

## SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION

**RE Purchase of 155 mm Howitzers Gun**

**SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY** (Karnataka) : Madam Deputy Chairman, with great anguish mixed with resentment, I am starting this debate on Bofors. The debate has been going on this issue and occupying the central attention of Parliament and also of the nation for nearly two and a half years. My friend, Shri K.C. Pant, who is the Defence Minister, while replying to the debate previously said that the report of the Joint Parliamentary Committee on this issue had drawn the final curtain. At that stage pointed out that the curtain was not drawn at all and this issue was going to be in the mind of the people till the truth, the final truth, was found. In my view, Madam, as the days have gone on, the Bofors issue is becoming curiouseer and curiouseer, cruder and cruder, full of surprises and sending shocks throughout the length and breadth of this country, shocks about their credibility, the name, the prestige of the nation. In my view, the Bofors contract scandal has been a permanent blot on the fair name of this country, besides being a blot on the Government itself. Today there may not be a motion of impeachment of this Government. There is no provision for impeachment of the Government. But virtually what we are discussing in the House today will be an impeachment nothing short of impeachment against the Central Government and particularly the impeachment of the head of the Government who happened to be the Defence Minister at the time this deal was signed. This is the biggest scandal in the post-Independence era of this country. Compared to other scandals of the world, in Japan, in England, in Germany, in America, this scandal because of prevarication, dawdling and deliberate masquerade and cover-up practised

sinisterly and clandestinely by the Government, has become a Frankenstein for Shri Rajiv Gandhi.

Madam, it was I who started the debate first on Bofors. I said on that day : I did not know all the facts at this time. Shri Venkataraman was the Chairman of the House. I said : I am not on the issue of middlemen. The Government of India might have decided not to have middlemen in defence deals. I did not also say anything on the question of commission. I even said that in spite of the decision of the Government of India to forego, to do away with middlemen and commissions in defence deals, in trading activities, which may also include defence deals, middlemen agents, commissions, liaison, etc. are parts of the system throughout the world. I said that. What I objected to at that time was whether this deal has any corruption behind it, whether any kickbacks were involved. If corruption, bribery and kickbacks were involved in securing the deal for Bofors Company, then I said Parliament will not tolerate it, the country will not tolerate it and it will have far-reaching and serious implications for the Government itself. And that is what has happened today.

Revelations have come out not only in 'The Hindu', 'Statesman' and 'Indian Express' but the C&AG has also come out with his report. Please don't interrupt. My time is very short. (Interruptions) I do not know whether we will live long at your hands.

Madam, the C.A.G. report also came out with its verdict. The Government would not respond to verdict. After that, the *Hindu* published some documents revealing further information and today there is more information available. The Government of India has taken every step, sinister and otherwise, to cover up this scandal, a gigantic scandal. They have not heeded General Sundarji's advice. They did not

heed his suggestion. Sundarji was quoted by the Government not once but several times. The Government has said that he the Chief of staff gave his advice and had accepted his advice. That very person has said in his interview to *India Today* that he had advised the Government of India to pressurise Bofors, to apply the screw, even by threatening them that the contract would be cancelled if they did not reveal the names of persons who had been benefited by this contract. In other words, he asked the Government to pressurise Bofors to come out with the names of recipients of bribery and kickbacks. He said in his interview that the Prime Minister...  
(Time bell rings)

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :**  
Three minutes more.

**SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY :** I have to take a little more time.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :**  
I am very very sorry. You might be the Leader of the Opposition.

**SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY :** I am initiating the debate.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :**  
I am not going to give you even one minute more. It is not my fault.

**SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY :** I don't want to quarrel with you.

**THE MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER) :** We have agreed that we will adhere to the time schedule.

**SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY :** I am only craving for indulgence.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :**  
Today I am not indulgent.

**SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY :** I know that. But I don't

know why you had to say this kind of a thing. We know the atmosphere. I am trying to be brief.  
(Interruptions)

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :**  
I would request the hon. Members not to disturb and not to interrupt.

**SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY :** I don't want to quote because of the paucity of time. General Sundarji has said that the Prime Minister stopped the process of putting pressure on Bofors. He has said that if Bofors had been told that the contract would be cancelled, they would have informed the Government about the persons who were the beneficiaries of the kickbacks. It was not done. But what is the latest report that has appeared in the press today and also three days back? It has been brought out that one company Moresco got about 8 per cent of commission, or bribery or whatever you call it. And that Company had taken direct interest in getting the deal in favour of Bofors. There were other Companies. Sveenska was there. It was mentioned earlier. A.E. Services was there. And then Pitco was there. Moresco is very much mentioned today in the papers. I charge the Government Madam that the documents that have been so far published reveal that the Government is directly involved in bribery. (Interruptions) Who has taken this money? Who was behind Moresco? Who was behind pitco? If the Government is not guilty why it has brought pressure on Kasturi, the Chief Editor of the 'Hindu' not to publish the documents? (Interruptions) Shri Ram has to resign yesterday because the Government of India pressurised the 'Hindu' paper not to publish the documents further. The freedom of the press has been suppressed. Not only the freedom of the press has been crudely and rudely suppressed, but the Editor was also not given the freedom to publish the documents which are very important and vital for the country.

SHRI SYED SIBTEY RAZI (Uttar Pradesh) : He has denied it.

SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY : I charge this Government, Madam, that by this deal, the Government is directly involved in corruption. Those who were responsible for signing the contract were involved in these kickbacks. I also say that they have compromised the interests of national defence. They have compromised the security of the country, and they have done the most unpatriotic act in selling this country to Bofors, a foreign Company. I charge this Government that this Government stands impeached in the eyes of the people. This Government stands indicted stands exposed completely in the eyes of the nation and the Parliament. (Interruptions) I want that this Government should resign. The Prime Minister of India should resign. He should lay down his office. We want nothing short of resignation. No more evidence is required. There is enough to show that the Prime Minister is directly involved in this deal. Therefore, I want the Prime Minister of India to quit and go to the polls and take the verdict of the people. Thank you very much, Madam. (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I will allow one person on point of order.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN (Tamil Nadu) : Madam, this is about setting the record straight about what Mr. Gurupadaswamy was saying about the Government bringing pressure... (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It is a point of order and it is going in her time.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN : Madam, I am...

SHRI PUTTAPAGA RADHAKRISHNA (Andhra Pradesh) : Madam...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : If you raise your point of order, I am going to take it out from your Party time. (Interruptions)

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN : Madam, this is completely and totally from the Congress time. This is a complete falsehood that any pressure was brought on Mr. Kasturi by anybody else. The same newspaper... (Interruptions) Madam, I have a right to be heard also if you heard Mr. Gurupadaswamy.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : She has a right to ask from the Congress time. She is asking. She has a right to ask. How can you object? You sit down. I have a right to give her time from her own party time. Don't interrupt me.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN : Madam, on the other hand...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu) : there is a Chairman of the House and a Deputy Chairman of the House. How could you say your party time?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : From her party time, she is taking. (Interruptions) Don't argue with me.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : You are the Deputy Chairman. How could you say from your party time?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Gopalsamy, I want to make the record straight which I said, perhaps, when you were not there. Today I am going to strictly abide by time. (Interruptions) It is no question of asking why. We should be doing it always. If anybody interrupts, that time will be deducted from the time of that party. If she is speaking, the time taken by her will be deducted from the time of the Congress Party. (Interruptions).

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : You do not represent the Congress Party in the Chair.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : What do you mean?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : You said, from our party.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Don't put allegations on the Chair, Mr. Gopalsamy. Take your words back.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : I take my words back. (*Interruptions*). Madam, I take my words back, but you said it. (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Take your words back, I never said it. (*Interruptions*). Please sit down. I am capable of handling him. Day in and day out you put allegations on the Chair. I am not going to allow it. (*Interruptions*). Sit down. I say, sit down.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : You said, your party. Go and get it checked up.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN : My point of order is this that on the question of pressure I want to state with complete responsibility on the floor of this House that it was Mr. Ram who on several occasions spoke to me and told me, Madam, don't sign any statements and not to say anything about V.P. Singh because he said... (*Interruptions*). This is the kind of pressure. (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I have permitted her. (*Interruptions*). Please sit down. Let her speak. I have given her permission to speak. It is going in their time.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN : Madam, we all know that Mr. Ram is puppet of the opposition. He is going to be an opposition candidate. That is why

he is making the so-called disclosures and revelations.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Yes, Mr. Dipen Ghosh, ten minutes and fifteen seconds.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH (West Bengal) : Madam Deputy Chairman, since my learned colleague, Mrs. Jayanthi Natarajan has called Mr. Ram a puppet, I consider it my duty on behalf of the opposition to set the record straight and say that if we could get more journalists, more courageous journalists like Mr. Ram, then the nation would have been saved from the hands of the party of Mrs. Jayanthi Natarajan. (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please do not interrupt. I will request the Members not to interrupt anybody. Let him make his point and you can answer.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : Madam Deputy Chairman, today I rise more with anguish than anger to take part in the discussion on *L'affaire Bofors*. So long we had been discussing on many times in the past what were the commissions or kick-backs or bribery paid by Bofors and to whom. I heard Mr. Arun Singh, the Minister of State for Defence, and no person could match his eloquence in this House at least. "Who, when and what", was his question. But today I think you will agree with me and even persons like Mr. P. Shiv Shanker or Mr. K. C. Pant, Mr. Chavan, will agree with me because you are all honourable men; you have not taken a single pie. I know. I can say Mr. K. C. Pant is an honourable man. He has not taken a single pie. Madam, after the disclosures in today's newspapers, this episode has assumed a preposterously perverse light. It is not merely a question of how much money was paid by a foreign multinational to somebody in India or in any other country abroad; it is no more a question as to who

[Shri Dipen Ghosh]

the recipients of this kickbacks are ...

**SHRI YASHWANT SINHA** (Bihar) : Italians.

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH** : It is now established that the State and the Government of India entered into an agreement with a foreign multinational selling arms to hide the truth. This is the high. I am not going to repeat what has been discussed here earlier. I was very much shocked when I found the facsimile of some of the agreed record of discussion between the Government of India and the Bofors delegation, and it is signed by as many as four officials of the Government of India... (*Interruptions*). I am telling you; you are also an advocate. The more you object to the publication of this as not being authenticated, the more authenticated reports will be coming out in the press. It is your experience, because you know the journalists, whether they are the puppets of the opposition or whether they are courageous; they do not publish anything without getting hold of the original papers or the photo copies of it. You know better than anybody else.

So, Madam, really I am shocked that the ex. Defence Secretary, ex. Principal Secretary to the Prime Minister of India, ex. Additional Secretary in the Ministry of Defence, all these people have agreed with the representatives of a foreign multinational selling arms that they would maintain the secrecy as desired by Bofors, about the names of the recipients of the commission or the kickback. It is not a question of scoring a point in a debate. You must probe; you must address yourself. You can say today that it is not authentic; you can say it all false. When the Thakkar Commission Report was being discussed, you were always saying that these are all false and these are not authen-

tic. Later you come up with the same thing. Must you not address yourself to this particular point? Take even a letter written by Mr. Bhatnagar, ex. Defence Secretary, and I quote : "When Mr. Martin Ardbo, the then President of Bofors, resigned, because there was pressure in his own country" because of his involvement in this deal Mr. Bhatnagar had written, had a check to say : "To me this has been a personal loss because I have had the pleasure of knowing you for well over a decade during which period the relationship between Ministry of Defence (India) and Bofors continued to grow significantly." What a shame, and he has been made the Governor.

**AN HON. MEMBER** : Rewarded.

**SHRIDIPEN GHOSH** : Madam, you will surely appreciate because as long as you are on the Chair and you are the Deputy Chairman ... I am not in agreement with what he said. I know you have no party.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** : Thank you.

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY** : But you were so angry with me, Madam.

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH** : But you must appreciate as a politician—you are in this field of politics—has it ever happened in our country that a State entering into an agreement with a foreign multinational selling arms to their country that as desired by that foreign national the Government of India will be obliged to maintain secrecy and will mislead the Parliament or mislead the nation? It is a shame, it is a dishonour for the country. (*Time bell rings*). Madam I am not going to take much of the time. I am only to highlight this particular point.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** : I do not succumb to bribes.

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH :** What a shameful act they have done. By this agreement they have not only concealed truth from Parliament they have not only concealed truth from the people from the nation, they have misled a Parliamentary Committee. We place high regard for Parliament. Everytime you speak about the sanctity of the House, prestige of the House. And this is how the JPC was led to conclude, was made to conclude, I quote :

“On the ground of commercial confidentiality Bofors have not furnished full details of the persons to whom rounding up costs were paid. The Committee, therefore, have not been able to reach to any conclusion in regard to the identity of recipients.”

But what does this disclosure say now, particularly the summary record of discussion held between the Bofors representative and the Government of India representatives ? It says that they were told as far back as in September 1987 and they agreed to suppress this thing, to keep it secret, not to tell anything to Parliament of India. So, I am not accusing Mr. Pant. I know who is Moineao, Moresco or AE Services because otherwise the State would not have entered into an agreement with a foreign multi-national to keep secrecy. This is only to save Win Chadha or Hinduja or a company like Moresco or AE Services. They are all conduits. Madam, what on earth made the Government to take this type of position ? There are so many old Congress(I) people who have fought for the freedom of the country, who have been split the party on the question of principle. Have you lost everything ?

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :**  
Please conclude.

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH :** Today it is not a question of how much

money one has paid to whom. It is the question of the honour of the country and the honour of the State. The honour of the country and the State has been sold out...

**SHRI SYED SIBTEY RAZI :**  
By Mr. V. P. Singh.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :**  
Don't interrupt, please.

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH :** I am not going to hold brief for anybody. Whosoever have allowed high officials to enter into such agreements have no right to continue in the Government for a single day. They have sold out the honour, integrity and freedom of the country to a foreign multi-national corporation by agreeing to keep the names of the recipients of the kickbacks secret from the Parliament and from the nation.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :**  
Please conclude.

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH :** Only one second. I know that it is not insignificant that we are discussing this issue in the morning. Afterwards we will be discussing the Constitutional Amendments. We know what will happen after the Constitutional Amendment Bills are defeated this night. We know your decision. We know your decision. (Time bell rings) As soon as the Constitutional Amendment Bills are defeated, there will be flash of news. So, I must demand that this Government must not exist, must not continue till the Constitutional Amendment Bills are defeated, this House is adjourned *sine die*, Lok Sabha is dissolved and new elections are called for. Before that, if you have a sense of honour, if you have a sense of elementary democracy, you should go. You have misled Parliament. You have misled the country. You have misled the nation. You have entered into an agreement with a foreign company to hook-wink the Parliament and the nation

[Shri Dipen Ghosh]

and, therefore, you must resign forthwith.

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :

I am not allowing anybody. Please sit down. Mr. Madan Bhatia. Ten minutes, please.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA (Nominated) : Hon. Deputy Chairman, the Bofors issue had died many a time in the last two years and each time it has been sought to be resuscitated on one ground or the other, on one pretext or the other, through one stratagem or the other. I submit, Madam, that screaming headlines have been carried by one particular newspaper which was carrying on an onslaught against the Government with the theory that the Government is indulging in cover-up. These screaming headlines by themselves prove beyond all reasonable doubt that this particular newspaper is indulging and has been indulging for the last two years in nothing but falsehood. I will draw the attention of this hon. House to one screaming headline on the very first page. It says : "The Prime Minister was not interested in carrying forward the probe." And what does the content of the report say ? It says :

"He said the Prime Minister personally requested him to co-operate in investigating the deal but subsequently 'I felt that the Government was not interested in carrying forward the investigation'."

He makes a confession that the Prime Minister calls upon him to give full cooperation in the investigation which is being carried on, and in the next sentence he says, "I felt that the Government was not interested in carrying forward the investigation". When and where did he get this feeling from ? In his bathroom ? In his toilet ? In his bathroom or at the bus-stop ?

Who gave him this feeling ? He does not name the Prime Minister. He says, "I felt that the Government was not interested..." So far as the honourable Prime Minister is concerned, he categorically makes a confession that the Prime Minister had asked him to give full cooperation in the investigation of the matter. This is one aspect.

I respectfully submit that the document which has been published gives a total lie. It derives a nail into the entire falsehood which has been built up in the last two years by this media and by the Opposition on this side. The very document blasts them and tears to shreds the whole theory of cover-up in which they have been indulging and misleading the people of this country. I draw the attention of this honourable House to the record of the talk which took place between Bofors and the representatives of the Government. I am relying upon the document which has been published. It says :

"Agreed summary record of discussions between Government of India and the Bofors' delegation."

The earlier part reproduces the entire talk which the Bofors' representatives had with the Government. They insisted upon confidentiality and commercial secrecy and they insisted that could not be called upon to disclose the information which the Government of India was asking them to disclose. And what does the Government of India's representative say to that ? I would just like to draw the attention of this honourable House to that. It says :

"The Government of India drew attention to the situation arising out of the publication of the SNAB Report and said that the public mind was greatly agitated about the facts that had been revealed. The public opinion is also exercised about the facts that had been withheld from the Government of India.

Government of India also referred to the extended discussions in the Parliament on the issue and to the fact that public authorities in Sweden had taken notice of the implications of the large payments referred to in the SNAB Report. The State Prosecutor General was looking into the matter. Government of India would like to state emphatically that information which Bofors would be required to furnish to the authorities in Sweden should also be made available to the GOI so that a complete picture could be given to the Parliamentary Committee.

Government of India added that if Bofors valued its relationship with the Indian Government, it should not withhold relevant information from the latter. That is the only way to dispel misgivings and suspicions that had been generated."

Then it says :

"In the aforesaid context, it was explained that Government of India's obligation was to ensure complete openness. While Government of India understood the desire of Bofors management for commercial secrecy, in the situation prevailing in India it was the obligation of Government of India to make available to the Parliamentary Committee all facts having a bearing on the issues being investigated by the Committee. Government of India had no intention to injure the business interests of Bofors but the commitment to inform the Parliamentary Committee took precedence over all other considerations."

If that is the record of the conversation which took place between the representatives of Bofors and the representatives of the Government of India, then, I respectfully submit, Sir, that there cannot be a greater vindication than this of the entire stand which the Government of India and the hon. Prime Minister

have been taking in the country for the last two years. There cannot be a greater and stronger proof of the utter falsehood and the lies in which certain sections of the media have been indulging and in which the entire Opposition has been indulging to reap political benefits and political dividends for the purpose of the next election.

I respectfully submit, Sir, the re-track record of the Government apart from this vindication which has now become public to the people of India. The whole issue started in this country with one broadcast on the 16th of April, 1987 by the Swedish Radio. The Swedish Radio said that bribes have been paid to various political and official figures in India in connection with the Bofors deal. The allegation was not of the payment of commissions. The allegation was of bribery. If they do not understand the difference between "commission" and "bribery", it is not my fault. They should try to understand the difference. If they do not want to understand it, it is because of their intellectual and political bankruptcy and they are guilty of hoodwinking the people of India. For their intellectual and political bankruptcy I hold on brief whatsoever, I submit.

**SHRI RAM AWADHESH SINGH (Bihar) :** "Commission" is an ornamental form of "bribery."

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :**  
Please sit down. Please go to your seat.

**SHRI MADAN BHATIA :** Immediately after this broadcast was made, the Government of India got in touch with the Swedish Government and the Swedish Radio, and both were asked to disclose the true facts behind this broadcast. What was the reply which was given by the Swedish Radio ? The Swedish Radio said, "We do not know. We have received this information from one representative of ours,



[Sri Madan Bhatia]

who has landed in Delhi on the 14th of April."

Now this is important because this will show that this entire exercise, how it started, was a part of a gigantic political conspiracy inspired by foreign elements in collaboration with elements inside the country. Madam, the Government of India gets in touch with the representative, and the representative refuses to disclose the sources of information. Now what was the position ?

Now the sequence of events is very important to show that there was a conspiracy behind this broadcast. On the 11th of April, Mr. V.P. Singh resigns as the Finance Minister. On the 13th of April the "INDIAN EXPRESS" carries an editorial on its first page demanding the resignation of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi and suggesting that Mr. V.P. Singh should become the Prime Minister of India. On the 14th of April this representative lands in India, and within 48 hours this broadcast is made on the basis of the alleged information supplied by this representative of the Swedish Radio. I submit, Sir, "Is it possible that a representative of a foreign radio would land in India and within a period of a few hours would gather such a sensitive information, would pass it on the radio, and the radio would broadcast the whole information within a period of 48 hours?" I respectfully submit that the whole thing was a pre-planned and grand design of a conspiracy. There were some individuals who were already in touch with their foreign friends abroad. They had fixed up the Swedish Radio, and they created a semblance of innocence by arranging the visit of the representative of the Swedish Radio to India so that the broadcast which has been made should appear to have been made on the basis of an innocuously collected information by the representative of the

Swedish Radio.

I charge those people who have scores to settle with the Prime Minister, Mr. V.P. Singh and his friends, of having entered into this gigantic and the most hideous conspiracy in collaboration with their friends abroad who were trying to destabilise the Government of hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, of having created this entire drama.

Then what happens ?

12.00 NOON

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:  
Please conclude.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: I will take only three or four minutes more.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:  
One minute more.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA:  
Please. When the Swedish Radio representative refuses to give the information the Government of India gets in touch with the Swedish Government and asks that the full particulars must be collected and given to the Indian Government. It is at the instance of the hon. Prime Minister and the Government of India that this National Audit Bureau was appointed by the Swedish Government to collect the information. Let us not forget this particular important and vital fact about who generated the whole process of investigation. It was the hon. Prime Minister. It is at the instance of the hon. Prime Minister that this investigation was carried out and the report was furnished by the National Audit Bureau.

I submit some supposed withheld extracts have been published by THE HINDU now. I don't know how far they are authentic or how far they are not authentic, but if you read the entire report, you will find that what has been published

today does not fit in with that portion of the report which was furnished to the Government of India and the authenticity of which has not been challenged by THE HINDU. I will read that portion. That says:

"Now the case sought to be made out is that there was no winding up, there was no settlement of the existing agreements, but there was a full-fledged commission and the agreements continued to exist."

But what does this report say in the beginning?

The report says:

"There are no agreements on commissions. Local contracts have been used but these had been wound up before negotiations were concluded."

This is what the report says in the beginning. It was furnished to the Government of India and the authenticity of it has not been challenged. Then it says:

"An agreement exists between the AB Bofors and concerning the settlement of the commission subsequently to the F.H. deal and that a considerable amount has been paid subsequently to, among others, AB Bofors."

Now, this Audit Report in turn says that agreements had been settled before this deal was entered into. It was only in pursuance of the settlement of these agreements that the amounts were paid to the various persons concerned. Now this is the report. And today they say that the portions which have been withheld completely blast this theory. This is also part of the report. If that is genuine then this is also genuine.

Then I would submit that because these portions were withheld from this report that the hon.

Prime Minister and the Government of India were not satisfied and they decided to appoint a Joint Parliamentary Committee. The Joint Parliamentary Committee was appointed only because certain portions of the National Audit Bureau were withheld from the Government of India. And what was their conduct? They were not interested in the truth. They were only interested in the political denigration and political assassination of the hon. Prime Minister. Therefore, they boycotted the Joint Parliamentary Committee. And today they have the checks to say that they are interested in the truth. They are beating drums of falsehood all over the country and are not disclosing what the true facts are. It is as a result of the efforts of the Joint Parliamentary Committee that the names of the three companies were found out. It was the Joint Parliamentary Committee which put into action the investigating agencies of India as well as the Interpol. It is those agencies which discovered the particular fact that so far as these three companies are concerned they are post box companies. Who found out this information? This information was found out by the Indian agency as a result of the efforts of the Government of India. I respectfully submit even after that the Government of India is still not satisfied. The Government of India is carrying on the investigation. The hon. Prime Minister has further carried on the investigation to find out what the truth is. And lastly, Madam, I must say one thing. I will utter only two sentences. If there is one individual who has been a victim of idealism, straight forwardness, total confidence and faith in the democratic institutions of this country, namely, the Parliament, it is the hon. Prime Minister. One contract was entered into in 1978. The other was entered into in 1982. In 1978 when the contract was entered into, the whole family was fighting with

[Shri Madan Bhatia]

its back to the wall with the entire Janata dogs running after them to bite them. So far as 1982 contract is concerned, the hon. Prime Minister Mr. Rajiv Gandhi was not the Prime Minister of India. So far as the third contract is concerned, it was executed in November 1985 but in October 1985, it was the hon. Prime Minister who spoke to Mr. Palme and told him that so far as defence equipment is concerned, we shall not have any middlemen. Can it be possibly imagined that on the one hand he would talk to Mr. Palme that there should be no middlemen and in November 1985, and on the other a company would be floated to collect commission? I respectfully submit that these are the types of arguments which they have been uttering and I respectfully submit that today is the day, with the publication of these documents, when the final deathknell of their political demise has been sounded and people are going to throw them by the wayside, completely stripped, politically naked, of their political hypocrisy, their dissimulation their deception and their treachery to the country. Thank you.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA (Andhra Pradesh) : Madam Deputy Chairman, I stand today with anger and anguish. With anger because this Parliament, this country has been continuously misled by the highest in this Government. They said, there was no commission, there were no middlemen and no Indians. All things have been proved false by the evidence that has been coming in leaps and bounds from time to time. Therefore, every honest Indian, every right thinking Indian today is angry with this Government and with the way in which it has been functioning and misleading them. I am also in anguish because this Government is standing naked today. Already they have been stripped about which Mr. Madan Bhatia was speaking and I am sorry that they stand stripped amidst the people

today. That is the tragedy of it. Now, I would like to prove how they stand stripped today? Madam, they said that there was no commission, there were no middlemen. What is the fact? Subsequently, there were four organisations to which commissions were paid. They were A.E. Services, Svenska and Win Chadha's Anatronic Corporation. There was the fourth one. The identity of the first three was not sought to be obliterated. No effort was made to make mischief about the first three. They agreed upon those three. Now, I come to the fourth one which was Pitco to start with and which was replaced by Moresco. In 1984, it was sought to be mystified by no less a person than the Director of the CBI. In this process, Madam, the Director of the CBI misled a wing of this Parliament, namely the Joint Parliamentary Committee, though I do not have much to vouchsafe what it found out. But nonetheless, Mr. Katre, the Director of CBI, misled the JPC, misled the whole country, by saying that there was no company by the name Moineao while the fact was that the Company was Moresco. And subsequently, as has been proved by the documents released by Mr. N. Ram, Mr. Katre admitted that he misspelt it. Instead of Le Moineau he spelt it as Moineao SA and there was no organisation by the name Moineao SA and therefore what had been paid to some sources about which I will mention later, is not a fact. On the other hand, Madam, it is a fact that the organisation Moresco does exist. It is a fact that Pitco does exist and why was the effort made by Mr. Katre, the Director of CBI, and the entire Government to mystify Moresco? Is it because Moresco is having Italians as directors on its board? Therefore, does it mean that there was an attempt made by the highest in the Government, an agency which was supposed to investigate, to try to mystify Moresco and try to give the name of Moineao only because Italians were involved? What does it mean?

Where does it point ? Is it necessary for us to point out where it points ? Therefore Madam it is very clear that the highest in this country were obviously making continuous efforts to see that the information was suppressed, to suppress the real culprits who received the money really. Now the money is not Rs. 64 crores but it is Rs. 155 crores. That has been completely suppressed. I do not want to say which direction this points to. Further not only they made efforts to mislead in this direction, but when the documents were available with 'The Hindu' there were continuous efforts made to suppress to curb to create obstructions in the way of 'The Hindu' coming out with those documents. Who are the people involved ? Bureaucrats were involved, Investigating agencies were involved. Friends were involved. And who was not involved ? Madam, why, all of them, whether it is Gopi Arora or G. Parthasarathy or Mohan Katre or Bhatnagar or Hinduja....

**SHRI JAGESH DESAI** (Maharashtra) : Madam, he is referring to names of persons who are not here to defend themselves. This cannot be allowed.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** I request Members to avoid names as much as they can.

**PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA :** We will avoid wherever it is possible. But if any particular fact is to be told, we will tell that. Whether they are hard, whether they are not tasty, whether they are going to be bitter facts have to be told. That is why I am referring to them.

How is it that different types of people associated with the Government at the highest levels made efforts to curb, to stifle, the voice of truth ? Again, the pointing finger is towards a particular place which is very difficult to swallow for the party in power. What has been brought out by the revelations ?

589 RS—2

It has been brought out by the revelations that we are having a Government whose credibility has been completely destroyed which does not have the right to live even for one day, one minute, after the revelations. But then they go on: I do not want to say it but shamefacedly they go on.

Madam, the second point I would like to mention in this connection is as to what efforts were made to get facts, get the truth from Bofors. In the course of the investigations, in the course of disclosures on the floor of the House, it came to the conclusion that Bofors might have committed a breach of contract. That is at least what a former Minister of State for Defence said himself. The former Minister of State for Defence said that there was conclusive evidence to prove that Bofors had violated the contracts with the Government of India. He suggested two ways out ; either to cancel the contract—he did not want to go into the consequences of cancelling the contractor to at least demand from Bofors Rs. 64 crores which he accepted. This was not acceptable to the Government mainly because if you touch here you are going to destroy the whole net. And when the whole net is disturbed, I do not know where it is going to fall. That is why they did not do it. It was a Pandora's box.

The same point was also made by Gen. Sunderji. I do not want to go into the record of Gen. Sunderji before he became the Chief of Staff. It is this Government which appointed him. If his background was not worthy of his being the Chief of Staff, if he was made the Chief of Staff it is their fault not our fault. But he was the Chief of Staff. And he has gone on record saying—which has not been contradicted—that they wanted to have cancellation of the contract and he also gave enough proof to them that the damage would not be very much; it will be only two years. Nonetheless they do not do it, because

[Prof. C. Lakshmanan] they had more faith in a multinational which was trying to sell arms which was twisting the arms of the Government, rather than the people. The people are prepared for any eventuality if it comes to that. They did not take the people into confidence. They did not ask the people to make sacrifices if necessary. But they wanted to appease the Bofors Co., merely because Bofors had the key. If they had used the key, it would have exposed the people at the helm of affairs. Therefore, they did not want to do it. Therefore, I would like to say that what has been revealed by Gen. Sunderji and what has been revealed by 'The Hindu' has clearly demonstrated that this Government has no right to exist even for one minute, because it has paid and diverted huge sums of money out of the hard sweat of this country's people who have paid, through taxes, etc., into foreign accounts.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :**  
Your time is over. I am sorry. I cannot help it.

**PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA :**  
Last point. We have to look at the whole thing as to how to build a credible system in which the people can have faith tomorrow. If deal after deal, if issue after issue—whether it is submarine deal whether it is Bofors gun deal, whether it is Westland Helicopters deal or it is the pipeline deal, whatever be the deal, in each of these deals if such commissions are paid out of the money that has been contributed by the hard earning Indians of this country, I think such Government has no right to stand even for one minute. And if it still stands it is not before long that the people will teach them the lesson their life so that they will never rise again... (Interruptions) This is not a prediction. This is only the conclusion based upon the evidence available.

Thank you, Madam.

श्री सुरेन्द्रजी सिंह अहलूवालिया :  
(बिहार) : उपसभापति महोदय, रोज-

रोज एक नया तमाशा सामने लाने की कोशिश की जा रही है बोफोर्स की तोप का मैं इसके पहले भी कह चुका हूँ कि सबसे बड़ा दुर्भाग्य यह है कि गौतम की इस भूमि में, महावीर की इस भूमि में, नानक की इस भूमि में, गांधी की इस भूमि में, तोपों के सौदे में विचौलियों का जो काम था उसके बारे में विचार करने के लिए खड़े हो जाते हैं। मैं इसके पहले भी कहा था कि ये कौन सी तकते हैं जिन्होंने हमें मजबूर किया था आर्थ रेस का सदस्य बनने के लिये। 1962 में जब चीन ने हिन्दुस्तान पर आक्रमण किया तो हमारे पास बंदूकें और तोपें नहीं थी। यहाँ सारे विपक्ष के नेता बैठे हैं जिन्होंने चिल्ला-चिल्ला कर कहा था कि आपको किसने रोका था तोपें खरीदने के लिये, किसने रोका था एंटी एयर कपट गन खरीदने के लिये, किसने रोका था सोफ्ट-स्टिकेटेड गन खरीदने के लिये, किसने रोका था वाइरड खरीदने के लिये। इसके पीछे यह मकसद नहीं था कि वे मृतभूमि की रक्षा चाहते थे। इसके पीछे यह मकसद था कि विदेशी ताकतें जो अस्त्र-शस्त्र बनाती हैं उनकी एजेंटियाँ उन्हें भारत में खुलवाती थी। हिन्दुस्तान एक बड़ा बाजार है और उनके द्वारा निमित्त शस्त्र भारतवर्ष में बिक्री कराने के लिये वही लोग हमें मजबूर कर रहे हैं कि आप ये हथियार इस देश से नहीं खरीद सकते। आपको अगर हथियार खरीदने हैं तो आप इस मुल्क से खरीदें। अगर नहीं खरीदेंगे तो उसका जो अंजाम है वह हमें भुगतना पड़ेगा। इसके पीछे क्या-क्या कारण हैं? विपक्ष ने बड़े-बड़े भाषण दिये हैं। उन्होंने बहुत बड़ी-बड़ी बात की है। लेकिन सोफमा और बोफोर्स तोपों के सौदे में जो कीमतों का फर्क था, जो एक सौ करोड़ रुपये का फर्क था, वह किसको जाना था? जब 21 मार्च को उन्हें पता लगा कि यह कांटेक्ट हमें नहीं मिल रहा है तो उन्होंने एक सौ करोड़ रुपये अपनी कीमत कम की। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि वह पैसा किसको जाने वाला था? क्या कभी आपने इसको समझने की कोशिश की है? आप लोगों ने शुरू से जनता को दिग्भ्रांत करने की कोशिश की है कि राजीव गांधी

ने पैसा खाया है ? लेकिन इसमें राजीव गांधी का नाम कहा जाता है। कल मि० राम ने जो इंटरव्यू दिया, तो उसमें उन्होंने कहा है कि मैं जब राजीव गांधी जी से मिला तो उन्होंने मुझसे कहा कि जो इन्वेस्टीगेटिव टीम है उसकी आप मदद करें और जो कागजात आपके पास हैं उनको आप उन्हें दे दें, उनकी मदद करें। राजीव गांधी ने कहा उनको यह कहा कि आप इसको दवाने की कोशिश करें या पब्लिश न करें। बड़े गर्व से उन्होंने कहा कि कस्तुरी से कहा कि इसे अखबार में नहीं छापने दें, और उस पर तरह तरह से दबाव डाले गये। बड़ी बेवकूफी का सवाल है। सारे लोग जानते हैं कि एक अखबार नहीं बल्कि चार चार अखबार भारत सरकार के खिलाफ लिख रहे हैं। एक अखबार को बन्द करवायेंगे तो दूसरा अखबार लिखेगा ही। हम कोई दूसरा रास्ता नहीं अपनाना चाहते हैं। हम उस रास्ते पर नहीं जाना चाहते हैं। हम चाहते हैं कि कमीशन किपको मिला इसका पता लगे। आप पिंटो की

**[उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश बेंसाई) पीठासीन हुए]**

बात करते हैं, आप पिंटो संस्था की बात करते हैं, आप जिस विवेक की बात करते हैं तो आप उसका ध्यान देवने की कोशिश करें कि यह पिंटो कंपनी क्या रजिस्टर्ड हुई थी ? बोफोर्स कंपनी के साथ उसको जो पहला एग्रीमेंट हुआ वह कब हुआ था ? उस वक्त भारत में किपकी सरकार थी और उस वक्त विदेश मंत्रालय का मंत्री कौन था, उस वक्त डिफेंस मिनिस्टर कौन था ? इस पर ध्यान देना जरूरी है। लोटस के बारे में बहुत तरह की बातें कही गईं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि लोटस किसका चुनाव चिन्ह रहा है। लोटस बी०जे०पी० का चुनाव चिन्ह है और उस वक्त सीमागम से बी०जे०पी० के ही नेता विदेश मंत्री थे। उनका पासपोर्ट अगर 1977 से लेकर 1980 तक का देखा जाय तो आप देखेंगे कि उस पर एक नहीं बहुत सारी मोहरें लगी हुई हैं। क्योंकि वे उस वक्त हिन्दुस्तान में नहीं रहते थे। वे विदेशों में ही ज्यादातर रहा करते हैं। इस लोटस के नाम पर जो फंड दिलाया गया उस पर विपक्ष ने क्या

कोई बात करने की कोशिश की ? लेफ्टिनेंट कर्नल कौल ने कहा है कि आस्ट्रियन गन जो कि तीसरी चौथी पोजीशन पर थी वह अपना नाम जोड़ने के लिये ढाई करोड़ रुपया देने को तैयार थी। आप यह मांग क्यों नहीं करते कि सरकार लेफ्टिनेंट कर्नल कौल से पूछे कि वह कौन एजेंट था जिसने ढाई करोड़ रुपया देने का आफर किया था ? वह कौनसा एजेंट था जिसने यह करने की कोशिश की ? आप यह क्यों नहीं पूछते कि सोफमा ने उसमें एक सौ करोड़ रुपये का फर्क क्यों रखा था ? वह सौ करोड़ का फर्क था उसके एजेंट हिन्दुस्तान में कौन कौन हैं और वह किस किससे मिलते थे और सोफमा गन पहले नम्बर पर शुरू से क्यों आ रही थी। लड़ाई इस बात को नहीं है कि कंट्रेक्ट किम को गया कमीशन किमने खाया यह लड़ाई सिर्फ यह है कि सोफमा गन को कंट्रेक्ट नहीं मिला और इन्हें सौ करोड़ नहीं मिला, लड़ाई इस बात की है और दुर्भाग्य इस बात का है कि उस वक्त इंदिरा जी की हत्या के पहले जिस तरह से हमारे मूलक में दुश्मन कुछ पोलिटिकल लीडर्स जो जगह जगह बैठे हुए हैं व विदेश में जा कर पाकिस्तान में जाकर कह कर आए थे कि जनरल जिया-उल-हक बहुत बड़ा एडमिनिस्ट्रेटर है, हिन्दुस्तान का दोस्त है, हिन्दुस्तान के प्रति बकादार है। यह वही लोग हैं जिन्होंने उसको बकादारी का सर्टिफिकेट हिन्दुस्तान में आ कर दिया था। आपके माध्यम से मैं हिन्दुस्तान की जनता को बताना चाहता हूँ कि बोफोर्स गन खरीदने के पीछे जो सर्टिफिकेट जनरल सुन्दर जी ने दिये वह गन जनरल सुन्दर जी ने क्यों खरीदवाई। जब पाकिस्तान के पास अमरीका से फाइबर फाइडिंग रेडार आया जो रेडार तोप से गोला चलने के 45 सेकेंड के अन्दर यह पता लगा लेता था कि यह गन कहां पर स्थित है और कम्प्यूटर के माध्यम से उस गन को हिट करने के लिए अपनी मिजाइल को आदेश दे देता था। यह बोफोर्स गन में काबलियत थी, आज हमारे मित्र संसद् सदस्य जसवंत सिंह जी भी हैं जो देख कर आए थे जिस गन के विषय में इन्होंने कहा था कि यह गन बहुत अच्छी गन है बेस्ट गन है। इस

[श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया]

गन का जो शूट एंड स्कूट का करेक्टर है उसके माध्यम से सिर्फ हम तोप की रक्षा नहीं करते अपने मुल्क की रक्षा नहीं करते संग से अपने भाई भतीज जो इसके तोपची हैं उनकी भी रक्षा करते हैं इन सारी चीजों को इस विपक्ष ने सबसे ज्यादा खतरा पहुंचाया है। आज शूट एंड स्कूट का स्पेसिफिकेशन हिन्दुस्तान की सड़कों पर विक रहा है विदेश में बैठे हुए हमारे दुश्मनों के पास भी पहुंच गया है। 45 से 55 सेकंड के अन्दर वृहत्मिजाइल हमारी तोप को उड़ा देती थी यह बोफोर गन में गुण है कि यह 13 सेकंड के अन्दर गोली चलाने के बाद अपनी पोजीशन बदल लेती है। और तो और इंडिया टु डे में 30 सितम्बर को जनरल सुन्दर जी ने अपने स्टेटमेंट में कहा कि—

“...knocking a good gun, sowing doubts in the minds of the troops about the efficacy of the gun system, is a mean, dishonourable thing to do. It did untold damage and I had to make sure that it stopped. This is the reason why I spoke out when I did.”

दूसरी बार जनरल सुन्दर जी फिर कहते हैं। उनका जवाब 17 सितम्बर को इण्डियन एक्सप्रेस में जो छपा वह इस प्रकार है—

“No, I am sorry. As far as I am concerned, as far as the Army is concerned, it is bloody fundamental. I am not a politician. I am not interested in politics. I care two hoots for the ruling party. I couldn't care less about the bloody opposition. The quality of the gun is being used more and more today by the opposition as an electoral gimmick...”

श्री कल्पनाय राय (उत्तर प्रदेश) : यह ब्लडी अपोजीशन है ... (व्यवधान)

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA : They are real bloody opposition. They are making a political gimmick.

इतना ही नहीं कहते,

“They are a bloody immoral, dishonourable lot. Mr. Rama Rao quotes me to say I am supporting his contention that it is a bad gun and our defences are being jeopardised. I am very upset with that man for insisting that it is a bad weapon and is being foisted on the armed forces, and because of that our defence preparedness is being jeopardised. It is wrong, immoral and irresponsible.” यह एन० टी० रामाराव जिसने हिन्दुस्तान की कोजों को म्यूटिनी करते के लिए कहा इनको शर्म आनी चाहिये। यह पहला मौका नहीं है जिन लोगों ने हिन्दुस्तान में देशद्रोही ताकतों को भड़काने की कोशिश की है (व्यवधान) एक तरफ कौमी दंगे करवाते हैं दूसरी तरफ हिन्दुस्तान की फौजों को भड़काने की कोशिश चलती है। (व्यवधान)

श्री मोहम्मद खलीलुर रहमान : (आंध्र प्रदेश) : मेरा प्वाइंट आफ ऑर्डर है (व्यवधान) इनको सेंस की बात करनी चाहिये। (व्यवधान)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : Mr. Ahluwalia, you please continue.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA : मैं तो कामनसेंस की बात कर रहा हूँ। I am not talking about intellectual sense or nonsense. I am talking about commonsense. (Interruptions) यह मेरा भाषण नहीं है। यह सुन्दरजी का भाषण है। सुन्दर जी ने आप लोगों के बारे में कहा है।

No, I am sorry, as far as I am concerned, as far as the Army is concerned, it is bloody fundamental. I am not a politician. I am not interested in politics. I care two hoots for the ruling party. I could not care less about the bloody opposition. The quality of the gun

is being used more and more today by the opposition as an electoral gimmick. (Interruptions).

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, एक बार समझ नहीं आया तो दूसरी बार पढ़ कर सुना देता हूँ।

They are a bloody immoral dishonourable lot. Mr. Rama Rao quotes me to say I am supporting his contention that it is a bad gun and our defences are being jeopardised. I am very upset with that man for insisting that it is a bad gun and it is being foisted on the Armed Forces and because of that our defence preparedness is being jeopardised. It is wrong, immoral and irresponsible.

This is the second time I am repeating मैं बार बार याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ जिस दिन आप चुनाव क्षेत्र में पहुंचेंगे आपको जनता याद दिलाएगी कि किस तरह से गद्दारी आपने जनता के साथ की है। यह लड़ाई कोई नयी लड़ाई नहीं है (व्यवधान) सरदार बोलने के पहले मेरा इतिहास जानने की कोशिश करो। इस सारे विपक्ष ने विदेशी ताकतों से मिलकर 1967 में पोलिटिक्स आफ डिफेंशन का गेम खेला। 1977 में पोलिटिक्स आफ मेनोपुलेशन का गेम खेला और 1984 में पोलिटिक्स आफ इलिमिनेशन का गेम खेला इन्होंने हमारी महान नेता इंदिरा जी की हत्या कराई (व्यवधान) आज इसका प्रमाण मांग रहे हैं (व्यवधान)

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY (Andhra Pradesh) : What is he saying? (Interruptions). You kindly look into the records. He cannot talk like that. (Interruptions). इन्होंने इंदिरा गांधी की हत्या करवाई (व्यवधान)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : Now the last point and you have two minutes.

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : आज जब कुछ बाकी नहीं रहा है पोलिटिक्स आफ इलिमिनेशन में जब हार गये और इन्होंने देखा 415 सीटें लेकर राजीव गांधी राज करने आया है तब इन्होंने पोलिटिक्स आफ एक्विजेशन शुरू किया है (व्यवधान) आप अगर ध्यान से देखें तो गरीबी हटाओ का नारा जब दिया गया तो इन्होंने अपनी पोलिटिक्स खेली। जब बैंकों के राष्ट्रीयकरण का नारा दिया तब इन्होंने अपनी पोलिटिक्स खेला। जब डिसेंट्रलाइजेशन आफ पावर का प्रोग्राम दिया तब इन्होंने अपना गेम खेला। जब 1986 में राजीव गांधी ने हर एक शहर-शहर गांव-गांव में जाना शुरू किया जनता से मिलना शुरू किया और डी० एम० की मीटिंग बुलाई डिसेंट्रलाइजेशन आफ पावर की बात सोची पंचायती राज का ड्राफ्ट बिल तैयार करने की कोशिश चली तो यह बोर्कोस उठा कर ले आए (व्यवधान) आप अगर आज का अखबार उठा कर देखें हेडलाइन में कुछ और है नीचे मुद्रा कुछ और लिखा गया है (व्यवधान)

श्री कल्पनाथ राव : यह ब्लडी अपोजीशन है . . . (व्यवधान)

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : Can we call him a bloody Minister, if he calls us bloody opposition? (Interruptions).

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA : It is general Sundarji saying. It is not Surendarjit saying.

—THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : Now come to the last point.

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय यह जो तरह तरह के आरोप लगा रहे हैं आज मुद्रा मुद्रा जो पता लगाने की जरूरत है वह यह है कि सोफिया के दलाल कौन-कौन थे हिन्दुस्तान में और 100 करोड़ खयाल सको जाना



[श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया]

था यह पता लगाने की जरूरत है । दूसरा पता लगाने की जरूरत है जनरल कोल से कि आपको ढाई करोड़ रुपया किसने आकर किया था । इसके दलाल हिन्दुस्तान में कौन कौन हैं यह पता लगाने की जरूरत है । इसी रास्ते पर चल कर हम सरकार की जिम्मेदारी को समझते हुए इनका मुखांटा उतार कर रहेंगे । धन्यवाद ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : Mr. Jaswant Singh, your time is limited to five minutes; you can take 7 or 8 minutes.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan) : I am grateful for your expression of consideration in advance. Before I make my intervention, I would like to make a request to the hon. Defence Minister in emulation of his example. The previous speaker has also quoted me and has said something about what I had said about the quality of the gun system, and the hon. Defence Minister knows it on how many numerous occasions he has chosen to quote me on that subject. Therefore, there is just one request that I would make to the hon. Defence Minister. Whereas he gives so much importance to an expression of an agreement about the quality of the weapon system, it is my request to him that he should give equal importance and equal weightage to all the other comments that I have to make about corruption that is attendant on this issue.

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI K.C. PANT) : I do not know whether he has equal experience of both. I thought he had better experience of the gun.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : The hon. Defence Minister asked me about experience, whether I have equal experience of both. I cannot match the experience of the Government in corruption certainly.

SHRI K. C. PANT (On the gun you can.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : I cannot match the Government when it comes to corruption. I can also certainly not match the Government when it comes to blatant cover-up. Therefore, when I express a viewpoint about all the other aspects of the Bofors, it is my expectation now to be reassured that the Government and the hon. Defence Minister will give equal weightage to it.

You have limited the time that is at my disposal. Therefore, I will not, and I cannot, engage in an expression of all the views that I hold about that matter. We have, in effect, reached the *Atharwan Adhyay* of this matter, and I must publicly express my gratitude to my colleague from Rajasthan, hon. Kamal Morarka, when he said that really the way to look at this whole matter is not to start from the beginning but to only talk about what obtains today. We have talked endlessly about Bofors. It is not necessary for me to go into the shoddy beginnings or the sorry continuation of this episode. We are now engaged with the *Atharwan Adhyay*. Truth stares us in the face. It is self-evident. The Government does not wish to recognise the truth because truth would sear it, and because it does not wish to recognise truth, therefore, I will limit my intervention—because the time you have allotted to me is also limited—to asking the Government only certain specific clarifications.

श्री पशपति नाथ सुकुल (उत्तर प्रदेश) :  
जसवंत सिंह जी, 18वां अध्याय य युद्ध का अध्याय है ।

श्रीमती रेणुका चौधरी : कल इलेक्शन में युद्ध ही चलेगा इश्क नहीं ।

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : There are two observations that I

would however make. They are not observations that are subjective. That is the impression that the entire country today holds, that when it comes to malfeasance in the procurement of this weapon system, regrettably, we have come to observe and to find that much more than Bofors themselves, more even than the Government of Sweden, when it comes to speaking for Bofors A.B. as a pedlar of arms, it is the Government of India that has become the chief spokesman for Bofors.

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJ-PAYEE** (Madhya Pradesh) : They are their agents.

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH** : The Prime Minister in his individual capacity might or might not be personally liable ; time will tell ; documents will establish, but he alone singly is certainly personally and individually responsible for all that Bofors has brought upon this country. On account of Bofors, as a people we are today sent as never before and the nation has been diminished as never before. I have had occasions to state that it is on account of Bofors that every single institution of the Republic today stands diminished, and that it is on account of the conduct of this Government for which the principal responsibility is upon the head of the Prime Minister. If the Republic is diminished, if the State of India has lost its moral authority, it is on account of Bofors and the responsibility for that is of the Prime Minister.

Sir, I would like the hon. Defence Minister to clarify the reasoning that has been advanced and which is not convincing. Why did you not, when so recommended not just by the Chief of Army Staff but indeed by the officials of the Ministry of Defence, by the then Minister of State for Defence,

threaten to cancel the contract with Bofors in the middle of 1987? The reasoning that is advanced now and without bringing the office of the Chief of Army Staff into political controversy, I would like to go very briefly into the reasoning that has already been advanced by the Ministry of Defence that the security of nation was in peril. Therefore, I would like to ask some clarifications from the Government.

The security of the nation cannot be determined or is not a dependent on a single weapon system. If Chief of the Army Staff had given his considered opinion on the security environment and if the Government had a different view-point from it, why then did the Government not inform the Chief of Army Staff that your perception of the threat facing the country is different from ours, you are in error in looking north when we are looking west? I make this charge upon the Government in all seriousness that the situation that has been created yet again, on account of Bofors, is very similar to the situation that the country went through in the late 50s, early 60s, culminating in the national humiliation of 1962. It is no small matter that the Chief of Army Staff should have a perception of threat which is different from the Government's perception and if there does exist a difference of view on threat perceptions, then it is obligatory on the Government to brief the Chief of Army Staff, the Chief of Naval Staff and the Chief of Air Staff that this is the real threat. Why was this not done?

Now I would like to ask, who determines the security environment of the country. Whose input was it? Was it the input of the Ministry of External Affairs or the Joint Intelligence Committee? If it was the Joint Intelligence Committee, the Director General of Military Intelligence is a member,

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

of the Joint Intelligence Committee. Is it the suggestion of the Government that the Director General of Military Intelligence who sits in the Joint Intelligence Committee had a different perception of the threat facing the country than the Joint Intelligence Committee, than the Government, than a Lt. General had an appreciation of threat facing the country when he sat in the JIC which was different from his own Chief of Army Staff? These are the puerile explanations that have been provided by the Defence Ministry and I consider it my responsibility to point out in all seriousness that the situation is not dissimilar to 1962. If the Defence Ministry persists on this path, the national humiliation that has already been suffered, I hope and pray is not furthered. Coming to my next clarification...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): The last one.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: How can it be the last one? I have just begun.

[The Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

(Interruptions). Madam, my next clarification is, when from Interpol of Stockholm you had received a written communication on 17th September, 1987 offering cooperation and in addition to offering cooperation on 17th September, 1987, they went to the extent of saying, Interpol Stockholm that it is their information that Anartomics is involved in this matter, why since 17th September 1987, till 13th October, 1989, have you not even once questioned Shri Win Chadha of Anartomics or charged him with a single offence relating to Bofors?

My next clarification, Madam...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is over, Mr. Jaswant Singh...

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Give him some more time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You could have given it from your party's time. I have no objection.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: We are giving.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is already over.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: He is concluding.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I will conclude, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I have to abide by your direction. I will conclude. When you had information regarding Moresco, Moineao, PITCO, why did the Director-General of CBI come back to Government of India to say that no such entity exists Number two, when you had information about Moineao, PITCO, Moresco here I again express my gratitude to hon. Shri Morarka, my colleague—that when it is not a question of banking secrecy, surely the Government of India could have found out who is this company, what is behind this company? You could have asked from the Bofors: who is this company, who is behind this company? Have you discussed this matter with Bofors? After all—and again I owe it to him—they have not paid their commission—not arranged commission just to a company letterhead. There must be a person who had been spoken to. It is the simplest of things that the Government of India could have asked Bofors: who is behind Moineao, PITCO, Moresco? I will conclude, Madam.

There was an aide-memoire given by our Ambassador, Shri Bhupat Rai Oza. He had addressed himself seriously to this malfeasance, the corruption and the perjury of Bofors. He had addressed an aide-memoire which is in the possession of Government of India. Why has the Government of India not revealed this aide-memoire till today? Why has Mr. Oza's, who was our Ambassador in Stockholm during all those crucial months, testimony not been taken till today? I would like a clarification on this from the Government of India.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:**  
Now please conclude.

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH:** I will just conclude in two half seconds.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:**  
What is two half seconds?

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH:** You will see, Madam. Why has Government, till today, not questioned either Shri Win Chadha or Shri Hinduja when it stands established that these two Indians are as individuals, involved in pay offs? Why did, Madam, Mr. Katre inform the Editor of the *Hindu* that he had received advice "no action on Hinduja"? Why did the Government of India ask for assistance from Switzerland on grounds of evasion of taxation when it knows very well that on grounds of evasion of taxation, Swiss laws forbid them to cooperate with it? Why did you not, when there was corruption involved, when there was perjury involved, when there was bribery involved, address such a communication till today, at least in respect of Hinduja and Win Chadha? Madam, I would like to know why have you not till today, in this endless list...

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:**  
Your endless speech should end now.

**SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY:** Because it hurts, because the truth hurts.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:**  
I would not like you to make such comments. You are making a comment on the Chair. It does not hurt me at all. It hurts the time of the House.

**SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY:** I have not made any comment on the Chair. You are speaking on behalf of the House. I am also saying on behalf of the House.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:**  
Don't make such comments that it hurts. It does not hurt me at all. Don't think that you can get away with whatever comments you make in this House against the Chair.

**SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY:** What did you say?

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:**  
I told Mr. Jaswant Singh, "your time is over, so please sit down". No, I am not giving you any time.

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH:**  
Madam, I will conclude. The next clarification that I have to ask makes it a bit difficult for me to ask. It is addressed directly to the Defence Minister and it is with a great deal of hesitation that I am mentioning officials, which I have never done this House. When the Principal

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

Secretary to the Prime Minister, and when the then Defence Minister himself got so much worked up at this entire episode of *The Hindu* exposures in a manner that does not convince us, that does not fill us with conviction that you were interested in extracting every bit of harsh truth. Why did the Principal Secretary to the Prime Minister take so much interest? Why is it that always the Defence Minister's, or the Government of India's first response to every additional bit of information that comes about this bribery is that it is false? Why is it that the first response is to go back to Sweden when the truth is self-evident? When the truth stares you in the face, why is it that you go back to Sweden? Because, with Sweden you have a collusion. It is an international collusion that you have arrived at today. You have a collusion with Bofors, you have a collusion with Sweden, and that is why it makes it so difficult for me to ask this question.

Madam, I will conclude..

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:  
Mr. Vishvjit Singh.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH:  
Madam...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:  
Now it is over. Mr. Vishvjit Singh. I am sorry. Your time was only five minutes. Your previous speaker had been very indulgent. I am sorry.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH:  
One sentence, with your permission, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:  
How many conclusions do you have?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH:  
The concluding sentence, is, this journey had started on 16th April 1987. Then the first response of the Government was that the report

was false, mischievous, etc. etc. Since then we had traversed a very long distance. From "No Indians, no commissions, no bribery, no middleman, no politicians," we have finally arrived at a point—that is why I called it the Eighteenth Chapter of the Gita—when the truth is self-evident. If still the Government does not recognize the truth, the country will pay a price. It is a matter of some indifference to me whether the ruling party pays that price or does not pay that price. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:  
Mr. Vishvjit Singh. You have exactly ten minutes. Please try and abide by the time.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH  
(Maharashtra): Madam, I will try and abide by your ruling.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: For his size you are allotting the time!

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH:  
Madam, I would echo the words of my honourable colleague, Prof. Lakshmananna, also said that he rise with anguish and anger—anguish at the state which we have been reduced to and anger at the reasons why this has happened.

Madam, my honourable colleague, Mr. Jaswant Singh, has said that it is like the Eighteenth Chapter of the Gita when truth will finally be revealed, and I say to him, yes, it is like the Eighteenth Chapter of the Gita. Today the truth has been revealed, and it has been revealed in the columns of the newspapers. It is all there. As has been pointed out by honourable Mr. Bhatia, false headlines, screaming headlines, misinterpretation of the documentation, none of which is going to get you anywhere! Because today the truth is out, I am grateful—and I say this with some responsibility—to Shri N. Ram of *the Hindu* for giving these documents for publication.

What do these documents reveal? A mere perusal of these documents makes clear the repeated efforts of the Government to try and get at the truth. And they also reveal the reason why this truth has not been forthcoming. I would like to quote, Madam, from, what they call, the secret record of talks between the Government and Bofors. This is the brief summary record of discussions between the Government of India and the Bofors delegation. I would like to quote para 4:

"4. Bofors made the following proposals :

(i) Was it possible for GOI to arrive at a "secrecy arrangement" with Bofors, within which Bofors could supply the requisite information to GOI;

(ii) Whether GOI would be satisfied and close the matter if Bofors opened their entire accounts of the Indian Contract for scrutiny by a Public Accountant of international repute to be mutually agreed upon."

Madam, our response to that makes clear what we thought.

"5. GOI explained to Bofors that in the circumstances already explained at great length to Bofors, it was not possible to consider any kind of "secrecy arrangement." Nor was it possible, at this juncture, to consider that the problem would be resolved by the appointment of a Public Accountant, no matter how well regarded. GOI, Parliament and the people of India would be satisfied only on being informed of the complete facts and not by a mere certification that Bofors accounts were in order."

Then Bofors goes on to say :

"Bofors would furnish certain facts, but could offer no conclusions."

Madam, Bofors made clear what their problem was.

Bofors stated that their success and business reputation spreading over decades has been established by demonstrating that they were capable of preserving the confidence of various national authorities and private companies with which it had dealings. In this context it was contended that compromising the requirements of commercial secrecy would not be possible as this would adversely affect Bofors standing and future reputation. Under no circumstances could Bofors afford to lose the confidence of its clients. It had to look to its other international commitments.

That is the reason, Madam, why Bofors is not willing to part with any information. We have tried. The Prime Minister has gone to the extent of asking the Swedish Government. The Swedish Government has had two separate agencies investigating into this whole affair, and no conclusion has been found. We have chased the leads to their final end, to wherever we could get them. We have finally chased them to Switzerland. We have finally chased them to certain banks. We have finally got certain account numbers. We have finally got all the information. But beyond that the tea goes cold. We are trying even now. We have signed a secrecy agreement with Switzerland. We have signed bilateral treaties. We are in the process of trying to get them to co-operate with us even further this case. Our whole stand throughout has been that we want this information. We have tried. We have put pressure. The letters of Mr. Bhatnagar which have been quoted here, speak for themselves. Now I would like to quote. I am quoting now from "THE STATESMAN." The last time I was quoting from "THE INDIAN EXPRESS." These are the newspapers which you people are relying

[Shri Vishvijit P. Singh]

on today. That is why I say that today is the date of truth. In a confidential letter to Bofors President bearing some number dated October 15, 1987—note the date, "October 15"—Mr. Bhatnagar find the information deficient the letter says:

"The information supplied is inadequate. The names of the Presidents of the three companies as well as the directors have not been supplied. Further, no information has been given regarding contract structure of these companies. You have earlier informed us of the agreed summary record of our last discussion that one of the three companies to whom winding up payments were made, is called Moresco...."

Just now Mr. Jaswant Singhji was asking whether we asked any question about Moresco. There was one company whose name is Moresco.

"... and that when Bofors signed an agreement with that company it was called Pitco, but had since undergone a change of name. It has now been disclosed that Moresco is not a company but a reference for Moineao S.A. It would require to be suitably explained how a registered company requires to have a "reference." Is Moresco a code name for the actual company? If so, did the same code reference also apply to Pitco when Bofors originally signed an agreement with it? On what date did Pitco change its name to Moineao S.A.? The names of the directors of Pitco also require to be furnished specially indicating the changes among directors of the new company called Moineao S.A."

Mr. Bhatnagar further says:

"It was stated that Bofors originally entered into an agreement with Moineao S.A. on October 15, 1979. In view of the earlier disclosure of Agreed Summary Re-

cord that the agreement was entered into when the company was called Pitco, the factually correct position required to be confirmed. Further, the specific date on which Bofors entered into and terminated its agreement with Moineao S.A. may be furnished."

He goes on to say:

"As per para 6.1 (iii) of the Agreed Summary Record, Bofors had agreed to check and indicate how many of the three payments to Moresco (the name of the company has now been disclosed as Moineao S.A.) were paid into coded Swiss Bank accounts."

Now he goes on to say that money was paid to three different banks. Could we have details? This is the letter of Mr. Bhatnagar, Defence Secretary. It is their own newspaper. I call it their own newspaper because we have been finally reduced to a state where it is not we as a Member of Parliament, who are conducting any investigation. It is not we who are trying to find out something. When I say 'we', I mean my colleagues on the other side. They are being fed and I go on further to say that they are not just being fed but are being spoon-fed by journalists who write screaming headlines. What do the headlines say and what does the news actually indicate? What are the facts? The facts, as disclosed by them, are completely contrary to the screaming headlines, the kind of rhetoric that goes on here.

I would like to say just one thing. No matter how much they can keep on shouting, how loudly they may shout, how far they may shout, they cannot change the facts. Today, as Mr. Jaswant Singh said, is the day of the truth. The Dharma Adhyay of the Geeta is upon us. The truth is finally out. It is out in the words of the people who are accusing us. It is in their words that I quote: "This truth is now out."

And what do they say? They go further. There is a headline in THE INDIAN EXPRESS—'The tell-tale documents'. It gives a list of documents. Document B, letter of October 15, Bofers letter. These are the letters I am quoting. These are supposed to be tell-tale documents. I could like to ask Jaswant Singh Ji further. He asked four questions. The last question he asked is the most telling. I leave the other three to the hon. Minister of Defence to reply, but the fourth question I will reply.

When he says what is the response of the Government or the Defence Ministry everytime a document is published, I will say to him that the response of the Ministry is absolutely correct because when a document is published, how can we take it as true? How can we say that any document that is published in any newspaper is true? It is not true. I say that it is absolutely correct of the Defence Minister to ask the Swedish authorities first to authenticate those documents. Each time he should ask for authentication. I would mention here when the head of the CBI, Mr. Katre went and met Mr. N. Ram and asked him for documents, he gave only those which were published. He said: Could you give me some more documents. I would like to follow this to its conclusion. But no, he was not forthcoming. There is a pattern; there is a scheme; there is a conspiracy. It is the same conspiracy which overthrew democratic regimes in Chile, in Paraguay, in Nicaragua and in Afghanistan. It is the same conspiracy—I will not name anybody, because I do not know who they are. I would say only one thing that it is an international conspiracy which is aimed at threatening our existence. The moment we are at the state of self-reliance, when India is to take its rightful place in the congress of nations, that is the time when these attacks begin. I say once again today is the day of truth;

today is the day of our Dharma Adhyay. Face the truth. It is in front of you. It is starting at your life the cosmos was starting at Arjuna. And when we open our mouth it is in front of you. Look at it. Beware, share, fear, tremble. And like Bofers, let me tell you further, by seeing the comparatively empty opposition benches, they have adopted shoot and scoot policy. They shoot. And when we reply they scoot. Thank you.

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY :** Madam Deputy Chairman, we have to salute Mr. N. Ram and Mr. Chitra Subramaniam for their scaling of the Himalayan heights in investigative journalism. But for them, the Parliament the people of India and the whole world would not have known the full facts and the real facts... (*Interruptions*).

**SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY (Uttar Pradesh) :** Madam this was a matter of great happiness to congratulate two Brahmins.

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY :** Madam are you deducting this time? He is a man always with poison in his mind. You kindly deduct this time.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** You continue.

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY :** The Government headed by Mr. Rajiv Gandhi has been put in the dock by whom. First by the Swedish National Broadcasting Corporation. The next minute the hon. Prime Minister rushed here to the floor of the House and categorically stated that there was no payment of commission money, no question of middleman because in his capacity as the Defence Minister he monitored all the details of the contract and signed the contract. Then who did put the Government in the dock? The man Mr. Arun Singh who stoutly defended the Government in the



[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

month of April on the floor of this House, the very same man sitting here as a Member of the Treasury Banchos, he had to say that Bofors company has committed a deliberate fraud against the people of India and it could be blacklisted and the money should be collected from them with penal interest. Then again, due to the revelations, documentary evidence authentic evidence published in "The Hindu" again the discussion took place in Parliament. Here again the man who was heading the army the Chief of Army Staff has given a statement that his suggestions were overruled were rejected. Then first of all the man who defended the Government in his capacity as the Minister for Defence he did put the Government in the dock. Then the Chief of Army Staff. Now, the latest revelations appeared on 9th October, 1989. Again today, it, appeared in the various newspapers "The Hindu", "The Indian Express" and the "Statesman". This has proved without an idea of doubt that the Government of India and the Bofors company have committed a deliberate fraud against the people of India against this Parliament. Madam the very foundation of the cover of edifice built up by the Government on Bofors shattered and crumbled to dust now. It has been established that the winding-up charges theory is an afterthought conceived by the mutual conspiracy of Indian Government and Bofors. Today, the documentary evidence given by Mr. N. Ram and Ms. Chitra Subramaniam exposed the nefarious conspiracy between the Government of India and the Bofors to obscure the real identity of Pitco and Moresco and suggested that Moresco is a mere reference for Moineao. Today it is clear and we understand from the evidence that Moresco exists somewhere near Italy. Pitco exists somewhere near in Switzerland. The million dollar

question before us is the real beneficiary. It has been proved that Win Chadha who was given a clear chit was the recipient. But who is the real beneficiary? That is the million dollar question. Who is behind the curtain? Who was responsible for this deal? That is the question before us. That is the question before Parliament. Madam top officials of the CBI were used as tools. The propagation of wilful falsehood and the concealment of information makes the Government of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi a direct accessor to the perpetration of fraud on the country. Madam, we have to view the whole episode with reference to the entries made in the diary of Martin Arbedo. I quote: "G.P. does not bother. Even if is hurt. G must be saved at all costs" Q Who is that G? That is the question. There are people in some quarters making prayers to the other G that is the big "G", that is God to save this G. But I am afraid that may not be possible. Recently in Europe, the whole world witnessed a scenario a darling of the masses of Greece, Mr. Andreu Papandreu was put in the dock both by the right and the left, for the scandal in the deal for the aircraft for the air-force. This country is also very soon going to witness such a scenario. Madam, they wanted to postpone the doom's day. They did not heed the advice of Mr. Arun Singh or they deliberately ignored it. But the doom's day has come today. In all fairness according to the best tradition of parliamentary democracy this Government of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi should apologise to the Parliament of the people for its unsuccessful cover-up and resign. Thank you.

SHRI P.N. SUKUL : Madam Deputy Chairman, I am really very grateful to you that you have given me this chance to speak on this important subject although I find it most regrettable that instead of discussing something really

important for the common man of India like price rise or if you like the offensive defence policy of Pakistan towards India, for the umpteenth time we are discussing this issue of Bofors in this House and that too for nothing. Our Opposition friends wanted a discussion on the subject only on what had appeared in 'The Hindu' on the 9th October last. The Chairman granted permission for a discussion on the subject and then our Opposition friends started booing everybody and the ycame to the well and created a scene and they did not discuss. Last Session also, when they wanted this subject to be discussed and permission was granted for a discussion, they simply walked out and they did not discuss. They demanded the appointment of a Joint Parliamentary Committee to go into the details of the Bofors deal and when the Joint Parliamentary Committee was constituted, they walked out of it. This has been the attitude a rather negative attitude, of our Opposition friends. And I am really sorry that once again we have to discuss this subject of Bofors. In fact, there is nothing new to discuss. We have discussed it umpteen times, as I have said, What new thing has come out in today's newspapers? In today's newspapers the new thing that has come out is the allegation of Mr. N. Ram that Mr. Kasthuri was pressurised by the Government not to publish any further details regarding Bofors and also the categorical denial of Mr. Kasthuri that he had been pressurised by anybody. (Interruptions)

[The Vice-Chairman Shri Jagesh Desai in the Chair] This is the new thing that has appeared today. Should we discuss this? Are we supposed to discuss this? In fact, we have to discuss what appeared in 'The Hindu' on the 9th October, In 'The Hindu' on the 9th October two most important things appeared. (1)

Commissions were paid to those who had something to do with the Bofors deal. (2) The largest recipient of the payment was Svenska and the largest beneficiary was Win Chadha. That was all that was published in 'The Hindu'. That can be discussed or that could have been discussed. Nothing more. And on this, 'The Hindu' has tried to build up a story that our Government has tried to have a cover-up of the whole thing; our Government as well as the Swedish Government. They have blamed all for a cover-up. The Swedish Government... (Interruptions). Yes, This is what the Hindu has said; not that it is a fact or that you know exactly what happened (Interruptions). This is the impression that 'The Hindu' wanted to create. Inquiries are going on. As my friend was just saying, we have to know one day what actually happened.

As regards the conduct of the Prime Minister, as Mr. Gopalsamy was just saying, when the Prime Minister was saying that no commissions were paid, that was really the position on that day. I cannot anticipate what is going to happen one year later or three years later. That was a pre-condition. Our Prime Minister had talked to their Prime Minister to ensure that the Bofors do not pay any commission to anybody. That is why the Prime Minister said on that presumption that no commission has been paid in connection with this deal. And even Gen. Sunderji has not said it. One of our friends Mr. Jaswant Singh was mentioning Gen. Sundarji or anybody and even Gen. Kaul. Nobody has said that the gun is in any way inferior to any other gun that was before us. In fact, Gen. Sundarji has praised the quality of the gun. My hats off to Gen. Sundarji! But Immediately after his statement I condemned his action in going out of his bounds to say. My suggestion was turned down. His suggestion was

[Shri P. N. Sukul]

turned down not for the gun, not for the number of guns that the Army required. His suggestion was turned down for cancelling the contract, cancelling the agreement. And as regards the cancellation of an agreement, who is involved? The Defence Ministry is involved, the Law Ministry is involved, the Finance Ministry is involved and overall the entire Government is involved if security is involved. So if the Government decided that the contract should not be cancelled in the largest and the best interests of the country, then Gen. Sunderji should not have any grouse on the subject. That is in fact what Gen. Sundarji has to be criticised for. But he still holds that the gun, the Bofors gun, is the best gun.

My friend quoted from his interview to the 'Newstime' of 8th September 1989. I quote :

"There is one thing I want to say about N.T. Rama Rao..."  
(Interruptions)

I am quoting from Sundarji's statement, Mr. Upendra. Bear with me. This is because Mr. Rama Rao tried to incite the army people against the quality of the gun. That is why I am referring to that. I quote:

"There is one thing I want to say about N.T. Rama Rao. This gentleman sees only what he wants to see and seems to hear only what he wants to hear. He goes to the extent of quoting me to support his contention that the Bofors is a bad gun. I cannot understand how a sane and logical individual can come to this conclusion. It beats me hollow. The Opposition is highly dishonest and immoral if they use 'quality' of the weapon as an election gimmick."

(Interruptions)

So my hats off to Sundarji at last for saying this truth! At

least he has opened the eyes of our countrymen regarding the viewpoint of the Opposition about the Bofors quality. So it is not a question of quality.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : He did not justify commission.

SHRI P.N. SUKUL : He never mentioned it.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : But he said that Bofors should be blacklisted. You should not skip over it.

SHRI P.N. SUKUL : I was referring to 'The Hindu' of the 9th October.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : Another three minutes.

SHRI P.N. SUKUL : Ten minutes. What can be said in three minutes?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : I cannot help you today.

SHRI P.N. SUKUL : There is nothing more to be discussed about the *Hindu* of the 9th of October. There is nothing to be discussed as regards references to Mr. Landford and Mr. Marshi. In this connection, you must not forget one thing. Here our opposition friends talk of a cover-up attempt and this and that. (Interruptions) Of course, Mr. Balaram is the man who knows everything in this world.

SHRI N.E. BALARAM (Kerala) : Why do you mention my name?

SHRI P.N. SUKUL : Please keep quiet while I am speaking. I have been sitting and keeping quiet since morning. Sir, the entire investigation was done at the instance of the Prime Minister. They are blaming the Prime

Minister. It is yet to be established whether an Indian has received the commission. But, I think, it is beyond the imagination of even the Hindu to be able to prove that Mr. Rajiv Gandhi had anything to do with the whole deal. And today our Marxist friend, Mr. Dipen Ghosh, had the cheek to demand the resignation of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi. Why? Are commissions not paid in such deals? Even today, in every Ministry commissions are being paid to the agents. Even the Janata Government, when it came into power in 1977, did not take a decision that commissions should not be paid and middlemen should not be there. We are yet to get to the truth as to who got it. The basic question is: "To whom was it paid"? If Mr. Rajiv Gandhi and his Government had nothing to do with it, then why are you demanding their resignation? Then why can't we demand your resignation for demanding his resignation? No election gimmick, Sir. Mr. Gopalsamy, you know that your Government has been formed in Tamil Nadu only with 34 per cent votes.

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY :** What percentage of votes have you got?

**SHRI P. N. SUKUL :** Don't you think that next time something otherwise can happen?

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY :** The ruling party at the Centre lost deposits in some of the constituencies.

**SHRI P. N. SUKUL :** Next time you can lose the deposit. You are just on the verge. As regards cover-up and the Joint Parliamentary Committee, I may ask: "Has the Government withheld any information that it had. Has our Government not given to the J. P. C. and to the Parliament any information?" This exposed portion of the report which the Hindu claims to have published is to be proved.

We have yet to know whether it is ~~afair~~ or not or whether it is true or not. We have asked the Swedish Government to tell us whether this story is a factual one or not. But if this information is not given to our Government, then how it can place it before the Parliament or before the people?

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) :** Please conclude within one minute. Please cooperate with me today.

**SHRI P. N. SUKUL :** If you want me to conclude then all I can say is that our opposition friends have been ~~thriving~~ on this single issue of Bofors. They have to offer nothing else. No economic policy. No foreign policy. Nothing else. Bofors. Bofors. Bofors. Mr. Gurupadaswamy, while talking, called it the biggest scandal since independence. I say that the bottling scandal in Karnataka was a bigger scandal than this. Mr Hegde took Rs. 200 crores. (Interruptions).

श्री राम स्वर्धेश सिंह : स्टीव माडनविज्ञेशन में (स्ववधान) राजीव गांधी ने 1500 करोड़ रुपये ख़ाया... (स्ववधान)

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY :** You admit that that was the biggest scandal and this is a bigger scandal.

**SHRI P. N. SUKUL :** You must use the words carefully. This is what I want to say.

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY :** I appreciate you. (Interruptions)

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) :** Please sit down.

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY :** He has agreed. We should appreciate. He has agreed that it is a scandal. (Interruptions)

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) :** Please sit down.

**SHRI P. N. SUKUL :** So, I say, Sir, the thesis of the Opposition absolutely holds no water. There is nothing like a cover-up. There is nothing like anything that the Government has not done. The Government is still pursuing the investigations. The necessary investigations are on. And I would like to know from the Defence Minister one thing. Gen. Kaul said that he was offered by someone a large amount so that some other gun should be purchased, this gun or that gun. I would like to know from the hon. Defence Minister whether the Bofors had offered him this money or some other Company had offered him this money. Is there any information available with the Government on the subject regarding what Gen. Kaul said? If it is available, I would like him kindly to take the Parliament into confidence and place it before the House. Thank you, Sir.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) :** Shri Chaturanan Mishra—only five minutes.

**श्री चतुरानन मिश्र (बिहार) :** ठीक है जैसे 107 सेकेण्ड का मिनट उधर हुआ है इधर भी वैसे ही कर दीजिए हमको और कुछ नहीं चाहिए।

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) :** You know how to speak. So, you can speak within five minutes. You have your own time.

**श्री चतुरानन मिश्र :** उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, सदन के कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा है कि अब गीता के 18वें अध्याय में हम लोग पहुँच गये हैं। हमारा इससे मतभेद है। हमको ऐसा लग रहा है कि 18वां अध्याय तो व्यास जी ने तब लिखा था जब धृतराष्ट्र अंधा था ... (व्यवधान) अब आँख रहते हुए अगर कोई नहीं देखे तो दो और अध्यायों की जरूरत होगी, 19वां और 20वां।

19वां अध्याय यह होगा ...

**श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकुल :** विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह।

**श्री चतुरानन मिश्र :** बता रहा हूँ आप घबड़ा क्यों रहे हैं। जरा सुनकर जाइये। जब चुनाव के पहले मोरस्को कंपनी में कौन कौन लोग हैं जिन्होंने पैसा लिया है उनका नाम प्रकाशित होगा तब 19वां अध्याय होगा और जब चुनाव आयेगा इलेक्शन होगा और जयद्रथ जो छिपाकर रखे हुए हैं उनकी हार हो जायेगी तब 20वां अध्याय होगा। यह महाभारत 18 के बदले 20 अध्याय का होगा। यही हमें लग रहा है मैं ऐसा क्यों कह रहा हूँ। मैं इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि बोफर्स मामले में और क्या सबूत चाहिए, आप बता दीजिए। हम और कहाँ से सबूत लायें। सर्वोच्च जो अधिकारी हैं, इन सब मामलों में वे अपनी राय दे चुके हैं। सी०ए०जी० ने कहा कि क्या दोष है। जो हमारी फौज के एक्स चीफ हैं उन्होंने कहा कि क्या इसमें दोष है। नेशनल प्रेस ने लिखा कि सरकार क्या गड़बड़ी कर रही है। आपोजीशन ने कहा है और आपने नहीं माना। आपोजीशन ने इस्तीफा दे दिया, सब से सब ने कि हम पार्लियामेंट में रहकर क्या करेंगे। जो पब्लिक ओपिनियन पोल हुआ, उसमें आया है कि 64 परसेंट आफ द पीपुल बिलीव कि इसमें गोलमाल किया गया है और 58 परसेंट पीपुल बिलीव कि इसमें राजीव गांधी का हाथ है। तो यह पब्लिक ओपिनियन पोल है। जो स्वीडन के पब्लिक प्रोसीक्यूटर हैं मिस्टर रिंगबर्ग उन्होंने कहा है कि :

“Mr. Ringberg has substantially recorded the fact that he obtained no worthwhile co-operation either from Bofors or officials of India ...”

यह वहाँ के पब्लिक प्रोसीक्यूटर कहते हैं :

“... and that a judicial inquiry similar to our preliminary inquiry concerning possible bribery offences has not been commenced in India.”

अब हम आपको किस तरह से सबूत दें। तीन आदमी बचे हैं या तो प्रधान मंत्री मुखबिर होकर कह दे कि हमने यह काम किया, नहीं तो दो ही और बचे हुए हैं। एक राष्ट्रपति और दूसरे, मदन भाटिया जो नहीं हैं, सर्वोच्च न्यायालय के चीफ जस्टिस बचे हुए हैं और कोई बचा नहीं आ है, जो सम्माननीय आदमी हो। ऐसा कोई इस्टीमेशन बचा हुआ नहीं है जिसने आपको कन्डेमन न किया हो। तब हम आपको आधुनिक धतराष्ट्र कह रहे हैं और एक ही फर्क है कि वह नेचुरल इलाइंड था और आप आख रखते हुए अंधे हैं। यही फर्क है। यही हम आपको कहने जा रहे हैं। ... (व्यवधान)

दूसरी बात, आज जब मैं हाऊस में आ रहा था, उसके पहले एक लेडी प्रोफेसर मिली। उन्होंने कहा कि रात को आप लोग बहुत देर से आए थे।

हमने कहा कि हां दोबज गये थे रात को।

तो आज क्या होगा हाऊस में, उन्होंने पूछा ?

मैंने कहा क्या कहें, कहीं बोफोर्स न आ जाए, क्योंकि हम डर रहे थे, आज अखबार में निकला था, कि आज फिर आ जाए, लेकिन हम यह नहीं सोचें थे कि हमारे अध्यक्ष महोदय इसको वहस के लिए मान लेंगे हम सोचे थे कि हल्ला-गुल्ला होगा और आज फिर वही होगा। अच्छी बात है कि आपने मान लिया है।

उस महिला ने हमसे कहा कि आप मर्द लोग जो हैं, उनकी तो बराबर से यह वीकनेस रही है कि सपुराल के लिए कुछ ज्यादा सिम्पेथी रखें। तो अगर प्रधान मंत्री ने सपुराल को कुछ दे दिया, तो आप लोग काहे चिंतित होते हैं।

यही एकमात्र डिफेंस आपकी है जो आपको लेनी चाहिए, वरना आपको कोई डिफेंस बचा नहीं है।

**श्री सैयद सिकते रबी :** वह महिला भी आपकी सुसुराल से ही आई थी, मुझे ऐसा लगता है।

**श्री चतुरानन मिश्र :** अगर हमारी सुसुराल से ही आई थी, तो क्या। हम तो आपकी सुसुराल में हिस्सा ले नहीं रहे हैं। हम तो आपनी ही जगह पर हैं।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई) :** उनके बोलने का स्टाईल ऐसा ही है। उनको बोलने दीजिए।

**श्री चतुरानन मिश्र :** उपसभाध्यक्षजी, आप रात को हाऊस में ही थे जब मैंने कहा था कि प्रधान मंत्री से मिलना बड़ा ही कठिन है—अ गे-आगे इटालियन और पीछे-पीछे इटालियन। अह हमने रात में कहा था हम प्रेस कान्फेंस को सुन गये थे कि पीछे इटालियन पड़ा हुआ है। मोरेस्को कम्पनी इटालियन है और कौन कहाँ है ? और न म आने वाला है और तब आप फिर डिफेंस लीजिएगा।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई) :** कुछ नहीं है।

**श्री चतुरानन मिश्र :** कुछ है कि नहीं है। आप शुरू से ही कह रहे हैं कि कुछ नहीं है और जब तक डिलवरी नहीं होगी, कौन कहेगा कि क्या है ? ... (व्यवधान)

**एक माननीय सदस्य :** मेल या फोमेल।

**श्री चतुरानन मिश्र :** आप हमारी बात सुनिये। हम कह रहे हैं कि हम चिंतित हैं। प्रधान मंत्री का पद बहुत ही गरिमा का पद है। यह बात नहीं है कि आज आप राजीव गांधी के बारे में कुछ बोलें। हमको तो दुख लगता है सब पृष्ठिये कि जब इधर से नारा लगता है—प्रधान मंत्री चोर है और उधर से आप लोग कहते हैं कि नहीं दूसरा आदमी चोर है। यानी मतलब हुआ कि दोनों चोर हैं। क्या सदन में यही होना चाहिए यह मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ।

### [ श्री चतुरावन मिश्र ]

सदन की गरिमा सबको बचानी चाहिए लेकिन आप उसे रहने नहीं देते। अब प्रधान मंत्री के बारे में इस तरह का लीग क्यों हमेशा कहते हैं ? कुछ सदस्यों ने कहा है कि बीपीएस का टारगेट ठीक है कि नहीं या इसका निशाना ठीक है कि नहीं ?

हमने पहले ही रोज कहा था कि इसका निशाना बहुत ठीक है इसका ब्रम सब का सब 2-रेस कोर्स में गिरता है। देखो न कैसे जाता है।... (व्यवधान) इसमें हमकी कोई डाऊट नहीं है हम जिस बात के लिए कह रहे थे कि प्रधान मंत्री अभी हाल में... (व्यवधान) तो आप ही भ्रष्टाचार के बारे में बोल रहे थे। उन्होंने कहा कि गांव के लोगों के लिए जी पसा भैंजा है एक सी रूपया भैंजा है वो पंद्रह रुपये भी वहाँ नहीं मिलते हैं। तो उसको सीरियस्ली ले रहे हैं लेकिन मरि साथ क्या विपत्ति हो गई। आप तो देश में कभी-कभी जाते हैं कि उपसभाध्यक्ष जी। हमारे यहाँ यह होता है आदिवासी क्षेत्र में और गांव में जब किसी को भूत लग जाता है तो ओझा आता है तो ओझा क्या करता है कि वह मुद्दों लेकर उसे छोड़ता है और भूत भाग जाता है।

अभी क्या हो गया है कि सरसों में ही भूत है। अब हम क्या करें ?

अब शुक्ल जी यहाँ से चले गये हैं वह कह रहे हैं कि कमीशन सुना क्या जुल्म है—जनता पार्टी गवर्नमेंट के टाईम में कमीशन लिया गया। शुक्ल जी ने नहीं पढ़ा कि यही प्रधान मंत्री थे जिन्होंने आदेश दिया कि कोई भी मिडलमैन डिप्टी को परवेज में नहीं लगाया जाएगा। यह इसी प्रधान मंत्री का आदेश है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई) : उन्होंने ऐसा कहा होगा यही शुक्ल जी ने कहा।

श्री चतुरावन मिश्र : उस आदेश से फिर बदल गये हैं तो क्या यह लज्जाजनक बात नहीं है और तब क्या इसकी यही

सुन लेनी चाहिए कि कमीशन लेना खराब नहीं है और तब आप कहते हैं कि भ्रष्टाचार के खिलाफ लड़ेंगे। जब केन्द्र ही घुट हो गया तो इस देश को कौन बचायेगा यह हमको बताइये। जब प्रधान मंत्री पर यह काला बादल लटका हुआ है और आप लोग उसको सब भिल करके उसे साफ करने की नहीं कहते—वह सदन में क्यों नहीं आते हम आपसे पूछना चाहते हैं ? कहीं कोर्ट में हा पर किसी केस में चार्ज लगेगा तो कोर्ट में हमकी ही बुलाया जाएगा यह सदन सवाँच है क्यों नहीं आते... (व्यवधान)

### SHRI SYED SIBTEY RAZI

On a point of order. The hon. Member is trying to make an aspersion there is nothing against the Prime Minister and he is trying to make aspersion against our leader... (Interruptions). It is my right to rise on a point of order. Sir, you should control the House and such aspersions should not go on record.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : The Minister is here. He will take care.

### SHRI SYED SIBTEY RAZI

The Defence Minister will reply to the points raised by the hon. Members but it is my right to raise this matter that if any aspersion is being made with malicious intent for you should control it. If the remark being made are with malicious intention, you should look into the record. My request is that such aspersions should not be allowed. The hon. Member is trying to make a case against the Prime Minister whereas there is nothing against him.

श्री चतुरावन मिश्र : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय हमने कोई एस्पersion नहीं दिया जो एलोगेशन है, चार्ज है, उस चार्ज पर यह सबीक सबीक विचार कर रही वहाँ आ कर के वह बताये कि वह किस आफ अपने असिस्टेंट के कहें कि वहाँ सीधे आ करके भेंट करें।... (व्यवधान)

**SHRI SYED SIBTEY RAZI :** It is with malicious intentions that he is trying to call the Prime Minister. Why should he come ? (Inter-rptions).

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) :** He has not made any allegation against the Prime Minister.

**SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA :** I said charges are there. He should come before the House.... (Inter-rptions).

**SHRI SYED SIBTEY RAZI :** Why should he come before the House?

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) :** There are no charges anywhere against the Prime Minister. Please don't say like that.

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH :** But there is a complaint against the Prime Minister for having misled the House and the nation for having spoken untruth.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) :** Please sit down.

**श्री चतुरानन मिश्र :** उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, और नहीं तो, माननीय सदस्य सिक्ते रजी के आगे रिक्वेस्ट किया, एक रिक्वेस्ट हमारी भी प्रधान मंत्री के पास पहुँचा दें कि वह "दिस कोर्स रोड" जो है उसका नाम "बोफर्स रोड" रख दें। मैं दूसरी बात इस बार आपसे कह रहा था वह यह है कि हम लोग बड़े असहाय हो रहे हैं, यह पार्लियामेंट हैल्पलेस कौन्सिल बन रहा है, सर्वेज ब्राँज आया, हम यह नहीं कह रहे हैं कि प्रबल चार्ज हैं, लेकिन आइडेंटिटी कैसे तो सी०ए०जी० से ले करके और सबकी हमने चर्चा की, सब ने कहा कि यह समझा है और सदन इसकी जाँच करवाना चाहता है और आप इसकी जाँच होने नहीं देते हैं तो हमारी डिपार्लियामेंटरी प्रवृत्ति और पार्लियामेंट, दोनों डिग्रेडेड हो रहे हैं किसी भी प्रष्टाचार को यह पार्लियामेंट नहीं पकड़ सकती है। यह

हम पर चार्ज आया कि संसदीय प्रवृत्ति फिजूल है इसीलिए हम आपको कहने के लिए आए हैं। ... (व्यवधान)

**श्री० इन्द्राकर मास्करे (उत्तर प्रदेश) :** माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं आपके माध्यम से माननीय सदस्य से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जब वॉट पार्लियामेंट्री कमेटी होती थी तब इन्होंने उसका बायकाट क्यों किया, उसकी जमानत क्यों नहीं किया ?

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई) :** यह सब जानते हैं। ... (व्यवधान)

**श्री चतुरानन मिश्र :** सुनिए, यह पार्लियामेंट सर्वोच्च है। आपके लिए भी है और मेरे लिए भी है। मैंने कहा कि प्रधान मंत्री के लिए भी है। उनकी इसने पहले ही कहा कि उस पर आक्षेप आता है तो दिल में दुख होता है। हमारे देश के किसी प्रधान मंत्री पर ऐसा चार्ज नहीं आया था, जैसा आजकल आ रहा है। ... (व्यवधान)

**श्री० जगतपाल सिंह (मध्य प्रदेश) :** मोरारजी भाई के खिलाफ क्या-क्या खर्ची हुआ। ... (व्यवधान)

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई) :** प्लीज सिलें डाउन। ... (व्यवधान)

**श्री चतुरानन मिश्र :** उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, उतना हम अपने को अमेंड कर लेते हैं। हमको यह लगा था कि मोरारजी भाई कंजयल प्राइम मिनिस्टर थे इसलिए चर्चा नहीं की, अब हम जो परमार्शिट प्रधानमंत्री जो रहे हैं उनके बारे में कह रहे हैं। प्रधानमंत्री की चर्चा हो रही है, इंडिया जी की हमारा मतलब है नेहरू जी, जो लोग प्रधानमंत्री हुए, उन लोगों पर इस तरह का चार्ज कभी नहीं आया इसलिए हमने ऐसा कहा। ठीक है उतना हम अमेंड कर लेते हैं। ... (व्यवधान) ...

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई) :** आपका टाइम हो गया। आप एक मिनिट में खतम करिए।



**श्री चतुरानन मिश्र :** दो मिनट और दे दीजिए। कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा आज के अखबारों को पढ़कर—

Pitt. company was converted into Mr. Moresco.

उसमें कोई जाँच की जाय, इस पर हमको कुछ नहीं है, लेकिन जब Mr. clean converts into Mr. corruption, then I have serious objection.

**SHRI P.N. SUKUL :** You have not been able to prove it.

**SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA :** It is for this House to prove it. Let him come and say so. वह हमारे प्रधानमंत्री हैं, आएँ हमारे सामने हम नहीं चाहते हैं कि हमारे प्रधानमंत्री के ऊपर काला बादल बना रहे। इसलिए हम माँग करते हैं कि इस सदन के सामने आएँ और बात को रखें।

**SHRI P.N. SUKUL :** He has already said in Lok Sabha that no member of his family is involved. He has again said that none of his partyman is involved.

(Interruptions).

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH :** Does go-brother belong to his family? (Interruptions). Who is Win Chadha?

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) :** Order, order. Please sit down.

**SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (Punjab) :** You are desperate . . . (Interruptions)

**SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO (Andhra Pradesh) :** We have not disturbed the Treasury Benches. Why are they disturbing us?

**श्री चतुरानन मिश्र :** आखिरी बात, ज्योतिष महोदय, हम कहना चाहेंगे।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई) :** आखिरी बात नहीं, प्लीज कनक्लूड कीजिए। . . . (व्यवधान)

**श्री चतुरानन मिश्र :** अच्छा, आखिरी में सुन लाजिए। सारी दुनिया में हम लोगों की बड़नामी हो रही कि भारत के जो पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर हैं, वे कुछ नहीं कर सके, लेकिन कांग्रेसी सांसदों की बड़ी तारीफ हो रही है। अभी जापान से हमारे पास एक हमारे मित्र ने चिट्ठी लिखी है कि जापान वाले कह रहे हैं कि टेक्नोलोजी में तो हम सबसे आगे बढ़ गए हैं, लेकिन तीन-तीन प्रधानमंत्री हमारे चित हो गए इतने छोटे चार्ज पर, परन्तु इंडिया का प्रधानमंत्री ऐसी हुई टेक्नोलोजी है कि उसका कुछ भी न हो सका।

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) :** Mr. Anand Sharma. Not more than ten minutes. After 8 minutes I will ring the Bell. Then you can speak for two more minutes.

**SHRI ANAND SHARMA (Himachal Pradesh) :** Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, if you could have order in the House so that I can start. I cannot start. Let these people who have been making all these allegations at least hear me.

**PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA :** Yesterday night we did not have dinner.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) :** Just a minute. He wants to say something.

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH :** When it was discussed and decided that this will be discussed for two and a half hours and after this only, Constitution (Amendment) Bills will be taken up, it was also assured that the House will be informed when the Constitution (Amendment) Bills will be taken up and when the voting will take place. It was also said that the Constitution (Amendment) Bills will be taken up, considered and passed even if for that, if so required, the sitting has to continue overnight. But then there should be a lunch-break at least. What is this?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF WATER RESOURCES AND THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI M. M. JACOB): I am not against any proposal by Mr. Dipen Ghosh. But the understanding we arrived at earlier also was that we will sit these two days without having lunch. We are sitting tonight and all the arrangements for dinner...

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA : We are willing to sit any late. Only problem is about lunch.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : We do not mind sitting overnight. But you give us the lunch break.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : The time allotted was two and a half hours. Already more than two hours and fortyfive minutes are over. You don't want further debate on this ?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : No, no, we want a debate.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA : You can have the debate after lunch. We will have lunch and then we will have the debate.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : On many occasions it has happened that those who want to go for lunch go for lunch and then come back. Let the discussion continue. Otherwise I will not allow any Member to go beyond the time allotted.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : Oh, yes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : Just listen to me. Today every Member of every party has taken double the time.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : No, we were forced to sit down.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : Shri Chaturanan Mishra had only five minutes...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : That is a different thing.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : Just listen to me. Members should be within limits if you want to continue the debate. Otherwise we shall have to close the debate.

SHRI M. M. JACOB : We are agreeable to a strict time schedule.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : I will not allow a single Member to go beyond the time allotted to him. You want lunch now ? I adjourn the House for lunch and let us cut the lunch time today to half an hour. We shall meet again at 2.20 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at forty-eight minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled, after lunch, at twenty-two minutes past two of the clock. The Deputy Chairman in the Chair.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Before I call Mr. Anand Sharma, I want to announce in the House that everybody had agreed that we would finish this discussion in two and a half hours but we have exceeded the time. I have repeatedly said that we have the Constitution Amendment Bills and so, I will have to curtail all the names. Mr. Anand Sharma.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal) : Why ? ... (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : What else can I do ?

SHRI CHITTA BASU : How ?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : There is no question of "How?" Two and a half hours is two and a half hours in my language... (Interruptions) ... Mr. Anand Sharma.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : Madam, it cannot be. They must be allowed to speak.

**SHRI MOTURU HANUMAN-THA RAO :** The, must be allowed to speak.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** I will give two minutes each, not more than that. It is not my mistake. Why did some of the Members ask for a lunch-break?... (Interruptions)... I am not punishing anybody.

**SHRI M. M. JACOB :** Let us not waste time on this. Let him speak.

**SHRI CHITTA BASU :** You cannot punish the innocent.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** The House has been punished.

श्री आनन्द शर्मा : आप भी पांच मिनट बोलिएगा।

**SHRI ANAND SHARMA :** Madam Deputy Chairman, I feel very sad...

श्री राजेंद्र प्रसाद सिंह : जिसने जल्दी मिट्ट होये, उसने ही मिट्ट... (सम्भवतः)

श्री आनन्द शर्मा : मेरी मूढ़ होकर बैठ जाती। क्या उसने जल्दी ही मृत्यु।

Madam Deputy Chairman, I am saddened by the fact that we have a situation in the country where an Opposition, desperately looking for a political agenda devoid of ideology, unity or direction, is clutching to the Bofors controversy, hoping that it may sell it through the next General Elections.

Madam, the issue has been raised in this House, has been discussed in this House, at least half a dozen times in the past. The Opposition leaders themselves know that what they are charging the Government with, what they are accusing the Government of, is not true. They know, that lies and half-truths are being uttered Till this date, in two years, nobody

in this country has come forward to substantiate the accusations made earlier in April 1987. It is a tragic situation that we have an Opposition which claims to be in a position to give a direction to the country. But they are given direction by newspapers, they are directed by Iranis, Arun Shouries and N. Rams. Every debate which has been brought to this House by the Opposition is based on newspaper reports—not on the basis of any good work which they have done, not because of anything which emanates from convictions or which emanates from some love for the poor people of this country or some concern for the challenges which India is facing. Madam, why I say this is important issues have been relegated to the background in these two years. Issue after issue which concerns this country was not allowed to be discussed in detail because of this political agenda of the Indian opposition.

Madam, today's discussion is based on certain documents published by "THE STATESMAN". May I ask : What is the new feature, what is the revealing feature which has come ? There is nothing which is new. All these names of companies have been mentioned in the past, whether in the JPC Report or in this House. Madam, the Opposition is saying that the Prime Minister or the Government have in some manner tried to cover up or mislead the nation. The charge is motivated, malicious and a lie. It is distortion of facts. Yes it is a lie. I will use the word "lie" because it is a lie.

**SHRI KAMAL MORARKA** (Rajasthan) : "Lie" is not parliamentary.

**SHRI ANAND SHARMA** (Yes, I will call a lie a lie

**SHRI KAMAL MORARKA :** As if the House belongs to him. You cannot use it.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA : I will use it.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA : But you cannot use it.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA : If somebody is telling *jhoot*, I will say "*jhoot*".

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You can say it is not true. It is far from truth.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA : Madam, you take classes for him.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I will take classes. Everybody will have to come including you.

SHRI N. E. BALARAM : He is a young man. Let him say whatever he wants to say.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : All right. Continue.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA : If I recall, it was in this House that the Prime Minister has said that as far as the Government was concerned, it was the Government's belief that no commissions had been paid. But he qualified that remark in April, 1987 that we would like to get at the truth and that the Government would investigate. He appealed to the Opposition and to the media to come forward and co-operate. He also used these words, "I am not asking you to give the proof. Give me the information. Give the Government the information so that we can find out what the truth is." That is why I say that till this day none of them has written to the Government. Even those sections of the media which are trying to sensationalise this issue, coming with screaming headlines day after day, themselves also know what the truth is.

Mr. N. Ram on whose statements and revelations today's discussion is based, himself has gone

on record to say yesterday itself that the Prime Minister requested him to co-operate with the Government in investigation. It was this Government which took all these initiatives, which requested the Swedish Government which instituted an enquiry by the SNAB. The day that report was received here, except the excised portions, excised on the plea of commercial confidentiality by Bofors, the leaders of the Opposition were called, and the report was placed before them.

The House will remember before that the only demand of the Opposition was "investigate." The only demand was constitution of a Joint Parliamentary Committee. After that they were the ones who backed out, who ran away from the Joint Parliamentary Committee. Why? In the other House, of course, you ran away from discussing the CAG Report also because they know. Madam, this was a game plan. They were acting on an agenda. They knew that if they joined the JPC and they concurred in its findings, they would have no other issue, no other programme, no ideology to fight elections. So, Madam, it was because of this situation that the Opposition stayed away. The findings of the Committee came. Had they joined, they would have got access to all these letters, all these documents, the contract and everything. You would not have been running after Mr. N. Ram or Rani. You would have been in a position to see for yourself what the documents were. But this is the character of the Opposition which, in fact, is desperate and malicious. This is boring which constantly disturbs the Chair. This is very unfair. Madam, I need your attention.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I am hearing you.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA : I was just tracing the sequence of events. After that the JPC Report came and the attack was there on

[Shri Anand Sharma]

the JPC report. Today Mr. Jaswant Singh has said he is sad about the institutions, that no institution has survived in this country. Who is responsible for the attack on the institution?

**SHRI KAMAL MORARKA :**  
The Opposition.

**SHRI ANAND SHARMA :** The institution of Parliament was denigrated when the JP was attacked. The institution of Prime Minister's Office which is not a small office, and which is not a laughing matter, has been maliciously attacked. You have maligned it without an iota of evidence. You have hurled accusation in the most irresponsible manner and you are jeering and deriving sadistic pleasure. At least the nation will be ashamed of you. Then they have attacked the institution of Indian Civil Services and the bureaucracy and the institution of Chief of Army Staff. In this very House these very gentlemen had attacked the judgment of the Indian Army Chief and the judgment of civil servants.

**SHRI KAMAL MORARKA :**  
And now you are attacking.

**SHRI ANAND SHARMA :** I never attacked. I defended and supported the judgment of Sunderji in selecting Bofors as the best available weapon system. I want to expose today their double standards. They attacked Sundarji. Take out the records of the last five debates. They attacked him. When he could not come here to defend himself, they became weapon experts. What was happening was that in the last two years they become defence experts. They have created a situation where all defence secrets have to be discussed right from the pan shop to the streets. They have been asking why the Government did not purchase Sofma and paid Rs. 100 crores more. This is the dispute. There is no other dispute. As far

as the question of commission agent or middlemen is concerned, the truth is that in every defence deal in any such contract anywhere in the world defence and arms manufacturers use their people and their representatives; you may give them any name. But the reason why this controversy has arisen is it was a conscious decision of this Government...

**SHRI KAMAL MORARKA :**  
Foolish decision that you will not get commission.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :**  
Now, you stop your running commentary.

**SHRI ANAND SHARMA :**... that we will not have any such representative. The Prime Minister's assurance and statement was based on the guarantee given by the late Swedish Prime Minister, Mr. Olof Palme, and the Swedish Government. If today's documents are to be seen, the newspaper is here and I will not go into the authenticity or non-authenticity of the documents, I am very happy that they have been published. Even if this is true, then it gives all the dates on which Ana-tronics General Corporation, Bofors entered into an arrangement on 24th October, 1978, Svenska on 14th December, 1978, Moineau SA on 15th October, 1979. I want to make one thing very clearly known that all these arrangements or agreements are of a period when the Congress Government was not there, leave aside the present Prime Minister. Who was making the arrangements then? Could he imagine at that time that ten years after he would be the Prime Minister of the country? It is a shame on you. You should be ashamed. *(Interruptions)* I am just stating facts as they are. We have also established that it was this Government which made every possible effort to ascertain the truth. But if we have to look at their double standards...

**SHRI KAMAL MORARKA :**  
Have you been able to ascertain?

**SHRI ANAND SHARMA :** We are trying to, but you should be knowing better because you knew how you were representing the interests of Sofma. You should be knowing better. That is why, you have been propagating, you have been promoting the interest of one particular arms manufacturer. That is where the trouble started and after that, you people have been running around. Mr. Jethmalani is here. He has gone all over the world inserting advertisements in the newspapers in Sweden, Switzerland and everywhere. Who was assisting? Which were the investigating agencies which were assisting him? What is his finding? That is the same trash which Arun Shourie writes. That is your Bible and Gita. (*Interruptions*).

**SHRIMATI BIJOYA CHAKRAVARTY (Assam) :** Madam, he should not name a person who is not present in the House.

**SHRI ANAND SHARMA :** Then the entire discussion should be closed because the discussion is based on what has been written by Ram and Shourie. (*Interruptions*)

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** Please conclude now.

**SHRI ANAND SHARMA :** Madam, I am just concluding. They have been interrupting me constantly. You also know. Madam, all those steps of the Government right from the creation of the JPC, getting the information from the Swedish Government and it was the JPC which in fact unearthed the existence of most of these companies, the issues have been made public, the names have been made public by the Government. I would only say as far as these documents are concerned, and the question of official signatures is concerned I feel that the JPC had access to all these papers and I also feel that any firm could have reasonably claimed from the Government that the information we give may affect our own position in relation to commercial confidentiality

and what the officials were supposed to do to persuade, pressurise and I think this was the right way to persuade, to pressurize because you cannot go and interfere with the law of another country. (*Interruptions*)... Well, go to a lawyer, consult the laws of other country. Read the law and then talk. (*Interruptions*).

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** Please conclude.

**SHRI ANAND SHARMA :** I am about to conclude. I was referring to one thing. That is about the double standards of the Opposition. When they found the JPC report, when they found the categorical statement of the former Chief of Army staff defending the selection of the weapon system, those people who were promoting the Sofma had attacked Sunderji, they attacked the then Deputy Chief of Army Staff and each and every official, whether he was the Defence Secretary or the Finance Secretary, they attacked all of them. They attacked the JPC. When General Sunderji came up with one observation that he had recommended to the Government to consider cancellation, did you see the jubilation, the noise? They were dancing. Many of them met me in the Central Hall. Parliament was not in Session. They literally had Rasgullas saying, "O, everything is over. The party is over." And the same General about whom I am still proud of as an Indian, the same General whom they had castigated became their hero. Now, if you analyse what Sunderji had said, it was a question of perception. The Government certainly I hope had inputs from various agencies and it was the same army and the same General and the same officials who had demanded this particular weapon system saying that this was badly needed by the army. So, it was a question of cancellation. When it comes, I would like to put it on record that by all facts available with us now, it was the Prime Minister who was the first person to ask the Defence Minis-

[Shri Anand Sharma]

try to examine the security implications in the event of cancellation of the contract way back in June 1987. If anybody raised this issue, this issue was examined by the Army Headquarters because the Defence Ministry asked and that was because of a letter from the Prime Minister. Today, they are maligning that person who has taken the initiative and the same General Sunderji, Madam, when, two days after that, he came out with another statement which was quoted extensively by my friend, Mr. Ahluwalia, defending again the choices of the weapon system and condemning the Opposition saying that their charge is a political charge, they were playing a political game and he called them a bunch of crooks. The word which he had particularly about Mr. Rama Rao... (Interruptions).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anand Sharma, please conclude.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I am just concluding. I am quoting General Sunderji. (Interruptions). He has said that the Opposition is using this as an electoral gimmick. They are a bloody, immoral, dishonourable lot.

"Mr. Rama Rao quotes me to say I am supporting his contention that it is a bad gun and our defences are being jeopardised. I am very upset with the man for insisting that it is a bad weapon and it is being foisted on the armed forces and because of that our defence preparedness is being jeopardised. It is wrong, immoral and irresponsible."

I think these are the right words, for, the Opposition is wrong, immoral and irresponsible and I hope that they will accept General Sunderji's one analysis about their leader, the National Front Chairman, Rama Rao. Now, which version of General Sunderji do they accept? Let the nation wait and watch whether they

accept his version that they are a bunch of crooks, immoral and irresponsible people. Madam, I only hope, as a Member of this House, that this Opposition which has done incalculable damage to the polity, which was systematically attacked, denigrated institutions, will at least introspect at this stage, reflect on their behaviour, so that in future, posterity may not say that these were the gentlemen who were responsible for the denigration, weakening and destruction of India's institutions. Thank you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Nagen Saikia. Two minutes, please. I have about ten speakers for twenty minutes.

DR. NAGEN SAIKIA (Assam): Madam, while associating myself with what has been said by my colleagues in the Opposition, I rise to demand the resignation of this Government on this Bofors deal. Madam, at last, Mr. Ham of 'The Hindu' has blasted the last piece on Bofors as Shri Ram in the Ramayan sent the last and the strongest arrow from his bow to kill Ravana. For the last two years, Madam, Parliament, at the instance of the Opposition, has been discussing the issue of the Bofors deal. At the instance of the Opposition, the JPC was formed but not in the way it was suggested by the Opposition. But it was formed to the convenience of the Government to cover up the scandalous deal of crores and crores of Rupees. Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, the most corrupt Prime Minister in the world who poses to be a clean man, tried his best to cover up the whole affair. (Interruption). Yes. We know how much clean he is. He stated in the House that there was no middleman in the deal, there was no pay-off as such and no Indian was involved in the deal. Now, the revelations, shocking revelations, have proved it, leaving not even the slightest room to suspect, that the Prime Minister deliberately has been

misleading the House, misleading the country and the people. The *Hindu* has published the suppressed portions of the whole affair. The Government is selling the secrecy of this country to Bofors. It is a horrifying news. It is a shocking news for the whole country. I charge the Government to be working against the nation itself. Madam, the C & AG was criticised by the Government and the Congress-I for his speaking of the truth. This was for the first time in the history of Indian Parliament that the Government chose to criticise a Constitutional body for not falling in line with the Government.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** Mr. Saikia, C & AG and everything we have discussed. Do not repeat. There is no point in repeating arguments of one or two years.

**DR. NAIGEN SAIKIA :** Now the Government has suppressed the Press for the revelation of the facts about this most scandalous deal which has taken place in independent India. Anybody, Madam, least who has the least sense of honour would have stepped down and sought people's verdict. *(Time bell rings)* But it is very unfortunate for the country that this Government is shamelessly clinging to its 'gaddi'. Madam, how has this Government the least moral right to be in power after the revelation of sky-high corruption, its advocacy for untruth and what is more dangerous its consistent effort to mislead the people and sell the security of the country to a company for money? I do not have words to condemn these activities of the Government. Whatever endeavour is made by the hon. Members of the Congress (I) to interpret the revelations to their own convenience, the people of this country have lost their confidence in the Government totally. *(Time bell rings)* Now it has ceased to be a Government

of the people, by the people and for the people.

Therefore, I demand immediate resignation of this Government.

**SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA (Punjab) :** Madam, Deputy Chairperson, I have often been quoted by the hon. Defence Minister about my evaluation of the Bofors gun saying that it is a good gun. I still stand by it that it is a good gun. But when I used this word and said that it is a good gun, I also remarked that the trouble with it is that its kickbacks are much worse than the back blast. Today we find that the kickbacks have recoiled to such an extent that the curtain of cover-up has been blown as under. It is to the credit of Mr. Ram and Chitra Subramaniam who, unmindful of their future well-being, have decided to face all odds and expose the nefarious transactions. It is strange that knowing that PITCO had changed its name to MORESCO and the Government was, in the know of it, yet the CBI went on a wild goose chase to look for MOINEAO. Now that MORESCO has been identified which was to get 8 per cent of the commission, it appears that A.B. Bofors has been the eventual gainer. Not only it had left a cushion for 64 crores that it had paid as winding up or commission charges but it had also catered for paying another 8 per cent to MORESCO, which it has not done. The net result is that the Indian coffers have been robbed of nearly Rs. 155 crores. I would like the Government to tell us how they propose to get it back from A.B. Bofors.

Hon. Member Shri Bharla had read certain portions from Mr. Ram's statement in the newspapers. I do not propose to read any more. But I would suggest to all those who are interested, to go through



[Sardar Jagit Singh Aurora]

the entire statement. Mr. Ram has fully clarified why he lost faith that the Prime Minister was really interested in finding the truth.

Now, one thing that I would like to ask is, how is it that anybody who becomes critical of the Government's doings is to be denigrated and run down? Mr. Ram considered to be a highly respected person. But today he is down in the dumps. The C.A.G. is possibly one of the most respected persons. He was referred to as Charlie because he criticised the Government where they slipped up or where they were not efficient enough.

The next thing is that if anybody criticises the Government for its failings, some deliberate and others due to inefficiency, he is blamed for trying to destabilise the country and that it is a deep-seated conspiracy. With the majority that the Government has, it still seems to suffer terribly from some complex which really shows that they are unsure of themselves.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA : I will conclude. But I want to take a couple of minutes. Don't push me.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It is not a question of pushing. There is no time.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA : Everybody has got extra time. I normally don't take much time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Don't argue. Please carry on. Otherwise I will call another speaker.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA : You can call another speaker. That is OK. But I have

not yet finished. How is it that everybody else is given a chance.. ?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Nobody is given a chance...

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA : I said I am finishing in a minute.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Finish in one minute.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA : I think it is very upsetting when you are treated in a high-handed manner like this. I was just going to finish and this is the way I am treated. The point I really wanted to make was that it is wrong not to respect certain established institutions. The Armed Forces have established institutions. If you want to find out about a threat to the security of the country in the future, there is not only an intelligence organisation. There is also a Chief of Staff Committee. The Chief of Army Staff is one of its members. The Chiefs of Staff Committee should have been asked and their view should have been taken into account. But what happens is that when the Chief of Army Staff is asked for a certain assessment and he gives it and it is not to the liking of the Government, he is treated with scant respect. Now this sort of thing denigrates the Chief of Army Staff's office and brings him into disrepute within his own service. This is very serious. I would like to stress that this way of ignoring the established institutions can bring about a great deal of harm to the country, specially to the Defence Services. Thank you.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE (West Bengal) : Madam Deputy Chairman, at the outset I should stress that the episode of the purchase of 155 mm Howitzer gun deal has brought out so many faults that it was expected that from the side of the Govern-

ment there should be an adequate clarification. The Head of the Government, the Prime Minister, who has come in for criticism on different counts, should come forward to explain the position of his entire Government in relation to the minimum amount of 64 crores of rupees being paid as commission contrary to the stipulation reported to be made by the Prime Minister of India and the Defence Minister and confirmed by the Swedish Prime Minister, the late lamented Mr. Olof Palme and A.B. Bofors. This particular fact is not dealt with. How did it happen? How could it happen and in which way the violations of this contract of this agreement, would be dealt with?

It is found actually that his clause is not there in the Bofors contract. It is also reported that Bofors was at one time black-listed in its own country because of its supply of arms to South Africa and to two warring countries contrary to the principle of the Government of Sweden. When we were entering into an agreement with such a Company, what precautions were taken that they did not violate the terms of contract, whether verbal or written? This thing has not been explained as to why the A.B. Bofors was taken so much into confidence.

Regarding the involvement of the Prime Minister, Madam Deputy Chairman, I would bring to your notice certain facts stated by the C.A.G. Report which is an anathema to the ruling party. There it is stated that when our Prime Minister was to meet the Swedish Prime Minister here in India, the PMO requested the Defence Ministry to prepare a brief placing Sofma and Bofors at par since in the course of the discussion by the Prime Minister this question of an agreement might come up. *(Time bell rings)* Just two minutes, Madam. And again it is found that before the final contract was

signed the Sofma Company of France reduced its price by 100 crores of rupees. It was at this point that again Mr. Bhatnagar, now the Governor of Sikkim and the then Defence Secretary ran after Bofors to persuade them to reduce their price and to make a contribution of ten free guns at the request of or on the instruction of the Prime Minister. Why was this undue interest regarding the obtaining of contract with Bofors from the side of the Prime Minister? And the then Minister of State for Defence, Mr. Arun Singh pleaded for cancellation of the contract. Therefore, Mr. Bhatnagar's plea was that ten guns would be received free. In our part of the country, Madam, there is a word 'fow'. When once somebody buys a thing, something in addition is given. And that 'fow' is more important than the main thing. Therefore, it was contrived to make it so. The CAG Report says that this free gift was really not a free gift and there were attendant things which augmented the expenses and reduced the margin that Bofors was reported to have offered.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:

Now conclude.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: These are the involvements of the Prime Minister, besides the involvement par excellence in putting his foot down on the proposal to cancel the Bofors deal. Mr. Arun Singh himself advocated for this in this House. That also was negated under instructions of the Prime Minister. So his involvement is quite clear. If the cloud of suspicion is to be removed, if the august office of the Prime Minister is not to become an object of ridicule, it is incumbent upon the Prime Minister that he should clear his position or otherwise public opinion will take care of it.

3 P.M.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Madam, you have been a witness to the spectacle in this House where

[Shri Chitta Basu]

the Government all the time persistently and perseveringly has taken the position that there is no middleman and no commission has been paid and no Indians are involved and that only winding up charges and termination charges have been paid and that the Government is also incapable of identifying the recipients and beneficiaries of this so-called winding up charges or termination charges. This we have witnessed. But several revelations by the *Hindu*, by the *Indian Express*, by the *Statesman* and finally by the report of the CAG and again by the interview of General Sundarji to *India Today* have completely demolished the Government's position. The Government's position has been found to be false. Madam, since you cannot allow me to use the word 'lie', therefore, I charge that all the falsehoods and all the untruths so far trotted out by the Government have been nalled. In this situation what does the country expect? The people in the country, as the situation stands today, feel that the Government is in the dock. The Government led by the Prime Minister, Rajiv Gandhi is to explain and answer to the people. The accusations are: The Government was engaged in the cover up operation and unscrupulously indulged in falsehoods and untruths, undiluted falsehoods. This is to be answered. It is the accusation that the Government of this country, headed by the Prime Minister, Rajiv Gandhi, colluded with A.B. Bofors and with the Government of Sweden to suppress the truth. It is the accusation that the Government compromised the security interest of our country, which is an unpatriotic act on the part of the Government. For this reason the safety, security and integrity of the Government is not safe in the hands of the present Government.

Lastly, Madam, the Government has sullied the fair image of

India at the international plane and it has embarked upon the role of sell out of Indian interests to foreign countries. In fact, the Government has allowed wilfully the State machinery to devour the State itself. It is a self-destructive position, a self-destructive process that the Government has taken. Therefore, the Government owe an explanation to the country. I want that the Government should explain and the Prime Minister, the person who can explain to the countrymen through this House the replies to the charges that have been levelled.

Madam, I want to seek only two clarifications. One is, do you still reject the idea as propounded by General Sundarji for the cancellation of the Bofors contract? Or would you like to review your decision in this respect and straight away announced in this House that the contract be cancelled. Then, do you assure that you would at a certain point of time, as early as possible, reveal the true identity of Moresco, the persons behind the Moresco and the nexus between the Italians and the Indian Government? Lastly, if the Government does not heed to it and continues to refuse to answer the charges, I think Marcos way on awaits the Prime Minister of the country.

श्री राम बबधेश सिंह : उपसभापति महोदया, इस सदन में, भारत के संसदीय इतिहास में जितना समय बोफोर्स काफ़े के ऊपर जवा दिया गया है और जितना साधन लगाये गये हैं शायदे आज तक भारत के संसदीय इतिहास में कोई ऐसा विषय नहीं रहा होगा जिस पर संसद ने इतना समय और साधन जताया है जितने (बोफोर्स) महोदया, संसदीय पद्धति में संसद के सदस्यों की विकसित क्षमता सर्वोच्च होती चाहिए। लेकिन हमारे यहां ऐसा है कि देश को क्या समझकर सरकार और मन्त्रालय को वे बड़े बर्तनों की क्षमता लगाते हुये रहते हैं। ऐसे जोरें धाये हैं।

देश में जब पक्ष और प्रतिपक्ष देश के सवाल को लेकर एक हो गये। 1962 में चाइनीज एग्रेसन हुआ। उस वक्त सारी संसद एक हो गई, सारा देश एक हो गया और उस सवाल पर एक होकर लड़ा। सत्ता पक्ष और प्रतिपक्ष के सांसदों ने एक स्वर से कहा पंडित जवाहर लाल को कि इस पराजय के लिए, भारतीय पराजय के लिए जिम्मेवार डिफेंस मिनिस्टर श्री कृष्ण मेनन हैं, उनको तत्काल हटा दें। केवल प्रतिपक्ष के लोगों ने नहीं कहा बल्कि शासक दल के लोगों ने उतनी ही मजबूती से कहा और पंडित जवाहर लाल ने तत्काल उनकी मांग को स्वीकार किया। बल्कि मुझे यह भी बताया गया है उन दिनों के सांसदों के जरिये कि सरकारी पक्ष के सदस्यों ने कहा कि पंडित जी अगर आप नहीं सुनेंगे और इस मंत्री को नहीं हटाएंगे तो हमको आपके खिलाफ भी अविश्वास प्रस्ताव लाना पड़ेगा। जवाहर लाल नेहरू जैसे आदमी के खिलाफ भी अविश्वास प्रस्ताव पास करने की घमकी शासक दल के सांसदों ने देने की हिम्मत की थी क्योंकि उस समय संसद की परम्परा और गरिमा ऊंची थी . . . (व्यवधान)

श्री राम जगन्नाथ बिकाल : (उत्तर प्रदेश) : कुछ ऐसी बात कह रहे हैं जो बिल्कुल ही गलत है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जवाहर लाल जी का इस्तीफा कभी नहीं मांगा गया। मुझे पूरी बात मालूम है। जवाहर लाल जी से कभी इस्तीफा नहीं मांगा गया . . . (व्यवधान)

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : यही आपको छे डूबेगा . . . (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति : आप बोफोर्स पर बोलिए।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : उसी पर बोल रहा हूँ। एक समय ऐसा था, संसद की परम्परा ऐसी ऊंची थी और संसद के सदस्य इतने निर्भीक होते थे सत्ता पक्ष और प्रतिपक्ष के कि कोई राष्ट्रीय हित का सवाल उठाने पर सारे सांसद एक हो जाते थे, पक्ष और प्रतिपक्ष

भूल जाते थे . . . (व्यवधान) मैंने यह कहा कि पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू जैसे महान नेता और बड़े शासक के खिलाफ भी शासक दल के लोगों ने बोलने की हिम्मत की थी।

महोदया, देश बड़ा है। बड़े से बड़ा और महान से महान प्रधान मंत्री या महान से महान राष्ट्रपति भी देश से छोटा होता है। देश, महान से महान राष्ट्रपति और प्रधान मंत्री से ऊंचा होता है . . . (समय की घंटी) आज जो सवाल खड़ा हुआ है उसमें सत्ता पक्ष के लोगों को बोलना चाहिए था। क्या आप तैयार हैं? जितने कागज त, जितने दस्तावेज आपके सामने आ चुके हैं, उतने काफ़ी थे प्रधान मंत्री से कहने के लिए, सत्ता पक्ष के सांसदों द्वारा कि आप इस्तीफा दो। सत्ता पक्ष के सांसदों को हमसे ज्यादा कहना चाहिए। और इस्तीफा दो, ताकि देश की गरिमा को ऊंचा उठाया जा सके, संसद की गरिमा को उठाया जा सके और कांग्रेस पार्टी की गरिमा को ऊंचा उठाया जा सके। क्या यह प्रधान मंत्री हट जायेंगे, तो कांग्रेस पार्टी खत्म हो जाएगी? (समय की घंटी) यदि प्रधान मंत्री इस्तीफा दे देंगे, तो क्या देश टूट जाएगा, देश क्या काफ़िर का गोला है कि आकाश में उड़ जाएगा? नहीं उड़ेगा। . . . (व्यवधान) यह ऐसे\* प्रधान मंत्री को बचाने के लिए . . . (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति : यह शब्द रिकार्ड में नहीं जाएगा।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : यह सारे लोग खामोश हैं . . . (व्यवधान) यह वही स्थिति है . . . (व्यवधान) यह प्रधान मंत्री को बचाने के लिए आप बिल्कुल विवश हैं . . . . . (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति : वस, अब आप बैठ जाइये।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : इनकी स्थिति भीष्म पितामह जैसी हो गई है और भीष्म पितामह देखते रहे कि बीर हरण

\*Not Recorded.

[श्री राम अवधेश सिंह]

हो रहा है, लेकिन मौन थे, वह मुक थे। आज यह देख रहे हैं कि देश की अस्मिता पर सवाल उठा है और उसके बाद भी यह नहीं बोल रहे हैं।

इसके लिए आने वाली पीढ़ी प्रश्न करेगी। ... (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति: अब आप बैठ जाइये।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: आने वाली पीढ़ी इस बहस को बहुत गंभीरता से लेगी क्योंकि यह रिकार्ड में जा रहा है कि इतना अन्तर्ग होने के बाद, इतना गंगा होने के बाद प्रधान मंत्री को शासक दल बचाने की कोशिश कर रहा है। शासक दल जब आप इस हाऊस से जायेंगे, इस गोल घर से बाहर जायेंगे, तो जनता आपसे पूछेगी कि तुम कितने बेईमान हो, तुम कितने ... (व्यवधान) कि प्रधान मंत्री पर कब्जा नहीं कर सकते हैं?

और प्रधान मंत्री को देश से ऊपर मानते हैं? कभी देश की जनता प्रधान मंत्री को देश से ऊपर मानने को तैयार नहीं होती है। .... (व्यवधान)

**SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY** (Uttar Pradesh) : Madam Deputy Chairman, the debate has more or less petered out judging by the attendance in the House. During the proceedings of the debate, in fact, I found most of the activities watching cricket in the Central Hall. This shows the extent to which we have gone in discovering the truth about the Bofors matter.

What has been established so far is that the gun is good. Neither Mr. Jaswant Singh nor General Aurora denied having given a certificate to the gun. It has also been fairly well established that a bribe was paid and the question is that the Government has not been able to find out so far to whom this bribe was paid. According to

the loose talk that goes on in the international capitals which deal with the arms purchase, the commission payment was supposed to be as high as 25 per cent which would amount to Rs. 340 in total. There were three principal decision makers for that Bofors gun at the political level. One was the Prime Minister. The second was the then Finance Minister, Mr. V.P. Singh. And the third is Mr. Arun Nehru who did all the shadowy work from 1981 onwards.

Madam, I have great regard for journalists. So I have great regard for Mr. Ram Reddy. Somebody called him a CIA agent in the discussion. That is absurd. He can never be a CIA agent. If anything, he is a Communist, he has been a member of the Communist party for a long time. Anyway from what I can see, the focus appears to be that Mr. V.P. Singh and Mr. Arun Nehru are innocent, they did not get any of the share and 10 per cent of the money went to the Prime Minister. That seems to be the allegation. I have not been able to decide for any logical proof that leads to this. Of course there are great deal of suspicion to which I will come, but I am quite touched to see the social revelations that have taken place in the Bofors debate. You hear the DMK Member quote as authority Mr. Sunderji, Mr. N. Ram and Mr. Chitra Subramaniam and the three are Tamil Brahmins. For the DMK to quote them as authority is indeed a great social revolution. I also saw Mr. Chaturanan Mishra quoting from the Bhagwad Gita and considering that the Communists are supposed to be godless, for him to quote with flourish the Bhagwad Gita is also a contribution of the Bofors debate. Since this is going to be the last debate before elections, I would say at least you should be grateful to Bofors for moulding, in the right direction at least two extremist sections of our society.

Now, there is obviously a question which is unanswered by the Government. Where did this money go? After all the Svenska money could not have gone to those three ladies. The Svenska company is owned by three ladies in Panama who know nothing about a gun. They cannot tell a pistol from an AK-47 gun. How could they be instrumental in making the Government of India buy the Bofors gun? So we have to find out. And till it is found out, naturally the suspicion will be there. But the standard of proof that is used in the debate should be applied uniformly. I am unable to understand that if Mr. Rajiv Gandhi is guilty of taking Bofors' money, then why don't they admit, by the same standard of proof, that Mr. Hedge is corrupt as hell in the State of Karnataka? Or for that matter, Mr. V.P. Singh in respect of whom I have presented documents to show that his wife had declared him to be a former lunatic and subject to bouts of insanity—why don't they accept that? If, of course, his wife told lie, that is equally serious that the wife of a candidate who poses himself as a candidate for Prime Ministership should falsify on his mental health. This itself is something that we have to be concerned about. So the question is, by this standard of proof, they should also look inwards. That has been our point.

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA-SWAMY:** I listen to my friend very attentively. I have great respect for him. But he should not attack Mr. V.P. Singh who is not here, number one. He should not make such adverse remarks against him without any foundation because that has been denied and denied and denied in the past. He is aware of that. May I request him not to repeat it again and that he should confine his remarks to Bofors?

**SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY:** I have not called Mr. V.P. Singh anything. It is only what is put in the form of an affidavit with the Allahabad High Court. That is all I am referring to. I am asking them to explain. I am not using their standard of proof to find him guilty. I am only saying that you must also explain.

So, Madam, it does matter because if you are going to raise it and say "you have taken a share in the Bofors", then I would like to know why? If you both are guilty, then I think the country needs to know.

**SHRI VIRENDRA VERMA (Uttar Pradesh):** You should confine yourself to Bofors.

**SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY:** Can Mr. Virendra Verma say that Mr. Arun Nehru has not taken a share? He has taken a share in every deal since 1980. And therefore how can he say that he has not taken a share in the Bofors deal? I am only saying that some element of objectivity should come.

Now they charge the Prime Minister of being corrupt and they charge them of being corrupt. If the country is going to be faced with a choice between a corrupt sane person and a corrupt insane person, I think the future of the country is doomed. This is what the Bofors debate has shown.

**SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL:** Madam, in his press conference yesterday, Mr. N. Ram, the Associate Editor of the *Hindu* accused the Editor of thwarting his efforts to publish the second instalment of his story which he claimed to be based on incontrovertible evidence and on a deduction from facts established on the record. In this context, Madam, I would like to read only two sentences from an earlier story of his, published

[Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal] in *The Hindu* dated 9th October. It said:

"The Government of India did demand, formally, from the Swedish Government, the full report of the National Audit Bureau, even as it demanded, formally from the Bofors, full information on the payments and identities of the recipients."

Further he goes on to say :

"Behind the scenes, there were active efforts to ensure that nothing dangerous, by way of information, came out."

It is this second sentence which impels me to rise here to point out the motives which sometimes lead people and journalists in our country to make averments which, they know, are false. Here it is just contrary to his own assertions yesterday, and I am sorry to point out that when he alleges that the Government of India had made efforts to ensure that nothing is revealed, it is based not on any evidence but on his whims and on an ulterior design to participate in creating an environment in which our friends on the other side have been willing partners for the last two and a half years.

Madam, because of the time granted to me, I would like not take long but I do want to raise one or two questions in this context. After skewing invectives and falsehoods, Shri N. Ram now has the audacity to even accuse his own Editor. In any case, I would like to urge the honourable Minister to hold an inquiry into another fact. This, Madam, is again based on the story of Mr. N. Ram, because on the 9th again he referred to three entitlements, two old ones going back to the late 1970s. Mr. Anand Sharma referred in detail to that. But I want to go further on that. I have every reason to believe—with all responsibility I am saying this—that money

was paid to a very senior officer associated with the then Janta Prime Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, by Bofors. I would like to know from the honourable Minister as to what steps the Government would take to cull out the evidence, to find out what was the money paid to an associate of Shri Morarji Desai by Bofors in 1978 or 1979.

Madam, in this context I would like to point out another thing, a very dangerous trend that has developed in our country. In dribblets they want to throw out information, to continue the charade against the Government, to continue to spread disaffection against the Government. It would not be out of context to point out here—and that is again admitted by Mr. N. Ram that the Prime Minister had sought his cooperation in reaching at the truth. Even, otherwise, the law of this country enjoins upon every citizen to bring to the notice of the Government any information that he has regarding the commission of any offence anywhere. Mr. N. Ram goes to the extent of saying that he has hundreds of pages of documents with him. Why did he not bring it to the notice of the Government at that stage? Why has he chosen this particular time? And every time when the Parliament has to meet, one day before Parliament meets, you have an instalment of these documents. Madam it is an instance where Shri N. Ram, the self-proclaimed repository of virtue and morality, has kept away information, if at all he has any from the Government. It was his responsibility to bring it to the notice of the Government to pass on that information so that the Government, committed as it was to cull out the truth, to reach and find the truth. That would have facilitated the Government in its endeavours.

The Government has not faulted in its endeavours to reach the truth. The Joint Parliament

Committee was constituted. Our friends from the other side boycotted it. Madam, every effort was made to impress upon the Swedish Government to give us the information. If some information was not passed on to us, it was not the fault of the Government. Our friends there have the check to accuse the Government of prevaricating. Madam, let us see what the Government has said and what are the facts established on record. It is for the sake of only adding some emphasis to it that I may repeat a sentence. No fault has been found with the quality of the gun. It is also an established fact that over Rs. 193 crores was saved in the transaction. What worries our friends on the other side perhaps is that Sofma was not chosen for the purpose. In their anxiety to score points, in their anxiety to spread disaffection against the Government, they have now come to allege that the Government has made money out of it.

Madam, we must not forget here again two sentences from the Report wherein Shri N. Ram says that the Bofors had deviated from the rules in depositing the money in the bank. Again taking a cue from this, Madam, I want to point out that this only leads to one conclusion. If at all Bofors had deviated from the rules in making deposits, what does it establish? It only establishes that the Government of India had insisted on elimination of the middlemen. If the Government had not done so, there was nothing debaring Bofors from making any payment, any deposit anywhere.

It has been pointed out earlier, and I would not like to repeat, at length but we do not know for what reason, what prompted Bofors to stash away its money for what purpose. Business people often do it. But that does not point

out that there was any middleman involved in this transaction. I am sorry to point out, Madam, that shorn of any ideology, shorn of any programme and flabbergasted by the progress that the Government of India has made under the leadership of Shri Rajiv Gandhi, the Opposition is left with one programme only. That is to find fault with anything that the Government does.

Shri Jaswant Singh said yesterday and today that any action by the Government is taken under the cloud, under the shadow of Bofors. It precisely applies to them, Madam, that all that they are left with is wild allegations, wild allegations which tend to denigrate, which tend to bring down the prestige of our institutions. Not once but on umpteen occasions we found our friends rushing from their seats to the well raising all sorts of slogans. That, they think, is the manifestation of democracy and assertion of their rights.

They go to the extent of taking it as a licence even to accuse the Prime Minister of a friendly foreign country. They have the audacity now to say that the Prime Minister of Sweden was uttering falsehood and that he was in collusion with the Government of India. Madam, I would like to know to what extent of depravity can our friends on the other side go only to cover up their failures, to cover up their weaknesses and only to blame the Government, only to spread disaffection against the Government to mislead the people.

Madam, because of your warning again and again, I would only like to say one thing. It was said today by a person as senior as Mr. Gurupadaswamy that the Bofors scandal has been the biggest and the most shocking scandal ever. Madam, with utmost respect to him, I would like to say that the raising of the Bofors scandal has been the biggest fraud that our



[Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal] friends in the Opposition have tried to play with the people of the country.

Thank you, Madam.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM): On 25th of July this year, intervening in a similar debate on the Bofors issue, I shared with this House as much information as I had in my possession regarding the steps taken and the efforts made by the investigative agencies of the Government to find out the true owners of certain accounts to which certain payments had been made ostensibly by A.B. Bofors. Even then I said that the investigations had not been completed and we had reached only a tentative conclusion based on investigations made thus far that it does not appear that the beneficiary of any of these payments was an Indian or an Indian entity. I promised this House on behalf of the Government that investigations will continue until we find the true owners of these accounts. You will recall I said that the greatest difficulty that we have in finding out the true owners of the accounts is the attitude taken by the Swiss Federal Government, in particular the Department of Justice and Police. Briefly to Department of Justice and Police. Briefly to recapitulate on the 20th of February, 1989 India and Switzerland entered into a memorandum of understanding for mutual assistance. Following an inquiry which had been registered by the CBI on the 8th of November, 1988, on the 23rd of February 1989 we served a formal letter rogatory on the Swiss Government requesting for legal assistance to investigate on a particular account viz. Svenska account, which is the major account of the three accounts. You will kindly recall that the Swiss in

their reply to us dated the 16th of June, 1989, which was received by us on the 28th of June, 1989, declined the legal assistance. Earlier the Swiss had declined legal assistance to the Swedish request. They declined legal assistance to us also. But as I said in this House, while the Swedish authorities may have closed their inquiry accepting the Swiss answer, we have no intention of closing the inquiry. We intend to continue the investigation and we intend to find out what other legal steps..

SHRI JASWANT SINGH

With your permission will the hon. Minister kindly yield for a second? In the letters rogatory so addressed to the Federal Government of Switzerland is it correct that the request was made on ground of violations of tax laws, evasion of taxation knowing that the Swiss laws prohibit sharing of information on that score and that in this letter rogatory to the Swiss Government no request was made on possible grounds of alleged grounds of perjury, bribe corruption or any of those similar criminal offences?

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM

Madam, let me continue with what I said in my way. I am not obliged to answer his question just now. I have heard his question and will answer it, but let me continue with what I am saying. (Interruptions) I am making an intervention in the debate. I yielded to Mr. Jaswant Singh. I heard his question and let me continue with my intervention.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

It is not question-hour discussion. He is making a statement and in his speech he will mention what is being asked.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM

Those questions have been asked and these questions have been answered. If Mr. Jaswant Singh wishes to raise this question again

he is welcome to raise it, but let me continue with my intervention and the answers will be furnished. I said while the Swedish authorities have closed their investigation accepting the refusal of legal assistance by the Swiss, we are not going to close our investigations. We are determined to continue with our investigations and we are looking into the legal provisions to find out ways and means to persuade the Swiss authorities to extend us legal assistance.

Madam, in the last three months we have applied our minds to this. We have looked into the Swiss laws more carefully. We have looked into the Indian laws more carefully and we have concluded that the refusal by the Swiss authorities to render legal assistance on the basis of the averments contained in our letter rogatory of 23rd February, 1989 was incorrect and on the averments contained in the letter rogatory and under Swiss law, we believe that the Swiss authorities are obliged to render us legal assistance. It is at this stage that *The Hindu* has published certain documents in its issue on the 9th October and in this morning the newspapers, particularly *The Indian Express* and *The Statesman*, certain other documents have been published. Madam, I wish to deal briefly with this in so far as it concerns the investigation. The other aspects will be dealt with by the hon. Defence Minister. Let me, Madam, utter a word of caution about investigations. The CBI or any other investigating agency acts under law. Nobody tells the CBI, do this, do that, don't do this, don't do that. On the 25th July, when I intervened, I was reporting to this House information placed before me by the investigating agency and today also I place before this

House information placed before me by the investigating agency. Madam, a very important document which in my personal view, perhaps, could have been placed before this House on an earlier occasion is the minutes of the discussion between officials of the Government of India and representatives of A.B. Bofors which was recorded on the 19th of September, 1987. It so happens that this document has now been published in the newspapers. This document, I believe, would have been carefully read by the hon. Members. In fact, there can be no better concrete written proof of the complete commitment and determination of this Government to find out what amounts were paid and to whom and why. In fact, if you go through the document very carefully, whenever Bofors raised the question of secrecy, the Government of India rejected it. The Government of India said, the public mind was greatly agitated about the facts that have been revealed. The public opinion is also exercised about the facts that have been withheld from the Government of India. The Government of India also referred to the extended discussions in Parliament on the issue and the fact that public authorities in Sweden had taken notice of the implications of the large payments. The Government of India would like to state emphatically that information which Bofors would be required to furnish to the authorities in Sweden should also be made available to the Government of India so that a complete picture could be given to the Parliament Committee. The Government of India added that if Bofors valued its relationship with the Indian Government, it should not withhold relevant information. It was explained, Government of India's obligation was to ensure complete openness. Government of India had no intention to injure the

[Shri P. Chidambaram] business interests of Bofors but the commitment to inform the Parliamentary Committee took precedence over all other interests. JPC is a Committee of our sovereign Parliament and would take its own decision in regard to the various matters. The Government of India reemphasised that in the context of the existing allegations, Bofors would have to review their notion of secrecy in the normal circumstances and consider it in terms of the altogether unusual situation sought to be resolved. If all essential facts were not supplied to the Government of India, the consequences, ramifications for Bofors could be very serious. Madam, Bofors made the proposal to the Government of India to arrive at a secrecy arrangement. The Government of India explained to Bofors that in the circumstances already explained in great length to Bofors, it was not possible to consider any kind of secrecy arrangement.

SHRI DEPEN GHOSH : What about paragraphs...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : No interruptions.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : He is reading from paragraphs 11, 12 and the last.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : I will read in my way. You can read as much as I can... (Interruptions)

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : You are establishing... (Interruptions)

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : Madam, I have taken note of his question.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : Your representatives did not agree to it. I am referring to paragraph 11 and 12.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : I have taken note of Mr. Depen Ghosh's

questions as I have taken note of Mr. Jaswant Singh's questions.

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : would request the hon. Members if they want a serious reply from the Government, then please don't interrupt.

(Interruptions)

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : I want a serious reply, Madam. (Interruptions). I heard him. When he stated that his summary is considered to be a proof of their fidelity that the Government did not agree to Bofors for keeping the information secret... (Interruptions)... I wanted him to quote the last two paragraphs 11 and 12. Shall I read it?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I am not allowing you. (Interruptions). I am not permitting. (Interruptions). It won't go on record. Let the Minister reply. (Interruptions)

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : \*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Dipen Ghosh, behave like a Member of Parliament. Please sit down. Don't interrupt. (Interruption)... Otherwise, I will not allow you to speak like this, Please take your seat. (Interruptions). Please sit down. This is not the way. I will not allow you. You cannot dictate terms to the Chair. Please take your seat. (Interruptions)... I will not allow.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : He is misleading the House.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : Madam, I have taken note of Mr. Dipen Ghosh's questions. (Interruptions). I have taken note of Mr. Dipen Ghosh's questions as I have taken note of Mr. Jaswant Singh's questions. As I said earlier, let me continue and answers will be furnished. I thought this is a very serious debate and I am giving very serious reply. (Interruptions)

† Not recorded.

tions)... You have talked questions. I heard your questions. I will answer your questions. (Interruptions)

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** If you want your own reply, then why do you want the reply of the Minister.

**SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM:** I will come to both the questions. Something has been published in "The Hindu" of 9th October and "The Statesman" and "The Indian Express" of this morning. One of the most important thing is the minutes of the meeting that took place and I believe and I am entitled to submit--this is the view of the Government that this document is a complete vindication of the Government's position that it was committed to extract as much information as possible from Bofors; in fact, all the information that is necessary to set at rest the controversy. Madam, there are two major issues which have been posed by "The Hindu". "The Hindu" alleged and today other papers have alleged that the Government is holding a non-serious investigation. This is the sum and substance of the charge of both Mr. Jaswant Singh when he criticised the letters rogatory and Mr. Dipen Ghosh when he referred to paragraphs 11 and 12. I will deal with those things. First, this Svenska account. Madam, the suspicion that Mr. Win Chadha had a connection with the Svenska account is nothing new. In fact, when the investigating agencies embarked upon this investigation, they formed a reasonable suspicion that Mr. Win Chadha and Svenska had some connection between them. That is why the inquiry which was registered by the CBI on the 8th of November 1988 proceeds on the basis that Mr. Win Chadha and his associates have a connection with the Svenska accounts. That is why within three days of the Memorandum of Understanding we served a letter rogatory on the Swiss authorities connecting Mr. Win Chadha with the Svenska account, assuming that Win Chadha is the

beneficiary of the Svenska account and asking the Swiss to confirm to us to tell us whether Mr. Win Chadha has any connection with the Svenska account and who the true owners of the account are. We went to Panama. I have already disclosed to this House our enquiries in Panama. We went to Switzerland. We went to the banks and finally served the letters rogatory. Madam, Unfortunately, the Swiss have declined to render us legal assistance on the basis of the facts communicated to them which, I believe, is wrong. I believe it is wrong after having looked into the Swiss law as well as the Indian law. The Swiss law and the India law are no different on these matters. The element of *mens rea* is present in the Swiss law as well as in the India law and the avements which we made in our letter rogatory were more than adequate for the Swiss to have rendered us legal assistance. However, we take note of the criticism that we have not been able to persuade the Swiss to render us legal assistance. Therefore, Madam, I have the duty to inform this House that another letter rogatory is being issued to the Swiss authorities taking note of subsequent developments and subsequent information which has become available and requesting the Swiss authorities to render us legal assistance. This time I hope that the Swiss authorities will render us legal assistance. We will do everything on our part....

(Interruptions)... to ensure that the Swiss render us legal assistance. As regards Mr. Win Chadha, Madam, the Ministry of Finance, the Enforcement Directorate, has issued a notice to him under the appropriate provisions of law requiring him to furnish answers to certain questions and to furnish certain information. We will ensure that every possible legal step is taken to ensure that the answers of these questions when he appears in an inquiry before the appropriate authority.

Then, Madam, I come to the next one. The next one is the slightly more complex Pitco, Moresco, Moineao of which the newspapers today hint that

[Shri P. Chidambaram]

there has been a major discovery of facts which is being placed before the people. Unfortunately, Madam, to my mind, this implication is incorrect. I have with me the Pitco documents. They were referred to in this House on the earlier occasion. I only wish to recapitulate briefly the key facts. The first published document refers to the Pitco account. That is dated the 19th of October 1979. I believe it is nobody's case that this has any connection with the FH-77 Howitzer deal. This is a communication addressed to the British Bank of the Middle-East. On 22-6-1981 the terms of this agreement were marginally varied. This is another communication addressed to the British Bank of the Middle-East. It continues to refer to the account as the Pitco account. The next crucial document is a letter dated 29-6-1984 from AB Bofors to the Continental Illinois Bank and addressed to Moresco and the key words are that the agreement dated 22-6-1981 has been transferred to Moresco. What did we make out of this? We made out of this that originally there was a Pitco account in the British Bank of the Middle-East, the terms of the agreement were marginally varied and on 29-6-1984 this account was transferred to Moresco, c/o Continental Illinois Banks. What did Bofors representatives tell the JPC? Before the JPC—at page 132—they said “MORESCO is not the name of the company but a reference (code name) for MOINEARO S. A. registered in Switzerland (when the agreement was signed in 1979, the reference name was PITCO).

“(When the agreement was signed in 1979, the reference name was PITCO). Following are the Directors of the Company :

(1) J.P. ESBINO

(2) M. BIGGS

(3) M. ESTRIBI

The address of the Company is 30, Rue du Rhone, Geneva, Switzerland.

The bankers of the Company are Credit Suisse and Manufacturers' Hanover Trust....”

The investigating officers went to Switzerland. We did not even—this is a point which, I believe, my good friend Mr. Ram has missed—we did not ever fall into the trap that PITCO OR MORESCO OR MOINEARO were only code names and could not refer to companies. Now, I believe that the Defence Minister will go into greater details in this. If you kindly see the letter published in this morning's newspapers, letter dated 15-10-87, written by the Defence Secretary to the President of A.B. Bofors, in paragraph 2 sub-paragraph (1), he goes into great details about the apparent contradiction between the change of names of PITAO, MORESCO and MOINEARO and calls upon Bofors to furnish the true status of these words or the code names or the companies, who are the bankers, when were they formed, when was the agreement entered into and when they were terminated. These documents, as the Defence Minister will explain in greater detail, were placed before JPC. But that is a different matter. Our agencies went to Switzerland. We have looked into the companies registered office at Geneva, and scrutinized all the information that is available there. And we have found that no company by that names is registered in Switzerland. Similarly, the names of MORESCO and PITCO were also not found in these records. To the best of our efforts the Companies registration office in Geneva, Switzerland does not disclose any company registered in the name of PITCO or MORESCO. That is why on the 25th July I candidly stated before Parliament that we have not been able to establish who these companies are, the owners of these companies whether they are code names and who owns these code names. On the contrary, we have been able to establish that there are three banks in which there are

three code name accounts in which moneys have been paid. And this was also stated before Parliament. One is Credit swisse, second is Swiss Bank Coporation and the third is Manufacturers' Hanover Trust. When we approach the Credit Swiss and Swiss Bank Corporation, they flatly refused to discuss anything with us. The Manufacturers Hanover Trust flatly denied any connection with any account of any beneficiary who received Bofors payments.

Madam, therefore, I said that following the SVENSKA experience I think the only way we can find out about the owners of these accounts is to breach the laws of secrecy which surround these accounts and ask the Swiss authorities to render their assistance to find out who opened these accounts, when they were opened, what were the payments made out of these accounts, what were the payments made into these accounts who are the beneficiarties who operated these accounts, etc. That is the only way to find out who their beneficiaries are.

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH :**  
What about Bofors?

**SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM :**  
Madam this effort is still on. We have not closed this effort. Madam, now Mr. Ram and the papers today say that they have found out that PITCO and MORESCO—I am using the words very carefully—are companies found in the Central Computerised Registry in Switzerland. Madam, I am grateful for this piece of information. But this in formation, I believe, carries with it a certain obligation. Government have decided to depute another team of officers immediately... *(Interruptions)*... to go to Switzerland once again and go through these computerised or other companies registry to find out if PITCO and MORESCO are companies registered issued in Switzerland. In the meanwhile, a letter is being issued to Mr.

Ram referring to the ongoing inquiry, referring to the inquiry which has been registered on 8-11-88 be C.B.I., and the investigating Agency and requesting Mr. Ram to kindly assist to the investigation by producing the documents with him and sharing the information with us. I would expect Mr. Ram as a serious journalist and a serious investigator of this controversy, to honour our request and to assist in the investigation by sharing with the investigating Agency the information which is in his possession and the documents which are in his possession.

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH :** Mr. Ram was dubbed as a puppet of the opposition by no less a person than Mrs. Jayanthi Natarajan. Now you are calling that puppet to assist you in the investigation. Very good.

**SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM :**  
Madam, many things have been said on many occasions. I do not wish to add to the controversies. I do not wish to add to the various things which have been said. I am only reminded on an occasion like this of a very apt quote from Mr. Adlai Stevenson :—

“When political ammunition runs low, inevitably the rusty artillery of abuse is wheeled into action.”

Madam, let me end it on a personal note. Mr. Ram has been my friend for over 40 years.

**AN HON. MEMBER :** How old both of you are?

**SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM :**  
Must be over 40, not under 40. Mr. Ram has been my friend for over 40 years. We studied together. We grew up together. *(Interruptions)*. Take it seriously. Today he has accused the Government of a cover-up. He is entitled to his view. Let me say this. I came into this debate on Bofors once last year when Mr. Arun Singh spoke and once again in July 1989. I believe

[Shri P. Chidambaram] that there is no over-up. This is my view. Madam, I must be grateful to Mr. Ram for small mercies. He does not accuse me of being a part of the cover-up and, therefore, today I invite my friend. Come. Let us work together. Let Government and you join together in this investigation. (*Interruptions*) Don't laugh it away. If you are serious, take it seriously.

Madam, who asked for an investigation by the Swedish authorities? It was the Prime Minister. Who asked for a copy of the report of SNAB? It was the Prime Minister. Who demanded that the entire report should be given to the Government of India? It was the Prime Minister. Who directed that the report furnished to us should be placed before Parliament? It was the Prime Minister. Even according to Mr. Ram, who deputed Mr. Gopi Arora to talk to him? It was the Prime Minister. Even according to Mr. Ram, who deputed Mr. Katre to talk to him? It was the Prime Minister. Even according to Mr. Ram, who invited him for the two-hour discussion and spent 40 minutes talking about the course of investigation? It was the Prime Minister. Madam, we are serious. We will pursue this matter in Switzerland. We will pursue this matter with the Companies Registration Office. We will pursue this matter with the Swiss Department of Police and Justice. But if Mr. Ram has in his possession documents and information which will assist in the investigation, I believe that he is honour-bound to assist the investigation and to share it with the Government so that we can find out who the owners of these accounts are.

4-00 P.M.

Madam, with this I wish to conclude. Just to sum up, we are another letter rogatory upon the Swiss Government. We are deputing a team of office to go into the Companies' Registration office in Switzerland to find out if pitco and Moresco or any

other name is a Company registered in Switzerland. We are also serving notices upon Mr. Win Chaddha to answer questions, to furnish information, and we shall take every possible step to ensure that he answers the questions and appears in an inquiry. We are also issuing a letter to Mr. Ram to assist in the investigation. These steps, Madam, I believe, are once again demonstrative of our clear commitment to pursue the investigation and find out the truth. Thank you.

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH :** Madam Deputy Chairman, he assured that he would consider my point...

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** What are you talking about? .

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH :** Madam, I am glad that Mr. Chidambaram in his wisdom has not stated that what has appeared in today's newspaper is wrong. Instead...

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** Let me inform you that this was only an Intervention, and the Defence Minister will give the rest of the reply. Your point was well taken. There are two more Members to speak.

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH :** There is another point. He referred to Moresco. Mr. Chidambaram, you said that your people had gone and had checked up the records and did not find any Company as Moresco, this thing and that thing. But, in the Summary Record which you considered a very good document, it is mentioned *inter alia* in Paragraph 7, sub-para (6) (v) (i) that payments to all parties except Moresco were through regular banking channels.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** You talk to him and tell him.

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH :** Then again at (vii) it is said : "Code name or names in respect of payments made to Swiss banks for Moresco will be furnished after referring to the relevant records. Then it is

expected and they assured your officers that the information about Moresco will be furnished, and it is taken that that information has been furnished. Yet, your officers have said that there is no firm with the name of Moresco. How is it? Your reply.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :**  
Shri Mirza Irshadbaig—you have five minutes.

**श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबाग :** उपसभापति महोदया, देश का विपक्ष इतना हतोत्साहित सत्ता के लिए इतना लालायित और इतना अज्ञाताभी इसके पहले कभी नहीं हुआ। बार-बार महोदया, इस सदन में और लोक सभा में भी चर्चा होती है और मैं समझता हूँ कि इसके लिए बाग साहब का एक और ही काफी है—

“मज” दे गया फसाना हमारा कि महीनी वहाँ उसकी चर्चा रही है”

चर्चा करते रहे। हमेशा उन्होंने जो बातें यहां उठायी हैं वे पहाड़ खोदकर चूहा निकालने वाली बात है मैं भी यह समझता था जब कल कुछ बात हो रही थी कि कुछ निकल आयेगा लेकिन आज मखबारों में देखा और यहां जो चर्चा सुनी तो लगा कि उसमें कोई वस्तु नहीं है। महोदया, बोफोर्स बोफोर्स इतना कहा गया है, मैं विपक्ष से एक सवाल करना चाहता हूँ कि उनका विश्वास किन सूत्रों में है। क्या देश के सूत्रों में आज भी उनका विश्वास है? एक भी कब्र पर प्रधान संतो राजीव गांधी जी ने या जिस दिन यह खबर छपी उसके पश्चात इमीडियेटली उन्होंने... उन्होंने अपने तमाम सूत्रों से यह कहा कि इस बात की तलाशी ली जाए, इस बात का इन्वेस्टिगेशन किया जाए।

जे० पी० सो० किसने बनाई वह किसके कहने पर बनी है? लेकिन

हमेशा विपक्ष मुकरता रहा, क्योंकि उन्हें पता है, इकीकत उन्हें पता है, लेकिन चूँकि माने वाले चुनाव में उनके पास लड़ने के लिए कोई मुद्दा नहीं है, इस वजह से अब यही एक मुद्दा बाकी रह जाता है।

महोदया, क्या यह बात भी सच नहीं है कि जे० पी० सी० के सामने अगर मखबारों के पास और जर्नेलिस्ट्स के पास कोई एविडेंस थे और यदि आज भी है, तो जे० पी० सी० के सामने अकार के वह एविडेंस उस वक्त तुमने क्यों नहीं दिये क्योंकि इससे यह साबित होता है कि उनका जो मोटिव है, वह राजनीतिक मोटिव है। वह उसको लेकर के लोगों के बीच में इस बात को उछालना चाहते हैं, और महोदया, आज ही क्यों दिया उन्होंने; क्योंकि उनको पता था कि आज के बाद शायद यह सेशन वहां पर मिले या न मिले और आज के बाद उछालने का उन्हें कोई मौका उसके अंदर नहीं मिलेगा।

माननीया, इसके लिए जो जमात यहां पर बैठी है, उनका विश्वास और साबित किया है कुछ सूत्रों ने कि देश की विरोधी ताकतें जो हैं, और विदेशी जो एक दस्ता है विदेश की धरती पर; जिसे सी० आई० ए० का नाम दिया गया है, उसके साथ के सम्पर्क सूत्र कौन हैं? जिस देश की सी० बी० आई० अगर एक इन्वॉयरी करती है, तो उस पर उनको विश्वास नहीं है, उनका विश्वास सी० आई० ए० के साथ है।

वही लोग यहां पर बैठे हैं। अभी सुब्रह्मण्यम स्वामी जी यहां कह रहे थे, मैं उनसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर यह अब हमको बार-बार कहते हैं कि बी० पी० सिंह आपके पास में बैठे थे, इसलिए उनको विश्वसनीयता हमारी पूरी जानकारी के लिए ज्यादा है, तो मैं भी वही कहना चाहता हूँ कि सुब्रह्मण्यम स्वामी वहां से आये थे और वह जो बातें बता रहे हैं, वह आप क्यों नहीं मानते? लेकिन यह जो बहाने वाली बात है, उसको एक्स्प्लेन कर लें और जो बातें उनको भाती नहीं हैं, उनको नहीं मानते। जो जमात यहां पर जमा हो रही है और जो जमात कांग्रेस



[श्री मीर्जा इशानदेव]

को परास्त करने के लिए देश में आई है, उसमें कौन लगे हैं, इसके लिए तो मैं एक ही उदाहरण देकर अपनी बात को खत्म करना चाहूंगा।

माननीया, मुझे एक कहानी याद आ रही है। एक गांव में एक बुढ़िया रहती थी। एक रात को उस बुढ़िया के घर में चोरों की एक टोली आ गई और उसने उसके घर में जितने बर्तन, साज-सामान था उठा लिया और उठा करके भागने लगे। अब बुढ़िया चिल्लाई कि चोर, चोर, चोर, कोई बचाओ, यह चोर मेरा भामाव लेकर के भाग रहा है। तो चोरों ने क्या किया कि बुढ़िया को अपने कंधे पर बिठा लिया और भागने लगे। जब लोग पीछे आये, तो उन्होंने कहा कि बुढ़िया सच कहती है, बुढ़िया सच कहती है।

तो लोग यह समझे कि यह तो बुढ़िया का कोई रिश्तेदार होगा और वह ले जा रहा होगा यानी इसी तरह से देश के लोगों में यह एक छम फैलाना चाहते हैं कि चोर-चोर, दलाल-दलाल, कमोशन लेने वाले—कमोशन लेने वाले असल के जो चोर हैं, वह कहाँ बैठे हैं—यह देश की जनता को बताये जो जमात उन्होंने बनाई है, उनके जो नेता उन्होंने चुने है, उन नेताओं को इस देश की धरती ने, जुड़-शरी ने साफ-साफ बताया है कि वह कितने साफ है, कितने सुधरे हैं और इसके पश्चात् भी आज लोगों के बीच में जाकर के—हमारा कहना कोई बहाना नहीं है इस वजह से गलत-सलत, मनगढ़ंत कहा-मियां सुनाते हैं। राजीव गांधी का दोष क्या है जनता पार्टी की सरकार भी बनी थी। मैं उनसे पूछना चाहूंगा कि बिचौलियों की व्यवस्था उन्होंने खत्म क्यों नहीं की? इस देश का एक ही नेता था राजीव गांधी, जिसने सत्ता में आने के तुरन्त ही बाद कहा कि किसी भी डील में बिचौलियों की व्यवस्था नहीं रखी जाएगी और राजीव गांधी का दोष यही था कि उसने देश का करोड़ों रुपया बचाने के लिए इस डील को लम्बा करके, उसने लोगों के साथ अर्चयों की और कौनसी बात उन्होंने बताई है

जे० पी० सी० की रिपोर्ट आपको कहते हैं—उन लोगों ने आकर कहा है कि राजीव गांधी और राजीव गांधी के साथ में बठने वाले—और आज मुझे कहते हुए फख है कि राजीव गांधी तो क्या, लेकिन राजीव गांधी की फौज का एक सिपाही भी इसके अंदर आपको सम्मिलित नहीं मिलेगा—यह मैं दृढ़ विश्वास के साथ कहना चाहता हूं।

कांग्रेस का इतिहास कह रहा है कि वह आज तक साफ रही है लेकिन जो धब्बे आपकी पहरेन पर लगे हुए हैं, जो धब्बे आपके दामन पर लगे हुए हैं, उनको आप मिटा नहीं सकेंगे और उनको देख कर देश की जनता इस बात को स्वीकार करेगी कि आने वाले दिनों में इस देश में किसके नेतृत्व को लेकर के जाना है।

मैं आशा और विश्वास रखता हूं कि हमारे तमाम सूत्र लगे हुए हैं कि इस देश की सुरक्षा के साथ कोई खिलवाड़ न किया जाए, लेकिन खिलवाड़ कौन कर रहा है? वह उनके नेता हैं। उनके आन्ध्र के नेता ने क्या कहा? उन्होंने आन्ध्र के नेता ने महोदय यह कहा है किसको डीमोरलाइज करने की बात की है? हमारी फौज को डीमोरलाइज कौन कर रहा है? किसके निवेदन से? यही विपक्ष के लोगों के निवेदन से कि हमारी फौज डीमोरलाइज हो। ऐसी बात करें हमारे शस्त्रों की प्रणाली और कई बात तो ऐसी आई है कि उसके सुरक्षा के जो कागजात थे वे विदेशों को कौन बेच रहा है, यहां दो-तीन कमोशन की रिपोर्ट इस सदन में पेश हो चुकी हैं। इससे साफ साफ है कि देश की सुरक्षा की कि आपको परवाह है और देश की सुरक्षा को और लोगों तक कौन बेचने जा रहा है? मैं आशा और विश्वास करता हूं कि बोफोर्स के मामले में मेरा नेता मेरी पार्टी और इसके साथ जुड़े हुए तनाम जो साधन हैं वह साधन आज भी गंगा की तरह पवित्र हैं और उन पर कोई धब्बा नहीं है। अगर कोई धब्बा है तो उसके मानस में धब्बा है। लेकिन आज भी अगर देश के सामने और राजीव गांधी के सामने

यह बात आपने रखी है तो तमाम सरकारी सूत्रों को, सरकारी साधनों को काम पर लगाया है। महोदया, तमाम कागजात एक भी कागजात सरकार ने छिपाया नहीं और जे० पी० सी० के सामने रखा था। क्यों मकर गए आप लोग और जे० पी० सी० के साथ क्यों नहीं बैठे? महोदया, यही बताता है कि उनके पास बोलने को, कहने को या देश की जनता को बताने के लिए कुछ नहीं है। इसलिए ऐसी शून्य बातों को उठा कर के राजीव गांधी का चरित्र हनन करना चाहते हैं। इस देश की सबसे बड़ी पार्टी का चरित्र नहीं हनन करना चाहते हैं। लेकिन मुझे विश्वास है कि देश की जनता सही वक्त पर, सही अर्थों में सही लोगों का हमेशा चुनाव करती आई है और आने वाले दिनों में भी फिर से पुनः कांग्रेस को और राजीव गांधी को स्थापित करेगी। यह एक निश्चित बात है। धन्यवाद।

**SHRI K. C. PANT:** Madam, I have listened very attentively to this debate. Judging from the excitement before the debate, I had expected greater fireworks but I find that there is very little new that has emerged in the course of this debate, and whatever little remained to be said, has been said by my colleague, Shri Chidambaram who has covered the area of investigation and has also indicated the steps the Government has taken after the recent publication in *The Hindu*. I am very glad that at the end of this debate I find my friends opposite sitting in the House. Last time I missed them very much, because reply to a debate loses much meaning if my friends opposite walk out of the House. So I welcome their sitting here today.

**SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA:**  
No, they will go out.

**SHRI K.C. PANT :** They will go out not because of us. They will go out because of other reason. That is a rather painful reason. Therefore, I do not go into it.

The way in which the debate began, I was hoping that we would talk about national security matters. There was some reference to national security matters but for the most part, the debate became a slanging match because I presume that as elections approach, our friends opposite would like to keep this issue alive and would like to make use of the last occasion when Rajya Sabha meets before the elections, to throw some dust in the air. I can understand that. But I would request them not to underestimate the intelligence of the Indian electorate. They are able to see through this very clearly, and in the absence of any fresh material, or anything, which would carry the investigation forward, people will see very clearly as to why this debate took place, what was the purpose behind it and how it has failed to achieve the purpose which you had in mind.

So far as Shri Upendra goes, unnecessarily he brought his leader directly into the line of Shri Sundarji's attack. That would not have been possible but for the fact that he brought up this issue. He should at least have spared him.

My friend, Shri Gurupadaswamy, an old friend, a valued friend, referred to documents. I think the words used by him were "documents reveal that corruption and bribery etc. have taken place." He is a responsible person. I have great respect for him. I would be grateful if he passes on that document to me so that it could be passed on to the investigating authority, or even place it on the Table of the House. If he has a document which reveal bribery and 'corruption, all he has to do is to put it on the Table of the House. The House will look into them, I am quite sure they will look into them objectively and will reach the right conclusions. But merely to say that the documents are there which reveal this and that

[Shri K. C. Pant]

do not take the case any farther. I am very glad that he has such documents. We have been looking for such documents in the last two years. Please give us these documents. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI PARVATHANENI  
UPENDRA (Andhra Pradesh):  
Really, how innocent you are.

SHRI K.C. PANT : Unsubstantiated allegations or unsubstantiated charges do not amount to documents. I would request you in all seriousness to consider the implications of what Shri Gurupadaswamy said because he has said something which, I think, I will be happy to take up in case he can give me the documents. I do not want to rub this in, I do not want to make a point out of it except to say that we have been looking for such thing and if any of you, not only Mr. Ram but any of you, has got, we would welcome it, we would welcome any information that you can give.

Some hon. Members raised the question with regard to the intrinsic quality of the gun being separate from the question of payment made by Bofors. I think it is good to underline this point so that the two questions can be separated. On the quality of the gun I take it now that whatever may have been said earlier, there is no one in this House who doubts the quality of the gun. I take it that is something on which they are unanimously agreed and if that is so, it has carried us forward in this debate. If anybody disputes it, I would like him to get up and dispute it now. Now is the time to be counted *(Interruptions)*. Did you dispute the quality of the gun?

SHRI PARVATHANENI  
UPENDRA : We are not concerned with the quality of the gun.

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO : We are concerned with the kickbacks.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA :  
It is not the question of quality only.

SHRI K. C. PANT : Are you disputing the quality of the gun, Prof. Lakshmanna ? *(Interruptions)*. I am asking you the question about the quality of the gun. *(Interruptions)*.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :  
Mr. Upendra, please.

SHRI PARVATHANENI  
UPENDRA : He is asking us.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :  
No, he is not asking anybody. *(Interruptions.)* Please sit down. Do not get agitated. Let him speak.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : He is asking about the quality of the gun. I am quoting what General Sundarji has said about the quality.

SHRI K. C. PANT : What is your opinion ? *(Interruptions)*. I am not yielding.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : Just listen. I am quoting from General Sundarji's version. He was the Chief of the Army Staff. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI K. C. PANT : I am not yielding. I have a long speech to make.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : I am quoting from his interview.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :  
You do not understand what is the meaning of "I am not yielding". That means he does not want you to speak.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : He wants us to say whether we have doubts about the quality of the gun.

SHRI K. C. PANT : Say "yes" or "no". *(Interruptions)*

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : There are so many questions which cannot

be replied by saying "yes" or "no". You know it.

**SHRI K.C. PANT :** The quality of the gun is good or bad. It cannot be anything in between.

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH :** You have asked a question and I am replying to that question by quoting from General Sundarji. Will you allow it?

**SHRI K.C. PANT :** If you say that the quality of the gun is bad, we will take note of it.

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH :** I am giving my reply. (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI K.C. PANT :** Please listen to me, Mr. Ghosh. I am not asking you to say that the quality of the gun is good. All I am saying is, if you think it is bad, please say it is bad and be done with it. Why should I sit down ? Therefore, Madam ... (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI KAMAL MORARKA :** He wants to say "yes" or "not" without sitting down himself. This is a new procedure.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** Please don't interrupt... No, I have not permitted you to speak.

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA-SWAMY :** Madam, just intervention...

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** Please do not let me spoil my throat more than what it already is.

**SHRI M.S. GURUPADA-SWAMY :** It is just like asking a man : Have you stopped beating your wife ? Say, "yes" or "no". (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI YASHWANT SINHA :** You are beating about the bush.

589 R.S.—5.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** Hon. Members, please listen to the Minister peacefully.

**SHRI K.C. PANT :** Two Members of the Opposition who can speak with some authority on this subject have spoken. One is Shri Jaswant Singh and the other is General Aurora.

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH :** What is this ? Today you are the Defence Minister. Tomorrow you may be Minister for Agriculture or Minister for Animal Husbandry. Are you an expert on gun system? You are speaking like an expert.

**SHRI K.C. PANT :** Let us not interrupt each other. I was saying that the two Members, whose opinion in this matter carries weight with me—may be not with my friends opposite—I can only speak for myself...

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH :** What about General Sundarji ?

**SHRI K.C. PANT :** ... are General Aurora—his expertise in this matter is undoubted—and Shri Jaswant Singh. Now I have certainly quoted both of them, but I may tell them, because both of them seem to take umbrage at that, that they did not speak to me in confidence. It is not as if they spoke to me privately. They were with me in seeing a demonstration of this gun. After that they spoke to the TV and that was broadcast all over the country. It is not as if I have revealed a secret.

**SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA :** If I have given the impression that I only said that, that is not correct, I also said the other phrase. That is what I said and I stand by it.

**SHRI K.C. PANT :** I know and therefore I am saying that you have said that the quality of the gun is good. I think I am entitled...

**SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA :** It is a diversion. He should explain the kick—backs.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :**  
What is happening to you today ?

**SHRI K. C. PANT :** I take objection to Mr. Upendra saying that it is a diversion. Both General Aurora and Shri Jaswant Singh spoke in the House. They spoke in the House and both of them referred to me that I had said something. Am I not entitled to say anything in reply ? What is this ? How is this diversion ?

**SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA :** Why refer to quality?... (*Interruptions*)

Why are you expanding it ? ... (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI KAMAL MORARKA :**  
Let him say yes or no... (*Interruptions*).

**SHRI SURESH KALMADI (Maharashtra) :** The gun is good but the Opposition has no ammunition or has only poor ammunition.

**SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA :** That is why empty boxes have come.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :**  
I would request all the Members, please do not speak in the House... (*Interruptions*)... Mr. Ram Awadhesh Singh please sit down. The Minister is on his legs.

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH :**  
You said "Don't speak in the House." Then, what for have we come here ?

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :**  
Mr. Dipen Ghosh, you should keep your mind here. Don't leave it in Calcutta. Keep it here in the Rajya Sabha when you come over here. They are disrupting the House and I have a right to tell them not

to disrupt the House. [And I have a right to tell you not to disrupt the Minister's speech. Listen to him. Otherwise I will close the discussion.]

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY :**  
Don't threaten... (*Interruptions*.)

**SHRI K. C. PANT :** Madam, the other point which Shri Jaswant Singh made was as to why we referred the facts or the publications or the material call them what you like—I won't get into the semantics—published in *The Hindu*, for confirmation to Sweden. Now, some documents were referred to. If the Swedish Government sent us a certain document, as he knows, the SNAB report, and someone excises certain portions from that report and today the newspaper publishes purportedly those portions, then is it not absolutely obligatory on the Government to ask the Swedish Government whether it is correct or not correct ?

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH :** If the honourable Minister would yield for a minute... (*Interruptions*)... Madam, I will appreciate the point that the Defence Minister is making. Indeed he is entirely reasonable in suggesting that if a document is supposed to have originated from Sweden, the least that the Government of India would do is refer it back to Sweden for authenticity. I think that is a perfectly reasonable point and it is not disputable at all. However, while he is being very reasonable about this, would he, therefore, also clarify just two simple points ? Because in this case the honourable Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs has not done so, I seek just two simple clarifications.

In the case of Momeao, Moresco, Pitco, whatever name you choose, why have you not referred the matter to Bofors AB when Bofors themselves, during this meeting of September, said that they would provide you more detailed information ?

Secondly, in this meeting itself, Bofors, in addition to the secrecy clause, also agreed to have the entire matter audited by an auditor of international repute. Why did the Government not pursue that matter?

**SHRI K. C. PANT :** I will come to this part also. As a matter of fact, it was pursued and, as a matter of fact, it was partly covered by my colleague, but I will later on come to that also.

Madam, you know very well that I do not forget. The trouble is that all of us have gone over this matter so many times that wantend to cover the same ground again and again and if you go through the old debates, you will find that almost everything that can be said has been said except that now *The Hindu* has come forward with the portions which were purportedly excised. Now that is the new input and that is what we are really discussing. But since all these matters are again discussed, again debated, charges are again made about a cover-up, my colleague and I are obliged to reply. Otherwise, I would have spared the House of this process of again going over the ground which we have already covered.

So, Madam, the point I wanted to make is, the Chairman the other day said, "A newspaper report cannot be the basis of any further action." But, in fact, the Government, although it has written to Sweden for verification, although in the meantime Mr. Morberg's statement has appeared questioning some of the things that have been said in "THE HINDU" in spite of that, we have taken action. In spite of that, we have not waited for the confirmation to begin to take action. I think that the House will appreciate what my colleague Mr. Chidambaram, said that he had already taken some steps in the light of the material that has appeared. So, is that the action of a Government which is avoiding taking action? I would

leave it to you to consider this.

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA-SWAMY :** Just one clarification.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** There will be no end to it.

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA-SWAMY :** If he can yield. I request him to yield.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** He is not yielding. No.

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA-SWAMY :** He has not said that. You are saying that.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** Yes, I am saying that.

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA-SWAMY :** Why are you answering on his behalf? I do not understand you.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** It is my job to allow people or not to allow people.

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA-SWAMY :** If he can yield for a minute.

**SHRI K. C. PANT :** Madam, we need to look into this whole matter dispassionately. I do not want to import any heat into this debate because I think there are aspects of this matter which require very serious consideration, and, therefore we have been looking into this in all seriousness. And my friend, Shri Chidambaram, has explained in some detail what steps the Government has been taking.

Some of my friends seem to feel that an allegation should be enough for the Government always to act, and not merely to act but to act on the conviction that the allegation is correct. My friend, Shri Subramanian Swamy, in his own style and manner which he has learnt from the friends with whom he sits, has

made a speech which, I think, they should ponder over. But, leaving aside the other part, he asked, "Are you prepared to apply to your own house the standard of proof which you want to apply the Government when you make an allegation?" It is a serious question. Please think ten times before you say "yes". All of you are sitting in glass houses. Unfortunately, today most of you have state Governments, luckily not all of you yet. But most of you have State Governments. Most of you have State Assemblies. Most of you have allegations against those State Governments. Most of you have allegations against the Chief Ministers. I am not making them here on the floor of this House. It is not my habit to make unsubstantiated allegations. (*Interruptions*). It is also not my habit, Mr. Upendra, to interrupt you when you speak. But there have been judicial pronouncements in some of the States. I do not want to raise all those issues here. (*Interruptions*).

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** Don't interrupt. He did not interrupt anybody.

**SHRI K.C. PANT :** The Government and its agencies when they carry out an investigation, they carry out the investigation for the purpose of later on taking action. It is not merely for the fun of it. There is a serious purpose behind an investigation. Evidence must be collected. My friend knows this. It must stand up in a court of law. There are police procedures to be followed. Unless all this is done—you may go through the motions, you can even get a few claps for having said some very harsh things—it will not lead to eliminate precisely the kind of things which you and I want to eliminate or to tackle. So, in order to successfully tackle the kind of things which you talk about, you have to follow investigations in a manner which would stand up in a court of law ultimately. I would request you with all the seriousness at my command that if you make charges and if you want culprits to

be brought to book, then, a certain process has to be followed. Whether it is the Congress Government, whether it is the Janata Dal Government or it is the CPI(M) Government, so long as the law of the land prevails, it is the same set of standards which ought to prevail in all the States and at the Centre. Therefore, all of us do become rather involved in this matter when we talk about standards of proof.

Now talking about the latest issue of THE HINDU about which we had a lot of discussions on some of the points, I frankly thought after Mr. Ram's interview yesterday that he would have much to say which would carry forward this investigation. After all ultimately, as Shri Chidambaram said, both sides are interested that the investigations should be carried forward. But I am disappointed. I don't find enough material or substance which will really help this investigation. And if he has said the Editor or Mr. Ram has material which can carry investigations forward, I hope he will help the investigation to proceed. There was some reference to pressure having been used. I do not want to enter into that argument, but the Editor of THE HINDU himself has categorically denied this. I think most of my friends opposite are very zealous in protection of the editor's rights in this matter and they have lectured to us on many occasions. So, I think they will concede that the Editor's judgement must be respected both by the Government and by the Opposition.

Now, there is a reference in the headlines to the Prime Minister not being interested in carrying forward the probe. Now this is what it says. What Mr. Ram has said in his statement I quote :

"The Prime Minister personally requested me, i.e. Mr. Ram, to cooperate in investigating the deal

but subsequently I felt that the Government was not interested in carrying forward the investigation."

Mark the words. One is a matter of fact that the Prime Minister suggested that he should cooperate in investigation, the other is a feeling that the Government did not appear to be interested in carrying forward the investigation. But the fact is, he records it, that the Prime Minister said please help us in carrying forward the investigation. This is to be noted and this is to be underlined. I remember I met him also. He is a good friend of mine also, not for 40 years perhaps, but certainly he is a good friend of mine and I had occasions to discuss Sri Lankan issue with him many times. I also told him once when I met him if he has material which can help the investigation, would he kindly pass on the material to the investigating agency so that we can move forward.

Now there is this question with regard to Moresco, which was raised by Prof. Lakshmanna and Shri Dipen Ghosh and some other friends. Now, the existence of Moresco as a company registered in Switzerland is explicitly recorded as such in the record of discussions of September 1987 to which Shri Chidambaram referred. This record was sent to the Chairman, JPC in a letter dated 23-9-1987 and the CBI, an investigating agency, launched an inquiry on the basis of the information contained therein. Now, Prof. Lakshmanna said this was concealed; this information was not given. Mr. Dipen Ghosh said that we have refused to give this information to the JPC. All kinds of statement are made. (Interruptions) I am giving you the date of the letter.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : Is there such a conclusion?

SHRI K.C. PANT : I have given you the date of the letter. This morning I checked up when you spoke.

We had half-an-hour's break, you remember. I checked up then. I said show it to me and I saw it actually. Therefore, I would request that we should not get led away by emotions. I am not going beyond that. I am not saying what you said was *mala-fide*. That was not the point. It must have been *bona fide*. But it is a warning to all of us what we believe to be true should also be examined carefully and we should make sure that it is correct and we build up a case on something which is not correct. That case can be easily demolished. I am not standing here to demolish your case. Please don't misunderstand me. But it stands demolished by itself. So, therefore...

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA : Will you yield for a minute?... (Interruptions)

SHRI K.C. PANT : Now, about the JPC

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : About the JPC I quote from page 191....

SHRI K.C. PANT : I will tell you, these facts are mentioned at page 131 to 136 of the JPC report. In particular the fact that Moresco, Moineao and Pitco have been gone into is recorded on page 132 of the JPC report. Please see page 132. Page 135 of the JPC report refers explicitly to the CBI efforts to get to the bottom of the identity of Moresco on the basis of information supplied by Bofors.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : I know it.

SHRI K.C. PANT : If you know it, then, why did you say that we are trying to conceal?

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : You pursue it. Bofors have committed to you. Did you pursue it?

SHRI K.C. PANT : I am on a limited point.



**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH :** Why did you not pursue it? Is it because of Italian connection? ... *(Interruptions).*

**SHRI K.C. PANT :** Shri Dipen Ghosh is a good actor. He can act angily also when he wants to but he is a good natured man. So, don't be misled by that. I will come to your point. I have noted that point also as to follow up this particular piece of information but I am only requesting both my respected colleagues on the opposite side to see how wrong they were in suggesting that the Government concealed this information from the JPC. Both of them specifically said it. I have noted it. Both of them made this point, highly respected Members of this House and Mr. Dipen Ghosh now is quoting from the JPC report.

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH :** Will you yield for a second? How could JPC come to this conclusion? Bofors have not furnished full details of the person to whom winding up costs were paid. Bofors here in the record have said that they will be sending the documents to you. I quote, "The payment to all parties except Moresco were through regular banking channels. (ii) Code name(s) in respect of payments made to Swiss banks for Moresco will be furnished after referring to the relevant records." Mr. Jaswant Singh has also made it known. Did you pursue it? Did Bofors send the code names? If not, what action have you taken against Bofors?

**SHRI K.C. PANT :** My colleague, Shri Chidambaram, has covered part of that already. As I said, I will give you more information. Yes, I will give you, if you give me a chance. The point I was making was : (a) We did not conceal the information and I am glad that you are now conceding that we did not conceal the information; how could it be in the JPC if we concealed

this information?

Information with regard to Moresco was conveyed to JPC. JPC has made a note of it and now you yourself have quoted it. It is on record.

Then comes the second point about investigating what was said. That was investigated and I made a point that the investigating agency did follow up on the Moresco question also. Shri Chidambaram has given details. You are quoting the discussions of September, 1987. Now, they concluded with the explicit understanding that the details of all the companies including Moresco would be supplied. The information was received with the Bofors letter of 6th October, 1987. And in that letter, Bofors state that it is not a company but a reference of Moineao SA. Directors names were given. Directors were named and the address in Switzerland was given. This was gone into further by the Government of India and the Defence Secretary again sought in his letter of 15th October an explanation. Now, Shri Chidambaram referred to that but he did not quote. If you like, I will quote from that. I quote : "How a registered company required to have a reference. Is Moresco a code reference for the actual company?" These are questions raised by the Defence Secretary. "If so, did the same code reference also applied to Pitco when Bofors originally signed an agreement with it? On what date the Pitco changed its name to Moineao SA? The names of the directors of Pitco also are required to be furnished specifically indicating with changed names of the directors of the new company called Moineao SA." Therefore, it is not as though we stopped there. Certainly, all the questions were asked. All the questions which you are asking have been asked and this is what I have. *(Interruptions).*

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : प्रश्न यह है कि...

श्री के० सी० पंत : उनका प्रश्न है आपका नहीं है। आपके प्रश्न पर मैं बाद में आऊँगा।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : हिन्दा को खबर मिल जाती है लेकिन हमारी सरकार को खबर नहीं मिलती है।

SHRI K.C. PANT : Now, we come to Bofors reply of 4th November. In its reply of 4th November, Bofors replied that the name of the company is and has been Moineao SA. The rest is all reference of code and is used for the sake of convenience. This is what Shri Chidambaram had earlier explained to you. (Interruptions)... Please have some patience, Prof. Lakshman. Now, another question has been raised and that question is, why did the Government follow it up at that point of time. I would remind the House that in August 1987, the JPC was set up and we had passed a resolution in both Houses and that resolution said: That investigating agencies would be given to the JPC and the JPC would then conduct the investigations. In fact, the JPC invited you to join. (Interruptions)... You did not agree to join it. (Interruptions)... If you had agreed to join the JPC you, might have got Moresco. You are quite right. (Interruptions).

PROF. C. LAKSHMAN : not only the Moresco but then all the details would have come.

श्री गुरुरान-ए-आजम (मध्य प्रदेश) : कस्टीनएरली इंटरेशन कर रहे हैं। मैं भी हाउस में आपको बोलने नहीं दूँगा।... (व्यवधान)... आप भाषण देकर देखिये, बोलें... (व्यवधान) आपको बतायें... (व्यवधान) देखते हैं कि कैसे बोलते हो।

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA : Madam, we take a strong exception to his threat. This relic of fascism should be thrown out of this House. (Interruptions)

SHRI K.C. PANT: Madam, I think, it was Shri Jaswant Singh, who asked just now when my colleague was speaking about whether we asked Bofors for the information. I think it was his voice. Now, if he goes through the minutes of that meeting of September 1987 and he may have gone through it already in what appeared in the press, he will see, to what extent the Government put pressure on Bofors to get information out of them. I am sure, he knows what confidentiality clauses are like in Europe and this is not a matter merely between India and Sweden but Sweden sells to other countries also and as any country would, in France, in UK, in U.S.A. any country this is a matter for that country to decide and commercial laws, secrecy laws, etc. are prevalent in almost all the countries. Now, in this situation, they were taking shelter being their laws. We were putting pressure on them. We said we must have the facts. And this conversation comes out with great clarity in the minutes which he has just read out and which I hope all of you are aware of. I would like you to judge by that. I would like you to go into it. I would like you to say what the Government has said and what Bofors has said. I would like to say, with all respect, that the Joint Parliamentary Committee also would not have got all the facts that it did get but for the fact that the Government put considerable pressure on Bofors to get the names of those three companies out of them, the names of the directors and the addresses, and so on and so forth. That helped the Joint Parliamentary Committee to push the investigation forward. So it is not as though the Government did not make efforts and did not succeed in its efforts to get information out of Bofors. But we have not been able to get all the information. That I agree. There I agree. I have no hesitation in that. But that we have failed to get anything at all is also not

[Shri K. C. Pant]

correct and whatever information is there, except what 'The Hindu' has produced, has come from the Government. So I would like you to be fair to the Government in this matter and to be fair to the Government after reading the record as it is and as it is available to you. Now, there is one thing which Shri Chidambaram said and which some of you laughed at and that is when he said that Mr. Ram should cooperate in the investigation as a responsible journalist. (*Interruptions*).

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY:** He will continue his investigation.

**SHRI K. C. PANT:** I don't mind. He may certainly continue his investigation. I am not saying he should stop his investigation. All I am saying is that, you want me as a Minister or Mr. Chidambaram on behalf of the Government to take certain action. That action will be helped if we get the information that we need to carry the investigation forward and to the extent that Mr. Ram can help us, we will welcome it. So he can publish it. I do not say he should not publish it. He is welcome to publish it. If he cannot publish in 'The Hindu', there are other newspapers which are ready to publish. So let him publish it by all means. I am not, for a moment, saying, 'do not publish it'. All I am saying is, let him publish it if he likes, but let him also cooperate in the investigation. (*Interruption*). I would request my friend Shri Gopalsamy to see what Mr. Ram has said even today. He says he has information with him. But he has not come right out and said, "This is the information with me." He has kept them back up his sleeves. Now, is this a game? Are we serious about it? And if we are serious about it, should we not cooperate with each other in getting at the truth or should we try merely to score points over each other? If Mr. Ram wants to score a point over the Government and produces dribblets of the informa-

tion just before the Parliament meets or if any of you gets up and scores a point by saying, "The Government has not been able to get this and we have got this information", you are welcome to do it. But it does not help the investigation. It would help the investigation if you pass on the information to the Government. Publish it by all means if you are sure of your facts. (*Interruptions*): Yes, if you are sure, All I would say is, Mr. Ram has not been able to carry conviction with his editor in this matter. That is all I will say, nothing more than that.

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY:** He is influenced by you. He has been prevailed upon by you.

**SHRI K. C. PANT:** I think you should be fair to the editor of 'The Hindu'. You and I are all upholding the rights of editors all the time. We should again not score a debating point. Just for the sake of scoring a debating point, we should not erode the image of editors in this country. And that, too, the Editor of a responsible paper like 'The Hindu', Shri Chidambaram has made it amply clear that whatever has appeared in 'The Hindu' will be looked into, will be investigated, and he said that we are continuing with the investigations. And I think that this should satisfy my friends opposite.

**SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA:** Continue for another three months.

**SHRI K. C. PANT:** Now, after three months in the new Government we will continue. Don't worry. (*Interruptions*) I would not have liked to say that but you have forced me. I do not want to demoralise you on the last day. (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY:** Is it the last day? (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN** (Tamil Nadu): On a point of order. As per the schedule we are meeting

on the 16th. The hon. Minister says that it is the last day.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:**  
Last day of the week!

**SHRI K. C. PANT:** If you want to continue to sit, I am not going to stand in your way. Sit on Tuesday also. *(Interruptions)*

**SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN:** As per the programme given to us, it is not the last day. *(Interruptions)*

**SHRI K. C. PANT:** Be a little literary. *(Interruptions)*

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY:** You are a very sober man. But today You have expressed your nervousness.

**SHRI K. C. PANT:** Shri Gopalsamy made the charge of cover-up. Now, my problem is that having dealt with this matter so many times I get tired of repeating the same things. But Mr. Chidambaram has summed it up in a few words as to the persistent efforts which the Government is making right from the beginning. If I repeat the whole thing, it will take the time of the House. All the facts are well known: whether it is the institution of SNAB, National Audit Bureau, report, and the action which the Government took after receiving the SNAB report, how the report is made public on the same day on which it is received, how certain portions were excised, which of course then become the springboard for a discussion today, how the JPC was setup, how in fact the Swedish Radio talked of 200 million SEK, if I remember, in the beginning and later on the SNAB report talked of 319 million SEK, and so on. All these facts are in records. I do not think that at this stage I would like to repeat them, except to say that all these matters were taken up by the Government and I would have expected my friends opposite at least to remember that we have not refrained from taking any action we could to get at the facts.

Somebody asked, with Sweden what have you done to get the information? I would only like to quote just a very small bit; that is, after the SNAB report came and certain portions were excised, which is the purpose of the debate today, we went back to the Government of Sweden and this is what we said. The Government sent that letter. I quote: In particular, full information on the following aspects of the matter may kindly be conveyed. (1) precise amounts which have been paid and amounts which are deemed to be paid by M/s. A.B. Bofors.

"2. The recipients of such amounts whether they be persons or companies and in the case of the latter, their proprietors, Presidents, Directors and places of incorporation.

3. The services rendered by such persons and companies with reference to which such amounts have been paid.

4. Copies of all the contracts, agreements and correspondence between M/s A.B. Bofors and such recipients. And

5. All other documents, facts, circumstances and details relevant to this contract."

5.00 P.M.

So, when certain portions were excised, it is not as though the Government ignored that. It is not as though we did not go back to the Swedish Government and asked them for this information. So, the question of cover-up or that they did not supply us the information does not arise. It is very wrong. But certainly the Swedish Government is a government and we have to respect a Government's rights. It is a government. It is not a private party. But they did do something. They never said ...

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA :  
Is Bofors a government?

SHRI K.C. PANT : No. No. It is the Swedish Government. You are missing the whole point. Kindly sometimes also listen. Prof. Lakshmanna, one of the problem is that a professor must also learn to listen just as a student. Please listen. Now what happened thereafter? Ringberg inquiry was set up in Sweden. When the Government wrote to them, they said: "O.K. We set up an inquiry." Ringberg obviously found no evidence of any illegality. So, he closed his inquiry. I remember one debate in this House in which Members opposite were praising Ringberg and saying that Ringberg is such a wonderful man. You should take full advantage of this and that and the other. When Ringberg closed the inquiry, I do not remember anybody here having shed any tears over that. So, we have to keep all these things in mind.

Today Shri Chaturanan Mishra spoke of many things. I am very glad of one thing and I hope he has read that. When Shri Indrajit Gupta went to Patna, in his speech there he said or to the press he said that the opposition should have joined the Joint Parliamentary Committee and that it was a mistake not to join the J.P.C. Did he say it or did he not say it?

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : नहीं, नहीं, उन्होंने पटना के प्रेस कॉन्फ्रेंस में यह कहा कि अगर सरकार कागजातों को छिपावे नहीं, तब हमारा उसमें जाना उचित था। अब आप छिपा लेते हैं, यह बात अलग है।

श्री रफीक आसम (बिहार) : यह डिस्टार्ट कर रहे हैं।

श्री के. सी. पंत : यह आप अपने लीबल को भी डिस्टार्ट करते हैं, तो मैं क्या कह सकता हूँ... (व्यवधान)

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : आपने तो बख्खार में पड़ा है, मैं तो वहीं था।... (व्यवधान)

श्री के. सी. पंत : आप इतने बड़े नेता हैं अपनी पार्टी के और अगर आप अपने सेक्रेटरी-जनरल के बारे में यह कह सकते हैं—उन्होंने जो कहा, उसको इधर-उधर कर सकते हैं, तो मुझे कुछ नहीं कहना है।

Shri Indrajit Gupta happens to be a good friend of mine and I have great respect for him. I read his statement to the press very carefully. What he said was that he felt that it was a mistake for the opposition not to have joined the Joint Parliamentary Committee. This is what he said. He went on to explain when he said it. He also said that they could have walked out and so on. I am not going into the details. Unfortunately, I read it rather well. I read it carefully. I read it because I personally spent a lot of time trying to persuade friends opposite to join the J.P.C. They did not join the J.P.C. I am still sorry about it because I feel that had they joined the J.P.C., it would have been much better for Parliament. It would have strengthened the institution of Parliament. It is for the first time that the Parliament set up an Inquiry Committee of this kind. If you had joined it and if there had been any attempt on the part of anybody, be it the Government or anybody else, you would have been able to catch. You would have been able to get the facts and this debate would have been unnecessary because we would have been able to look into it. You did not choose to join it. You cannot escape the responsibility of running away from the J.P.C. Somebody said, I think, two hon. Members said that Shri Arun Singh wanted cancellation of the contract. I have his speech here. And I find... (Interruptions) Some Members said. You did not speak, Mr. Upendra.

**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY :** He said that Bofors should be black-listed and money should be returned...

**SHRI K.C. PANT :** I have the record. I have noted every single point. I am not saying that you said it or "X" said it or "Y" said it. I am saying that somebody said it. I checked the record, and I find that what he has said is "I, therefore believe that as far as cancellation of the contract is concerned, generally it is not in the country's interest." (*Interruptions*) I beg your pardon.

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH :** He did not qualify ?

**SHRI K. C. PANT :** No. He said, generally it is not in the country's interest. This is what he said. If it is a qualification, it is only by the word 'generally'. I have it here. I went into it because I had my own doubts as to what exactly he has said. But, Shri Jaswant Singh, I know, is a fair man, and I can expect him, and if the record is correct and if he will go into it, he will see what he has said. Now, the question of what else appeared in the 'Hindu' is, I think now not necessary for me to dwell on because of the Intervention of my friend, Shri Chidambaram. I would only like to say that we are taking this investigation seriously and that because we are taking it seriously, we are going to take into account what has appeared in the 'Hindu', and as I said earlier, if anybody else can further the public cause by giving us more information, I would publicly on this occasion invite him to let us have that information. And this is not said in a light-hearted manner. We want to certainly get at the truth and it will help all of us if we can look into it together.

Now, the question of Gen. Soodarji's interview came up. Gen. Soodarji had been with me as Chief

of Army Staff. I have respect for him, and I have respect for his abilities. And it is not for me to say anything at all which is derogatory to him in any way. I would only like to say that while I agree with Gen. Aurora that the opinion of the Chief of Army Staff must be respected in relation to security matters, it is one of the inputs that the Government gets. There are other inputs which the Government gets.

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH :** Don't you share it ?

**SHRI K. C. PANT :** I will come to that. And, I think, no Government worth its salt in a democracy can run away from the responsibility of taking the ultimate decision on a matter of national security.

Now, coming to the...

**SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA :** If I may say so, I also said it that if you were concerned about it, then you should have asked the Chiefs of Staff Committee to consider this and give their view. It appears to me that the Chiefs of Staff Committee was not consulted about the threat to country.

**SHRI K. C. PANT :** Gen. Aurora is far more knowledgeable in these matters than me. But, nevertheless, having been exposed to some extent to Defence in the last couple of years, the question of Artillery hardly affects the Navy or the Air Force. It was an Artillery matter and this affected only the Army. And so, in this matter, I think, the Chief of Army Staff could not have been over-ruled either by the Chief of Naval Staff or by the Chief of Air Staff. He can correct me if I am wrong. But this was my view of the situation. Now, as far as eroding his authority...

**PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE :** Is it a question of Artillery or an overall situation?

SHRI K.C. PANT : If at the prompting of Gen. Aurora you get into this argument, and you get into an argument which you will find...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : Mr. Defence Minister, it was Gen. Sundarji who said. whoever is saying something contrary is lying... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K.C. PANT : Please read the whole of General Sundarji's statement, you will feel very uncomfortable.

SHRI DEPEN GHOSH : Shall I read it ?

SHRI K.C. PANT : It will not add to your comfort, I can assure you. I was telling General Aurora that the other serious point that he made was that we should not erode the authority of the Chief of Army Staff. I would remind him that it is not the Government which gave this interview to the press. It is the ex-Chief of Army Staff who gave the interview to the press. So, it is he who said it and I completely agree with you that we must uphold the authority of our chiefs and it will be far from me to be guilty and say anything which would erode the authority of the Chief of Army Staff.

Now, on the serious question of the security aspect or the security question, I would not go into any details because it is a sensitive matter, but I think, for instance, Atalji will recall and so many other friends will recall, that in the year 1987, a few months prior to June 1987, the situation along the borders was not too comfortable after the brasstacks operation. And that as far as I remember one of the important considerations which weighed with General Sunderji in making the change from Sofma to Bofors was the shoot and

scoot capability of which many Members have spoken. And so he felt that at that particular point of time it was necessary to take this step in view of what Pakistan had acquired, quite frankly, in reference to a certain radar system. Now, this is well known. Ordinarily I would not discuss it in the House. But now it is well known and everybody knows about it. So the question of cancellation, financial penalty to be paid for cancellation of the contract, the question of other factors coming into the picture is true and I will dwell on them briefly the financial aspect also. But if we did not buy the Bofors and bought the Sofma, to which some reference was made from my side also in the House, we would have bought the guns which General Sundarji felt did not measure up to the shoot and scoot capability of Bofors. Let us for a moment be dispassionate. After all, General Sundarji's opinion we all respect, and we have to respect his opinion also in respect of buying the best gun. He thought that the best gun was the Bofors for the reasons which he gave. And if that is so, then Sofma was the second best gun. Both cannot be the best. And so in this situation I think we should be clear that our interests were best served by buying the best gun and General Sundarji has said that there was a risk inherent in the cancellation of the contract. He has said that. But he has also said that he would be prepared to accept it for attaining certain objectives. So, I think we should see what he has said in the proper spirit and proper light and not put words in his mouth.

As far as the technical selection of the gun is concerned, I think all of us are agreed that the opinion of the Chief of Army Staff must prevail and in that respect again it is a matter of good fortune that his technical selection was the same as the financial, or the price selection.

Now, somebody raised the question towards the end of the

debate why did you take ten guns free? Who was it that raised it, I forget now. Those ten free guns were given by Bofors because French had reduced their price after the letter of intent had been issued. The French had reduced the price and the Bofors in order to save the contract gave us some guns free. That is the whole secret behind the free guns. So, there is nothing that the House does not know in this matter.

Now, Madam, about the threat scenario in 1987, all I would say is that in 1987, in the month of June, and in the month of July, it was a matter of some uneasiness along the borders. And I don't think anybody would have advised us to take undue risks at that particular stage. In any case, I think the Government has to accept the responsibility for taking this decision and it is no use trying to pass off this responsibility to anybody else. The question whether it was pre-judged by the Prime Minister or by the Government is important, because there are some suggestions that the Prime Minister pre-judged the issue or the Government pre-judged the issue. This is not a fact and I would like to explain that till the 4th of June, when we got SNAB report, the question did not arise because the payment was confirmed by the SNAB report of 4th of June and as soon as that was received, the Prime Minister met the leaders of the opposition and at that point he ordered an exercise to comprehensively assess the implications of cancellation as one of the alternatives available. Now this is a matter of record and so I would like to clarify this point. There was no pre-judging of this issue.

Now I come to the question as to why we did not cancel this contract. Firstly, as I said, the weapon was a good one, and cancellation of the contract, if it meant depriving the country of this weapon when it needed, would have been the act of a cowardly government. No

government which has to protect the national security can take such decisions in a huff. The second point was that we had reached a kind of a floor price and after that floor price we had got the best gun possible. So, both in respect of technical quality and in the price, this was a factor we had to take into account. Now if we again negotiated for a new gun, it would take a certain number of years. Now suppose it took three years. Take escalation at 10 per cent. In a contract which was almost of Rs. 1500 crores, it is almost Rs. 150 crore per year. Take exchange rate. This is another 150 crore of rupees per year. Then Rs. 150 crore advance we had paid to Bofors already. So we were putting all this in jeopardy, and these were the financial implications of the cancellation of the contract. I think we have to take this into account. Then there was the question of production of the gun...

**SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY:** If national honour is involved, you have got to cancel the contract whatever might be the cost...

**SHRI K.C. PANT:** Would it serve national honour if this country lost a war?

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY:** I think your perception is different and mine is different... (Interruptions).

**SHRI K.C. PANT:** Would it serve national honour if this country's defences were weakened? Would it serve national honour if our security suffered? Would security lapses serve national honour? So, it would be very easy to say...

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY:** May I say that even if we had cancelled the contract, the country would not have run the risk and you would have saved the honour of the country... (Interruptions)



**SHRI V. GOPALSAMY :** Gen. Sundarji gave that opinion.

**SHRI K. C. PANT :** Does any serious government, which is not a banana republic ... (*Interruptions*).

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA-SWAMY :** My charge is, you are not serious.

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH :** It is worse than that under your leadership.

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA-SWAMY :** Mr. Pant, you are a man of honour ? You are a man of conscience. But you are protecting a government which is falling and you are shielding the culprit. May I know whether or not the Prime Minister's relatives are involved in these pay-offs ? (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH :** Why MORESCO is being shielded ? Is it because it has Italian connections ?

**SHRI K. C. PANT :** It is unfortunate in the extreme that my hon. friend who is a leader of one of the opposition parties and a responsible man and basically a good man, should have to say unsubstantiated allegations of that kind.

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA-SWAMY :** If you deny it, I will be satisfied. I have given you the opportunity to deny.

**SHRI K. C. PANT :** That he should make unsubstantiated allegations of this kind, this is very unfair, this is extremely unfair and if this is the level to which we are reducing public life...

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA-SWAMY :** I am giving you the complement. You are a man of honour and conscience. Please tell me whether Prime Minister's family is involved or not. (*Interruptions*).

**SHRI K.C. PANT :** Now that my friend has not got anything out of the debate, they are trying to carry it to this level that they want to throw mud and dust. I am really ashamed of it.

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH :** You are an honourable man. You have not taken a pie. But you are protecting a dishonourable man, you are shielding him.

**SHRI K.C. PANT :** They have nothing to say and, therefore, they have descended to this level. I am ashamed of this. (*Interruptions*).

**SHRI M.S. GURUPADA-SWAMY :** May I repeat, the needle of suspicion is pointing to Prime Minister and Prime Minister alone ?

**SHRI K.C. PANT :** Madam, Shri Sukul made a reference to General Kaul. He in his interview, as far as I remember, said that somebody had offered him Rs. 2 crores. He did not say who had offered it to him. Shri Sukul asked me whether the person who offered came from the Bofors. I do not know but Shri S.K. Bhatnagar in his statement, as far as I remember, has categorically said that it was not Bofors. That is what General Kaul told him. Now the point here is that by insinuation, by innuendo, by *suppressio veri*, you deliberately throw out a suggestion in the hope that it will be understood as such. You know it fully well that it is not a fact. but you put it in a certain way so that people will believe. (*Interruptions*). General Kaul None of you. You are not involved in it. General Kaul has made this statement. What I am saying is, in fairness General Kaul should have said that this offer of Rs. 2 crores came from source A, whether it was SOFMA or Bofor or anybody else, I would not have objected to that. And what is more, he should have said it straightaway to the Chief to the Government so that action could have been taken against that person who had offered the money. No one has raised this

point. Why don't you speak about things like this? If you really want to see whether anybody is getting away with such things, we should take notice of such things. I hope my friends will realise that when they mention what General Kaul says... *(Interruptions)*... push up this particular gun and if it is a Bofors gun that is being pushed up, is he making a charge against General Sunderji? I am sure he is not, but that would be the implication. So, please be very careful. All of us have to be very careful of this.

The only other point is that somebody referred to CAG and General Sunderji's statement in the same breath. General Sunderji and CAG have been saying opposite things. They do not perhaps realise it. CAG has been saying that General Sunderji has made a wrong choice of a gun while General Sunderji has been saying that the CAG cannot make proper choice of a gun and he is nobody to judge the gun. Therefore, you should be very careful when you talk of such things. I do not want to deal with other points because the general debate has not really been such as to require me to answer each and every point.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE : I referred to CAG and General Sunderji in different connections.

SHRI K. C. PANT : All I would like to say is that the Government has not concealed anything, that the enquiries are still going on and...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : You will not yield. People will force you to yield.

SHRI K. C. PANT : Mr. Dipen Ghosh, you let the cat out of the bag. While you were speaking on this motion, you said, later in the evening you will pass the Panchayati Raj Bill.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : Your Minister has come to say that they do not want to take up the Panchayati Raj Bill... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI K.C. PANT : So while you were speaking on the Bofors issue, your mind was on the Panchayati Raj Bill, because you realised...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : We suggested in the morning let the Direct Taxes and financial Bills be taken up today and let the Constitution (Amendment) Bill be taken up on Monday. At that time, Mr. Bhagat said "No". Now he comes and says, let us take the other Bills and not the Constitution (Amendment Bill). Why are you afraid of that? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI K.C. PANT : Don't try to drown me out. I have listened to you very patiently. I am going to sit down in one minute. But before I sit down, all I can say is, what was in your mind was that the Government has made strides, this Government is getting popular... *(Interruptions)* Yes, that is what is worrying you.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : No, we are not satisfied. *(Interruptions)* We knew even when we participated in the debate that it will be an exercise in "Operation Cover up".

SHRI K. C. PANT : Elections are coming.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : We will see. We will defeat you.

SHRI K.C. PANT : People will decide. Unfortunately, you will not be able to shout there. Nobody is going to listen to these shouts. You will have to face the people tomorrow.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : We will defeat you.

**SHRI K. C. PANT** : I know what is worrying you now. But unfortunately I cannot help you. *(Interruptions)*

**DR. BAPU KALDATE** (Maharashtra) : Please help yourself.

**SHRI K.C. PANT** : I would like to thank you very much for your patience.

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA-SWAMY** : Madam Deputy Chairman...

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** : You have consumed your time.

**SHRI M. S. GURUPADA-SWAMY** : We listened attentively to the reply given by my friend. Shri K. C. Pant. I take it that it is no reply at all. It is not convincing. It is like old wine in new bottles and the whole effort is a futile exercise to cover up a fraud. We are not convinced at all. In protest, we walk out.

*(At this stage, some hon. Member left the Chamber)*

## RE. : BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT)** : I submit that the financial business can be taken up now. There are three items of financial business. The Congress Party will not take time on these three items. If they want to take time, they can. But we will not take time, so that these three items can be cleared quickly and then we go to the Constitution (Amendment) Bills.

*(Interruptions)*

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** : Please sit down.

**SHRI V. GOPALSAM** (Tamil Nadu) : The Constitution (Amendment) Bills should be taken up first. Mr. Bhagat, himself stated that after the Bofors discussion straightaway he will take up the Panchayati Raj Bills and no other Bills in between. He himself stated that. The Chairman also clearly stated that immediately after the Bofors discussion, we will take up the Panchayati Raj Bills and no other Bills.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** : There is no need to raise your voice just now. I can also hear you when you speak softly.

**SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA** (West Bengal) : They are afraid of defeat. Government is running away. You are running away.

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH** (West Bengal) : In the morning, it was I who suggested, when the Chairman had stated that he was going to allow a Short Duration Discussion on Bofors affair, that financial Bills be taken up first and afterwards the Constitution (Amendment) Bills could be taken up.

Then it was we who suggested that after the Bofors discussion the other Bills be taken up, completed today and the Constitution Amendment Bills taken up on Monday. But at the time the Leader of the House, Mr. P. Shiv Shankar, said, "No". Even Mr. Bhagat himself was present. He said, "No, the Constitution Amendment Bills will be taken up".

**SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT** : Do not say wrong things. I was not present.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** : He was not there.

**SHRI DIPEN GHOSH** : He said that the Constitution Amendment Bills would be taken up after the Bofors discussion. Then I asked what was the reason that the Constitution Amendment Bills can not be