

[Shri Satya Prakash Malaviya] A copy of the Report has been placed in the Library. Fortunately, the Home Minister is present here, and the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs is also present here. I want to know whether this Report is going to be laid on the Table of this House or not because earlier the Leader of the House has given an assurance that he was not ruling out the possibility of its being laid.

उपसभापति : यह तो लायब्रेरी रखा है।

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय : महोदय इसको हाउस में ले करना है।

उपसभापति : इस बारे में हो मिनिस्टर साहब जबाब दे रहे हैं।

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: My point is whether it will be laid on the Table of the House or not.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI S. B. CHAVAN): There was an understanding between all the leaders that a copy of the Report should be placed in the Library instead of being placed on the Table of the House and that copies of it should be circulated. That we have done already.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA (Rajasthan): We want to know whether we can discuss it in the House or not. We are not concerned with the technicality of placing it in the library. Now that it is a public document, because it has been placed in the Library. We want to know from the Government whether the Government has any objection to discussing it. The BJP has no objection to discuss it. Others have no objection to discuss it.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: There is no question of any party having objec-

tion or no objection. When the matter is before the Supreme Court, it is a matter *sub judice*. Contempt proceedings are going on. So, it will not be advisable to discuss the Report before the matter is disposed of by the Supreme Court.

श्री राम नरेश यादव : (उत्तर प्रदेश) : महोदय, मुझ निवेदन करना है कि... (व्यवधान)।

उपसभापति : मैंने आपसे कहा कि बहुत से स्पेशल मेंशनस हैं। बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी ने यह निर्णय लिया था, गुलाम नबी आजाद जी भी उसमें थे, कि बोफोर्स का इस बार बार इस हाउस में उठता है। आज फिर जयपाल रेड्डी जी ने चेयरमैन साहब को चिट्ठी लिखी है और यह तय हुआ कि जो पोलिटिकल पार्टियाँ हैं, ग्रुप्स हैं, उनको दो-दो, तीन-तीन या पाँच-पाँच मिनट से ज्यादा न दिए जायें। इसलिए इस पर आप कुछ कहें। अब जयपाल रेड्डी जी आप जरा संक्षेप में कहें।

श्री प्रमोद भूषाः (महाराष्ट्र) : बाकी स्पेशल मेंशनस कब होंगे ?

उपसभापति : उसके बाद ही ले लेंगे। इसमें आप जितनी जल्दी करेंगे तो बाकी 36 लोगों की जो समस्याएँ हैं उनका भी समाधान हो जाएगा।

Apart from the Bofors there are other issues which the Members have raised. So, if everybody takes less time we can dispose of a lot of business. Only two days are left.

MATTER RAISED WITH PERMISSION— BOFORS INVESTIGATIONS

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY): I must at the outset confess candidly that we cannot take any credit for the longevity or irrepressibility of the Bofors scandal. The credit, if any, should go entirely to the mighty

masked men operating both within the country and outside to scuttle and sabotage the Bofors investigations both at the national level and at the global level. The mystery of Bofors would have been perhaps by now unravelled if the perverse litigation started in early 1991 in the Court of Justice Chawla was nipped in the bud. Today we are once again discussing it. Why? A few weeks back we had to discuss it because Mr. Solanki admitted, to having delivered a memorandum to his counterpart in Switzerland. We would not have been discussing it today but for the Sphinx-like silence of the Prime Minister in regard to many missing links and yawning gaps in the Bofors story and but for the silent protection given to Mr. Solanki for his admitted guilt. The studied silence of the Prime Minister and the advertent absence of Mr. Solanki in the House today he speak volume of the thickening clouds of suspicion and the unfolding layers of mystery. I am tempted to quote the great Italian Poet Dante, who said;

The hottest places in hell are reserved
for those who are strictly neutral in a
moral crisis.

This is a moral crisis of the first magnitude. I regret to note the Prime Minister is being perceived as being strictly neutral between discharge of his Constitutional duty and dereliction of his Constitutional duty. We discussed this issue on 2nd April. At that time the Government withheld many facts from us. The most important fact withheld from us was that a letter was received by the CBI on the 24th March from its own counsel Mr. Mark Bonnant. If this was mentioned to us on that day we wouldn't have been discussing the issue today at all. We wouldn't have known about it if the *Stateman* did not break the story. In that case, Mr. Solanki would still have been our distinguished Foreign Minister.

The Prime Minister said that he had directed the CBI on the 25th March itself that a communication should be sent to the CBI's counsel, Mr. Mark Bonnant and the Government of Switzerland, clarifying the Prime Minister's position. But the communication sent by the CBI on the 26th March does not refer to the Prime Minister at all. How is this contradiction resolved? (Time bell rings)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will you please now be extremely brief? I have got only one minute out of five minutes.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: No, Madam. If the *Indian Express* did not carry the story on the 29th March about Mr. Solanki's note I would like to know whether Mr. Solanki would have been obliged to come before the House and express his regrets and then resign. According to the *Indian Express* Mr. Solanki denied any knowledge of this note on the 25th March. According to the *Indian Express*... again,

SHRI SURESH KALMADI (Maharashtra): Nothing new, all old news.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Everything is old for you.

Mr. Solanki denied any knowledge of this note to his Cabinet colleagues as late as on 29th March. How did Mr. Solanki come and make a confession about this note on the 30th of March? What did Mr. Solanki tell the Prime Minister between the 25th March and the 29th March? Why is the Prime Minister prevaricating so much about this crucial period?

Now I come to the question of identity of the lawyer. If Mr. Sivasubramanian's picture could be computerised, I think, the picture of the so-called lawyer, who is being referred to by Mr. Solanki, could also be drawn if only Mr. Solanki cooperates. I would like to know whether Mr. Solanki has been questioned by the

[Shri Jaipal Reddy] CBI in this regard. If Mr. Solanki does not cooperate, why does the Government not launch prosecution against Mr. Solanki?

Madam, I wish to draw the attention of the Government to the real danger of defreezing of all the ac. counts. As we all know, SIX accounts have been frozen. Even now attempts of sabotage are going on. There Was a hearing fixed on the 24th April in the Delhi High Court but for mysterious reasons, the hearing has been postponed to 25th May. I would like to know what role our counsel, Mr. Altaf Ahmed played in getting this hearing adjourned. Is this not a part of the process of sabotage? I would only like to say that through these sins of omissions and commissions, the Government has projected an impression of being vulnerable to the blackmail of Mr. Solanki. When I am referring to the Government, I am referring to the head of the Government as well.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude, Mr. Jaipal Reddy.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: I would only appeal to the Prime Minister not to develop Kama's complex and sacrifice his reputation for the modern-day Duryodanas. I would like to warn the Government that the nemesis of truth will overtake the Government and if the Government does not honestly stick to the line of investigation and does not come out with all the facts, the days of this Government are also being numbered.

उपसभापति : सिकन्दर बख्त साहब, मेहरबानी परमा कर आप अगर पांच मिनट के दायरे के अन्दर अपनी तफरीर को महसूस रखें तो मैं आपकी बहुत अहसानमंद रहूंगी।

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त (मध्य प्रदेश) :
सदर साहेबा, मैं भी अहसानमंद रहूंगा अगर देखल कम से कम हो।

شری سکندر بخت: میرا صاحبہ میں بھی
احسان مند رہوں گا اگر دیکھل کم سے کم ہو۔

उपसभापति : मेरे हाथ बंधे हैं इसलिए कल भी मैंने कहा था कि मुझ को हाऊस में और भी काम हैं। इसलिए इस मामले को (व्यवधान)

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : मैं तो तसलीम कर रहा हूँ किबला।

شری سکندر بخت: میں تو تسلیم کر رہا ہوں۔ قبلہ۔

I am not getting up to score any points But the whose situation is so painful and so sickening that there is an urgent need of coming clean and with

सदर साहेबा, यह सिलसिला 1987 से चल रहा है। बहुत तारीक साए हिन्दुस्तान पर है। साए मुसलसल अपनी जगह पर कायम हैं। वक्तों के बाद नये बाव शामिल हो जाते हैं इस अफसाने में। जो पर्दे हैं वह उठने तो हैं नहीं, नये पर्दे और पड़ जाने हैं। सीलकी साहब तथरीफ ले

[Transliteration in Arabic Script.]

गये मैं डेवोम में। मासूमियत की हद है कि एक अनजाने यादनी से उन्होंने एक कागज लिया और अपने स्विस् काउंटरपार्ट को दे दिया। एक नया बाब इस तकलीफदेह अफसाने में उभरा इजाफा हुआ। नया बाब इम्बेरेसिंग बाब जिसे कि प्राइममिनिस्टर ने भी तसलीम किया कि यह सब कुछ वाक्या जो डेवोस में हुआ यह हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार के लिए इम्बेरेसिंग है। सदर साहेबा, जैसे मैंने प्रजें किया, मैं कोई प्वाइंट स्कोर करने की कोशिश नहीं कर रहा हूँ लेकिन क्या वाकई यह उम्मीद की जाती है लोगों से कि इसको तसलीम कर लें कि न तो सीलंकी साहब ने वह नोट देखा और न उसकी कोई नकल रखी और जिन साहेबान ने वह नोट उनको दिया था उनकी पहचान न कल उनके सामने थी और न आज उनकी पहचान सामने आई है, हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों के सामने लाई गई है। प्रश्न क्या कहा जा सकता है। यह हाल, सीलंकी, साहब को खबरी या बाबखबरी की सच्चा मिल गई। तहकीकात को लम्बा करने की कहानी है। उसका जिक्र जयपाल रेड्डी साहब ने किया है। मैं उन तारीखों में नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ, एक लम्बी कहानी है पेटीशंस की, अदालतों में वकीलों को बदलने की। जिन करेक्टर्ज के नाम हैं, किन किन लोगों ने पेटीशंस दाखिल की है और लम्बा किया है उन सब तारीखों में मैं नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ। जयपाल रेड्डी साहब ने बहुत कुछ कह दिया है। लेकिन मैं यह जानना चाहूँगा कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने एक बात और कही थी, एक मामूली सी बात कि हम इस कागज के मिलसिले में कि कैसे पास आन हुआ सीलंकी साहब को, हम इसकी इन्क्वायरी करेंगे और जल्दी में जल्दी हिन्दुस्तान के सामने इसमें मुत्तालिक वाक्यात भी आएंगे। यह बात पहली अप्रैल को प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने फरमाई थी। डेढ़ महीना

(समय की घटी) हजुरेवाला, मैं बहुत जल्दी खत्म करूँगा। आप घंटी त बजाएं, ये बहुत जल्दी खत्म कर रहा हूँ।

उपसभापति : आप अपनी ड्यूटी निभा रहे हैं और मैं अपनी ड्यूटी निभा रही हूँ।

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : आप घंटी नहीं बजायेंगे तो वक्त दब जाएगा। मैं तो बहुत एहतियात से बोल रहा हूँ, मैंने कोई सिपासी तानाबाना खींचने की कोशिश नहीं की है। मैं सिर्फ यह कह रहा हूँ कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब के कहने के बाद भी एक मामूली सी चीज के लिए डेढ़ महीना गुजर गया और हमें मालूम नहीं कि जिसके लिए प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने आनन्द फ्लोर आफ द हाऊस कहा कि हम बहुत जल्द इसके असल वाक्यात लेकर हाउस के सामने आएंगे। नहीं तशरीफ लाए हैं। एक और मिनिस्टर साहब ने भी बात कही थी कि हम कमिटेड हैं कि हम सच्चाइयों को गहराई तक पहुँच जाएं। यह भी बात सही हुए अब एक अर्सा हो गया है लेकिन साथ में उन्होंने एक बहुत मोटी ताजी "लेकिन" लगा दी। लेकिन हम कानून के रास्ते से चलकर सच्चाइयों को सामने लाने की कोशिश करेंगे और कानून के रास्ते किस कदर टेढ़े हो चुके हैं वह 1987 से लेकर अब तक की कहानी साबित कर सकती है। मुझे अफसोस है कि इस किस्म की जिम्मेदारी के साथ बात करने के बाद भी इस किस्म की "लेकिन" जोड़े जाने का मतलब यह है कि सिर्फ पदें डाले जाएं। सच्चाई को बेनकाब करने की कोशिश की जगह पदें डाले जा रहे हैं। तस्वीरें ऐसी हैं मंडम कि अच्छी खासी मिलीभगत की कहानी है। किसकी तरफ से पिटीशन

[श्री सिकन्दर वक्त]

आई, कौन साहब आए, कौन वकील बदले गये, वगैरह वगैरह । जरा एक तस्वीर मुलाहिजा फरमाइये । 1987 से बोफोर्स की तोपों के सिलसिले में इल्जमात लगे, लेकिन पोजीशन ब्राज तक साफ नहीं । एक साल में स्वीडन की सरकार ने इन्क्वायरी रोक देने की बात कही, यह कहकर, यह इल्जाम हिंदुस्तान पर लगाकर कि हिंदुस्तान की सरकार रिस्पांस नहीं दे रही है ।

स्विस बैंक में 6 अकाउंट प्रोजन हैं । कोशिश यह है कि डीफीज किये जाए । पिछली दफा जब इस हाउस में बहस हुई थी जिसमें तीन मिनिस्टर साहबान ने जवाब दिया था तो मैंने एक गुजारिश की थी कि स्वीडन के आडिट ब्यूरो में इस चीज को तस्लीम कर लिया गया है कि 63 करोड़ रुपये पे आफूस के तीर पर—नाम कुछ भी ले लीजिए, पे आफ कहिए, कमीशन कहिए, आइवरी कहिए, कुछ कहिए, एनी थिंग—लिये गये । उसको तस्लीम कर लेने के बाद भी जो मैंने गुजारिश की थी जब बहस यहां इस हाउस में हो रही थी कि स्वीडन के आडिट ब्यूरो के इस इल्जाम का स्टेटस क्या है उस बहस में तो तीन मिनिस्टर्स ने जवाब दिया लेकिन किसी एक मिनिस्टर ने उस बात का जवाब नहीं दिया ।

नेट्रेस्ट तस्वीर क्या है । अखबार में खबर आती है तो हिंदुस्तान का प्राइम मिनिस्टर रिएक्ट करता है । इससे पहले हफ्ता दस रोज तक तस्वीर अगर खींची जाती है तो लगेगा ये आती हमले हो रहे हैं । मैं जाती हमले नहीं करना

चाहता हूँ । लेकिन बात हिंदुस्तान के इल्म में आ चुकी थी । पर उस वक्त एक हिंदुस्तान के लोगों को कान्फीडेंस में नहीं लिया गया जब तक अखबारात में इस सिलसिले को खोला नहीं गया । सिग्नीफिकेंट बातें ये हैं ।

जिफ्र किया 24 मार्च के फैक्स... (समय का बंदी) के मेसेज का हमारे साथी ने । यह भी कहा गया कि कहीं बीच में कि स्विस बैंक के अंदर कुछ एक्स्प्लोसिव डाक्यूमेंट्स हैं । लेकिन हर चीज पर पर्दा डाला हुआ है । इन तमाम बातों के पश्चेनजर मेरे कुछ मुताल्लिख सरकार से है । जो लोग इन्क्वायरी के रास्ते में रुकावट डाल रहे हैं उन्हें बेनकाब किया जाए । अब तक जो हकीकतें सामने आ चुकी हैं उनकी रोशनी में सरकार अपनी जिम्मेदारियां कबूल करे ।

अगली बात सोलंकी के अफसाने के मुताल्लिक है । प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा था कि स्विस गवर्नमेंट से नोट हासिल किया जाएगा । वह अब क्या हुआ । इसके कन्टेंट्स क्या हैं । इस नोट को देने वाला कौन था । कोई बजह नहीं कि इसका पता नहीं चलाया जा सका हो । इस नोट को तैयार करने और वहां तक पहुंचाने की साजिश के पीछे कौन कौन लोग हैं । सरकार मेहरबानी करके इन बातों का जवाब दे । मेरी गुजारिश दुबारा से है कि इस किस्से को साफ किया जाए । बहुत अंधेरा छा चुका है, बहुत बदनामी हो चुकी है, बरसों इसके अंदर लगा दिये गये हैं । रोजाना एक नयी बात के इजाफे के बावजूद मेरी सरकार से दरखास्त होगी

صدر صاحبہ۔ یہ سلسلہ ۱۹۸۷ء سے چل رہا ہے۔
بے حد تاریک سائے ہندوستان پر ہیں۔
سائے مسلسل اپنی جگہ پر قائم ہیں۔ وقفوں
کے بعد نئے باب شامل ہو جاتے ہیں۔ اس
افسانے میں جو پردے ہیں وہ اٹھتے تو
ہیں نہیں۔ نئے پردے اور بڑ جاتے ہیں۔
سولنکی صاحبہ۔ تشریف لے گئے تھے۔
ڈیوڈس میں۔ معصومیت کی حد ہے کہ
ایک انجانے آدمی سے انہوں نے ایک کاغذ
لیا اور اپنے سوتس کا ڈنٹر پارٹ کو دیدیا۔
ایک نیا باب اس تکلیف دہ افسانے میں
اس کا اضافہ ہوا۔ نیا باب امبرینگ باب
جس کو کہ پرائم منسٹر نے بھی تسلیم کیا کہ یہ
سب کچھ واقعہ جو ڈیوڈس میں ہوا یہ ہندوستان
کی سرکار کے لیے امبرینگ ہے۔ صدر صاحبہ
جیسے میں نے عرض کیا۔ میں کوئی پوائنٹ
اسکور کرنے کی کوشش نہیں کر رہا ہوں۔
لیکن کیا واقعی یہ امید کی جاتی ہے لوگوں
سے کہ وہ اسکو تسلیم کر لیں۔ کہ وہ نہ تو
سولنکی صاحبہ نے وہ نوٹ دیکھا اور نہ
اس کی کوئی نقل رکھی اور جن صاحبان
نے وہ نوٹ ان کو دیا تھا انکی پہچان نہ
کل انکے سامنے تھی اور نہ آج انکی پہچان
سلنے آئی ہے۔ ہندوستان کے لوگوں کے
سامنے لائی گئی ہے۔ اب کیا کہا جاسکتا ہے۔

بہر حال سولنکی صاحبہ کو بے خبری یا
باخبری کی سزا مل گئی۔ تحقیقات کو لمبا
کرنے کی کہانی ہے۔ اس کا ذکر جے پال
ریڈی صاحب نے کیا ہے۔ میں ان
تاریخوں میں نہیں جانا چاہتا ہوں ایک
بہی کہانی ہے۔ پیشنس کی۔ عدالتوں میں
وکیلوں کو بدلنے کی۔ جن کریکٹرز کے نام
ہیں۔ کن کن لوگوں نے پیشنس داخل
کی ہے اور لمبا کیا ہے ان سب تاریخوں
میں میں نہیں جانا چاہتا ہوں۔ جے پال
ریڈی صاحب نے بہت کچھ کہہ دیا ہے۔
لیکن میں جانا چاہوں گا کہ پرائم منسٹر
نے ایک بات اور کہی تھی ایک معمولی سی
بات کہ ہم اس کاغذ کے سلسلے میں کہ
پاس آن کیسے ہوا سولنکی صاحبہ کو۔
ہم اس کی انکوائری کریں گے اور جلدی
سے ہندوستان کے سامنے اس سے
متعلق واقعات بھی آئیں گے۔ یہ بات
پہلی اپریل کو پرائم منسٹر صاحب نے
فرمائی تھی۔ ڈیڑھ مہینہ وقت کی گھنٹی
حضور والا۔ میں بہت جلدی ختم کرونگا۔
آپ گھنٹی نہ بجائیں۔ میں بہت جلدی
ختم کر رہا ہوں۔
آپ سب جانتی: آپ اپنی ڈیوٹی نبھار رہے
ہیں۔ اور میں اپنی ڈیوٹی نبھار رہی ہوں۔

شری سکندر بخت: آپ گھنٹی نہیں بجا سکتے
تو وقت تک جاتے گا۔

میں تو بہت احتیاط رہا ہوں۔ یہ یوں رہا ہوں۔
میں نے کوئی سیاسی ٹانہ مارنا کھینچنے کی کوشش
نہیں کی۔ یہ میں صرف یہ کہہ رہا ہوں کہ
براہم مندر صاحب کے کہنے کے بعد بھی ایک
ممبر کی موجودگی کے لیے ڈیڑھ جہیز گزر گیا
اور اس کا نام نہیں کہ جس کے لیے براہم مندر
نے ان کی بی بی خاور آف دی ہاؤس کہا کہ ہم
جس جگہ اس کے اصل واقعات لے کر
ہائوس کے سامنے آئیں گے۔ نہیں تشریف
لے سکتے ہیں۔ ایک امیر مندر صاحب نے بھی
بات کی تھی کہ ہم کمیٹی میں کہ ہم سچائیوں
کا کوئی ایک نہیں پہنچ جاتیں۔ یہ کئی بات
کہ جس کو کہ اب ایک خرچہ ہو گیا ہے لیکن
ساتھ ساتھ انہوں نے ایک بہت موثر تازی
"کس" لکھی۔ لیکن ہم ان کے راستے
پر چل رہے ہیں۔ ان کو سامنے لانے کی کوشش
کر رہے ہیں۔ اور ان کے راستے کس پر ڈیڑھ
لڑ رہے ہیں۔ وہ ۱۹۸۷ سے لیکر اب
تک کی کتابت کر رہے ہیں۔ مجھے انہوں
نے کہ اس قسم کی ذمہ داری کے ساتھ بات
کرنے کے بعد بھی اس قسم کی دیکھ بھڑنے
جانے کا مطالبہ نہ ہے کہ صرف پردہ ہے
ڈاکٹر صاحب، سچائی کے لیے نقاب کرنے

کی کوشش کی جگہ پردہ ڈالے جا رہے
ہیں۔ تصویریں ایسی ہیں میٹم کہ ابھی
خاصی ملی بھگت کی کمائی ہے۔ کس کی
طرف سے پیش کش آئی۔ کون صاحب کہے۔
کون ذکیل بدے گئے۔ وغیرہ وغیرہ۔
ذرا ایک تصویر براہم مندر صاحب کے ۱۹۸۷
سے بوفورس کی تصویر کے سلسلہ میں
الزامات لگے۔ لیکن پوزیشن آج بھی
صاف نہیں ہے۔ ایک سال یا دو سال
کی گورنمنٹ نے انکوائری روک دینی
کی بات کی۔ یہ کہ کر یہ الزام ہندوستان
پر لگا کہ کہ ہندوستان کی مندر ہاؤس
ریس انس نہیں دے رہی ہے۔

سوشل بینک میں چھ اکاؤنٹ
فرورن ہیں۔ کوشش یہ ہے کہ فرورن
کے جائیں۔ پچھلی دفعہ چھ اس ہاؤس
میں بسٹ ہوتی تھی جس میں تین تین
منسٹر انہوں نے جو اب انہوں نے
نے ایک گزارش کی تھی کہ ہاؤس کے
آڈٹ بورڈ میں اس چیز کے نام کر لیا
گیا ہے کہ ۶۳ کروڑ روپے بے اند
کے طور پر۔ نام کچھ بھی ہے۔ لیکن
کیس یا کیسز۔ کیس براہم مندر صاحب
اپنی تھک۔ یہ ہے۔ اس کو تسلیم کر لیں
کے بعد بھی جو یہ ہے، گزارش کی ہو

ذمہ داری قبول کرے۔

بحث یہاں اس باتوں میں ہو رہی تھی کہ سوڈن
آڈٹ بیورو کے الزام کا اسٹیٹس کیا ہے
اس بحث میں تو تین منسٹرس نے جواب دیا۔
لیکھ، کسی ایک منسٹر نے اس بات کا جواب
نہیں دیا۔

ایسٹ تصویر کیا ہے۔ اخبار میں خبر
آتی ہے تو ہندوستان کا پرائم منسٹر دی ایکٹ
کرتا ہے۔ اس سے پہلے ہفتہ دس روز تک
تصویر اگر کھینچی جاتی ہے تو لگے گا۔ یہ ذاتی
تصویر ہو رہے ہیں۔ میں ذاتی حملے نہیں کرنا
چاہتا ہوں۔ لیکن بات ہندوستان کے
علم میں آچکی تھی۔ ہر اس وقت تک ہندوستان
کے لوگوں کو کانفرنس میں نہیں لیا گیا۔
جب تک اخبارات میں اس سلسلے کو
کھولا نہیں گیا۔ سنگین منکھپ بات یہ ہیں۔
ذکر کیا ۲۴ مارچ کے فیکس ... "وقت
کی گھنٹی" ... کے میسج کا ہمارے ساتھی
نے۔ یہ جلی کہا گیا کہ کہیں پنج میں کہ سوڈن
بینکس کے اندر کچھ ایکسپلو سیوڈا کو منسٹرس

ہیں۔ لیکن ہر وزیر ہر پردہ ڈالا ہوا ہے۔ ان
تمام باتوں کے پیش نظر میرے کچھ مطالبات
سرکار سے ہیں۔ جو لوگ انکو انری کے
راستے میں رکاوٹ ڈال رہے ہیں۔ انھیں
بے نقاب کیا جائے۔ اب تک جو حقیقتیں
سارے آچکی ہیں۔ انکی روشنی میں سرکار اپنی

اگلی بات سوڈن صاحب کے افسانے
سے متعلق ہے۔ پرائم منسٹر صاحب نے
کہا تھا کہ سوڈن گورنمنٹ سے نوٹ
حاصل کیا جائیگا۔ وہ اب کیا ہوا۔ اسکے
کنٹینٹس کیا ہیں۔ اس نوٹ کو دینے
والا کون تھا۔ کوئی وجہ نہیں کہ اس کا پتہ
نہیں چلا یا جا سکتا ہو۔ اس نوٹ کو تیار
کرنے اور وہاں تک پہنچانے کی سازش
کے پیچھے کون کون لوگ تھے۔ سرکار
مہربانی کر کے ان باتوں کا جواب دے۔
میری گزارش دوبارہ سے ہے کہ اس
قصد کو صاف کیا جائے۔ بہت اندھیرا
چھا چکا ہے۔ بہت بدنامی ہو چکی ہے۔
پرسوں اس کے اندر لگا دیئے گئے ہیں۔
روزانہ ایک نئی بات کے اضافے کے
باوجود میری سرکار سے درخواست ہوگی۔

Come clean with all the facts. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. D pen
Ghosh, Again I have to repeat. ...
(Interruptions).

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH (West Bengal): No,
Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So you
please confine yourself to questions.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Ma'am Deputy
Chairman, the issue, as it stands today, is of a
criminal offence committed by a Cabinet
Minister and of a sagging credibility of the
Prime Minister himself... (Interruptions)... I
say it... (Interruptions)... I re-

[Shri Dipen Ghosh]

peat it because he is smiling. I repeat, the issue is of a criminal offence committed by a Cabinet Minister..

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN (Maharashtra): On a foreign soil.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: It comes within the mischief of Section 186 read with Section 217 of the Indian Penal Code about what Mr. Solanki has done. That is why I say that the issue, as it stand today, is of a criminal offence committed by a Cabinet Minister and of a sagging credibility of the Prime Minister himself for failure to take action against that Cabinet Minister. Madam Deputy Chairman, Solanki-note is one aspect.

Now the issue has assumed another dimension, and that is, whether Mr. Solanki had handed over the note with the knowledge of the Prime Minister or not. There are conflicting reports in the press, the source being the same, the Swiss Government. One officer in the Swiss Foreign Department says, "Solanki while handing over this note had stated that the Prime Minister had the knowledge about it." Another junior officer in the same Department of the same Government, says, "No, we are not aware of the origin of the note." Of course, the word "origin" has a different meaning—with knowledge, whether the note was handed over to the Swiss Government with the knowledge of the Prime Minister or it originated from the Prime Minister, I am not going into that battle over the English language. Madam, it is a fact, that the Prime Minister himself has stated, has admitted—of late, he has stated— "On 25th night the CBI Director had brought it to the notice of the Prime Minister and on 26th the reply was given by the CBI about the SoJanki-note." But on the 2nd of April, in the Rajya Sabha, he had stated,—I quote: "Yesterday, I had promised to make this abundantly clear on behalf of the Government, as distinguished from the CBI, that the Government's intention is exactly the same." So until the

second of April, the CBI position an

the Government position were not the same. Until the *Indian Express* had published something, until Members of Parliament had raised questions on the floor of the House, the Prime Minister did not distinguish himself. And what happens? ... (*Interruptions*) ...I am taking only one minute. What happened, Madam, is, the Prime Minister had directed the CBI to give a reply on 26th of March, according to his own admission, without discussing the matter with Solanki, but later, the Prime Minister had stated in a statement that he was busy with the visit of Ukrainian President and after the Ukrainian President's visit was over, on 27th of March he had a talk with Solanki. So how did the Government function? The Prime Minister came to know that the External Affairs Minister had handed over a note to the Swiss Government and the Prime Minister had directed the CBI to reply, but the Prime Minister did not discuss the matter with the External Affairs Minister! On 1st April he has distinguished from the CBI, said, "Yes, Government position and the CBI position are the same." It is very funny. The Prime Minister again said that he had not seen the note; he did not have a copy of the note. He had only seen the note published in the *Indian Express*. I think, Indian Express owner and the editor and the journalists of the Indian Express will feel elated that the Prime Minister reads the *Indian Express*. It may help the *Indian Express* to enlarge and boost its circulation. But the question is: How does the Government function? The Government asked the CBI to reply; the Government did not discuss the matter with Mr. Solanki; after the reply was sent the Prime Minister discussed the matter with Mr. Solanki; on 1st April the Prime Minister said "my position and the CBI position are the same"; the Prime Minister did not ask the CBI to get hold of a copy of that note; the Prime Minister did not ask the CBI to enquire about the person who had handed over that note to Mr. Solanki. And yet the CBI

is the Central Bureau of Investigation. What is the "Centre"? Correspondence! The CBI is not a simple correspondence department.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will you please conclude now?

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: The CBI is supposed to conduct the investigation I would like to know whether the Government is prepared to ask the CBI if they have not yet asked, to investigate about the origin of that note; who had written that note; who the lawyer was; who handed over that note to Mr. Solanki. If the CBI does not find them out, if it is not in a position to find them out, prosecute Mr. Solanki under the Indian Penal Code. We know the crime. Before the Magistrate Mr. Solanki will open his mouth which you have shut by taking him away from attending the Rajya Sabha and allowing him to cast vote only on the Constitution (Amendment) Bill.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: So, prosecute him. If you want to find the truth prosecute him. I quote from what Mr. Chidambaram said.

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): Madam, v.e agreed for five minutes to one Member from each party.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, five minutes. Mr. Dipen Ghosh, you must restrict to your promise at least.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Madam, one minute. He said, "we will find the truth according to law". Indian Penal Code is the law.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Janata Dal Mr. Kamal Morarka.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Mr. Ghulam Nabi Azad is here. He has got the esteemed privilege of replying on behalf of the Prime Minister. So, please

reply. I would like to know whether the CBI is directed to investigate into the origin of that note, the status of that lawyer, the identity of the lawyer who had handed over that note to Mr. Solanki and if the Government is not prepared to do so whether the Government is going to prosecute Mr. Solanki and when.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Kamal Morarka. Again five minutes. At least Members should be true to their commitment to the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA (Rajas than): I will take less than that, Madam. In the five years since the issue has been engaging the attention of the country, this is the first time that an attempted cover-up has been found out. That distinguishes the matter from all the previous discussions that we had earlier on Bofors. I am one of those Members who do not suffer from the Bofors—manta as if it is the most important subject to be discussed. I also do not suffer from the Bofors—phobia that the moment the word "Bofors" comes Members should be shouted down. I think, this is an issue where alleged enrichment by some middlemen in the largest defence deal that this country had, has been in the news from various quarters. The CBI has been entrusted with the task. The issue has come up in the House again and again and unfortunately it is the newspaper which has leaked some documents from time to time, whatever may be the veracity of the documents. Madam, the most serious issue is this. I fully grant that the Government itself wants to know the truth. Since Mr. Narasimha Rao has become the Prime Minister, he has nothing to do with this deal. It was done at a time when he was neither Defence Minister nor Prime Minister. Mr. Solanki has been found out in a very crudely and blatantly attempted cover-up to which he became a party, wittingly or unwittingly. He is a colleague of ours. I have no reason to disbelieve him. A document was planted on him

[Shri Kamal Morarji] which he unwittingly gave to the Swiss Foreign JVENister. The Govern ment has already tried to mitigate the damage by writing to the Swiss authorities, "please ignore all that and carry on the investigations." Madam, I am on a different point. The CBI is investigating this matter. They are searching for a lead. The biggest single lead have got is the person who has planted this document. Who will be interested in the cover up? Obvi ously the people who have received the money. It is a common police par lance that the murderer always re turns to the scene of the crime. The police always is on the look-on for this biggest clue, for the person who has done the murder is the chap who has tried to come and erase the evi dence. Madam, in this case we have got a lead for the first time. There is a person who has tried to extin guish the investigation. The police must do nothing else except to rela tively pursue this character and find out whoever is the person. Then the entire Bofors mystery will be resolv ed. Let us not spend Government money. Let us not go on fighting in the Swiss courts. Why don't you nab this lawyer? Mr. Solanki is one of us. He owes a duty to this country to give all the information that he has. rf he does not know the name of the law- year, he must tell us how he met this person. Who introduced him to him? He must give a clue. The police must interrogate him and also prosecute him. Mr. Solanki should be able to give from his memory, from his recollection, every single piece of information he has about that person because in identifying this person lies the solution to the Bofors scandal. I just want to end by saying that the Prime Minister must know that unless this episode is resolved the clouds will hang on this Government. They must remember that in President Nixon's case it was not the Watergate scandal that resulted in his ouster but it was the coverup that resulted in his ouster. Please do not coverup for anvbody.

Please find out the identity of this person.
Therein lies the solution.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY (Andhra Pradesh): I wish to reiterate some of the statements made by my colleagues of mine who have spoken before me. Since you have put such a severe time constraint on the subject, I will stick to my five minutes. I have some very specific questions to ask the Government. I would appreciate it if they will give a specific reply. My first question is, what has the Government done to identify who this mysterious person supposedly a lawyer is? What conversation did he have with Mr. Solanki while handing over this memorandum? Who introduced him to Mr. Solanki? Has he been positively identified? What Mr. Kamal Morarka has just now said, I think, is important because vital clues lie in identifying who has introduced this gentleman and how he came to meet Mr. Solanki; what he spoke and what is the letter. Madam, letter rogatories are legal documents. They are almost tantamount to be an international commitment. Does the Government not consider that handing over the memorandum by Mr. Solanki amounts to a legal breach? What is the Government going to do in this regard? Madam, the Prime Minister came to learn of his name being involved in it on 25th March. When did he first meet Mr. Solanki and ask him to explain the whole episode? What was the response of Mr. Solanki? This is what I want established so that we know what both sides were up to. My next question is, between 25th March and first Of April, what action did the Prime Minister take to dispel all doubts about his involvement in this affair? It is no small matter at this point of time. As Mr. Morarka pointed out earlier, the Prime Minister was in no way involved in the Bofors deal earlier as Defence Minister or as any other Minister. But today as Prime Minister of this country, in troubled times like these, it is not a small

That is the most important characteristic of the Bofors scandal. Madam, I understand that Bofors is a cause of constant embarrassment to the Government, the ruling party, I have sympathy with the party in power and the people who are there in the Government. It cannot be helped because after the inflicting of a defeat in the General Elections, after all that has happened during the period of a little more than five years, sanity has not prevailed. The Government has not come to senses. That is another aspect of the characteristic of the Bofors episode. Even an election defeat has not been able to bring people to senses and therefore this senselessness of the people in power is another characteristic of the present Government. Madam, my point is, it is not because of the sum involved in the bribery episode that it concerns the nation. It is not because of Rs. 50 crores or Rs. 100 crores that are involved. The whole nation is agitated, the people are agitated and we are compelled, most reluctantly, to raise the issue on the floor of the House because of the high-profile personality involvement in this scandal. Never before had the nation been discussing the issue of bribery, the issue of scandals over decades. And never before could the needle of suspicion be projected so pointedly on the people in power. Never before has it happened, never before during the time of Mr. Krishnamachari; never during the jeep scandal or never before on other occasions... (Interruptions).

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra):
There was no jeep scandal.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: The most important point is that the needle of suspicion could not be projected. .. (Interruptions) ...

SHRI R. K. DHAWAN (Andhrti Pradesh): There was an FIR in the jeep scandal. Do you know what the court's judgement was? There was no scandal in it.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal): To me it appears that the main characteristic of the Bofors scandal is not the attempt that is being made by the criminals to cover-up their crimes. It is not the cover-up operation by the criminals. That is not the characteristic of this scandal. The most important characteristic of the Bofors scandal is the attempt to cover-up the political connection of the criminals who have acted against the law of the country. Therefore, the important part is that there is a cover-up attempt, of course. But what is sought to be covered up? An attempt is being made to cover up the political connection so that the people in high places are not punished, are not put to blame before the entire nation.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: There was no jeep scandal.

SHRI R. K. DHAWAN: The FIR was filed and the court said that there was nothing wrong in it. Only the Janata Government led by Mr. Morarji Desai had their head in it.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: He is talking of the jeep scandal and it was at the time of Mr. Krishna Menon... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: The point is, I am referring to the Defence scandal that erupted on a number of occasions in the past. The honourable Member is a prisoner of time. Madam, the honourable Member is a prisoner of time. That is the whole problem.

Now, coming to the issue proper, let me point out that never before have the people in power been put in the dock as they are put at the moment and I am constrained to say that this scandal will go down in history as a perpetual scandal. .. *(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta, please conclude now. I think you have very little time now. You confine yourself to the main issue.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Madam, you must have seen that there are certain Members in the House who do not feel agitated at all when certain things are said here. But why should they feel agitated when this is mentioned? I have not said that Mr. Dhawan is responsible for it. I never said it. Why should he feel agitated?

My point is that this scandal will go down in the country's history as a perpetual national scandal. Can you object to it?

SHRI R. K. DHAWAN: Certainly.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Madam, this is causing the greatest national embarrassment. Can you deny that? Repeated criminal attempts are being made to block the process of justice and law in the country. One after another, steps

are being taken by the Government to ensure that the process of law and justice does not operate. Therefore, the credibility of the nation is at stake. We are being painted before the entire world in such terms as, "Here is a nation where the law does not operate; here is a Government under which the law does not operate." Mr. Solanki has been made the scapegoat, according to me. He acted on somebody's behest. I never believed that Mr. Solanki being a senior politician, could have acted so blatantly in violation of the law. I never believed that. He must have been made to work. In that case, who is that superpower? Who is that superman? What is the reason for which this gentleman acted so blatantly? *

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am calling the next speaker.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Therefore, Madam, I would request the Government to clear this, to remove the veil of mystery and suspicion. This is necessary for them, not for the Opposition. It is necessary for the credibility of the Government and it is necessary for the credibility of the nation that the veil of mystery is lifted so that in history you are not painted as a bunch of people who acted in such a manner as to ensure that the process of law did not take its natural course. That is the greatest crime. Madam, it is not criminal to commit a crime only... *(Interruptions)*.. The greatest crime in history and on the part of a nation is not to commit a crime, but to ensure that the process of justice and law does not take its natural course. That is what is being done now.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Subramanian Swamy. Please be brief.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: I will be as brief as possible. I will not take more than half the time of Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta.

Madam, if the Congress (I) Party honestly feels that the Bofors scandal is a bogus thing, then they should have the courage to withdraw all the cases that are pending in the Courts. But, if they feel that there is something and if they want to know the truth, then there are some actions which they must take in the light of the perceptions in the country. The key question today is about the note that Mr. Solanki handed over. Mr. Solanki has, in his clarification, said that the note did not deal with the Bofors case. In the clarification that he gave this is what came out and he said that it was given to him by an Indian lawyer living in Switzerland. Madam, I have been to many international conferences as Commerce Minister and I can say that in such conferences it is impossible for any individual to come without his identity being shown.

1. p.m.

So, If there was indeed a lawyer standing outside the cubicle of the Swiss Foreign Minister, then it is very easy to indentify who that lawyer is through the use of secret cameras which are there in such conferences and the computer printouts that come of visitors who go into that conference, and not everybody can go.

Madam, in my opinion, in view of the fact that even a person like Mr. Rajiv Gandhi whom the Janata Dal pilloried day in day out agreed to a Joint Parliamentary Committee, I think, when Mr. Narasimha Rao is completely in the clear in this matter it would be appropriate not only to do the right thing but to be seen doing the right thing and, therefore, I would support a Joint Parliamentary Committee on this Note.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Madan Bhatia.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: It is very interesting to see the stand of Mr. Swamy, I welcome the change of position of Mr. Swamy.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Try to be brief as everybody else.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA (Nominated):
Madam, I would not take more than 5
minutes.

Madam Deputy Chairman, I have been listening with rapt attention to the points or the speeches which have been made by the hon. Members on this side. I must confess that I find myself totally lost in the discussive rhetoric of the hon. Members by which they have done nothing but repeat what they said in the course of the long debate which took place in this hon. House on 2nd April, 1992. There is absolutely nothing which has happened after the 2nd April, 1992 which should have prompted the hon. Members on this side to insist on taking up the time of this hon. House again for discussing the Bofors issue. There is absolutely nothing new which the hon. Members have said or by which, the hon. Members have enlightened this hon. House on the basis of which I can say that there was any justification for the hon. Members to raise the question of Bofors again. This puts me to thinking, how is it that it is not ones but a number of times after the 2nd of April, 1992, when the whole matter was discussed threadbare in this House and each and every point which was made by the Opposition Members was answered by no less a person than the hon. Prime Minister himself, that this issue is being raked up again and again. I find there is one and only one answer. Whenever a Leader of the nation catches the imagination of the people of his country and builds up a niche in the hearts of his countrymen and the Opposition parties find it impossible to fight that leader on the ideological plane, then invariably those Opposition parties resort to one and the only one weapon, and that is the weapon of character assassination one pretext or the other. This happened with Mrs. Gandhi from

onwards, this happened with Mr. Rajiv Gandhi on the Bofors issue from 1987 onwards. And lo and behold, for no other reason except that the Foreign Minister unwittingly or wittingly hands over one document to the Swiss Government, the name of the Prime Minister is dragged. And all kinds of attempts are made indirectly, overtly and covertly and surreptitiously to drag his name into this murky controversy. What is the reason? It is because over a period of ten months, the Prime Minister has built up a particular image in the hearts of the people of this country. It is because the hon. Prime Minister has initiated new grounds in this country, as a result of which this country has been put back on the rails from which it had been derailed on account of the policies of the previous two governments ever a period of more than a year. The country has been put back on the rails; the people are with him and, therefore, in this long session, they found no other issue on which they could fight this Government led by Mr. Narasimha Rao, and suddenly they picked up on this filmy issue of Bofors in order to drag his name, and because of this particular incident connected with Mr. Solanki that took place, repeated and concerted attempts have been made to indulge in a vilification campaign, in a character assassination campaign against the Prime Minister himself. Nothing can be more derogatory, nothing can be more condemnable than this particular action of theirs. (Time bell rings) I am concluding; I will just take one more minute.

Madam, this business of indulging in a vilification campaign and character assassination of leaders is not only confined to India from 1969 onwards. This is a worldwide phenomenon. This happened with De Gaulle in France when he put France back on the rails and broke new grounds. This happened in Germany against Willy Brandt. This happened against John Kennedy and

ultimately he was assassinated I am respectfully submitting that the people of this country are totally disgusted with the manner in which the time of this hon. House, the time of the Parliament is being wasted by the opposition Members just for the purpose of indulging in character assassination of one person or the other. They are not even sparing the name of our dead leader... (Interruptions)

SHRI SINKANDAR BAKHT: This is very cruel.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA:.... by raising the question of Bofors again and again. Now they have gone after Mr. Solanki. (Interruptions), I am saying that Mr. Solanki might be prosecuted but let them point out any provision of law under which Mr. Solanki could be prosecuted..... (Interruptions). They are asking for Mr. Solanki to be prosecuted. They have gone after his head. They just do not know the law of the land and they are talking about criminal scandal. Let them quote a single provision of law under which they can say that Mr. Solanki can be prosecuted. They go on talking like this... (Interruptions). This is the only new point which they have made and for which they should be ashamed. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now that matter of Bofors is over.

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : क्या बात कर रहे हैं ? किसी एक श्रादमी ने राजीव गांधी का नाम नहीं लिया... (अवधान) बेकार बात कर रहे हैं !

شری سکندر بخت : کیا بات کر رہے ہیں۔ کسی ایک آدمی نے راجیو گاندھی کا نام نہیں لیا... "مداخلت" بیکار بات کر رہے۔

† [] Transliteration in Arabic script.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now we take the special mentions.

SHRI SINKANDAR BAKHT: This is absolutely absurd.

सदर साहिबा, सवाल यह है कि बोफोर्स का मामला इस मुल्क में है या नहीं। जो कुछ कहना है, हमने किसी का नाम नहीं लिया। यह बिल्कुल गलत बात है और सख्त एतराज करते हैं हम इस किस्म के तरीके पर और खास तौर से इमोजनल बातें करने का। बिल्कुल गलत बात है।

صدر صاحبہ۔ سوال یہ ہے کہ بوفورس کا معاملہ اس ملک میں ہے یا نہیں۔ جو کچھ کہنا ہے۔ ہم نے کسی کا نام نہیں لیا۔ یہ بالکل غلط بات ہے اور سخت اعتراض کرتے ہیں ہم اس قسم کے طریقے پر اور خاص طور سے انوشنل باتیں کرنے کا۔ بالکل غلط بات ہے۔

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: The understanding was that Mr. Azad would reply.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह (बिहार) : महोदया, बोफोर्स के मामले में मैं कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ... (व्यवधान)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: The understanding was that Mr. Azad as Minister of Parliamentary Affairs would reply to this discussion.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no discussion as such.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: . By whatever name you may call it. (Interruptions).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let me answer.

† [] Transliteration in Arabic Script.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : महोदया, बोफोर्स के मामले में मैं कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ।

उपसभापति : बोफोर्स पर कुछ बोलना नहीं है, जान खत्म हो गई। इट इज ओवर।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : उपसभापति महोदया, ... (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति : लीज, राम अवधेश जी, एक मिनट बैठिए... (व्यवधान)

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : आपने कहा था कि हर पार्टी के लोगों को बोलने देनी।

उपसभापति : आप बैठिए में बताती हूँ। वहीं बता रही हूँ।

Let me repeat what was decided in the Business Advisory Committee. It was that those Members belonging to a political party or a group of more than five Members will be allowed five minutes each. So I have allowed that. It was not decided that anybody is going to reply. That is all about it.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I stand to deny your statement. It was decided that... (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If he wants to answer, let him answer. I have no objection.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : उपसभापति जी,...

उपसभापति : राम अवधेश सिंह जी, मैं आपको बता दूँ कि यह तय हुआ था चेयरमैन के सामने, पार्लियामेंटरी अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर दोनों मौजूद थे, लीडर भी हाउस के थे और सारी पोलिटिकल पार्टियों के लीडर थे, कि जो पार्टियां 5 मेम्बर्स से ऊपर की हैं वे इस मामले पर 5 मिनट बोलेंगी। अगर आप 5

[श्री उपसभापति]

मैंबर से ऊपर की पार्टी को बिलॉग करते हैं, तो बोल सकते हैं नहीं हैं तो नहीं बोल सकते हैं ... (व्यवधान)

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : इनके कहां हैं 5 मैनबर से ऊपर ?

उपसभापति : वह यूनाइटेड मैनबर का एक ग्रुप है और ग्रुप में से एक बोलता है। मेरे पास लिस्टेड है उस ग्रुप से जो बोले हैं, कहिए तो मैं उनका नाम बता दूंगी। मैं एक को बोलने दूंगी तो मुझे 25 आदमियों को बुलाना पड़ेगा। The Pandora's Box I am not going to open.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : मेरा कहना है कि पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी से फिर से जांच कराई जाए।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, do you want to say something?

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD): Madam Deputy Chairman, a number of points have been raised here by the Leader of the Opposition and by other hon. Members. As far as the Bofors issue is concerned, it has been discussed in this House, in the past six years, more than a dozen times. A lot of money has also been spent on this. But repeated discussions inside the House, outside the House, have not brought us to any final or concrete conclusion. Elections have also been fought on this issue. The issue was taken to the streets and we are aware of the outcome of these elections also.

I would not like to go into the details.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Why?

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: I would not like to go into the details of this whole Bofors issue. Please, let me complete," Mr. Dipen Ghosh. As I said, this issue has been discussed

in this House time and again. Very recently, we had a full-day discussion and no less a person than the hon. Prime Minister himself...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: After that?

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: The hon. Prime Minister was here, in the House. He replied. He made a statement. He replied to the Members. (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dipen Ghosh, please, let him say what he wants to. HE did not interrupt anyone of you.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: The whole case is under investigation. I would like the law to take its own course.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: What about Mr. Solanki?

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: I will come to that. As far as this issue is concerned, let me assure the House that we have not stopped the investigation at any stage, nor have we tampered with the process of investigation.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: What about Mr. Solanki's note?

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: My friends on the other side have said that we have tried to suppress the facts. We have not tried to suppress the facts. You have mentioned about Solankiji. Well, it was a mistake.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Mistake?

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: It was a mistake for which he expressed his regret on the floor of the House.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: It is a crime, not a mistake.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: It is your perception.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: It is a criminal offence.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: I do not agree with the hon. Member that it is a criminal offence. (*Interruptions*) I will say that it was a mistake on the part of my colleague, for which he expressed his regret on' the floor of the House. He also resigned on this issue. So, I would like to assure the House that we have never traied to suppress this case at any stage. If my friends on the other side feel that at any stage we have tried to suppress these investigations, well, the people of this country provided an opportunity to my friends on the other side to unearth everything, if they could.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: We want to know whether the CBI is going to be asked to investigate about the origin of the note, identity of the person.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: As I have already said, the Prime Minister, the Defence Minister and my colleague Chidambaram, have already replied to the questions raised by hon. Members.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: They have not replied to these questions.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: I am going to reply to three pointed questions. (1) About JPC, we already had a JPC for the Bofors in which my hon. friends on the other side did not participate. So, there is no reason as to why we should have another JPC for the same case. So, there is no question as far as another JPC is concerned. *(Interruptions)*. I will come to that.

Secondly, my friends on the other side are very keen to know the contents of the note. I can assure this House that the Government has no hesitation whatsoever in getting a copy of the note handed over by the then Foreign Minister, Mr. Solanki, to his counterpart in Switzerland.

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT; Is there any time limit to that?

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: I cannot give any time-limit. As for the third question about the identity of the person, let me tell the hon. Members that the Government is equally keen and so are the Members of the ruling party...

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRA-KANT BHANDARE (Maharashtra): We are very keen. Somebody has taken us for a ride.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD:... to know the identity of the person. I must say that it is a so-called lie because we have read through the papers only 'the so-called lie', but unless we have any information or any clue, it is difficult for us to proceed further in this matter. Therefore, whenever we get any information or clue from, any corner, we shall certainly proceed further.

SHRI SINKANDER BAKHT: The Prime Minister made a promise that he will get facts with regard to the letter. What is happening to that?

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: Sir, you have not heard me. I have said that the Government has no hesitation in bringing a copy of that letter which has been...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Have you asked the Swiss Government Foreign Department to send a copy of that note?

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD; I may say, "The Government has no hesitation..." I am talking in future tense, not in present tense. I am saying in future tense, not in past tense. I am saying, the Government will have no hesitation. (Interruptions). "

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: You have not yet asked the Swiss Government.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN; Mr. Dipn Ghosh, that five minutes also include this. You cannot have a discussion. We cannot have another

discussion. I have got another business.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD- As for the identity of the other person, if my hon. friends on the other side have any information, any clue, we will definitely go ahead with that. Otherwise, on our part, whenever Government gets any clue or information, it will definitely proceed with that.

Thank you. ,

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: As a protest against the unsatisfactory reply of the Minister we stage a walk out.

[At the stage same hon. Members left the Chamber]

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now that there is some peace in the House, I can inform the Members that I have at least 36 special mentions listed before me, that too with two or three names included in one.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: I have got an important point.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let me first take the sense of the House whether we can dispense with the lunch hour, and finish these Special Mentions or we shall have the lunch hour.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: Let us finish the Special Mentions, Madam. A lot of Special Mentions are there.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are so many Special Mentions. Now we will have lunch but not the lunch hour.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: One small point. Mr. B. R. Ambedkar has been defamed by Mr. Karunanidhi.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now that is over; I am not permitting.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: This House should censure such an attitude.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am not permitting. Shri Ranjit Singh.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: He said that Mr. Ambedkar was mis taken in taking the..... (Interruptions) ... Can you say that Dr. Ambedkar posthumously accepting Bharat Ratna was wrong? He said, Periyar was not accepting. ... (Interruptions)...

SHRI M. VINCENT (Tamil Nadu): It is condemnable. It is an insult to Dr. Ambedkar and Dr. MGR, the leader of the masses.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): It is unfortunate.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Mr. Karunanidhi says, if Periyar were alive he would not have accepted Bharat Ratna. That means, if Dr. Ambedkar were alive he would not have accepted it... (Interruptions)... This is scandalous. This is a shame on India that Dr. B. R. Ambedkar is being treated this way.

SHRI M. VINCENT: The Government should compel him to withdraw his remarks. .. (Interruptions)..

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: * SHRI M. VINCENT: The Government should compel him to withdraw his remarks.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, please withdraw that remark. You can't say that anybody should be * Yes, Ranjit Singhji.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Bharat Ratna is not supposed to be protected by us. After all, it is the highest honour.

SHRI M. VINCENT: It is an insult to Babasaheb Ambedkar and the leader of the masses, Dr. MGR... (Interruptions) ..

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: It shows that he is anti-Scheduled Castes and that's why he says that no one worth his salt will accept Bharat Ratna.

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.