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Exactly.

MR. SPEAKER: Supposing something happens today....

(Interruptions)

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: There are two aspects. Containing matter, matter already having been discussed and thirdly substantially on press reports. These are the three aspects.

MR. SPEAKER: It is 'not substantiated'.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: No, substantially.

MR. SPEAKER: I will read it again for you.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: It is largely based on....

MR. SPEAKER: No, not largely.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: It is 'the matter to be raised is mainly based on press reports without being substantiated'.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Exactly.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapure): How can you say that it is not substantiated unless somebody comes and says what has happened? *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: I do not know. It is in the rule book.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: My submission here is that unless it is substantiated, it is one

aspect and largely based on press matters. Continuing discussion and not on matters of urgent public importance etc.

Now I submit, Sir, that under this umbrella of Bofors, this is of course a continuing saga...

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE
(SHRI BALRAM JAKHAR): Sir...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I have not yielded to the hon. Minister. Yet, Sir, if you would ask me to yield, I might consider it. As a former Speaker....

MR. SPEAKER: Please.

SHRI BALRAM JAKHAR: Sir, the Speaker's Ruling cannot be discussed here.

MR. SPEAKER: He is not discussing speaker's Ruling.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: I hope you are not discussing it.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Not at all. I do not have any standing or ability to do that.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not generally done because otherwise every time it will be discussed.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: It is not of the question. How can we discuss it? And it did not lie for this specific reason....

MR. SPEAKER: Now, this is a discussion which is unlisted.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: It did not lie, sir. He is my elder in every respect.

MR. SPEAKER: And he is 100 per cent correct also.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Absolutely, Sir, and he is only stating the obvious here. I cannot, of course, discuss the Speaker's

Ruling, but my submission is on three grounds. what is the distinction between a continuing saga...

MR. SPEAKER: This is....

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: It is, Sir, because this is relevant if you would allow me.

MR. SPEAKER: Again it will be discussing the Ruling.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: It is not discussing the Ruling. I am submitting...

MR. SPEAKER: Now, I here you in my Chamber on this point. You convince me, I will get convinced.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: But if you would permit me to put my view across. (Interruptions). I am not on the adjournment motion as such because you have ruled that out. You have said that 'I am not admitting the adjournment motion' etc. etc. I am on substantially other aspects. It is not on the Ruling on the adjournment motion and I bow to the wisdom of the former Speaker, he is my elder senior in every respect. I am not judging that. Now, what distinguishes is, sir, as issue which is containing and which is of recent occurrence. This saga of Bofors is, of course, a continuing saga. But under that umbrella every occurrence, every new incident, event new revelation has in itself been a new occurrence of urgent public importance. When the Swedish Radio first came out with the news, it was a matter of immediate occurrence. Then subsequently the Audit Bureau of Sweden came out with its findings. It became a separate occurrence. When the Joint Parliamentary Committee gave its findings, that became a separate occurrence. I submit to you, Sir, that earlier when we discussed, we discussed an aspect of this continuing saga, we discussed the former External Affairs Minister's misconduct. It was an aspect. Now you can situation in which under the umbrella of a continuing saga, every new occurrence has relevant urgent public importance. It is my submission, Sir, that there are two aspects. Firstly, the

urgency of 24th of April when the final hearing in the Delhi High Court is listed and the manner in which the Government is handling this hearing of the 24th of April is an aspect of urgent public importance and is a new occurrence. I submit, secondly, Sir, that when it is asserted and we exercised great restraint as I said earlier in the previous discussion....

SHRI BUTA SINGH (Jalore): I am on a point of order.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: There is no List of Business at the moment in the House. So, there cannot be a point of order. (Interruptions).

SHRI E. AHAMED (Manjeri): May I submit one thing, Sir? Every issue will have occurrence....(Interruptions).

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: After all what is the substance of our concern and why is it of new occurrence? The substance of our concern arises from an assertion of — I am not relying only on newspapers.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: I am on a point of order under Rule 58. Let him listen to me.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: We are in Zero Hour. Now I am making during a submission of Zero Hour. I am in Zero Hour, Buta Singhji.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: You are raising something which is irrelevant. I am raising something which is relevant. (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: Everything in this Hour is supposed to be out of order.

(Interruptions)

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: This is a Zero Hour submission, Sir. Let it be understood by the Treasury Benches. It is a submission that I am making the Zero Hour which all Members of Parliament here have a right to make. (Interruptions)

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Sir, my submission

is what the hon. Member is speaking is also under the rules. Therefore, it is the infringement of the rules that I am objecting to.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, the focus of our concern is that the hon. Prime Minister, in his intervention in this House, has misled the House. The focus of our concern is that the hon. former Minister for External Affairs in his assertion in Gujarat outside the House, has said: "If I were to speak, an explosion will be caused. I have merely done my duty, etc. etc." They create a doubt in my mind, Sir. What is the focus of our concern? The focus of our concern is that in the possession of the Central Bureau of Investigation exists and existed a letter before the Prime Minister had made his intervention in which it was categorically stated that Mr. Solanki gave that note under the instruction and direction of the Prime Minister of India and that no such reference was made here and it is a matter of new recent occurrence and this is the focus of our concern, because this letter concerns both an issue of privilege to which certain other Members have referred and also misleading the House and also of the propriety and the conduct of the Chief Executive of the Government. What are we saying, Sir? We are saying that this letter is in the possession of the Central Bureau of Investigation and was in the possession of the Central Bureau of Investigation when such an assertion was made. Then, the Central Bureau of Investigation is directly under the charge of the Prime Minister.

Secondly, the Prime Minister himself said- and a reference was made by others- that he does not want his Government to act under a shadow, so far as this matter is concerned. A shadow has come all over again. It is a new occurrence and this shadow having come, it is a matter that requires urgent attention. We appeal to you to consider our request for being able to raise this matter. Thirdly, and again because the hon. Prime Minister said on the floor of this House that he will take a personal interest in the Central Bureau of Investigation and in the management of this case. Now, is the personal assurance about the personal

interest given from the office of the Chief Executive about both? This is, about the case on the 24th of April and about the CBI letter which was existing even before the discussion in the House took place earlier. The Prime Minister's name is involved; the Prime Minister's name is mentioned by foreign officials. That the name of the Prime Minister is officially communicated to India, the Prime Minister was in the knowledge of this and despite all this, the Government and the Prime Minister have kept the House in the dark. How are we to express our concern if we do not come to you through the agencies and the means that are available to us in the Rule Book and seek your permission to make a reference to all these aspects of urgent public importance meriting consideration?

MR. SPEAKER: You can very well say that I am obstructing your speech now. But, supposing you are coming under certain rules, I am expected to interpret the rules which will not create difficulties in future.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Absolutely, Sir. You have been most kind, you have not interrupted me. You have permitted to have my say and I have done so. There are two issues that are involved, about the propriety, about the good name of the Chief Executive of this Government, about his name being used by foreign officials to make statements and make averments which are contrary to what has been stated in the House and the question of total privilege of Parliament. These are all aspects of new occurrence. They do come under that overall umbrella of Bofors which covers many sins, but, this I put it to you, is a new sin and it is a sin of sufficient importance and gravity to merit consideration afresh and that is why we are troubling you in this regard.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would respectfully remind you that I am neither on Question Hour because that is over, nor I am on Adjournment Motion, because I have not tabled an Adjournment Motion. I am on zero hour. I had written to you this morning because what appeared today in the Press was most

disturbing and would be disturbing to anybody. You have rightly quoted the rule which said that if the matter which is sought to be raised by way of adjournment- motion is based primarily on the Press reports which are unsubstantiated, then it cannot be admitted. One cannot question that rule except to say that anything which is based on the Press report cannot either be substantiated or unsubstantiated unless somebody in authority who is in a position either to affirm or to deny that Press report, comes forward to say so. I may remind you that the former External Affairs Minister's action in handing over a note to the Swiss Foreign Minister was first revealed in the Press. It first appeared in the Press and on the basis of that Press report that this House raised that matter, whether it is a fact or not that he had handed over a note to his counterpart. Up to that stage, it was an unsubstantiated Press report. It was only subsequently that the Minister himself came forward with a statement admitting that he had handed over a note whose contents, he said, he did not know; who had handed over to him, he did not know. It was some faceless, nameless person, and he apologised; he expressed regret in the House that he has done such a thing. It was only after that it has become clear that that the Press report was not unsubstantiated.

What I am submitting to you is, something new has appeared now in the Press quoting chapter and verse and I think, We are legitimately entitled to bring this to your attention and to the attention of the House and the country. This is a very serious matter. For the first time, the name of the Prime Minister is being implicated, is being involved in this. This was not there earlier. I am sure, you had thoroughly perused this Press report which we are referring, which has appeared this morning in *the Statesman*. There it is said, not once but three times that Mr. Felber Foreign Minister of Switzerland was given to understand that the note which was handed over to him, behind the note, it was supported or promoted by the Prime Minister of India. This may be true; it may not be true. It is a very serious matter. If it is not true, let the Prime Minister come here and

say so. We cannot take Sardar Buta Singh's words for granted. So, here in bold words, serious allegations are being made

I would also say one thing more. I must draw your attention to very curious way in which the House is again being treated. It is now about three weeks since the unfortunate Solanki episode took place. To this day, the identity of that person, that nameless, faceless person who handed over that paper to the Foreign Minister has not been revealed. Are we to take it that Government does not know; the Prime Minister does not know who that person was? He is supposed to be a lawyer.

An Hon. Member: Robot:

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: If he was robot, let us be satisfied on that point. It was a very remote-controlled robot.

In any case, it is very strange that after so many days have passed, Parliament is not in a position to know who was that name, who was that person and how did he come to perform that function of handing over a note to the External Affairs Minister to pass on to his counterpart in Switzerland. The contents of that note have subsequently appeared in the Press. If those are not correct, these have to be denied. If somebody wants to say it is an authentic version of that note, he is at liberty to say so. Nobody has said so yet. The contents of the note, as published in the Press, make it quite clear that the aim of that note was to persuade the Swiss authorities not to proceed seriously or vigorously with further investigation in this Bofors case.

Now on the basis of this latest report, it is implied or said, even more than implication, the name of the hon. Prime Minister is directly being involved in it that it was at his insistence, at his promoting that this note was handed over. Is it not a serious matter? Is it a matter which can be brushed aside only on the ground of technicalities of rules? It is for you to decide.

I am not regarding it under any rule.

MR. SPEAKER: I will tell you. Again the hon. Members have been advising me and guiding me from their benches. I do not have the opportunity to say what is the legal position from the chair, and if I enter into that kind of discussion, you know it becomes a thing which cannot be respected. So, may I very respectfully request the hon. Member for whom I have the greatest respect, not always to give me guidance? I will respect your guidance in the Chamber but not from the floor of the House because I cannot enter into a dialogue with you, how I am correct and how you are not correct.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I have not presumed in the least to give you any guidance.

MR. SPEAKER: I respect every word you say. I will hear you very respectfully. You know how much respect I have for you. But please desist from guiding me all the time from the bench because it becomes very difficult for me.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I am extremely sorry that you should have taken my remarks as being some sort of implied guidance to you.

MR. SPEAKER: No. Not in anger.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Nothing could be farther from my mind. I have to address those benches through you.

MR. SPEAKER: When I have said this thing, it applies to everybody. It is not only to you because every time you ask me to do this thing and that thing. I say I cannot do it and you say that is not correct.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I am not asking you to do anything. How can I ask you to anything?

MR. SPEAKER: I know how much affection you have for me and how much respect I have for you.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: We are old friends. Now, you should not think that we

are trying to guide you.

MR. SPEAKER: This remark of mine applies to all the Members in the House.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: What I am saying is this that I have to go through you in order to address these people on those benches. There is no other way to do it. All I am saying is, my point is a very short one.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: You can always talk.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: We can always talk. I continue to talk. But you do not talk when it is essential to talk. Then you keep quiet.

I am only saying that an unsubstantiated press report cannot be verified or substantiated unless the persons with whom that report is connected, to whom it pertains, come forward and make it clear whether it is substantiated or not, whether it is true or false. This time it is a highly serious matter because the name of the Prime Minister has been directly involved in this. We all know about Mr. Solanki's note. But we did not know this aspect of it. The other thing we do not know is the identity of that person who, I am sure, the Government knows who he is by now. But who is this great VIP whose identity has to be kept so secret who was able to read the Minister there in Davos, in Switzerland, and hand over that note to him? Are we not entitled to know? I am not asking them, through you. Should they not tell us?

It is up to them. If they prefer to go on like this, the suspicion that is being aroused in the public mind will multiply thousand-fold. That is all that will happen. If they prefer that, they are welcome to it. If they do not want to make a clean breast of it, it is up to them.

Therefore, I say it is a highly serious matter. They should be more concerned than we are because the Prime Minister's name has been brought into it. But they do not seem to be concerned at all.

So, this is all I have to say. I hope that

something fruitful will come out of this change of views here and we except that the Prime Minister himself — he is a man who can lift the veil of secrecy from all these things, if he wants to. If he does not want to, they are welcome to go on as they are doing. If they want to commit political suicide, they are welcome to do it. I cannot prevent them. But it is better, I think, in the interests of parliamentary democracy and in the interests of the nation, that the whole murky affair is cleared up once and for all.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): We have given notices for suspension of question hour. That is over. We wanted suspension of question hour. You allowed it to be killed.

Secondly, on adjournment motion, you have disallowed it.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not disallowing the discussion which you are having now.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: Third, we have motions also and it is not the question of technicality of rules. The matter is of substance. Now, we firmly realise that there is something new in what has appeared in the Press today. If you say or if anybody says that there is nothing new, I am surprised. Who of us knew that the Prime Minister had the knowledge of the note being given to the Swiss Foreign Minister? We do not know. Does anybody amongst us know that the communication that came from Switzerland to the CBI contained the same information? We never knew that. Shri Jaswant Singh has said that he knew of such a communication. It is for him to know that. **But we never knew of it. This is the new introduction of new elements in this whole affair. It has to be taken note of and has to be cleared by the Prime Minister.**

Sir, in the last debate the Prime Minister came out as a kind of hermit with no mud around him. Now, he has been muddied. Is that not the responsibility of the Prime Minister to clear the mind? The revelation is damning the Prime Minister, damning the Parliament, damning the relationship of the Government

with the Parliament, damning the country and we are not such fools sitting here to be misled by the Government spokesman. We want to know whether the facts that have come out in this form are true or not. We do not know about it. We thought that in this House we cannot take up any other matter before getting this cleared. This is a question of prestige of our country. Our country's prestige is involved in it. Sir, you may not allow a discussion. But let the Prime Minister come and make a statement. On that, if we satisfied, we take up other issues. Otherwise we have to have a dissuasion without that it will be very difficult to run this House. I am very sorry to say this. This is a question of the dignity of this House

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I regret to say that you have declined to admit the Adjournment-Motion which was presented before you. But you said that you would not like to hear any argument on this. Although it is my firm belief that we can perform the task of changing your opinion by advancing arguments before you, but we abide by your order. We shall have a discussion on it with you in your Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, when the Prime Minister presented his point of view in the House, on the 1st April, one of the sentence of his views is:

[English]

"...In fact, I do feel very strongly that what happened during the last two or three days has caused embarrassment to the Government. This embarrassment would have to be removed..."

[Translation]

Words of the Prime Minister, I would like to submit that what has appeared in today's newspaper is the same report of which the

Prime Minister had made a mention in his submission in the House saying that it has caused embarrassments. He further said:

[*English*]

"....If there has been any misunderstanding or confusion as a result of that note handed over by Mr. Solanki, that should be ignored and our position is clear..."

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, sir, now the matter has gone much beyond embarrassment since matter has been substantiated with a number of proofs, I am ready to authenticate the report of this newspaper and I am willing to our its responsibility if you allow me to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: No, No, not like this.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Because when there is the question of facts, it is always said that how should one believes the news-items.

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: I am not disallowing what you have to say on the floor of the House. I am disallowing it under certain rules.

[*Translation*]

SHRIGEROG FERNANDES: But what I am saying is that if there is a question of authentication we are ready to append our signatures to it lay in on the Table of the House as the matter is being raised here and it is being asked as to what is basis of such Press reports. But since we abide by your order, we shall not go beyond that. But today, one thing should be clarified and this is essential because two three issues have come up before us. Firstly, I am saying it with much distress that when the Prime Minister rose in the House on the 1st April and said that as soon as he came to know the newspaper reports, he felt it strongly and that there is an embarrassment and it would

have to be removed. Then Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Prime Minister had declined to place some facts in the House. The name of the lawyer instituting this case on behalf of Government of India in Switzerland is Mark Bona...(*Interruptions*) The hon. Minister of Defence may please look towards this side and listen. All this will not do. You are the Minister dealing with Bofors here. You should listen to us...(*Interruptions*). He is not listening, it is necessary to hear this. I fail to understand for whom we are speaking. Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are not merely speaking to make you listen. This is happening all the time. when the issue was raised here yesterday, four Minister were talking among themselves taking the issue as joke. Is it an empty theatre? Should they see what kind of a voice do we have and should they keep laughing and making fun. This serious matter...(*Interruptions*)..I am concerned with the Defence Minister, He is incharge of the Bofors matter.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI M.M.JACOB): We cannot cry. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: He has to listen to me. This is a serious matter. I do not want this House to be taken as some kind of a great national joke. (*Interruptions*) This House is not a national joke. I am angry. (*Interruptions*)

This House is being treated with contempt by the Government. I won't accept it..

MR. SPEAKER: Every word you say is recorded.

SHRIGEROG FERNANDES: That is another matter. But I want the Government to be attentive to what is being said from this side.

(Interruptions)

SHRI M.M.JACOB: The Ministers are listening to the speech.

SHRI GEROG FERNANDES: It is not the question of Ministers listening. I want the Defence Minister to listen to it. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJI (Dumdum): Not any Minister, but the Defence Minister and the Prime Minister. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: He is listening.

*(Interruptions)**[Translation]*

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA (South Delhi): They are feeling happy...

(Interruptions)

SHRI GEROG FERNANDES: They may feel happy. It is possible in view of what we are saying. Whatever we are saying, they may even derive happiness from this, I am denying it. whatever is going on in the Congress party right now, there is no room for discussion on that and they do not even listen. I agree to it. But the Prime Minister should give a reply, is it not right?...*(Interruptions)*....

[English]

Did you or did you not have a letter at the CBI Headquarters from Mr. Mark Bona, a note which said that your Prime Minister has sent a note to the Foreign Minister of Switzerland? The Prime Minister has sent a note to the Foreign Minister of Switzerland asking us not to go ahead with this matter. Please mark, I am saying my each word with deliberation. Did you or did you not receive a letter on the 23rd of March - I am giving you the date - at your CBI Headquarters that your country's Prime Minister has sent a note to the Swiss Foreign Minister that we do not intend to proceed seriously with this

matter? This is part (a).

Part (b) is, is it or is it not a fact that the CBI went to the Prime Minister and asked him: What shall we do about it? I would like to know what the Prime Minister said..

Is it or is it not a fact that from the 23rd March, everyone was aware here in the Government or at least showed concern or awareness in the Government that in every internal communication from one unit to the other in the Swiss Government and in the Swiss Court, the letter of the Prime Minister, the letter with imprimatur of the Prime Minister - because it was nobody's letter and it is still called a nameless, faceless person's letter - was being circulated? Did you not have information about this?

[Translation]

Even then they are not ready to say anything. We want to listen to the Prime Minister. I want to listen to him as well. I would like him to make a reply on this issue. He cannot run the Government in this manner. We are placing concrete questions before you. Today is the 22nd and the matter shall be given a hearing on the 24th ...*(Interruptions)*.. The Prime Minister had said in the House.

[English]

"All sections of the House are absolutely united in one thing: that the truth should be found out. That is how it shall be and I would like to reiterate this."

[Translation]

and he did not even stop at that juncture but added

[English]

"From now on, I propose also, as the Minister In-charge of the C.B.I., to keep myself regularly informed about the progress of the case."

[*Translation*]

Today, we would like to know.

[*English*]

What is the case?

[*Translation*]

That day, the Prime Minister stood from here, when we raised this question, he had gone to the official gallery and then came back and said there was a difference of four and a half hours between the time there and the time here. On that day, the discussion continued till 8 o' clock and I was speaking at about 7 o' clock. The Prime Minister came back and said, there is a difference of four and a half hours in the time and the message will be sent immediately. Who did send the message, did the Prime Minister send it or did any officer of the C.B.I. send it, where is the message? Are they willing to lay it on the Table of the House?

[*English*]

SHRI JASWANT SINGH(Chittorgarh): What my good friend, Shri George Fernandes dealt with is a substantial point I am not on other aspects. An assurance was given to us and to this House by the Government and the Prime Minister has said that a communication which would rectify - what am I to call Shri Solamki's behaviour as - whatever the former Minister of External Affairs did, was in fact going to be sent not by the CBI because this became a matter of discussion and that it would be sent as a communication from the Government of India. This was an assurance that was given to us. The Government itself said that this communication would be sent either from the Ministry of External Affairs, failing which, after the Prime Minister himself stood up here and said that before the four and a half hours or whatever the time difference may be, before today is out, this communication will go. My friend, Shri George Fernandes is asking who sent it and from which office did this communication go and what was the content of that communication? It is relevant

it is important to our total enquiry about the 24th of April; the Prime Minister's name etc., etc. That is my submission.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD): The information was sent on the very same day. The time was announced by the Prime Minister in the other House. As far as I remember, within two hours, the message was sent by the Foreign Ministry. And it is for the Foreign Ministry to mention the contents.

[*Translation*]

SHRI GEORGE FERNADES: Mr. Speaker Sir, it is request that the text of the letter should be placed before the House. It should be made clear also from whose side did it go and what was its content? We should like to know from the Prime Minister who had said that.

[*English*]

"As the Minister In-Charge of the C.B.I. , I propose to keep myself regularly informed about the progress of the case."

[*Translation*]

The matter is coming up on 24th and today everyone in Switzerland says that the account shall open on the 24th. Everyone may take his money and go. That means for a long time an effort had been made right from the Delhi High Court to every agency to suppress this information. There has been no difference in it.

Mr. Speaker, sir, there are two issues, on which we would like you to hold a discussion in the House. Firstly, what had been said today about the Prime Minister and secondly the information he had on the 1st of April before speaking here should be placed before the House. We want Mark Bona's Petter. We want the report of the talk held between the C.B.I. and the hon. Prime Minister to be presented in the House...(Interruptions)... Many people are

holding L.L.B. degrees. They do not practice law. They remain busy in their work. That is why it is unless to discuss as to who is a lawyer.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: The one who speaks much is a lawyer.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: It is not like that. That is why we would like the Prime Minister to clarify two-three things with sufficient proof. It is my request to you that you should give us permission to hold a discussion on this issue in the House.

[*English*]

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Gandhi Nagar): Mr. Speaker Sir, I do not want to add anything new to what my colleagues have said except referring to what the Prime Minister said the other day, on April 1st that what has happened in the past two-three days has been very embarrassing for the Government. He was referring only to the past two-three days not the Bofors issue as such. The two-three days meant Solanki episode and revelation about the Solanki episode. The Government got over that embarrassment by dropping Solankiji.

I am wondering three weeks later that today the position on the April 22nd is not merely that it is embarrassing for the Government, it is embarrassing for the whole country. The whole nation feels embarrassed by the revelations made in *The Statesman* this morning. I am still wondering that it nearly two hours since we are discussing this issue and the Prime Minister is not in the House as yet.

I remember in that very speech he even mentioned about the Solanki note and said that this note is said to be a note handed over from one individual to another and not from one Government to another. That makes it a little different. I am sure that he would appreciate that this morning's report in *The Statesman*. Either it is lie, and the Government is entitled to say that and the Prime Minister certainly is entitled to say that it is a total lie, there is no basis whatsoever in the fact that

any letter was written on the 23rd of March to the CBI telling the Government of India that the note that was handed over us, was said to be sent by the Prime Minister. This is what has been mentioned in this report. It is a damning indictment. Therefore I say that the shadow no longer is only on Shri Solanki. Because at that point of time the Prime Minister said that he knows from public experience, his long life in public affairs, that no Government can continue with a shadow on its head. Obviously he was referring to the conduct of Shri Solanki and Solankiji having been dropped, the shadow also had been removed. This was the kind of impression one got on April 1st. Today, the shadow looms large on the entire Government, including the Prime Minister, more particularly the Prime Minister.

Sir, you were telling my colleague Indrajitji that he should not guide you publicly in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Not all the time. Sometimes, yes. We will very much appreciate that.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I would also not like to. But I would very much feel that in situations of this kind the Chair also has a responsibility. I would request you to see to it that without any further delay, without any further business being taken up the Prime Minister comes to this House and makes a clean breast of the whole thing. Otherwise how can we work in Parliament? Because the shadow is now on the whole country, on the whole Parliament, embarrassment is for all of us collectively and we would like to get over this embarrassment. The Government may have thought they have got over this embarrassment by dropping Solankiji. But the former Foreign Minister of the country goes to Ahmedabad, receives a great reception there. And then ten days later when I visited Ahmedabad, on that very day I found his statement broadly published on the front pages of Gujarati newspapers that I have done my duty, I am not sorry for anything that has happened. What duty did he perform by handling over this note?

I have been watching sign-boards at various airports saying "Beware, please do not accept any packet from a stranger." These are sign-boards and here was Shri Solanki, a globe trotter ignoring that and accepting a note from an unknown lawyer. I do not believe that. It was incredible to believe it. Therefore I wrote a letter to the Prime Minister shortly after that saying that we have accepted your version of it, namely that the Government will now pursue the matter vigorously, see to it that the duty is done and the truth is fully found out. But what has appeared in the morning has shaken our confidence, has gravely embarrassed the whole Parliament, has gravely embarrassed the whole nation. I would appeal to you to intervene in the matter, ask the Prime Minister to make a clean breast of the whole thing.

[*Translation*]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN (Rosera): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the most important issue is that the Foreign Minister of Switzerland, Rene Felber has said that Foreign Minister of India has said to him that the letter had been given by the Prime Minister of India. A Foreign Minister of some other country says about the foreign Minister of India that the letter had been given by the Prime Minister, I would only like to request you to let me know whether the letter that has been given, was given by the Prime Minister of India or not? Secondly, it may also be stated whether what the Foreign Minister of that country is saying is true or not? If this is not true, the Indian Government should make a statement, because the entire thing is in record. Even this is written in that. It is not for once. Since his English was not up to the mark, he was asked for the second time whether it was correct or not. Then again said that the letter had been given by the Prime Minister and not the Foreign Minister. Then, I would only like to say that if the Foreign Minister of that country says anything wrong, the Government of India should assert that it is not correct. Because everything is in record. As per him, the C.B. had written to Swiss Police on that basis. This alone will not do. The joint **Parliamentary Committee** will

have to go there and determine all the factors. If this is true and the Foreign Minister of that country is right, then the Prime Minister will have to reveal whether the letter had been sent by him or not, and if the Prime Minister had sent it, then no one can stop him from giving his resignation, even not the God, and if the Prime Minister has not said it, then a criminal case should be started against Mr. Solanki. A mere resignation is not going to settle the case. That is why, Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a very serious issue. I shall not go into too many because all members have already spoken. The Foreign Minister of a country says about the Indian Foreign Minister that the Prime Minister had given the letter. Who is that lawyer? Is the lawyer the Prime Minister himself? It is not an ordinary thing. We would like to tell you in all seriousness that if there was ever any fit case for adjournment, there can never be a better case than this one. But you have your own ruling. That is why I would like to say that the Government should take this seriously and till there is a discussion in the house on this issue, we shall request you not to take up any other issue. You have come to know the sense of the House. We understand that you understand our feelings. The Prime Minister should come. The Prime Minister should give a reply in this regard. Then only the House should be allowed to conduct its further business. ... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI RABI RAY (Kendrapada): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to raise a question before you regarding corruption in high places. I would like to seek your guidance and that of the House on this. I seek your guidance that the matter of corruption in high places in the country should be discussed in this House. Sir, I would like to tell you one thing that all of us are grateful to Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, our former Prime Minister, for his efforts to eliminate corruption. He had made a recommendation for setting up the Santhanam Committee. As per its recommendations if ten M.L.A.S. or Members of Parliament give in writing about corruption at any place, immediate action would be taken against that and a probe would be ordered. Mr. Speaker Sir, the report of the Santhanam Committee had

come before the House through the former Prime Minister of this Government but this Government does not hold any discussion on these matters. The previous Janta Dal Government had thought about bringing forward the Lokpal Bill but before it could be introduced, the government fell. This government had not taken any steps for bringing forward the Lok Pal Bill in this Budget Session as to end corruption at the level of the ministers and the Prime Minister.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am raising this question because this question will give rise too many dangerous things that I am going to place before the house. Smells of corruption come out of them. The account holders of the A.E. Bank who are the recipients of kick backs say in the Geneva court, that the court should wait for a while, because a note was about to come from the Government of India. Now you can imagine that the recipients of the pay offs, all the big people, who are sitting in Geneva, go to the Geneva court and ask them not to deliver any verdict because a note had to come from the Government of India.

After this our foreign Minister goes to the foreign minister of Switzerland, Mr. Felber. At first I would like to know as to what was the need for the Foreign Minister of India to go to Davos with the delegation. He went there, three days before the Prime Minister went there. The meaning is clear that the matter which has come before us now in the courage of the debate in the beginning of April is that the Prime Minister knew everything about these happenings. I would not like to make any allegation against the Prime Minister here, but I would like to hold the Prime Minister responsible for this, from the way in which the Prime Minister gave a twist to the debate. He knew that time that if the Foreign Minister is made a scapegoat, the matter will be resolved.

My contention is that when these kind of things have come before us Mr. Felber himself makes a note that Mr. Solanki told him that this letter had been given by the hon'ble Prime Minister. Along with this, the officers of Switzerland, tell the C.B.I. that

such a letter had come. Then, Mr. Speaker, sir, on the 1st April the Prime Minister has deliberately misled the House about whatever he said to the people of the country and the august House. If whatever has been published in the newspaper is correct, is it not the duty of the Prime Minister to dispel the confusion which exists in the country regarding this? He should come before the House. It is his first and foremost duty that he should take the House and the people of the country into confidence regarding what has happened in connection with this issue.

I am not making any complaint here but I would only like to state very clearly that once a big scandal took place in England. It was the Profumo affair. In that, Mr. Profumo had spoken a lie in the House of Commons. The conservative party was in power at that time he was the Defense Minister. After this, meeting of the Parliamentary party of the conservative party was convened where a resolution was passed by a consensus vote and Mr. Profumo was told to appear before the House and admit his mistake for the lie he had spoken. After that, you know very well that he had to be removed from his office. The matter was proved and at the end Mr. Profumo had to go, not only from the Defense Ministry but also from politics.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, Sir, you are the protector of our rights. I am telling you that when we feel any kind of peril to parliamentary democracy and the peril is because of corruption, especially at high places, we become concerned. There has been corruption at high level in the Bofors affairs.

I would like to tell you that this corruption will not end unless we nip it in the bud. It is our duty to root out corruption. The facts that have now come to light indicate that the hon. Prime Minister was not only in the know of things but he also sent the letter through the former Minister of External Affairs. The recipients of the pay off before the Court that a letter had to come. This is a conspiracy. What the people outside will think about Parliament unless this conspiracy is unravelled here. If we set this type of

examples before the country it will not send good message. Unless everything is made clear, no discussion can take place in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: It is being discussed. There has been a discussion on it for last two hours.

SHRI RABI RAY: I want that the hon'ble Prime Minister should come here before we take up any other item. He has not yet come in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: No, that is a different matter.

SHRI RABI RAY: Let me repeat, has there been any statement today on the issue we raised about State Technology yesterday. You as well as the hon'ble Minister had said that a statement would be made. That statement has not yet come.

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: I was told by the Prime Minister that he is going to make a statement on that.

SHRI RABI RAY: Today?

MR. SPEAKER: I do not know today or tomorrow.

[*Translation*]

SHRI RABI RAY: It appears that

[*English*]

This House is taken for a ride. This House should not be taken for a ride.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I, therefore, want to say that the hon'ble Prime Minister should come in the House to solve this problem. He should make things clear before any other issue is taken into consideration. This is my humble submission to you.

13.00 hrs.

[*English*]

SHRI LOKANATH CHOUDHURY (Jagatsinghpur): Sir, the news item published in *The Statesman* has two aspects. One aspect is the involvement of the Prime Minister. The other aspect is about the investigation concerning the Bofors case. As you know Sir, in the three successive Parliaments, this House has been rocked on this issue. The country is either confused or in the entire country, people now have a suspicion with regard to the administration. If you see the development of events, even before Shri Solanki delivered the letter, the adjournment in Geneva Court was by sought the lawyer saying that the Government of India would send a message. Naturally, Government of India was not opposed to it. They were in the court and the adjournment was taken.

The second point is even after the declaration of the Prime Minister here that the case should be followed up and the matter should be brought to light, the way the CBI is handling the matter in the Delhi High Court again gives rise to suspicion. The CBI in the High Court has not dealt with the matter in a manner by which it would have over in the High Court. And I also say that the CBI is not doing this on its own. In spite of the fact that this should have been referred to the Supreme Court, especially when the judgment of the Supreme Court is there, the CBI has not gone to that point till now. So, naturally, the whole purpose behind it is to see that the frozen bank accounts are released and continue with it in the same way that they have been doing for the last 27 months.

This also reveals that the Government is consciously trying to hide this issue and to keep the whole country under suspicion.

Secondly Sir, when the Prime Minister spoke here, there was a suspicion as to how Shri Solanki could hand over such a letter. That suspicion is now confirmed by this news item that the Prime Minister has told him about it. That is what he has told the

Foreign Minister of Switzerland. The Foreign Minister of Switzerland has said, and it was on record, that the Prime Minister has said so. So, under these circumstances, is it not the responsibility of the Prime Minister to come and say that he has not done it and that he has never asked Shri Solanki to deliver the letter and that he is not a party to it? He should have done so, when this matter is unnecessarily agitating the whole country.

I warn my friends on the other side that if they do not clear up this issue, this will not only bring further political crisis in the country, but it will also create a very wrong impression among the masses of this country. People will come to believe that those who are in the administration are consciously hiding the facts. Unless truth is established, this will be something which will definitely go against our parliament as well.

SHRI SUDHIR SAWANT (Rajapur): Speaker, Sir, this hydra of Bofors has again raised its ugly head. It raised its head first time in 1989. At that time I was not linked with the politics at all. This issue was capitalised up on by the Opposition up to the hilt and result was destabilisation of the country. We have seen in June 1991, that because of this Bofors issue, they you brought the country to the brink of bankruptcy. After that everything was running smoothly. The foreign exchange reserves which they had brought down to Rs. 2000 crores crossed the mark of Rs. 16,000 crores. Thus hydra again raised its ugly head when the letter written by Shri Solanki was talked about. At that time people used to say that the real target is not Shri Solanki but the Prime Minister. I think the only reason of their saying so is to destabilise the country once again because it was running smoothly in the safe hands of the present Prime Minister.

SHRI LOKANATH CHOUDHURY: You are the de-stabilisers.

[*Translation*]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: Let the hon'ble Prime Minister come and say that it is incorrect.

SHRI SUDHIR SWAWANT: This was raised earlier also and the hon'ble Prime Minister replied to your question in detail. The same will happen today. My point is that how much time of this House you are going to waste. Today you did not allow the Question Hour to run. That day you took complete four hours. The general public are the worst suffers in it. The result is that matters which should be generally be discussed in the House are not discussed.

[*English*]

and a non-issue is being made an issue and discussed continuously. This is the cause of my concern.

Last time when the matter was discussed in the House the Prime Minister said that a shadow was cast over the Government, and that the letter written by Shri Solanki was an embarrassment to the Government, he said so because it was a fact. But today they are making conjectures; they are coming to certain inferences out of a statement which had appeared in some newspaper. My objection to this is that everytime this Bofors hydra is raised the time of the House is being taken on a non-issue when we have to discuss other important subjects like the Defence. So, I would request you to be moderate and come to our assistance so that real issues are discussed and time of the House is not taken by non-issues.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (Chandigarh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would agree with any hon. Member of the House if he was to seek your indulgence to act conscientiously as representative of the people to express our grave concern about any matter which may be a cause of embarrassment, as Advaniji said, to the country to their Government or to the Members of Parliament. But, Sir, I earnestly feel that after having heard the Prime Minister the other day we should have taken the time of the House today to raise the matter again on the basis of one news item. Sir, I am not wanting to play down any news items but I am only sharing the sentiments of Shri Sawant that if something has appeared in the news paper

today after an elaborate discussion the other day, the most prudent course for us would have been to make a representation to the Speaker; to wait for the response of the Government and then take up the matter again. Sir, it is unfortunate that when there are so many items on the List of Business for the day, we are not at all caring for it and we are just trying to pass judgment against the Government without even waiting for the Government to respond.

Sir, we know that the Secretary General of the United Nations is in the country today. The Prime Minister did not know that this news item would appear in the papers today. His programme was already made. Now, it has been told by the hon. Minister for parliamentary Affairs that the Prime Minister is coming to the House at 5.00 pm. Sir, more than two.....

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD): No.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Sir, in any case, we should have not taken up the item today. We should have waited for the Government to respond....(Interruptions)

Sir, I hope, the hon. Members would give me time to make my point.

Sir, this matter has been taken up a number of times here. It is one thing to sound rhetoric while referring to some shadows of doubt as to what the Prime Minister had said, but the impassioned speech that he made, the promise that he held out that he would look into the matter himself, left no scope of doubt to raise even a finger against the intention of the Government. And if one news item appears today, I repeat with all humility, that we should not have rushed to take the time of the House in this manner.....

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: Let the Prime Minister rush. Why is he not rushing into the House to make a statement?

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Does

he know that this news item would come up in the papers today?

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: Does he not read the newspapers?

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE (Vijayawada): MR. Speaker, Sir, I do not want to repeat what my colleagues have already brought to your kind notice. But I would like to say, with all humility, and I may be excused for saying so, that the revelations today give an impression that this Government has deliberately tried to fool on 1st April this august House which is the supreme body in our Parliamentary democracy.

Sir, it gives such an impression and in all fairness, the Government must categorically come forward to deny the news, if it is false.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would also like to bring to the notice of this Government, through you, and want a clear clarification regarding this point. My information is that on April 8, the Switzerland Government, had sought further clarification from this Government regarding Mr. Win Chadha's petition in the Delhi High Court. You are aware that no information need to have been passed about that petition at all. It is only with the sole objective to delay and stop the final judgment there that a copy of that petition and information regarding that petition was sent there. In spite of this House discussing about this issue on April 1, will now, the Government of India has not yet replied regarding that petition. I want this Government to categorically come forward with the facts.

Sir, as long as the Prime Minister does not clarify these things on that day I told that the needle of suspicion will be pointed towards him- this Government will have no moral right to continue in power. That is my humble submission.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Kishanganj): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I shall be very brief and I shall not repeat the plea that

has been made by various distinguished colleagues that the situation demands that the Prime Minister be present in the House, listen to us and remove the doubts from our minds.

MR. SPEAKER: Let it not be repeated all the time. I have said that the Secretary - General is here. He is with him.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN : I have only three brief points. I have been a diplomat and I had the honour of representing my country as an Ambassador. Sir, diplomatic etiquette demands that when a Foreign Minister meets another Foreign Minister, he is invariably accompanied by his Ambassador. Otherwise, it casts a shadow on the credibility and the status of the ambassador.

The Report says that the Minister was all by himself when he met his Swiss counterpart. May I know whether it is a fact and it is a fact why was this done? Was there something special about the occasion that the Ambassador of the country accredited to the Swiss Government had to be kept behind the *pardah*. I would like to have a categorical statement from the Government whether the Ambassador was present on that occasion or not and if he was not present, why was he not present? This is my first point.

The case is going to come up two days later in the Delhi High Court. It is a very serious matter. The proceedings in Switzerland will hinge on what happens here.

We have our Government lawyers. I would like the Government to tell us what is the brief that the Government has given to its lawyer in this case, for this hearing that is going to come on 24th April. That will tell us whether the hon. Prime Minister has fulfilled the assurance that he gave to the House.

Thirdly, I would like to draw your attention to the clarification reported to have been sought from Switzerland. Now I do not know who sought it. But I would like to know

whether it is a fact whether our lawyer in Switzerland or our Embassy in Switzerland or the Swiss Government sought clarification on this note from the Government of India or from any other authority of the Government of India including CBI on the 8th April; and whether Government of India has so far responded to that clarification or not; and if they have not responded so far, what does it make of the assurance of the Prime Minister that from now on he shall be personally in charge of the case and he shall see to it that all clouds are dispelled.

[*Translation*]

SHRI PIUS TIRKEY: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the House is supreme. The leader of the House is not merely the leader of a party; rather he is Prime Minister of the whole country. His prestige is the prestige of the whole country. A single word uttered from his mouths can make total chaos in the country. Moreover, he is the leader of the House and not the leader of the Congress Party. So it is not in keeping with the prestige of the whole country that the hon'ble Prime Minister should clandestinely send a letter through a person as had been published in the Statesman today. You are the hon. Speaker of the House (*Interruptions*). We have to accept that he is the leader and you are the speaker. We are under your protection and it causes concern when our Prime Minister and the leader of the Congress Party keeps mum. If the Statesman has published any distorted and connected report, they should be charge sheeted for that. Shri *Solanki should also deny it.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: This will not go on record.

[*Translation*]

SHRI PIUS TIRKEY: He is present here, Mr. Solanki is present here. I come

from a village. It is in colloquial language and the village people understand it. *(Interruptions)* what I mean to say is that Mr. Solanki has resigned. He used to be the External affairs, He is also present. He should also deny that he had not given any such statement to the Statesman. He can also say or let the Government say that the whole thing is baseless. The Statesman can also be charged. All the doors are open for the Government but the point is that the hon'ble Prime Minister should say something.

[*English*]

SHRI K .P. REDDAIAH YADAV (Machilipatanam): The entire country is hearing and watching the proceedings of the House. The hon. Member, Shri V.P. Singh was also the Prime Minister. During his time also these proceedings were conducted. It is not a new matter. This matter is being used as a trumpet card. When the set is not complete, they are putting this card before the Opposition. Either the Ruling Party or the Opposition does not really want to find out the truth of the Bofors case, it appears to me.

In the Eighth Lok Sabha, Members of the Opposition resigned on the Bofors issue. From Andhra Pradesh, out of 33 Telegu Desam Members of parliament, 30 were defeated by the people on the Bofors issue, when they talked about democracy and all that.

People really do not want this matter to go on, to postpone this litigation for years together, because the country's prestige is at stake in the whole world today.

*Not recorded.

So, Sir, are they really interested? I heard the last discussion on the subject and the force with which they discussed it on that day is quite different from the force that they are now using. Because of the resolution passed in the AICC session against the BJP they are now using more force and they want to argue the case before this august House.

Therefore, let them function in this manner.

This demand being made by the BJP and the Janata Dal also the people are watching. Let them be fair in demanding.

(Interruptions)

I am not saying anything. I am telling both the sides. I am accusing both the sides. I am not supporting the Congress.

The Prime Minister categorically assured the House that everything would be done in a fair manner and if something has appeared in the newspapers let the Prime Minister come and give a statement. We will hear it.

[*Translation*]

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was very much surprised to listen Shri Bensal's speech. Sir, no allegation was made against the hon. Prime Minister last time when there was a discussion about Solanki. There was no attack on the prestige of the Prime Minister at that time, but this time the hon'ble Prime Minister is put in a very embarrassing position. The hon'ble Prime Minister also holds the charge of the External Affairs Portfolio. Does he propose to send a protest letter to the Switzerland Government, if it is not true. Such a serious allegation has been published in a leading newspaper. Mr. Solanki had to resign when the allegation against him was published in a leading newspaper. Only the time will say whether the report that has been published in the newspapers today is right or wrong.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, when there was a licence scandal during the fifth Parliament and there were charges against the Ministers, the then Government had, in keeping with the Parliamentary conventions, given all the files to the hon. Speaker who in his turn had shown them to leaders of Opposition. The C.B.I. was also investigating at that time. Today the hon'ble Prime Minister is in an embarrassing position. It naturally becomes the question of prestige of the whole country. The entire nation is ashamed and we stand disgraced before the international Community. In view of this, will the

Government place all the documents before you for showing them to leaders of opposition?

[*English*]

SHRI CHITTABASU (Barasat): Sir, the revolution today in *The Statesman* has added a new dimension to this issue, because it involves directly the name of the Indian Prime Minister. It also indicates or involves the name of Mr. Felber who happens to be the Foreign Relations Minister of a friendly country. Our Prime Minister can make a statement here— I would demand it — to inform the country and the world about the truth of it.

It is stated that Mr. Felber has recorded this statement of Shri Solanki that the letter which he was handing over to his counterpart was from the Prime Minister of our country. It is reported that Mr. Felber also communicated this, after being recorded, to the Government of India.

My question is, if the Government has received such a communication from Mr. Felber, if that communication were with the Government, has the Government taken any action to say that it is false? Or has it enquired from Mr. Felber as to the circumstances which led him to make statement? This is my first question.

Secondly, I would like to know that it is reported that relatively junior officers of CBI have requested the Swedish Government about the Government's keenness regarding the pursuing of the case. why was it not communicated by the Government's representatives, particularly the Prime Minister who is in charge of the case because the CBI is under his charge? He assured the House that he will keep himself informed about this matter and take appropriate action at the earliest. Therefore, I need these two clarification to understand the background of the whole episode.

DR. KARTIKESWAR PATRA (Balasore): Sir, On one point I would like to differ with the hon. Member. There is no

difference between the earlier discussion and the present discussion. (*Interruptions*) You have also given the ruling that the matter which was discussed in the session should not be discussed in the same session again. One thing is that when the letter was handed over by Shri Solanki, the then Foreign Minister, to his counter-part at that time it was presumed that that letter was sent by the Prime Minister of India. It was presumed. But it could not be proved at that time. That is why Shri Solanki has resigned. He had resigned because he stated in this House and in Rajya Sabha that somebody handed over that letter to him and he has handed over that letter to his counter-part. That was substantiated. This time it has been stated in this news item that the Foreign Minister of Swiss Government stated that the letter which was handed over by Shri Solanki to him was handed over to Shri Solanki by the Prime Minister. That has been recorded. Shri Solanki is now the hon. Member of the other House. The hon. Prime Minister has also agreed to come forward with a statement. That is why there is no clear denial in this House about discussing this matter. Everybody is serious on this issue. The hon. Members of Opposition parties are very much serious. But there is no seriousness in this matter. This cannot be discussed when the hon. Prime Minister has agreed to make statement in this House. That is my submission.

SHRI GUMAN MAL LODHA (Pali): Sir, I want to make one submission. 24th April is the date fixed in the High Court. We have the experience of Chawla judgment wherein he quashed the F.I.R. saying that no case is made out. I had earlier also requested that the Government should take up under Article 139 (A) of the Constitution and make an application to the Supreme Court and get the case transferred there. Would the Government take steps immediately in this regard? Otherwise we are leading towards a great disaster. The whole debate would become meaningless once the High Court quashes the order, as was done earlier. There is a conspicuous silence on the part of the treasury benches on this aspect of the matter. So, I would like to tell them that let them move an application right today to the

hon. Supreme Court under Article 139 (A) for talking the case to Supreme Court. This is the most important point.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I wish to make a submission. You head a lot of points. Various hon. Members have had their say. There are various continuing aspects about the enquiry into the Bofors scandal and at the top of that is the shadow caused about the allegations of the Prime Minister's own involvement. We understand that the Prime Minister is, at the moment, pre-occupied with other affairs of State. The hon. Minister of Defence and the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs are here. A categorical statement is, nevertheless, merited from the Government to say - firstly so far as the Prime Minister's name is concerned it is not important.

Thereafter, all the various other things that have been raised like the suggestion given on legal matter by my good friend, Shri Guman Lal Lodha and other points that Shri George and also Shri Shahabuddin had raised, those can subsequently be answered by the Prime Minister himself coming here and satisfying the House. But this one thing from the Government is needed now that the Prime Minister was not involved. And Solanki etc. are all subsequent matters because Solanki has obviously stated an untruth then. Why not both speak the truth? And then consequences will follow. (*Interruptions*). Therefore, let the Government now say..... (*Interruptions*). This is the way out. We can well understand the Prime Minister's preoccupations with other matters of State. There are two senior Ministers in the Government, let them stand up and say that the Prime Minister is not involved. On all other aspects the Prime Minister will come at the earliest opportunity.

SHRI E. AHAMED (Manjeri): Sir, these people are demanding a statement from the Prime Minister. We all want that statement from the Prime Minister categorically. We agree with that. But now they change their stand and are asking for a statement from the Ministers here., Let the Prime Minister

come and make the statement.

(*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have been discussing this issue inside the House..... (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: You will also be involved. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: If I am involved, you will also be involved, you are with me and I share everything with you. If he talks about anything secret, he will definitely be implicated.

[*English*]

Sir, we have discussed this issue inside this House for the past five years on a number of occasions. Two Parliament elections have been fought on this issue. I am just saying only one word. I will come to that. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

You people spoke for two hours and when we speak for one minute from the Government's side, it trouble you people. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

No, no. This is very bad and we had the patience to hear you for two hours, you must also have the patience to hear us.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (Bankura): But that should be relevant.

SHRI RAM NAIK (Bombay North): You only said. 'one minute' (*Interruptions*)

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: Sir, two Parliament elections have already been fought on this issue and this issue generated a lot of heat both inside and outside this

House. And what was the ultimate result? The previous Government spent crores and crores of rupees as far as the investigation of this case is concerned.

Sir, very recently this issue was discussed at length in both the Houses. The outgoing Foreign Minister made a statement and subsequently the hon. Prime Minister replied to the debate on the floor of both Houses. I would like to mention here that a mention was made that hon. friends have not heard anything so far of what the hon. Prime Minister had promised here with regard to the message which was supposed to be from the Government of India to the Swiss Government. As I have already mentioned that immediately after the hon. Prime Minister replied to the debate in the other House, within two hours the Government of India passed on the message to the Swiss Government.

SHRICHITTABASU (Basarat): We sent that message? (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please.. If you mark the words, you will understand. He says, "the Government of India".

SHRIGHULAM NABI AZAD: So, it is not true that we were sleeping over the matter. The Prime Minister as in this speech fulfilled his commitment within the shortest span of time — I think two hours is too small a time for the Government of India to respond to an issue like this.

Sir, we do not have to hide anything. We have said it on a number of occasions when we were in power during Rajiv's time. No less than Rajivji made it clear on the floor of this House. Subsequently, the present Prime Minister had also made it clear in this House and in the other House. Even today, we are very clear on this subject. We do not have anything to hide as far as this Bofors issue is concerned. (*Interruptions*) You have sought that the hon. Prime Minister himself should come before this House.. This Prime Minister will come before this House tomorrow. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA: He should

come today itself, not tomorrow.

SHRIGULAM NABI AZAD: It is not that whenever you think, the Prime Minister should come. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister is replying to a debate which has taken place for almost two-and-a-half hours. You at least hear him for five minutes.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: Sir, whatever clarification's, the hon. Members have sought (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): Sir, it is very insulting to say that the Prime Minister will come tomorrow.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRISRIKANT JENA (Cuttack): Do not take this House for a ride. (*Interruptions*)

SHRIGULAM NABI AZAD: When I say that he will come to this House tomorrow that does not mean that he cannot come today. The Prime Minister will reply to the clarifications sought here. It may be in the form which you wanted or in the form of intervention in this discussion on the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs. If you want a separate statement, the Prime Minister is ready to come with a statement also, but tomorrow. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: He should come to the House right now. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA: He should come to the House right now. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Sir, I do not know whether the Government realises the implications of this kind of a statement that has been made by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. A public allegation has been made in a prominent newspaper of this morning on the basis of certain documents cited, which have been echoed here by various sections of the House and today, the Government has not even contradicted it. The Defence Minister who is in-charge of the Bofors investigation is present

in the House and in his presence, the Government spokesman stands up to say that whatever has to be said on this subject will be said by the Prime Minister tomorrow. The Government has, by taking this stand, condemned itself. What are the implications of this? My implication is that you are condemning your own Government even today. Therefore as my colleague suggested to you, the details may be brought out by the Prime Minister. But the essential fact is whether Mr. Solanki, when he handed over that note to his counterpart in Switzerland, had the approval, implied or expressed, of the Prime Minister. This is the crucial point. If you have said today that Mr. Solanki handed over this note, as the Prime Minister himself said, as an individual to another individual and it had no sanction from the Prime Minister, if this statement had been made, it would have been one thing. Why are you not willing to say even that? I am extremely sorry that this Government has condemned itself, has condemned the Prime Minister and kept silence on this.

We are not going to suffer this kind of attitude. Parliament cannot be reduced to a non-entity altogether. Right from 11 O' clock till about 2 O' clock, for the last three hours, in Parliament, we have been asking clarifications on this one point, whether the Prime Minister

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: This clarification is politically motivated and mischievous. *(Interruptions)*

13.41 hrs.

At this stage, Shri Lal K. Advani and some other hon. Members left the House.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I am not walking out. I want the Government to come out. I will not allow the Government to carry on its business. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA: The Minister should withdraw his statement about "Politically motivated". *(Interruptions)*

You adjourn the House till tomorrow.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: The House stands adjourned to met again at 3 O' clock.

13.42 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned for Lunch till Fifteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha reassembled after Lunch at Fifteen of the Clock

(MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair)

15.00 hrs.

[Translation]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA (South Delhi): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, please ask the Prime Minister to come to the House and the House may be adjourned till the Prime Minister arrive here. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN (Roser): When Mr. Speaker, was in the chair, we demanded that Prime Minister may be asked to come here and if the Prime Minister does not come to the House on such an important occasion, you may adjourn the House. *(Interruptions)*

15.02 hrs.

At this stage, Shri Basu Deb Acharia and some other hon. Members came to the well of the House.

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: Prime Minister's name is mentioned here, therefore he should present himself. Please adjourn the House. *(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House stands adjourned till Four O' clock.

15.04 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Sixteen of the Clock

16.00 hrs.

[English]

The Lok Sabha reassembled at Sixteen of the Clock

(MR. SPEAKER *in the chair*)

SHRI RAIM VILAS PASWAN (Rosera): Mr. Speaker, 'Sir, we have been demanding right since the question hour at 11.00 a.m. that the Prime Minister should clarify the position regarding the reference of this name in the today's newspaper 'Statesman' and in the context it has been mentioned, The External Affairs Minister of the Swiss Government has stated that the note delivered by the External Affairs Minister of India was given by the Prime Minister. About this note, I have already stated in the morning that there may be four types of presumptions either the news published in the newspaper can be wrong and if the news published in the newspaper is correct, then the Government should contradict the statement of the Swiss External Affairs Minister that the Indian External Affairs Minister has mentioned the name of the Prime Minister and specifically refute the allegations levelled by the Swiss External Affairs Minister who has stated that it is not only on record, but he has chanced it for the second time and all these reports have been passed on to C.B.I. Prime Minister's prestige and the dignity of the country is associated with it. The Prime Minister is not the Prime Minister of the Congress alone, he is the Prime Minister of the whole country and as well as the leader of the House. Therefore, we had demanded that it might be announced in the House itself that the Prime Minister was in no way a party to the note, as he was having no information of the note because of which Shri Solanki had to quit his office. The Prime Minister should give a statement in the House tomorrow and following the statement, if the hon. Members may express some apprehensions, they should be allowed to seek clarifications. But at least, today the Government should definitely issue a statement that the Prime Minister was neither involved in any way, nor was there his approval at all in this matter and he had no such information. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: In this House the rule is, when the Speaker stands Shri Acharia does not sit and when Shri Acharia stands, the Speaker sits. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (Bankura): ... at least the Government should clarify the position. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Please let me say something. After I say something of you are not satisfied, you can say.

[Translation]

I have discussed the matter today with the Leaders of all the parties in the House, and as Shri Paswan has just now said that everybody in the House is agreed to it. Therefore, I allow Shri Ghulam Nabi Azad or anybody else who wants to speak anything on behalf of the Government can express his views. As was said in the beginning by Shri Jaswant Singh, and yesterday we were told that the Prime Minister would make a statement in the House and if anything follows, only one Member of each party will speak on behalf of his own party. Thereafter the Prime Minister will reply. I will see under which law and rules it can be done.

[English]

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD): Mr. Speaker, Sir, let me reiterate what I had said earlier that the Prime Minister will either make a separate statement tomorrow in this regard or while replying to the discussion on the Demands for Grants of the External Affairs Ministry.... *(Interruptions)*

This is the problem. *(Interruptions)*

NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (Dumdum): We want a statement. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: Separate statement - all right, I had said two. One of you could have said this. I had already said before noon also that either of the two. But

since you are insisting on a statement, it is a statement. We do not have any objection. Where is the question for crying about it? As far as my friend, Shri Ram Vilas Paswan is concerned, whatever queries he is wanting, we do not have any objection. And let me be very clear that the Prime Minister, Shri Narasimha Rao had no knowledge of the note handed over by the then Foreign Minister of India, Shri Madhavasinh Solanki to Mr. Felber.

MR. SPEAKER: Now we shall take up papers to be laid on the Table.

16.00 hrs.

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

Detailed Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Urban Development for 1992-93

THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Detailed Demands for Grants (Hindi and English versions) of the Ministry of Urban Development for the year 1992-93. [Placed in Library. See No. L.T- 1804/92]

Detailed Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Power and Non-conventional Energy Sources for the year 1992-93.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF POWER AND NON-CONVENTIONAL ENERGY SOURCES (SHRI KALP NATH RAI): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Detailed Demands for Grants (Hindi and English versions) of the Ministry of Power and Non-Conventional Energy Sources for the year 1992-93. [Placed in Library. See No. L.T. - 1805/92]

Annual Report, Annual Accounts and Review on the working of Sree Chitra Tirunal Institute for Medical Sciences and Technology, Trivandrum, for 1990-91 and Statement for delay in laying these papers.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRIRANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM): On behalf of Shrimati Margaret Alva: I beg to lay on the Table —

(1) (i) A copy of the Annual Report (Hindi and English versions) of the Sree Chitra Tirunal Institute for Medical Sciences and Technology, Trivandrum, for the year 1990-91.

(ii) A copy of the Annual Accounts (Hindi and English versions) of the Sree Chitra Tirunal Institute for Medical sciences and Technology, Trivandrum, for the year 1990-91 together with Audit Report thereon.

(iii) A statement (Hindi and English versions) regarding Review by the Government on the working of the Sree Chitra Tirunal Institute for Medical Sciences and Technology, Trivandrum, for year 1990-91.

(2) A statement (Hindi and English versions) showing reasons for delay in laying the papers mentioned at (1) above. [Placed in Library. See No, LT - 1806/92]

(3) (i) A copy of the Annual Report (Hindi and English versions) of the Satyendra Nath Bose National Centre for Basic Sciences, Calcutta, for the year 1990- 91 alongwith Audited Accounts.

(ii) A statement (Hindi and English versions) regarding Review by the Government on the working of the