

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: What about America?

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: I am coming to you.

As far as Mr. Narayanasamy's question is concerned, yes, action is being taken, departmental action is being taken. An Enquiry Officer has been appointed. The officers in charge are being dealt with in a regular departmental enquiry for the Rajghat incident.

As regards Mr. Gurdas Das Gupta's question, obviously a statement of this nature and clarifications in response to questions is not the appropriate forum to make such a major pronouncement. The fact is that we have come out with such a statement and the voice of this House, I am sure, will send a diplomatic message to whoever has to receive such a diplomatic message.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Again you are non-committal. You are ambiguous.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Madam, my friend has the luxury of sitting on an Opposition bench...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: You have the responsibility of the Treasury benches. You have to name the power who is against India.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: I have the responsibility and the restraint of sitting here. And I cannot answer... (Interruption) I cannot answer in the manner that he wishes me to answer. (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now the House stands adjourned for lunch and will meet again at 2.45 p.m.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at forty-seven minutes past two of the clock,

The Vice-Chairman, Shri Anand Sharma, in the Chair.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION Recent Disclosure in the Press Regarding the Bofors Deal—Contd.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री आनन्द शर्मा) :
श्री बेकल उत्साही । इससे पहले आप शुरू करें, एक बात सभी माननीय सदस्यों के लिये कहना चाहता हूँ, यह तय हुआ है कि पाँच मिनट तक हम इस डिस्कशन को खत्म कर दें ? तो सभी सदस्यों से यह निवेदन है कि जो समय तय किया गया है हर पार्टी के लिये, जिस तरह कांग्रेस पार्टी के प्रत्येक सदस्य के लिये 15 मिनट तय हुये हैं, लोकदल के लिये 7 मिनट, ए०डी० एम०के० के लिये 6 मिनट, बी०जे०पी० के लिये 8 मिनट और बाकी दूसरी पार्टीज के लिये

The time is fixed. I am just requesting, please try to be brief, before we start this discussion today. I seek your cooperation. (Interruptions)

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): When the discussion was started, in between the Prime Minister's security problem came and there was discussion on that and...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): No time has been taken out of this discussion.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: At least Members from this side should be given more time. (Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): Shri Shiv Shanker took the Congress Party's time.

श्री बेकल "उत्साही (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
महोदय, मैं आपका शुक्रगुजार हूँ कि आपने मौका दिया । कल जो मैंने अपने विचारों को, जिसे लोग प्रोजेक्ट में कहना चाहते हैं, मैंने पोइंटरी में पेश करने का साहस किया तो कुछ हमारे दोस्तों को जरा चोट लगी थी, उसके लिये क्षमा चाहता हूँ । अगर आप इजाजत दें तो अपनी बात पूरी कहूँ ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री आनन्द शर्मा) :
ठीक है ।

श्री बेकल उत्साही :

फिर वही बोफोर्स का मसला वही चीखो
पुकार
फिर वही हंगामे में डूबी हुई बातें
उधार ।
मामिला ये कौन उठाता है यहां पर
बर बार
कौन खा जाता है इस हाउस का वक्ते
बेशुमार ।
एक बोफोर्स के सिवा तुम जानते कुछ भी
नहीं
या महज अपने सिवा पहचानते कुछ भी
नहीं ।
तुम भी संसदीय समिति के गठन में साथ
जांच के हर हर कदम पर हर चलन में
साथ थे ।
फिर भी तुमको हर कदम हर बात अनजानी
लगी
जिस को अपनी जिन्दगी समझे वो बेगानी
लगी ।
ठोकरें खाते हो गिरते हो तो शर्मते
नहीं
अपनी जिद पर तुम अड़े रहते हो घबराते
नहीं ।
चाहते हो तुम कि ये नादानियां फैली
रहें
देश के हर अंग में बैचेनियां फैली रहें ।
रात भर गढ़ते हो तुम फिर सुबह को
पढ़ते हो तुम
'एक्सप्रेस' तुम को चढ़ा देता है फिर चढ़ते
हो तुम ।
शाम कर तुम बैठ जाते हो कभी "हिन्दू"
की मेज
शोर करते हो जमाने में किये हैं
दस्तावेज ।
पत्रिका कोई भी लिख देती है गद्दे को गुलाब
बस तुम्हारे वास्ते वो बनती है जीवन
किताब ।
भाव का फैलाव सारे जिस्म में भरहम
से है
देश में जो भी है अस्थिरता तुम्हारे दम
से है ।
बोलते हैं हम तो आखिर बोखला जाते
हो क्यों
नज़्म म कोई हो तो तुम लडखड़ा जाते
हो क्यों ।
हम तुम्हें कुछ भी बतायेंगे तो मानोगे
नहीं

अपनी आदत के मुताबिक सच को जानोगे
नहीं ।
वक्त कितना कीमती होता है तुमको
है खबर
फिर भी इस हाउस को भरभाया है तुमने
जानकर ।
बिन एजेंसी सारी वृनिया में कोई सौदा
नहीं
बिन हवा की छेड़ के बादल कोई बरसा
नहीं ।
चाहते हो तुम कि सच का रास्ता
बदनाम हो
कारवां टूटे हमारा रहनुमा बदनाम हो ।
झूठ को सच कहना वर्षों से तुम्हारा काम है
देश में उलझन रहे लेकिन तुम्हें आराम है ।
आज फिर से जांच हो इसके लिये इमरार
क्यों
पहली संसदीय समिति से तुम्हें डकार
क्यों ।
हो दुराहे पर कोई राशी तो वृनिया
क्या करे
खुद मुसाफिर ही भटक जाय जो रास्ता
क्या करे ।
अपनी बातें हम सुनाते हैं तो चिल्लाते
हो तुम
और विचारों की करूं क्विता तो चिढ़
जाते हो तुम ।
कह के तुम कुछ भी गुजर जाओ तो वो
है इतिफाक
मेरी सच्चाई मेरी भाषा को कहते
हो मजाक ।
अब तो बोफोर्स में धरा क्या है कहानी
के सिवा
कुछ नहीं झूठी दलीलें वहते पानी के
सिवा ।
तुम उड़ाओ धूल सूरज खुद चमकता
जायेगा
जो अंधेरे हैं उन्हें वो रोशनी पहुंचायेगा ।
एक होकर देश की सब गुत्थियां मुलझायें
हम
आने वाली नस्ल के आगे न फिर शरमाये
हम ।
संद है जिन का लहू विश्वास से गरमाये
हम
साजिशों को जाफरो जयचन्द को ठुकरायें
हम ।
एकता से फिर फरेहरा देश का फहरायें
हम

† [شری ہیکل اتساہی (انوپر دیس):

مہو دے مہوں آپکا شکر گزار ہوں کہ آپ نے موقع دیا - کل جو بات اچھ وچاروں کو جسے لوک پرور میں کہتے ہیں میں نے یوپیتری میں پیش کرنے کا ساجس کیا - تو کچھ ہمارے دوستوں کو ذرا چوٹ لگی تھی - اس کے بعد ہم چاہتا ہوں - اگر آپ اجازت دیں تو اپنی بات پوری کہہ دوں -

اپ سبھا ادیکھس : تھیک ہے۔

شری ہیکل اتساہی :

بہو وہی بوفورس کا مسئلہ وہی چھٹ و نکار

بہو وہی ہنکامے میں کوئی ہوئی باتوں ادھار -

معاملہ یہ کہوں اٹھا تا ہے یہاں پر ہار ہار کون کہا جاتا ہے اس ہاؤس کا وقت بے شمار -

ایک بوفورس کے سوا تم جانتے کچھ بھی نہیں

یہاں محض اپنے سوا پہچانتے کچھ بھی نہیں -

تم بھی مسٹرینڈ سمٹی کے بھی کتھن

مہوں ساتھ تھ

اچنچ کے ہر قدم پر ہر چلن میں ساتھ تھ -

بہر بھی تم کو ہر قدم ہر بات انجانی لگی

جس کو اپنی زندگی سمجھے وہ یہ گانی لگی -

تھو کریں کہاتے ہو کرتے ہو تو شرماتے نہیں اپنی ضد پر تم اڑے دھتے ہو گھبراتے نہیں -

چاہتے ہو بہ نادانہاں پھیلی دھوں دیس کے ہر انگ میں بیچیلہاں

پھیلی دھیں -

رات بھر گھرتے ہو تم پھر صبح کو پڑھتے ہو تم

”ایکسپریس“ تم کو چڑھا دیتا ہے بہر چڑھتے ہو تم -

تھام کر تم بٹھ جاتے ہو کبھی دھندو، کی سوز

شور کرتے ہو زمانے میں کئے ہیں دستاویز -

پتہ دیکھ کوئی بھی لکھ دیتی ہے گیلدے کو گلاب

بیس تمہارے واسطے بدلتی ہے جیون کتاب -

کہاؤ کا پھولڈ سڑے جسم میں مرہم سے ہے

دیکھ میں میں جو بھی اٹھتا تمہارے دم سے ہے -

بولتے ہیں ہم تو آخر بوکھلا جاتے ہو
کدوں

نشے میں کوئی ہو تو تم لو کہو جاتے ہو
کبوں -

ہم تمہیں کچھ بھی بتائیں گے تو مانو گے
نہیں

اپنی عادت کے مطابق سچ کو جانو گے نہیں

وقت کتنا قیمتی ہوتا ہے تم کو ہے خبر
پھر بھی اس ہاؤس کو بھرمایا ہے تم نے

جان کر -

بن ایجنسی ساری دنیا میں کوئی
سودا نہیں

بن ہوا کی چھوڑ کے پانل کوئی بوسا
نہیں -

چاہتے ہو تم کہ سچ کا رستہ بدنام ہو
کارواں توڑے ہمارا رھلما بدنام ہو -

چھوٹ کو سچ کہنا ورشوں سے تمہارا کام ہے
دیکھ میں الجھن رہے لیکن تمہیں
آرام ہے -

آپ پھر سے جانچ ہو اس کیلئے اصرار کہوں
پہلی سنسریٹ سے تمہیں انکار کیوں
ہو دوراھے پر کوئی راہی تو دنیا کیا کرے

خود مسافر ہی بھگت جائے تو راستہ
کیا کرے -

اپنی باتیں ہم سلگاتے ہیں تو چلاے ہو
تم

اور وچاروں کی کدوں کویتا تو چو جاتے
ہو تم -

کہہ کے تم کچھ بھی گزر جاؤ تو وہ ہے
اتفاق

میری سچائی میری بھاشا کو کہتے ہو
سداق -

اب تو برفورس میں دھرا کیا ہے کہانی
کے سوا

کچھ نہیں جھوٹی دلیلیں آہتے ہاسی
کے سوا -

تم اڑاؤ دھول سورج خود چمکتا جائے گا
جو اندھیرے میں رہے انہیں روشنی

پہنچائے گا -

ایک طرف ہو کر دیکھ کی سب کتہیاں
سلجھائیں ہم

آئے والی نسل کے آگے نہ پھر شرمائیں ہم -
سردے جن کا لہو وشواس سے پھر

گرمائیں ہم
سازشوں کو جعفر و جے چدن کو
تھکرائیں ہم -

ایکٹما سے پھر پھر دیکھ کا پھر آئیں ہم]

श्री कैलाशपति मिश्र (बिहार) : "शायर तो सारे मर गए*

उपतन्नाध्यक्ष (श्री आनन्द शर्मा) : आपको ऐसे शब्दों का इस्तेमाल नहीं करना चाहिए । हमें सदन की मर्यादा को भी देखना है । These words are expunged.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA (Andhra Pradesh): Is it unparliamentary? (Interruptions).

SHRI V. GOPALASAMY: Then the whole thing should be expunged.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AN-AND SHARMA): No, That was a poem and he has not abused anybody.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARU-NACHALAM (Tamil Nadu): He is a Member of the House. It cannot be expunged unless it is unparliamentary. (Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AN-AND SHARMA): Mr. Gopalasamy, you can also recite a poem.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: But this is also part of a poem which he recited.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AN-AND SHARMA): His name is there on the list.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: You please tell us what is unparliamentary in what he said. (Interruptions). By simply saying that it is unparliamentary, it cannot become unparliamentary.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AN-AND SHARMA): Why are you making an issue of it? I have expunged it and I am not going to withdraw.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARU-NACHALAM: You try to accommodate.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AN-AND SHARMA): I will be the last person, sitting on this Chair, to accommodate unparliamentary words. We have to uphold the dignity of the House. I will request the Members to co-operate.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Is this the type of co-operation you want? What is this? (Interruptions).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AN-AND SHARMA): Let us set a better example.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: It is all the more important that we set a good example. Now he did not say a word which is unparliamentary... (Interruptions).

श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकुल (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
यहाँ हाउस में भी कोई सदस्य अपने को *नहीं कहता ।

श्री कैलाशपति मिश्र : एक कविता की पंक्ति है, शायर तो सारे मर गए *

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AN-AND SHARMA): I will request you to maintain order.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Karnataka): Sir, before you call upon Mr. Jaswant Singh to speak, may I make a submission? You said that time-limit has been fixed and we will have to conclude this debate at 5 p.m. This is what I heard. Am I correct?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AN-AND SHARMA): That is the decision.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: It is not correct because we have not set any time-limit. There are quite a few Members who have to participate in this debate. Therefore...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AN-AND SHARMA): Everybody will get his chance.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: We can sit longer. There is no time-limit. (Interruptions)

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): Generally, for a Short-Duration Discussion, the time allotted is two and a half hours. We can go up to 5 p.m. But it is not correct to say that there is no time-limit.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AN-AND SHARMA): I would like to point out to hon.. Members that four hours were

initially allotted for this. Out of this, we have taken three hours and twenty eight minutes so far. We still have about two hours. Let us see what the position is. But I would request hon. Members to co-operate with me. We have not been able to take up any legislative work. (Interruptions)

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Sir, one day was allotted for this debate but because of the important discussion which intervened relating to Prime Minister's security....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): Mr. Gopalsamy, let us not waste any more time. Mr. Jaswant Singh please.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, what about the Short-Duration Discussion in regard to atrocities on Harijans, standing in my name? (Interruptions)

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री आनन्द शर्मा) :
उसके बाद आज ही ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : : खेद है शाम के बाद । क्या सदन के पास हरिजनों के लिए, आदिवासियों के लिए कोई समय नहीं है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री आनन्द शर्मा) : यह भी लोग ही लाते हैं, यह चर्चा भी.....

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : तो फिर कल आनी चाहिए, 12.00 बजे के बाद । विषय बहुत गंभीर है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री आनन्द शर्मा) :
वाजपेयी जी, जैसे आप कह रहे हैं, वैसे ही होगा ।

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM: Tomorrow morning, we can have it soon after the Question Hour.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): I will now request hon. Members to listen to Mr. Jaswant Singh.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, at the outset, I must say one thing. I do not approach

this debate in any self-righteous, pompous and adversarial attitude. The political discomfiture of this Government does not automatically delight me. On the contrary, the paralysis of decision-making that afflicts our Government affects me very deeply. It affects all of us. It affects the entire nation. I approach this debate in a mood of great sadness because I would like to continue to believe, despite all evidence to the contrary, that your quest for truth, on the treasury side, is not a partisan concern, that it is not a sole proprietary right; this quest for truth, whether ours or yours.

Sir, the essence of the many discussions that we have had on Bofors has been, and continues to be, about probity in public life; accountability and the answerability of the executive to this House, to Parliament and to the nation. Our central concern, when we are discussing Bofors, is not whether there ought to be another JPC or there ought not to be another JPC. After all, the JPC is merely a medium, a method, of arriving at the truth. Our central concern is not with the methods of arriving at that truth. Our central concern is about this spreading epidemic of the cholera of corruption. The only detail that needs to be established is: who has taken this Rs. 64 crores and why? Here again, if we end up by being on both sides of the question, it is only because you have made accusations that this search for truth is tantamount to destabilisation that it is falsehood. Or, as a very senior Member of the treasury benches put it, it is wasting Parliament's time. Or, as a Cabinet Minister, hon. Mr. Sa'he, put it that is an act of traitors. I am 3.00 P.M. intrigued as to how search for truth can be destabilising and why the Treasury Benches or the Government assume that the truth about Bofors would, as a natural consequence, destabilise the Government, Sir, in an act of outstanding piece of journalism. The Hindu published some documents. Participants from the Treasury Benches went to the extent of saying that those documents are 'plants'. Why should that be the first reaction? Why ought not the concern of the Government exceed our concern? Why ought not the Government always remain one step ahead of public concern?

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

Here again, Sir, the Parliament is not occupied with the complex mechanisms of the working of a medium artillery weapon system. We are engaged in a pursuit which is soul-searing. It is the pursuit of some questions that concern this great assembly, questions which are of profound importance to the future of our Republic.

About what the hon. Minister, Mr. Sathe said, about being traitors, etc. I will come a little later. Right now I would like to say that this is also not a second discussion on the findings of the IPC.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (Punjab): Just for the sake of a clarification, I would like to know where did Mr. Sathe say all these things?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Somewhere.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: I do not know whether Mr. Sathe has said these things. So, I only wanted to know where...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): I will request Mr. Jaswant Singh not to refer to the debate in the other House.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am not referring to the debate in the other House. What a Cabinet Minister has spoken about has been widely reported in the press. I am merely referring to a press report. I will be very very happy if Mr. Sathe came here and said that he did not say these things.

Now, what I was saying is that this is not a second discussion of the findings of a Committee, called the Joint Parliamentary Committee. Let me quickly recapitulate what the established facts are because the established facts will give the boundaries of today's discussion. The established facts are that roughly Rs. 64 crores have been paid by Bofors AB. Secondly, that this money was paid to three front companies, Svenska, Moineau (Pitco-Moresco) or whatever it is, and to A&E Services. Thirdly, that this money was paid as commission,

and in the case of A&E Services, suspiciously, like a bribe. Fourthly, that these payments were contract-related to the Indian deal. Fifthly, that these payments continued to be made upto March 1987—in contravention of all norms and would, in all probability, have continued to be paid even beyond, had not the Swedish radio come out with the information on the subject. Sixthly, that therefore, Bofors repeatedly lied and committed breach of faith of the contract. Seventhly, that the banks, and in some cases the bank accounts into which these monies have been paid, are known and details of that are available with the Government of India. That there is sufficient direct and circumstantial evidence to link these companies with some Indians. That in the face of all this evidence and proof the Government of India has so far taken the following actions. I am not going into its detailed examination, but this is the action that the Government of India has taken so far. That it has ordered a further CBI enquiry. Secondly, it has not asked the Government of Sweden for assistance. Thirdly, it has not insisted upon Bofors for full disclosure. Fourthly, it has not sought any information from Switzerland so far. Fifthly, it did not ask Her Majesty's Government in UK to give details about payments made to A&E Services Limited which was a London registered organisation. Next, it does not want the appointment of another Joint Parliamentary Committee.

And, finally, Government has repeatedly stated that it wishes to punish the guilty, but not a single guilty has yet been identified, leave aside punished.

These are all incontrovertible facts. These are based on what the Government has repeatedly stated.

In examining our Government's conduct, I come across a strange phenomenon which I call the phenomenon of "fortnightly alibis". The first reaction of the Government on April 16, 1987, was that this report is "false, mischievous and baseless". When it was found that it was not false, then it was shifted to that "no Indians are involved". The hon. Prime Minister and various other dignitaries of

the Government repeatedly said: "no Indians are involved". When it was established that Indians are involved, now the new line is that "no politician is involved".

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: That is more important.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: If we go by the track record, whatever assertion is made by the Government—if it said "no Indian was involved" and then "no politician was involved"—then perhaps a politician is involved. It started by saying, "no payments have been made". These are almost exactly the words of the hon. Prime Minister that "no payments have been made" and nothing has been paid into the Swiss banks. When it was established that actually payments had been made and they were made into the Swiss Banks, the line that was taken by the Government was, "no commissions have been paid". When it was established that actually "commissions" have been paid and the documents established categorically that these were "commissions" that were paid, the Government now says, "no bribes have been paid".

Sir, the hon. Prime Minister, to start with, here in this House and elsewhere said: "I do not need proof, just give me evidence". He said, "for heaven's sake"—there were his words "just show the direction in which to look". When that evidence is shown, almost proof is shown, when more than the direction in which to look is shown, then the Government comes up with the statement, "the guilty will be punished". And yet till today, Sir, clearly identified Win Chadha has not even been charged with a single misdemeanour regarding the Bofors deal. There are two points about what hon. Defence Minister said in the other House that require immediate rebuttal. He, had in his earlier intervention said, we are not to denigrate the investigative agencies because we have none other, which is a fair point. But the real denigration of the investigative agencies is by a selectively political employment of them. The real denigration of the investigative agencies takes place when for the last two years

or more they continue to unearth manipulation of funds and other misdeeds by that firm of Ambani and yet no results come out, when as some other colleague of mine in this Parliament said in the context of the Bachchans that really the CBI has to ask two simple questions: have you got property in Switzerland? If so, where did you find the money to buy that property from? CBI is just wasting its time in investigating it. In the case of Win Chadha, it is still investigating. Nothing. In the case of Hinduja's is it investigating. Result, nothing. It is this politically selective misemployment of the investigative agencies which robs them of their credibility, which is why we come up then and say: merely handing it over to the CBI is a ploy and it is not a search for truth.

The hon. Defence Minister then said: We asked of the Bofors to comment on the revelations made by the *Hindu* and the Bofors said that they do not comment on press reports. I am surprised, Sir, that a man of the rectitude and intelligence and experience of hon. Defence Minister ought to have made that statement in Parliament, because Bofors in fact, in four specific cases, has reacted only to press statements. It reacted first...

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE
(**SHRI K. C. PANT**): May I explain, Sir? Bofors wrote something to us and I am asked what they have said. I must report what they have said. That is all I said.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am also reacting to what the hon. Defence Minister said that Bofors say that they do not react to press statements. This is a canard—I am not saying what the Defence Minister has said is a canard. I am saying that what Bofors had replied is a canard. Actually, the Defence Minister has honestly admitted what Bofors had replied. But what Bofors said, that they do not react to press statements, is a canard. On four separate occasions they had reacted, to start with. The very first, when *suo motu* they gave a press statement, on press report that Hinduja's were involved, that Hinduja's

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

were not involved. Then they issued a press statement gratuitously, on their own, to say that Bachchan was not involved. Then, gratuitously, on their own, they said that the Indian Prime Minister was not involved. Then, when it came to a report of the meeting between Mr. Martin Arbo and the Indian Prime Minister, almost in a startlingly similarly-worded statement, Bofors issued a statement that there was no meeting between Mr. Martin Arbo and the Prime Minister in relation to winning of the contract. Bofors reacted, had reacted in the past, their history is of reacting to the press, and I am surprised that the Government has accepted all that from Bofors and has not reacted violently.

Sir, the Prime Minister, on 25th June, reacted to these revelations of Bofors as carried by *The Hindu*, by making three points. He said that they confirm that "no politician was involved." Secondly, that they corroborate—this, to my mind, is an incredible assertion—"the findings of the Joint Parliamentary Committee have been corroborated." Thirdly, according to the Prime Minister, as 'these documents are part of the investigations of the Swedish Public Prosecutor, Mr. Ringberg, there is no reason to dispute them,' as it has been suddenly discovered that "Mr. Ringberg, as the Chief Public Prosecutor, is an autonomous body. These conclusions of the Prime Minister, to my mind, of astounding illogic and numbing triviality, were arrived at even before the CBI investigation had been launched. Even before the CBI had found out what was to be found, he made this statement on 25th June. Then, what was the CBI asked to investigate into? The principal public servant of the Republic, the Leader of Parliament and the Leader of the Government, judges the issue even before the CBI has found anything, and makes a pronouncement on 25th June. What, therefore, has the CBI been asked to look into now?

Secondly, the Government has suddenly found merit in the office of the Chief Public Prosecutor of Sweden despite the fact that during the pendency of the Joint Parliamentary Committee, during the pendency of the Chief Public

Prosecutor's own investigations, not on a single occasion did we officially, formally, ask him of what he had found out or offered to him what we were doing. How, suddenly, has Mr. Ringberg now become an issue meriting such praise?

I would like to answer here the question about patriotism. I do not want to repeat what Mark Twain said, about patriotism being the last refuge of scoundrels, but I am also not ready to accept fligid and jingoistic buffoonery masquerading as patriotism. Patriotism is not your sole proprietary right and you are no one to give me certificates or give us certificates about our patriotism. You talk about patriotism. In that agreement with Mr. Win Chad'na—with Anatronics—there are these specific requirements that Anatronics had to perform. You have questioned our patriotism because we questioned the workings of Bofors. Yet, not a single statement has come from the Treasury Benches to inquire about these two provisions of the agreement of 1978 with Anatronics which says, specifically, that Anatronics will be obliged to keep Bofors informed about the Defence organization in order to ascertain what persons currently have influential positions, and to try and judge who will have influence in the near future. Further, to keep Bofors informed, as well as possible, about current procurement plans of India and, in consultation with Bofors, to determine what objects comprise in these plans that might be of interest to Bofors. Anatronics by an agreement is obliged to provide information about defence procurement plans. None of you have commented on that.

And you wish to comment on our patriotism.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL:

A clarification I would like to have from Mr. Jaswant Singh. Is it not a fact that this provision which he is reading from an agreement between A.B. Bofors and Anatronik General Corporation was executed in 1978? And in 1978 it was the Janata Government which ruled at the Centre. Precisely. Sir, it was to eliminate such contracts between the private parties and to eliminate the influence of any

outside person on Government decisions that the Rajiv Government, the Congress Government took a decision to eliminate the agents.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA (Rajasthan): Sir, I should clarify...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): No.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: He has referred to the Janata Government.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): He has referred to the Janta Government. You were not a Minister at that time. You cannot clarify on behalf of the Janata Government.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: This is not correct. I am on a point of order.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): Let me hear your point of order.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: When a particular Member is speaking, under what rule is this Member interrupting? He is not a Minister in the Government.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): He sought a clarification, and he has yielded, Mr. Jaswant Singh has yielded.

SHRI KAMAL MOARKA: The fault lies with my colleague yielding. That is what Mr. Chairman is saying.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Mr. Bansal for whom I have high regard, is quite right. Historically he is correct. In 1978 the Janata Government was in power. I don't think that it is a point that needs to be answered by him. That the agreement was signed in 1978 is also correct.

So far as the question of commission agents is concerned, I have with me here the report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India. It is Report No. 10 of 1988. It was already been laid on the Table of Parliament

It says here that the CAG has examined the question of what Mr. Bansal has said about abolishing of commission agents etc. It says that the sample study of 50 cases in audit has revealed that commissions paid to Indian agents range from 2 to 1.25 per cent. This is a report which relates to 1987. This is not my assertion. This is an assertion of the Comptroller and Auditor General of the country.

Just a little elaboration about morale because considerable emphasis was laid on this aspect that if you talk about Bofors, the morale of the armed forces is lower. I have had the great privilege of having worn uniform for this country. Also my gallant colleague, Gen. Arora. I don't have to obtain certificate; or ask him what constitutes the morale of our armed forces. That high morale which enables a member of the armed forces to lay down his life, is not a by-product of untruth. Please recognise that. I have no time to elaborate this point. (*Time bell rings*)

I will conclude now, Sir, by asking the hon. Defence Minister to clarify some points which remain, in my mind as nagging questions. I would like to know, Sir, why till date three key witnesses have not been examined:

Why has our former Ambassador to Stockholm in Sweden. Mr. Bhupat Rai Oza, not been examined by the Joint Parliamentary Committee or by the Government?

Why was Ringberg not examined, not sought assistance from?

Thirdly, why have we not made any efforts even now to seek examination of Martin Arbo with the assistance of Swedish Government when he has revealed himself in Stockholm?

Sir, I would like clarification of this riddle of Shri Win Chadha. We were informed, when he was in the United States, that he was a green card holder. Then we were informed that he was untraceable, we could

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

not find where he was staying in the United States of America. Then he had passports, affidavits made. Then we informed that he was not actually a green card holder returns to India, I am told, on a piece of paper masquerading as a passport. What is the current status of the investigation into Shri Win Chadha? I would also like to be informed on the riddle of the Hinduja's. The hon. Defence Minister said whatever information has been found out on the subject has been found out only by the Government. I do not want to speak on first person singular as it will embarrass me if I have to say this. Still I may say that in the month of May 1987 following upon a self-financed visit to Stockholm, only for this purpose. I was the first one to report that it is common knowledge in Sweden that Hinduja's were involved through a front company called Svenska Inc. and that was in May 1987. It, therefore, does not lie in the mouth of the hon. Defence Minister to say that only his Ministry has done whatever it has done. What has been done by way of an outstanding piece of journalism by the Hinduja's deserves credit and this credit goes to them. I would, therefore, like to know...

SHRI K. C. PANT: But the Hinduja seems to suggest otherwise.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I have not followed your intervention, but if the hon. Defence Minister says that the Hinduja suggests otherwise that the Hinduja's were not involved, it is wrong. But I would like to know what is this riddle of the Hinduja's? Either the Hinduja's are guilty; in which case say so. Or they are not guilty; in that case why does the Government not stand up and say the Hinduja's are not guilty? If they are guilty, why have you not taken pains even of telling them once? Why do you permit them to continue to buy into India through IVECO and others? That very IVECO of the Westland helicopter fame and you continue to allow this

company to buy into India through them.

I would then like this riddle, about which I asked yesterday, to be clarified. That is about the non-cancellation, rescinding of the contract. I have already asked about it yesterday. I would, therefore, like the Government to clarify. Is it a fact what I asked yesterday of the hon. Leader of the House—that the Defence Ministry had information? It is a point which was earlier made by Mr. Vajpayee, in an earlier intervention.

I would like a specific clarification from the Defence Minister on this aspect of the fire-finding radar. We were informed that one of the reasons to switch from the Sofma, the French gun, to the Swedish Bofors, was this aspect of the development of the fire-finding radar. Hence because of that development in February 1986, this change had to be made. It is my information and I really condemn myself for not having come forward with this piece of information earlier. I ought really to have made a great study of this, that in fact, this AN-36 radar has been with the Pakistan Army since well before 1977. So far as AN-37 is concerned it has been in development since 1977. Seventytwo pieces were ordered and, in fact the defence supply of it concluded towards the end of 1985. How then suddenly did this fire-finding radar become the determining factor for switching from sofna to Bofors.

I will conclude with just two sentences. You were most considerate to me. Our central concern is not to discomfit the Government. We will continue to pursue these facts, however condemnatory the Government's attitude might be to such a pursuit, because I am sure the Treasury Benches share with me the sentiments that this country cannot be held to ransom by international fixers or arms peddlers. India is not an object which can be held to ransom merely because a firm of arms peddlers in Sweden decides to hold us to ransom

Please recognise, therefore, even now that the greater your efforts to colour the truth with political convenience, the more starkly the bones of the question will stand revealed in black and in white, if not to-day tomorrow. They will do so with you without you, even, in fact, despite you.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA (Nominated):
The issue of Bofors has been raked up once again and the provocation or the justification that is being made for raking up this issue is the publication of a report in the Hindu newspaper on 22nd June and on 23rd June in the "Hindu" newspaper on 22nd June and 23rd June, 1988. But I must share my feelings with you, Sir, that each time the Bofors issue is taken up either in Parliament or outside, the sole object is to make insinuations and insidious innuendoes against the hon. Prime Minister. Let me, Sir, be totally frank. The object of the Opposition in drumming up this issue over and over again is to politically denigrate the hon. Prime Minister, weaken the Congress Government and the Congress party. That is their sole object. The object is not their concern for truth. I say so, Sir, because there are certain facts which stare us in the face and if these facts are adverted to by the hon. Opposition their entire political design will collapse. The political drums which they have been beating around for one year will come to a silence. I put to myself, what are those stark facts on which there is no controversy whatsoever on both sides of the House? The stark facts are Bofors entered into three agreements, one in 1978 with Svenska, the other agreement was entered into in 1979 with Pitco and the third agreement was entered into on the 15th

November, 1985 with AE Services Ltd. These are the agreements which appointed the agents and provided for the payment of the commission. Now, there can be two possibilities. One is that the payments to the tune of Rs. 64 crores have been made in pursuance of these agreements. The other possibility is that the payments have been made not in pursuance of these agreements but in pursuance of the agreements which terminated these agreements and by way of compensation for the termination of the commission agency agreements at the instance of the Government of India. Now, let us take the first possibility that there were no termination agreements and the payments have been in pursuance of these three agreements with these three companies. Let us take the first company and the second company, two agreements of 1978 and 1979. Can it ever be imagined that this hon. Prime Minister in 1978 and 1979 would have been associated with the formation of the companies? Can it ever be even suggested that this hon. Prime Minister in 1978 and 1979 was a party to the execution of these agreements? Those, Sir, were the dark years when the entire Gandhi family was fighting with its back to the wall against the might of the Janata Government. Therefore, it would be sheer political madness to suggest the name of the hon. Prime Minister being associated in any manner with the formation of these two companies or with the execution of these two agreements and if these agreements existed and they were not cancelled then, Bofors were not under contractual obligation to make the payments, under these agreements, to these companies. Let us take the third agreement. It is an established fact that the third agreement was entered into on 15th of November 1985. It is also established on the record that it was in September or October 1985 that while Mr. Olof Palme broached the subject of purchase of the Bofors guns from Bofors to the hon. Prime Minister, the hon. Prime Minister said if they want to enter into the arena of competition, they must ensure that there shall be no middle men. It was in December 1985 that Bofors conveyed to Olof Palme, who in turn, conveyed to the Government of India that it has been ensured that Bofors will have

[Shri Madan Bhatia]

no middlemen and no agents. Can it be imagined that on the one hand, the hon. Prime Minister would be insisting that there would be no middlemen if they want to enter into the arena of competition and on the other hand, he would be a party to the formation of a company and the execution of agreement by that company with Bofors for payment of commission? It is nothing but nonsense. I respectfully submit, Sir, these are the stark facts. What is the other possibility? The other possibility is the case put forth by Bofors. Bofors say that these payments were made not in pursuance of these three agreements, but in pursuance of fresh termination agreements, which were entered into by way of negotiations with these three agents, in order to settle the matter amicably because they had three options. One, when this condition was put by the Government of India, they would say, since we cannot fulfil this condition because of the existence of these agreements, we are out of the race. The second option was that they would cancel these existing agency agreements unilaterally. If they had done it, they would have still been legally liable to pay the commissions if they had bagged this contract. This is the basic principle of law that if a principal engages an agent to sell certain goods or to purchase certain goods and then over the head of the agent, enters into direct negotiations with the parties and concludes a contract, his liability to pay the amount under the agreement the agents does not vanish. He still remains liable. So, it was impossible for Bofors to cancel these agreements unilaterally. The third possibility was a settlement across the table and that is the case of Bofors. If you accept the second possibility that these payments have been made in pursuance of the termination of agreements, then your whole case collapses. The entire hullabaloo that you have been creating for the last more than one year stands destroyed by your own confession and that it is by virtue of the second possibility put forth by Bofors that the payments of Rs. 64 crores have been made and in this context, there is one important fact which stares us in the face. Under

the Commission Agency Agreements of 1978-79 and November 1985, the total amounts of commission which were liable to be paid by Bofors were Rs. 168 crores. But the actual amount paid is Rs. 64 crores only. It is obvious that 64 crores of rupees have not been paid under the earlier original agreements. They have been paid by way of settlement. Sir, these are the stark facts. The only weapon which the Opposition has been wielding for more than one year is that the Government is seeking to suppress the truth. This is the only weapon. Therefore, the basic issue before this hon. House is: Is the Government guilty of seeking to hide the truth or is the Opposition guilty of spreading and perpetuating the monstrous falsehood in the country? That is the basic issue. In order to find an answer to this issue, we have to start from the beginning.

On the 16th April, Sir, the radio broadcast says, "Bribery has been paid to high politicians and key defence officials in the Bofors deal". There was no allegation of payment of commission or engagement of any agents. Bribery is not the same thing as agency commission. But this was a startling allegation which was made by the Swedish radio. How does the Government act? The Government immediately gets in touch with the Swedish radio and asks, "Please give us the facts on the basis of which you have made this broadcast". The Swedish radio says, "We do not have any information. This information has been fed to us by our representative in India." This is very important. I will deal with this point separately. The Government of India tracks down the representative of the Swedish radio in India in Delhi and asks him, "Please give us the source of the information and the material on the basis of which you transmitted this information to the Swedish radio." And he says "I shall not. I shall not disclose any information. I shall not disclose any material."

Then what should the government do? It was perfectly legitimate for the Government to come before this hon. House and say, "This is the position and on that basis we cannot but treat this allegation with contempt." But it goes to the credit of

the hon. Prime Minister that, although the allegation was one of bribery and no material was forthcoming from those who had made this accusation, he, in his straight-forward and forthright manner, reposes full confidence in the Opposition and tells the Opposition not to talk of bribery. He says, "These are the efforts which I made to eliminate middlemen or agents and payment of commission." This is for the first time in the history of independent India that one Prime Minister has stood up to say that so far as defence deals are concerned, India shall not tolerate the payment of any commission or the engagement of any agent. And he has been made the victim of the confidence which he placed in his forthright and straight-forward manner in the Opposition by sharing this information with the Opposition. It was totally unnecessary for the Government of India, in the context of the allegation of bribery, to divulge this information. Then what happens? The Government of India does not rest at that. The Government of India gets in touch with the Swedish Government. And on the 29th April, the hon. Defence Minister makes a statement in Parliament and he says, "We have got in touch with the Swedish Government and the Swedish Government has appointed its own National Audit Bureau to hold an investigation, make an auditing review and give the report." Who got the National Audit Bureau appointed through the Swedish Government? It was the Government of India led by the hon. Prime Minister. Then what happens? The National Audit Bureau gives the report on 4th June 1986 and it says:

"Considerable amounts have been paid to previous agents in India. Agreement existed between Bofors and ... concerning the settlement of commission subsequently to the deal."

Not a word about bribery. Now, it was possible for the Government again to drop the whole issue because so far as this allegation of bribery was concerned there was a positive finding given by the National Audit Bureau that there was no bribery whatsoever. But the honourable Prime Minister feels concerned because

he had made the efforts to eliminate middlemen, he made the efforts to eliminate the payment of any amount to any agent whatsoever. Since the National Audit Bureau talks of payment to agents, then it is the honourable Prime Minister who decides that there should be a Joint Parliamentary Committee. Whose decision was this? It was the decision of the honourable Prime Minister. When this decision is taken and announced in Parliament, what is the attitude of the Opposition? The Opposition backs out. Why does it back out? Because they were not interested in knowing the truth. They knew the truth, as it was, could be of no political value or use to them and the only political weapon if they wanted to go on wielding it was the weapon that the Government was seeking to hide the truth and for that it was necessary for them to boycott the Joint Parliamentary Committee. It was a politically motivated move against their own conscience, against their own earlier stand, that they boycotted this Committee. Then this Committee goes into action. Even when this Committee is holding an inquiry holding its proceedings, the Government of India does not sit quiet. The Government of India at its own administrative level continues to press the Swedish Government on its own to ferret out the information and in this regard I want to draw the attention of the honourable House to what the Defence Secretary had deposed before the Committee. He says:

"Our Ambassador in Sweden and we in Delhi tried all conceivable methods of getting this information. We wrote letters; we sent telexes. Our Ambassador in Sweden called to the Government of Sweden. We wrote letters to the Government of Sweden as well as to Bofors. Whatever could conceivably be done to collect the information was done. We took Parliament into confidence immediately. The correspondence which took place was placed before Parliament the objective being that the entire picture should be transparent and should be placed in as lucid and vivid a fashion before them as possible. I want to say by way of general remarks that our letters were couched in stern language and sometimes we even made them

[Shri Madan Bhatia]

threatening for the simple reason that we were wanting to put a lot of pressure on the suppliers."

This is the position. And the Joint Parliamentary Committee goes into all aspects. What were the general, broad, aspects? (1) the quality of the gun; (2) the price of the gun; (3) the payment which had been made—to whom the payments had been made, why those payments had been made and to what extent those payments had been made. As regards the quality of the gun I would submit that the entire military authorities who were concerned with the selection of this gun were examined and they deposed about the quality of the gun. They stood by their recommendation. The members of the Price Negotiating Committee stood by their recommendation about the quality of the gun. The Minister of State for Defence stood by his recommendation for the quality of the gun. The only person who resiled, because he was a party to this entire transaction—he signed the whole transaction—was the Minister of Finance. The only person who resiled from his stand on the quality of the gun was the former Finance Minister.

SHRI VIRENDRA VERMA (Uttar Pradesh): Not the Defence Minister?

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: On what specious plea? On the specious plea that he was not concerned with the technical quality of the gun. It is an amazing thing. The honourable Defence Minister has already given replies about the joint responsibility in the Lok Sabha and I will not go into that. But here he was personally concerned. He was personally concerned because he was personally a party to the whole transaction and he had his representative in the Negotiating Committee, the Finance Secretary. He made a statement before the Committee that the Finance Minister had absolutely no reservations about the quality of the gun. He had said that he had approved the quality of the gun the Minister of Finance approved the quality of the gun. I need not go

further because many honourable Members on the Opposition who are attacking us have approved the quality of the gun. As regards the price, its finding has not been challenged, that the price of this gun was lower than the price at which this gun was sold by Bofors even the Swedish army. Now, Sir, with regard to the payments, I respectfully submit... (Time Bell rings) ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHRI ANAND SHARMA): Only three minutes more.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: I am submitting only two more points. First, the Committee gives its finding not merely after examining the recommendations of Bofors. The Committee gives its findings on the basis of the report of the Public Prosecutor and the Committee gives its findings on the basis of the report of the Public Accountants who had been appointed to go into the entire accounts of Bofors. Who are the Public Accountants? They were linked with the chain of international accountants, a completely independent body. They went through the entire accounts and they vindicated the stand of Bofors that these payments had been made by way of termination charges. The three names are given. But the Committee does not stop at that. The Committee engages investigating agencies. The investigating agencies appointed by the Committee find that these are post-box companies. Who discovered it? It was the discovery of the Committee that these were post-box companies and that the real owners of these companies were different. But, beyond that, the investigating agencies, despite the help of the Interpol, could not proceed. Therefore, I respectfully submit that this allegation, the only allegation, which is being levelled by the Opposition in order to make insinuations and insidious innuendoes against the honourable Prime Minister that the Government is trying to hide the truth is nothing but an utter falsehood. It is

the Opposition which is guilty of this monstrous falsehood.

Sir, as I said earlier, the provocation is the publication of the documents in "The Hindu". I will take only two or three minutes because this is important. What are these documents? It is 22nd June. Bouquets have been given to "The Hindu" and bouquets have been given to this correspondent for having ferreted out this information. I will show that these very reports published on the 22nd June and 23rd June stand demolished by the report of this very correspondent and the documents or the papers which this very correspondent published on the 22nd April. Just see, Sir: On the 22nd June, on the basis of these papers, he says:

"That the story of termination negotiations and winding up costs was again trotted out by Bofors is proved by these documents."

This is what he says. And, Sir, what is the document which he published on the 22nd April?... I am sorry, it should be 27th April; I am sorry. What is the document which he publishes on the 27th April? He publishes this report:

"A key document which the Joint Parliamentary Committee says it had failed to get from Bofors on account of the plea of commercial secrecy has been made available to "The Hindu" by privileged sources."

The document published here in fact reveals the nature of the secret agreement concluded between Bofors and Moineao of December 27, 1985, for the payment to the latter of a cancellation fee."

And what is the document it publishes? I read only two paragraphs:

"Moineao is a strategic consultant company. Bofors decided to cancel the earlier agreement between the parties. As they had no legal means to cancel the agreement, the parties after a lengthy discussion and in order to avoid legal proceedings, had made the following set-

tlement concerning the differences of opinion:

(1) "...has accepted the cancellation of the contract of December 31, 1985. Bofors has agreed to pay the cancellation fee of 50 million Kroner to be paid in instalments during 1986."

Now, here is a document which is published on 27th April by this very correspondent to say that the earlier agreement was cancelled, a fresh agreement was entered into, termination fee has been paid, and on 22nd June this very correspondent has the temerity to make the statement that the whole story of termination fee or cancellation of the earlier agreement is a concoction. Can you believe this correspondent? Can you hand over bouquets to this newspaper? What else does it say? Then it says:

"Mr. Win Chaddha served as a conduit for the largest category of Bofors payments."

This statement, I respectfully submit, Sir, is not only false. This is malicious and utterly *mala fide*. Take the papers which he has published on their face value. They will only establish one thing that so far as Svenska is concerned it was a conduit pipe for Win Chaddha. But what is the story he has put forth? He has put forth the story that Win Chaddha is a conduit pipe for some other persons. From where does he get this? From the bus stop? From the figment of his imagination? Or from his malice against this Government and against the hon. Prime Minister.

Then, the third thing on the basis of which he says that these papers are genuine is that the payments continued to be made up to March 1987.

I will draw the attention of this honourable House to the report of the Public Accountant, which was placed before the JPC. And it said:

"We have been retained by A. B. Bofors to examine their accounting records for 1986 and January 1 to August 31, 1987, as well as consultancy agreements ... in connection with FH

[Shri Madan Bhatia]

77 contract dated March 24, 1986. In our opinion, the results of our examination, examination of accounts and the books of accounts of the Company up to August 1987, support the statement by Bofors, namely, that no payments had been made after December, 1986."

Whom will I believe? Shall I believe this malicious correspondent? Or shall I believe the certificate of the Public Accountants? I respectfully submit, Sir, that this has nothing to do with a paper which deserves to be thrown into the wastepaper basket. (*Time Bell rings*)

One more point. In this very document, this is something very important — I will add, Sir. He says in the 22nd June paper at Page 4:

"An array of payment documents establishes that there could not have possibly been these payments to Svenska A.E. Services or Pitco-Moresco-Moineao if Bofors had not won the howitzer contract with India."

It means that if there had been no contract, no payment was to be made. This document which he publishes and which he says is a genuine document, says that the payment will have to be made 'contract or no contract'. This is the credibility of this paper on the basis of which this debate has been raked up.

I want only two minutes more. The date on which the Swedish Radio made this broadcast is very disturbing. The broadcast is made on 16th of April and it is made on the basis of a report received from the representative in Delhi who arrived in Delhi on 14th of April. Within 73 hours, a foreign correspondent gets this information and passes it on to the Swedish Radio and it is broadcast. It boggles my imagination. When they are asked which is the material, they don't have the material. They don't produce any documentary material either before the Public Prosecutor or before the Public Accountants or before the Joint Parliamentary Committee. Obviously, there was some oral information which was given to this representative. Who were the persons who were interested in giving this oral information and arranging his visit to Delhi? The

sequence of events preceding his arrival and this broadcast and succeeding this broadcast will give some indication of what transpired really. I will not go into details. On 9th of April, when I discussed this submarine matter, I went into the details of the press release which was released by the former Defence Minister to show how each and over sentence of that was false and utterly *mala fide*, intended to create a pre-emptive political defence for himself. On 11th of April, he resigns. On 13th of April, there is an editorial in the Indian Express demanding the removal of the hon. Prime Minister. On 14th of April, he arrives. On 16th of April, this canard is spread by the radio. After 16th of April, the highest constitution institution is involved on the basis of this scandal to secure the dismissal of the hon. Prime Minister. Obviously, there was a grand design involving some of those persons who were interested to reap their vengeance to settle their scores with the hon. Prime Minister and to spread this canard. Who could those persons be? I would leave it to the imagination of the hon. House. I would like to add that they were not acting alone because the Swedish Radio was involved and a foreign correspondent was involved. There were some persons who were in touch with this. There were the friends abroad of some persons. In this regard, I will close by reading on report. But there were persons who were friends abroad. Now, this is a report of an article by Mr. Kreisberg. It says:

"Mr. Kreisberg said that Mr. Rajiv Gandhi had also promoted "more traditional politicians in his general age bracket, such as V. P. Singh, a shrewd Congress party member of Parliament in his mid-forties. Mr. Singh, Mr. Rajiv's Finance Minister, held several Cabinet positions in Mrs. Gandhi's post-1980 Cabinets and organised the Congress victory at the recent elections in Uttar Pradesh, which has 119 million people and 84 parliamentary seats. He has the grass-root links which Rajiv Gandhi still lacks, despite the Prime Minister's demonstrated appeal to the Indian voters, and yet is fully committed to honest, efficient and modern government. Mr. V. P. Singh is a man to watch for the future."

Who is this man whose links with the CIA are quite well known? Sir, in the end, I respectfully submit that this 4.00 P.M. is a matter on which the Opposition and particularly those persons in whom the hon. Prime Minister reposed his total confidence, whom he elevated to the highest political positions on international scene, whom he got rehabilitated when they were down and out in their political career, for them, it is time to have an introspection and decide whether it is proper to mislead the people of this country with canards such as these.

Thank you, Sir.

श्री श्रीराम वर्मा : माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह इस देश का दुर्भाग्य है कि भ्रष्टाचार इस देश में बढ़ा है और बढ़ता चला जा रहा है। मैं जीवन भर भ्रष्टाचार के खिलाफ रहा हूँ और रहूँगा और इसी कारण मैं अपना नैतिक कर्तव्य, दायित्व और धर्म मानता हूँ कि बोफोर्स सौदे के मामले में अपने विचार सदन के सामने रखूँ। पक्ष के माननीय सदस्यों ने विपक्ष के ऊपर और विपक्ष के माननीय सदस्यों के ऊपर जिस प्रकार का कटाक्ष किया है जस्टिस पालियामेन्टरी कमेटी के गठन में विपक्ष के हिस्सा न लेने पर जिस प्रकार का कटाक्ष किया है यह भी मेरा फर्ज है कि उस के संबन्ध में कुछ कहूँ। 16 अप्रैल, 1987 को स्वीडन जो हमारे देश का मित्र राष्ट्र है के राष्ट्रीय रेडियो ने हिन्दुस्तान के साथ बोफोर्स के सौदे पर भ्रष्टाचार का आरोप लगाया। हम जैसे लोगों को भी उसी समय अखबार में पढ़ने को और देखने को मिला। सभी माननीय सदस्यों को जानकारी होगी कि विन चड्ढा का भी नाम उस समय आया। मुझे मालूम नहीं रक्षा मन्त्री जी अपने उत्तर में बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि उस समय विन चड्ढा को क्यों देश से जाने दिया गया। बाद में तो विन चड्ढा की बड़ी भारी तलाश रही लापता भी कहा गया लेकिन उस समय क्यों जाने दिया गया विन चड्ढा को ? इस पर माननीय रक्षा मन्त्री जी अपने विचार व्यक्त करेंगे जिस समय स्वीडन के राष्ट्रीय रेडियो की तरफ से यह बयान निकला

उस समय भारत सरकार की ओर से सम्भवतः प्रधान मन्त्री जी की ओर से भी यह कहा गया कि यह झूठ है निराधार है शरारतपूर्ण है। उसी स्वीडन रेडियो के आधार पर हम लोगों ने मांग की थी कि इस की जांच के लिए एक संसदीय समिति बैठायी जाए लेकिन माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपकी स्मरण होगा कि सरकार ने उसको अमान्य कर दिया था। परन्तु भारत सरकार ने नेशनल आडिट ब्यूरो स्वीडन को यह कहा कि इसकी जांच की जाए। इसने अपनी रिपोर्ट दी और रिपोर्ट में यह स्पष्ट कहा कि इसमें खपता भी काफी दिया गया है और एग्रीमेंट में कमीशन दिया जाना भी तथ्य है। जब वह नेशनल आडिट ब्यूरो ने रिपोर्ट दी तब भारत सरकार ने संसद की नेशनल समिति बैठाने पर विचार किया। इसी सदन में यहाँ से बोलते हुए मैंने यह कहा था कि ठीक है हम लोगों ने मांग की थी लेकिन ऐसी समिति बनायी जाए जिस पर जनता का विश्वास हो जिसके निष्पक्षता को जनता स्वीकार करे और मान्यवर, मैंने यह भी कहा था कि उस कमेटी का चेयरमैन या तो सुप्रीम कोर्ट का जज हो या ऐसी संतुलित समिति बनायी जाये कि जो आपस में मिलकर अपना चेयरमैन छाटे मान्यवर, मैं उस समिति के निर्णयों के मिलसिले में कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ। लेकिन यह अवश्य आपके माध्यम से बताना चाहता हूँ कि उस समिति में प्रायः सभी सदस्य कांग्रेस-मैन थे या कांग्रेस के एलाइड थे और चेयरमैन भी, तब भी मिस्टर थे और आज भी फिर मिनिस्टर है, उनसे यह एक्सपेक्ट करना, यह अपेक्षा करना कि वे अपनी रिपोर्ट गवर्नमेन्ट के खिलाफ देंगे यह एक ज्यादाती होगी, उन लोगों के साथ भी और उनसे ऐसी तक्का करना भी मान्यवर, कमेटी बनी। माननीय रक्षा मंत्री जी अगर अपने उत्तर में यह बताने की कृपा कर सकें तो अच्छा होगा कि उस कमेटी ने तत्कालीन फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर या डिफेंस मिनिस्टर श्री बी. पी. सिंह जी, जिनकी अनेको यहाँ पर चर्चाएँ माननीय सदस्यों ने की है, उनको इविडेन्स में क्यों नहीं बुलाया गया। अरुण सिंह जी जो तत्कालीन डिफेंस स्टेट मिनिस्टर थे उनको इविडेन्स; उस कमेटी

[श्री बीरेन्द्र वर्मा]

ने क्यों नहीं बुलाया। 18 जुलाई, 1987 को तत्कालीन डिफेंस स्टेट मिनिस्टर ने रक्षा मंत्रालय में इस्तीफा दिया। उनकी आत्मा की आवाज थी। देश में आत्मा की आवाज पर बहुत बड़ी पोलिटिकल क्रांति इस देश में हुई। इस देश के राज्य रक्षा मंत्री ने आत्मा की आवाज पर इस्तीफा दिया। रक्षा मंत्रालय से, उन्होंने स्वयं कहा कि मुझे क्यों नहीं बुलाया गया। वे भी गवाही देना चाहते थे। वी० पी० सिंह जी ने कहा कि वे भी बयान देना चाहते थे। क्योंकि नहीं इनके बयान लिये गये, तत्कालीन डिफेंस मिनिस्टर से, जिनकी कई दफा चर्चा हुई है। इसके लिए भी बताये और माननीय डिफेंस मिनिस्टर महोदय इस पर भी प्रकाश डालें कि क्या रक्षा सौदों के मामले में डिफेंस मिनिस्टर पिकचर में आते हैं या कि फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर पिकचर में आते हैं और अगर डिफेंस मिनिस्टर पिकचर में आते हैं तो स्टेट डिफेंस मिनिस्टर आपके अरुण सिंह जी थे तो डिफेंस मिनिस्टर कौन था उनके भी हस्ताक्षर होते हैं कि नहीं, इसे भी बताने की कृपा करेंगे। मान्यवर, यहाँ पर अरुण सिंह जी बोले थे तो उन्होंने स्पष्ट कह था कि :

This is a breach of faith and they should be asked to remit back the money.

रुपया वापस करें और विश्वास के साथ धोखाधड़ी हुई है। यह उन्होंने कहा था और उसी आत्मा की आवाज पर अरुण सिंह जी ने इस माननीय सदन की सदस्यता से भी त्यागपत्र दिया। पूछना चाहिए था, क्यों नहीं पूछा गया और डिफेंस मिनिस्टर महोदय यहाँ पर बैठे हैं, डिफेंस सेक्रेट्री ने क्या कहा था तत्कालीन डिफेंस सेक्रेट्री ने कि :

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

मान्यवर, डिफेंस सेक्रेट्री ने इस प्रकार से स्पष्ट कहा था कि तय हुआ था कि कोई कमीशन और एजेंट नहीं होगा। उसके

खिलाफ बोफोर्स कम्पनी ने किया सभी मानते हैं कि 64 करोड़ रुपया दिया गया। मामूली रकम नहीं है। मेरे जैसा आदमी जो गाँव के गरीब किसानों और मजदूरों में काम करता है उसे 64 करोड़ रुपया इतना नजर पड़ता है। 64 करोड़ रुपया किन काम के लिये दिया? क्या विन चड्ढा इंजीनियर है, विन चड्ढा टेक्नीशियन हैं या टेक्नोलॉजिस्ट हैं? किस काम का 64 करोड़ दिया? हिन्दुस्तान खरीद रहा है और स्वीडन बेच रहा है। तीन कपनियों में 64 करोड़ रुपया, अलग-अलग कपनियों ने अलग-नामों से स्विटजरलैंड के बैंकों में जमा किया जाना, क्या ठीक है और किस काम के लिए है? एक नए पैसे का भी कमीशन नहीं दिया जाना चाहिए। एक नया पैसा तक भी हिन्दुस्तान के काम में आना चाहिये। 64 करोड़ रुपये कम हमारे इन तोपों की कीमत में से किए जाने चाहिए थे। इसे एक व्यक्ति ने जाए तो मैं इसका घोर विरोधी हूँ और इसी कारण मान्यवर, मैंने यह बात आपके सामने कही है। मान्यवर, अभी 22-23 जून को राष्ट्रीय पत्र "हिन्दू" में जो उन्होंने एकाउन्ट नम्बर दिए हैं, धन दिया है, रजिस्ट्रेशन सब कुछ बताया है और तारीखें आदि सब कुछ दी है उस मामले में क्या प्रधान मंत्री जी और क्या इस हाउस का कोई भी बोलने वाला माननीय सदस्य और क्या कोई भी मंत्री, कल नेता सदन बोल रहे थे, हर कोई यह कहता है कि यह तब गलत है, यह सब झूठ है तो फिर इस पर सी० बी० आई० की रिपोर्ट किसलिए करा रहे हैं? जब यह सब झूठ है और गलत है तो फिर सी० बी० आई० की जांच किसलिए करा रहे हैं? क्या प्रधान मंत्री जी जब यह कहेंगे कि यह बिल्कुल गलत है, बिल्कुल झूठ है तो फिर सी० बी० आई० क्या उसके खिलाफ रिपोर्ट देगी? ऐसी बात की कहना मैं निहायत गलत मानता हूँ। जब जांच आप करा रहे हैं तो फिर यह कहना कि गलत है तो फिर जांच बन्द करा देनी चाहिए। क्यों जांच पर आप खर्च कर रहे हैं?

मान्यवर, माननीय मित्रवर सरदार दरबारा सिंह जी बैठे हैं, इस मामले में जे. पी. सी. की रिपोर्ट के पेज 191

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

न बाहर वाले को और न यहां वाले को वाइंडिंग अप चार्ज काई नहीं दिए गए। यह आपकी रिपोर्ट के पेज 191 पर है। मान्यवर, आप तो यह बता रहे हैं कि कोई नहीं दिए गए और मान्यवर, आपकी ही रिपोर्ट के पेज 125 पर है :

"Bofors had said that all payments had been made by way of winding up charges in 1986."

रिपोर्ट यह कहती है कि कोई नहीं दिया गया और रिपोर्ट में ही पेज 125 पर आप यह बताते हैं कि मब 1986 तक दे दिया गया और मान्यवर फिर वाइंडिंग अप चार्ज के सम्बन्ध में मैं माननीय रक्षा मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहूंगा कि सन् 1980 से तत्कालीन प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी जी ने कमीशन और एजेंट को बन्द कर दिया है। एजेंट कोई नहीं होगा और कमीशन भी कोई नहीं दिया जाएगा। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहूंगा कि जब एजेंट और कमीशन नहीं होंगे तो फिर किस मामले में वाइंडिंग अप चार्ज दिए गए? माननीय मंत्री जी यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि 1980 से जब से यह बन्द किया गया है तब से भारत सरकार द्वारा कितने वाइंडिंग अप चार्ज कितनी कंपनियों के अब तक उन्होंने दिए हैं, उसकी तरफ भी जरा अपनी ओर से प्रकाश डालने की कृपा करेंगे?

मान्यवर, अभी कल-परसों तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस कमीशन का मामला उठा और हम लोगों ने उठाया कि साढ़े छ करोड़ रुपया दिया गया दो कार्ट्रिज में विदेशी बैंक में लंदन में जमा हुआ और 65 लाख रुपया सूद का मुआफ कर दिया और पैनल्टी भी और यही नहीं सी हाउस में बैठे हुए एक माननीय

सदस्य एतराज कर रहे थे कि हरियाणा की सरकार ने किसानों के कर्ज मुआफ कर दिए। चांप पापुलरटी है। किसान और गरीब का कर्ज माफ कर दिया तो चांप पापुलरटी है और साढ़े दूह करोड़ रुपए की पैनल्टी भी माफ, सूद भी माफ और कोई काम भी नहीं हुआ, इस तरह अमीरों को अमीर बनाया जा रहा है और गरीबों के सिलमिले में एतराज उठाया जा रहा है।

मान्यवर, मैं माननीय रक्षामंत्री जी से एकान्व वात पूछकर के अपनी वात समाप्त करना चाहूंगा। क्या रक्षामंत्री जी कृपा कर स्वीडन के चीफ पब्लिक प्रोसिक्यूटर को या स्वीडन की गवर्नमेंट को यह लिखेंगे या प्रार्थना करेंगे कि जो नए एवीएन्स, जो नए प्रमाण हमें प्राप्त हुए हैं, उसके आधार पर चीफ प्रोसीक्यूशन आफीसर कार्य करें? क्या यह मुमकिन है? अगर नहीं है तो बताएं और क्या आप ऐसा कदम उठाने की कोशिश करेंगे?

मान्यवर, रक्षा मंत्री जी यह भी बताने की कृपा करें कि क्या कमी स्विटजरलैंड की गवर्नमेंट ने स्विडन सरकार को अथवा भारत सरकार को यह लिखा कि बोफोर्स के मामले में जो लेनदेन और कमीशन की बात हुई है, इसमें हम उनकी सहायता कर सकते हैं? नहीं लिखा तो क्या आप लिख सकते हैं कि स्विटजरलैंड की सरकार उन एकाउण्ट पर या उन लोगों की, जो आर्थिक अपराधी हैं, जिन्होंने वहां हथिया जमा कर रखा है, उनकी जानकारी प्राप्त करने की कोशिश करें। क्या आप उन्हें लिखने की कोशिश करेंगे, उनकी सहायता लेने की कोशिश करेंगे?

मान्यवर, अभी मेरे मे पक्षों जा बक्ता बोल रहे थे कि गत क्वालिटी के संबंध में फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर ने स्वीकृति प्रदान कर दी थी। तो क्या फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर उसकी स्वीकृति देता है या डिफेंस मिनिस्टर स्वीकृति देता है या हमारा कमांडर-इन-चीफ उसकी स्वीकृति देता है? इस सिलमिले में भी बताएं कि क्या स्वी ति फाइनेंस वाले देते हैं क्वालिटी

[श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा]

के उपर या कि डिफेंस वाले देते है या फिर कमांडर-इन-चीफ देते है या सेक्रेटरी देते है ? कौन देते है ?

आखिर में, एक बात कहकर समाप्त करता हूं, वह यह कि सब स्वीकार करते हैं कि वाइड-अप चार्जेंज थे 64 करोड़, मैंने तो पूछ लिया कि क्या किसी और भी फर्म को दिए गए, क्या यह वाइड-अप चार्जेंज थे या जब-जब सामान देता था उसका पेमेंट सरकार करती थी तो उसका रसेंटज के हिसाब से पेमेंट किया जाता था ? अगर पेमेंट परसेंटज के हिसाब से था तो वह कमीशन था, जो कि एग्रीमेंट में था जोकि नेशनल ग्राडिट व्यूरो ने बताया, वह वाइड-अप चार्जेंज नहीं थे ? इन सब बातों को माननीय मंत्री जी बताने की कृपा करेंगे ।

मैं अंत में पक्ष के माननीय सदस्यों से नम्र निवेदन करना चाहता हूं और मैं स्वीकार करता हूँ कि आप ईमानदार हैं, लेकिन मैं आपसे यह भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि दूसरे पक्ष में बैठे हुए आदमियों पर इस प्रकार का कटाक्ष करना, दोषारोपण करना न आपके लिए शोभनीय है, न उनके लिए शोभनीय है । देश के प्रति जिसे प्रेम है, जो भ्रष्टाचार का विरोधी है, वह तो यह चाहेगा कि देश में न रक्षा सौदों में और न ही अन्य किसी भी मामले में किसी प्रकार का कोई पैसा लिया जाय और न ही दिया जाय । केवल इसी भावना के साथ जो रक्षा सौदों में यह पैसा लिया और दिया जाता है, जो बीच में कमीशन का खाया जाना है, जिसको सरकार ने बंद किया है और बंद करने के बाद भी यह सब हो रहा है, सदन में कल भी यह साढ़े छह करोड़ की बात आई और आज भी यह चल रहा है । तो इसे कड़ाई से बंद किया जाय, रोका जाय और हिन्दुस्तान के गरीब का पैसा देश से बाहर जाने से बचाया जाय ।। धन्यवाद

श्री सीर्जा इशार्द बेग (गुजरात) : मान्यवर उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, पिछले एक वर्ष

से निरन्तर देश में बोफोर्स के मामले को लेकर देश की जनता के मानस में कुछ-न-कुछ संशय डाले जा रहे हैं । मान्यवर यह सरकार का कर्तव्य है कि देश में किसी मामले पर यदि कोई संशय व्यक्त किया जाता है तो उसका समाधान अपने साधनों से करे । सरकार ने निरन्तर यह प्रयास किए हैं कि जब-जब भी, जिन मुद्दों को उठाया गया, उस मामले पर अविलम्ब उपयुक्त कदम उठाए गए । हर कदम पर सदन में जो संशय व्यक्त किए गए, अखबारों में जो संशय व्यक्त किए गए, सरकार ने उस पर टिप्पणी की । उस पर आवश्यक कदम उठाए । महोदय मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे प्रजातंत्र का अगर कोई सर्वोच्च आसन है तो वह संसद है और उसकी सर्वोच्च समिति है । उसके द्वारा दिए गए तथ्यों पर आशंका व्यक्त करना, मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे दिमाग की हं। कोई कमजोरी है । हम मानस में एक चीज को लेकर चल रहे हैं और सत्य को खिड़कियों से अंदर झांकने ही नहीं देते हैं ।

मान्यवर, वर्मा जी हमारे बड़े सीनियर और आदरणीय सदस्य हैं । मैं उनका बहुत आदर करता हूँ । लेकिन आज उन्होंने जो दो तीन शब्द कहे हैं, उनके बारे में बाद में जिक्र करूंगा । मान्यवर जब हमने बोफोर्स तोप खरीदने का निर्णय किया उस समय देश में कुछ ऐसा वातावरण था, ऐसा समय था जिस कारण इस तोप को खरीदने का निर्णय लेना पड़ा । इस बात को सभी ने स्वीकार किया है, विरोधी दलों ने भी स्वीकार किया है और सरकार ने भी निरन्तर उसके सपोर्ट में अपनी बात कही है । मान्यवर, मैं इस सम्बन्ध में दो-तीन बातें सदन के सामने रखना चाहूंगा भारतीय सेना के लिए अत्यन्त आवश्यक शस्त्र के रूप में हमने बोफोर्स तोप की खरीद की है । यह कुछ तथ्य हैं जो कि जाईंट पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी ने उजागर किए हैं और सरकारी पक्ष ने हमेशा उसका समर्थन किया है । मान्यवर, ये समग्र कागजात देखने के पश्चात् मुझे प्रतीत हुआ कि इसके जो कामशियल टर्म्स थे, वह हमने बड़ी बारीकी से गढ़े थे और उसमें भी समस्त एहतियात बरते गए

मैं यह कहूंगा कि वह हमारे देश के लिए अत्यन्त हितकर थे और इससे वित्तीय स्वरूप में बेहतरीन लाभान्वित हमने प्राप्त किए हैं। यह सत्य है और इसे कोई झुठला नहीं सकता। मान्यवर, यह सौदा अन्य पक्ष के साथ निरंतर वार्ताएं और बिना किसी दबाव के सजग अधिकारियों के बीच चर्चाओं के माध्यम से होता रहा। मान्यवर, तोप की खरीद में कोई भी अनियमितता नहीं पाई गई तथा इसके चलन में भी कोई अनियमितता नहीं पाई गई है। मान्यवर, ऐसी हालत में अगर हमारे दिल में कोई चोर होता, प्रधान मंत्री के दिल में चोर होता तो प्रधान मंत्री यह न कहते कि बिचौलिए नहीं रहेंगे। पहले भी रक्षा सौदे हुए और यह कहा जाता है कि अंतर्राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर भी यदि कोई ऐसे सौदे होते हैं तो हमेशा उन में बिचौलिए रहते हैं। इस देश में भी यह परम्परा थी। फिर भी जो मित्र बोलते हैं, उन्होंने भी सरकार चलाई है, लेकिन उन्होंने उसके लिए निर्णय नहीं किया था कि किसी भी रक्षा सौदे में या किसी भी सौदे में बिचौलिए नहीं रहेंगे। लेकिन इस देश के प्रधान मंत्री श्री राजीव गांधी ने पहला ही सौदा होने के पश्चात् फौरन यह कहा कि ऐसे किसी भी सौदे में कोई भी बिचौलिया न रखने का हमने निर्णय लिया है। किंतु एक संशय पैदा किया गया। रेडियो स्वीडिश 16 अप्रैल, 1987 को समाचार प्रसारित कर रहा है और उसमें उसने यह कहा कि बोफोर्स कम्पनी ने वरिष्ठ भारतीय राजनीतिज्ञों और रक्षा मंत्रालय के प्रमुख अधिकारियों को घूस देकर स्वीडिश का सबसे बड़ा निर्यात ठेका प्राप्त किया। इस पर राजनीतिक उथाला हमारे देश में मच गया और सरकारी पक्ष तथा विपक्ष दोनों चिन्तित हुए और तुरन्त, समय देखिए, दूसरे ही दिन यानि 17 अप्रैल को भारत सरकार ने विवरण जारी करते हुए कहा कि सरकार की नीति यह है कि रक्षा सौदे में किसी भी तरह किसी भी व्यक्ति को अनियमित भुगतान नहीं करेगी और इस नीति के उल्लंघन पर उसके खिलाफ सख्त कार्रवाई की जाएगी। रक्षा मंत्री का तथा प्रधान मंत्री का इस पर वक्तव्य और देश के सर्वोच्च

दोनों सदनों में आश्वासन दिया जाता है कि यदि कानून के उल्लंघन का कोई प्रमाण दिया जाता है तो समामले की व्यापक रूप से छान-बीन की जाएगी और दोषी व्यक्ति को, चाहे वह कोई भी हो, उसे दण्डित किया जाएगा।

मान्यवर, संसद के दोनों सदनों से यह मांग उठी कि मामला गंभीर है, संसदीय समिति का गठन करो। विपक्ष ने यह मांग की। प्रधान मंत्री ने फौरन इसको स्वीकार किया और तमाम विपक्ष को समिति का सदस्य बनकर सत्य, हकीकत उजागर करने को निर्मलित किया, किन्तु मान्यवर, जिसके मन में काला चोर बैठा हो, तमाम लक्ष्य राजनीति से प्रेरित हों तब आप उसमें शामिल नैसे हो सकते हैं। मेरे साथी ने कहा कि चकि सत्य, हकीकत जो थी वह अगर सामने आ जाती तो आने वाले चुनाव के दिन तक इस वास्तव को लेकर आप जनता तक नहीं जा सकते थे, यही कारण था कि आपने समिति में शामिल होने से इन्कार किया। और आज फिर इसी बात को उठाया जा रहा है। हमने बार-बार कहा हमारे सीनियर लोगों ने जाकर आपसे वार्ताएं कीं कि आप शामिल हों। दूसरी समितियों में जाकर अगर हम सत्य सा न ले सकते हैं तो इस समिति में क्यों नहीं जा सकते। अभी आदरणीय वर्मा जी कह रहे थे कि हमारे पूर्व रक्षा मंत्री जी के पास अगर कोई हकीकत आज भी मौजूद है तो उन्हें कौन रोक रहा है कि सरकार के सामने वह उसे न रखें। हम मांग करेंगे कि आइए उस बात पर आप विचार-विमर्श कीजिए और बताइए कि इसके अन्दर क्या घोटाला है? कौन रोक रहा है उन्हें? जे. पी. सी. में हमने मान लिया नहीं बुलाया, आपको किसने रोका था वहां पर आने में? यों नहीं आए आप वहां पर? गलत तथ्यों के आधार पर देश का विपक्ष जा रहा है, यह देश की सबसे बड़ी कष्टगता है। ऐसे कौन से तथ्य हैं आपके पास। आज तक कोई तथ्य नहीं दे सके। किसी अखबार ने छाप दिया, "हिन्दू" ने छाप दिया तो ब्रह्म वाक्य बन गया, वेद वाक्य बन गया। और जितने भी साधन हैं सरकार के पास कौन

[श्री मिर्जा इशदि बेग]

से साधन से सरकार ने इसकी इन्क्वायरी कराने से मना किया है। सबसे बड़ी हमारा यह समिति होती है—संसद की, वही समिति गठित का गई। आपसे बार-बार कहा गया लेकिन आप उसमें शामिल नहीं हुए। पहले भी मैंने कहा था और फिर से भी कह रहा हूँ कि समिति अगर बनाओ तो गोर और न वनाओ तो मातम। अब कहां ले जाकर बनाएं। किसपर आपको विश्वास है। आपको न तो प्रजातंत्र पर विश्वास है, न देश के लोगों पर आपका विश्वास है, न देश के सदनों पर आपका विश्वास है और न सदनों में चुने हुए लोगों द्वारा बनाई हुई सरकार पर आपका विश्वास है। आपको अपने आप पर विश्वास नहीं है इसलिए मान्यवर, कभी तो इधर से उधर बदल जाते हैं और कभी उधर से बदल इधर आते हैं।

मान्यवर, कोई संशय नहीं है कि देश की जनता का जो मानस है वह सक्षम है और जब समय आएगा, वह समय पर इसका निर्णय करेगा। आप कह रहे हैं कि नई समिति बनाओ। मैं स्पष्ट शब्दों में कहना चाहता हूँ कि मान्यवर, संसदीय प्रणाली में जो नियम बनाए गए हैं, यह कोई मजाक नहीं, मेहरबानी करके आप इसे मजाक में मत लीजिए। क्या हम यह साबित करना चाहते हैं कि जो पुरानी समिति बनी थी उसने ठीक ढंग से काम नहीं किया? क्या हम उनपर अविश्वास ले जाना चाहते हैं और फिर उसमें सिर्फ सरकारी पक्ष के लोग नहीं थे, चाहे भले ही आप कह दें कि जो हमारे साथ हैं वे शामिल थे, वे हमारे साथ में थे लेकिन विपक्ष के सदस्य भी समिति में थे जो आज आपके साथ में बैठे हैं, तो आज जो वह कह रहे हैं वह सत्य आपको लग रहा है। समिति ने बैठ कर जो बातें शुरू में कहीं वे आप को गलत लग रही हैं। इनका मानदंड क्या है आज तक मेरी समझ में नहीं आया। मैं आपको यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि इनका समय-समय पर मानदंड कैसे बदलता है। पहले इन्होंने कहा

कि इनका रेंज ठीक नहीं है। फिर उन्होंने कहा कि इसकी क्वालिटी ठीक नहीं है। बड़ी घटिया किस्म की उठा ली। हम लोग को तो इसका तुजुर्बा है नहीं। जसवन्त सिंह जी ने तोप का दागकर, चला कर देखा तो पाया बड़ी अच्छी है। जब बंगलादेश की लड़ाई हुई थी उसके कमांडर जनरल, जनरल ग्रोडा वह हमारी पार्टी के तो नहीं हैं लेकिन उन्होंने भी यह कहा कि ये गन बहुत अच्छी है। जब इन्होंने देखा कि बात नहीं बनी तो कहना शुरू कर दिया कि इनकी रेंज ठीक नहीं है। जो रेंज पहले मानी थी वह रेंज नहीं मिल रही है। जो जे.पी.सी. की रिपोर्ट आयी उसमें आपने देखा होगा कि सदस्यों ने जाकर रेंज को नापा-तोला और फिर यह पाया कि उसकी रेंज बिल्कुल सही है। बल्कि जो कहा गया था कि उससे कुछ ज्यादा ही रेंज मिली है। यह बात भी उठायी गयी कि प्रधान मंत्री उसमें शामिल हैं। वह उसका डिनायल करें। फिर बीच में अमिताभ बच्चन का नाम लिया गया। यह कहा गया कि इनकी तरफ से डिनायल आना चाहिये। जब डिनायल आता है तो दूसरा बहाना लगा देते हैं। इनका मानदंड मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि एक ही व्यक्ति एक ही पक्ष के लोग एक ही बात को दुधारी नीति पर कैसे चलाते हैं। सावन के दिन है। एक मुहावरा है सावन के अंधे को हमेशा हरा ही हरा दिखाई देता है।

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: He cannot understand it.

श्री मिर्जा इशदि बेग : वही हाल इनका होता चला जा रहा है। इन को कोई भी बात बताई जाय तो समझ में नहीं आती। शुरू में इन्होंने कहा कि राजीव गांधी, राजीव गांधी के परिवार से संबंधित व्यक्ति ने यह घूस जरूर ली। इससे अधिक और क्या हो सकता है कि प्रधान मंत्री राजीव गांधी ने खुद अपने आप से सदनों के सामने आकर अपना वक्तव्य दिया। प्रधान मंत्री ने जो लोक सभा में वक्तव्य दिया मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। लोक सभा में वाद-विवाद में हस्तक्षेप करते हुये प्रधान मंत्री ने दिनांक 6 अगस्त, 1987 को निम्नलिखित वक्तव्य दिया।

SHRI N. E. BALARAM (Kerala): Can he quote from Lok Sabha proceedings?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): He is quoting from Bofors JPC report ... (Interruptions)...

SHRI N. E. BALARAM: Thank you.

श्री मीर्जा इशार्द बेग : देखिये मान्यवर, इनको इस पर भी भरोसा नहीं है। मैं जे०पी०सी० से ही बोल रहा हूँ। सावन के अंधे को हमेशा हरा ही हरा दिखाई देता है। प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा :

“बोफोर्स मामले पर चर्चा के दौरान सभा के अन्दर और बाहर दोनों जगह पर कई आरोप लगाये गये। इस देश के नेतृत्व की छवि को धूमिल करने के लिये अफवाहें फैलायी गयीं। आधारहीन संदेह किये गये। भारतीय लोकतंत्र की इस उच्चतम सभा में स्पष्ट तौर पर घोषणा करता हूँ कि न तो मैंने और न मेरे परिवार के सदस्य ने इन सौदों में कोई पैसा लिया है। यह सच्चाई है। उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि अगर जांच के दौरान किसी व्यक्ति को गैर कानूनी ढंग से पैसा लेने के लिये दोषी पाया गया तो उसके विरुद्ध कानून के अन्तर्गत कठोर कार्रवाई की जायेगी।”

हम तो यह समझते थे कि विपक्ष के लोग इस पर हमारी सराहना करेंगे, हमारा अभिन्दन करेंगे। प्रधान मंत्री को कहेंगे कि यह बहुत सही किया। लेकिन फिर भी विपक्ष ने आरोप लगाये। मैं आपके मध्यम से देश के लोगों को यह कन्ना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने प्रधान मंत्री का जो पद है, उसकी जो गरिमा है उसके विरुद्ध बात की है। उनको ऐसी बात नहीं कहनी चाहिये। एक तरफ आप मांग करते हैं कि प्रधान मंत्री को कहना चाहिये कि वह कहीं वह दोषी है या नहीं और जब उन्होंने सदन में आकर यह कह दिया तो अब उनको तरफ से यह दलील आती है। मुझे समझ में नहीं आता किस किस तरह से उनको समझाया जाय। मैं उनकी कोई भी दलील मानने को तैयार नहीं हूँ। मैं अभी खत्म कर रहा हूँ। श्रीमन्, इस पर मुझे एक शेर याद आया —

आखें उठाते कहीं और पांव कहीं गिरते हैं,
उनको सब की खबर है, अपनी खबर कुछ
भी नहीं ;

अब मैं उनको याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने व्यर्थ में सदन का इतना वक्त जाया किया है। उस तरफ के और इस तरफ के हमारे साथी यहां पर बैठे हुये हैं। आप लोग यहां पर भ्रष्टाचार की बात लाते हैं। लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि बोर्टलिंग केस में कौन था? कर्नाटक के स्प्रिट स्कैंडल में कौन लोग शामिल थे। वहां पर जो जजमेंट दिया गया था वह किसने दिया था? कोर्ट ने दिया था। श्री राजीव गांधी ने वह जजमेंट नहीं दिया था। कांग्रेस सरकार ने वह जजमेंट नहीं दिया था। इसके बावजूद भी वह पार्टी लीपापोती करके अपने को वहां पर प्रति स्थापित किये हुये हैं। यही लोग हम पर आज दोषारोपण कर रहे हैं, बोफोर्स को लेकर चिल्लाते हैं। लेकिन जिन राज्यों में इनकी पार्टी की सरकारें हैं वहां पर क्या हो रहा है? सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने निर्णय दिया है, हाई कोर्ट ने कहा कि भ्रष्टाचार किया गया है। अपने दामादों को लेकर करोड़ों रुपयों का घोटाला किया गया है। उस पर भी इन लोगों को शर्म नहीं आती है... (व्यवधान) राम अवधेश जी, उनके साथ बैठने से आपको भी शर्म नहीं आती है। आपको उधर बैठने के बजाय इधर बैठना चाहिये था। इनके यहां बहुत स्कैंडल हुये हैं।

मान्यवर, मैं आखिरी बात कह कर अपनी बात समाप्त कर रहा हूँ। हिन्दू में जो कुछ छपा है उसका जिक्र यहां पर किया जाता है। हिन्दू में जो कुछ प्रकाशित हुआ है उसके लिये मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि कोई बात छाप देने से कोई निर्दोष व्यक्ति दोषी नहीं हो जाता... (व्यवधान)। मुश्किल यह है कि आप मुनते भी नहीं हैं, देखने भी नहीं हैं और समझते भी नहीं हैं। गलत लोगों के साथ बैठने का यही परिणाम होता है। शेखसादी ने कहा कि एक शरीफ इंसान के साथ बैठना एक हजार इबावत से ज्यादा होता है। श्री रामअवधेश सिंह जी, गलत लोगों के साथ बैठे हो, इसलिये यह कह रहे हो। इधर आ जाओ तो ठीक ढंग से सोचने लगोगे। तो मैं कह रहा था कि कोई

[श्री सीजी इशबिंदर]

बात अखबार में छाप देने से कोई दोषी या निर्दोष नहीं हो जाता है। हमारी सरकार ने जो भी किया है वह देश के कानून के मुताबिक किया है। हिन्दू में जो डाकुमेंट छपे उस पर सरकार ने सी.बी.आई. की इन्क्वायरी बैठा दी है। आप उसकी वेट तो कीजिये। लेकिन मान्यवर, अब इन लोगों का कहना है कि सी.बी.आई. पर इनको विश्वास नहीं है। लेकिन सी.आई.ए. पर ये विश्वास करते हैं। आज इनके एक नेता मसीहा बन गये हैं। उनको ये भावी प्रधान मंत्री बताते हैं। लोग उनको पसन्द करेंगे या नहीं, यह तो इस देश की जगता ही बतायेगी। जो बातें अखबारों में छपी हैं उनको जे.पी.सी. के सामने भी लाया जा सकता था। हिन्दू इन बातों को उनके सामने आकर कह सकता था। लेकिन वे जे.पी.सी. के सामने नहीं आये। ये लोग इस तरह की बातें छापते रहेंगे। यह चाहते हैं कि चुनावों के लिये कुछ किया जाय। देश के सामने जो प्रश्न हैं, जो मसले हैं, वे इनकी प्राइ-ओरिटीज नहीं हैं, सूखा इनकी प्राइओरिटी नहीं है, हैजा इनकी प्राइओरिटी नहीं है, अकाल इनकी प्राइओरिटी नहीं है, बाढ़ इनकी प्राइओरिटी नहीं है। इनकी प्राइ-ओरिटी सिर्फ सरकार का विरोध करना है। हिन्दू अखबार में जो कुछ छपा उसकी जांच करना सरकार ने स्वीकार कर लिया है। सी.बी.आई. उसकी जांच कर रहा है। मान्यवर, इसलिये मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार से यह मांग करता हूँ कि यह नयी कमेटी बनने की मांग जो विपक्ष ने की है यह पूर्णतय राजनीति से प्रेरित है, इसको न माना जाय और सी.बी.आई. की जो भी रिपोर्ट सामने आये और उस रिपोर्ट में, जैसा कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा है उसमें जो भी दोषी पाया जाता है उसके खिलाफ सख्त से सख्त कार्यवाही करने की मैं आपके माध्यम से मांग करता हूँ।

महोदय, आपने मुझे बोलने का समय दिया इसके लिये मैं आपका बहुत बहुत आभारी हूँ। धन्यवाद।

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. Aru-NACHALAM: At the outset I would like

to thank our Press, especially the *Hindu* and the *Indian Express* for rendering great service on the Bofors issue. Neither our Government, nor the JPC has helped us to unearth the truth. We have been much benefited by the press rather than our legitimate agency—Government.

In my note of dissent I have made some observations. These observations are substantiated and strengthened by the publication of the authentic documents by the *Hindu*. The publication of the *Hindu* documents earlier established that there is payment of commission, there is a utilisation of agency, there are three spurious agencies, there is a relationship between the Indian agent and foreign spurious agencies. So, the claim of winding up cost by Bofors is nothing but a fraud. More than that I would like to remind that the endorsement of the claim by the JPC as well as this Government is more fraudulent.

The crux of the problem is the selection of the gun itself. Of course, I am not underestimating the capability of the Bofors gun. But had we selected the gun on merit basis, we would have preferred Sofma gun. If we had preferred Sofma, it would have been on merit and we would have avoided so many controversies. Unfortunately, the Defence Ministry favoured Bofors gun, ignoring the merits of the Sofma gun with vested interests. Of course, Bofors gun is within the acceptable parameters, but right from the beginning up to the end of February 1986, it was in second rank in order of priority. Of course, it is an acceptable one, but the shift has taken place in the last stage. What is the reason for this? The reason on behalf of the Treasury benches and as per the report of the JPC is the possession of the fire-finding radar AN-TPS—37 by Pakistan. I would like to say that Sundarji in the beginning had recommended Sofma gun, but after becoming the Chief of the Army Staff, shifted his view towards Bofors gun on the basis of this fire-finding radar. So, the point for consideration of the House is whether the fire-finding radar is a new factor to change the opinion of the Army Headquarters. That is the most important

point. According to Gen. Sinha, the fire-finding radar had been developed and had been supplied by the US Army in the late 70s itself. And according to a well-known journal—Jane's Weapon System—it had been supplied to Pakistan in 1978 itself. So, it is false to say that it is a new factor. Therefore, Bofors has been favoured by the Defence Ministry ignoring merits.

The authentic documents published by the *Hindu* exposed the euphemism of Bofors as well as the Government of India. The entire country is aware of the fact that neither Bofors nor the Government of India is in a position to dispute the credibility of the documents published by the *Hindu*. Unfortunately, every time from Treasury Benches the argument is that neither the Opposition nor the persons who are alleging against the Government produced any valid or irrefutable facts to the Government. Sir, right from the beginning, our Government is exercising its strength only to protect the interests of Bofors. It has not showed any constructive interest in unearthing the truth. Bofors in the beginning has not informed our Government about their payment of so-called winding up costs or termination costs before signing the contract. Our Government came to know about it after it was broadcast by Swedish National Radio. Then, Sir, our Government has asked for the particulars from Bofors and Bofors refused to give the information in the beginning about the names of the agencies. When there was some pressure afterwards, they came forward to give the names of the agencies. But when our CBI examined the names of the agencies, they came to know that these are all spurious agencies. They have been created only for secrecy and tax avoidance. So, when CBI came to know, we wanted particulars about the persons who are behind the agencies. Then, our Government asked those particulars but in the name of 'business confidentiality' they refused to give these particulars. I would like to stress this point that we must test Bofors, first we must test their 'business confidentiality'. As far as the names of the agencies are concerned, they refused to give. Then, after pressure, they gave. Then, they shifted the area of 'business confidentiality' to

the services of these three agencies, more than that their agreement between Bofors and these three agencies. All along the ruling party Members are defending that. They have still not answered the question as to why Bofors paid this commission or winding up costs to the extent of Kroner 319 million? What was the service rendered by this agency in the past? Still this question remains unanswered. We are always accepting the words of Bofors. But we are not accepting what is the fraud behind this claim by the Bofors. All these days the Government is endorsing the stance of Bofors. Why? What is the reason?

The only person who had come forward to criticise the propensity, attitude and practice of Bofors was Mr. Arun Singh. Mr. Arun Singh while he was participating in the discussion, disclosed that there is a breach of faith, Bofors must be black-listed. He frankly and honestly told in this House. He requested the Government to blacklist the company. The Congress party has blacklisted Mr. Arun Singh but not Bofors. That is the tragedy. He has not criticised the Government. He has not criticised the Prime Minister. He has only criticised Bofors. But the Government has not come forward to examine the real observation of Mr. Arun Singh.

Sir, we know that in some criminal cases, the accused is acquitted on the ground that the prosecution failed to establish the case. In certain cases, the accused is acquitted due to the connivance of the prosecution and the accused. Our Bofors case belongs to the second category. The Government and Bofors joined together to suppress the facts. That is why we are not able to identify the real recipient. Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the House to find out the real recipient of the kickbacks. Bofors would have come forward to reveal the fact but it said, no. It has not come forward. Who are behind the spurious agencies?

Another effective agency to find out the truth is Swiss Bank. I would like to ask the Minister, what steps have so far been taken by this Government to get the particulars from the Swiss Bank? I

[Shri Aladi Aruna *alias* V. Aruna-chalam]

would like to quote:—

"Switzerland is willing to provide assistance to Sweden for the latter's investigation into the Bofors—India Howitzer deal pay-off accounts."

They are prepared to give assistance to Sweden as well as India. First, Mr. Kristler, the spokesman, Swedish Federal Department of Police and Justice has stated this. The same spokesman also has stated that:—

"Switzerland's offer to assist was still open provided all sides concerned are willing to cooperate."

Turning to India and the possibility of co-operating with New Delhi on the issue, Mr. Kristler said,

"Switzerland was willing to provide required assistance but till date, we have never received any request from India concerning this case."

Is it not a shame to the nation? If the Government is very serious in unearthing the truth, it would have cooperated with them but it has not done so. So, I would like to remind.... (*Time bell rings*).... Kindly give me five minutes

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): Please conclude in two minutes.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: I have only taken ten minutes. You have given 15 and 20 minutes to others.

(*Interruptions*)

Sir, everybody is criticising the former Finance Minister, Mr. V. P. Singh. It is left to you. I have no objection. But you must discuss it on merits. Sir, I would like to say that this contract was dealt with by the Defence Ministry under the chairmanship of Defence Secretary. He was the Chairman of the Price Negotiating Committee. Go through the list of Members. Who are they? Most of the Members are from Defence side. My point is, after the understanding of the Price Negotiating Committee on a particu-

lar date, I have forgotten the date, the file had been circulated. It is a routine way. (*Interruption*).

SHRI K. C. PANT: Who are the Members of the Price Negotiating Committee, will you read out?

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Yes, there is a representative from the Finance Department also. I am not denying that. But my point is, whether it was dealt with by the defence department or by the finance department, on a particular date, the file was circulated. All the heads of the departments had signed on a particular date. Nobody examined the file seriously because it was already discussed in the Price Negotiating Committee. Therefore, they just endorsed the decision of the Price Negotiating Committee. If there is any merit, if there is any defect, if there is any fault, then everything must go to the Defence Ministry and not to the Finance Ministry?

Then, Sir, everybody is arguing that now the *Hindu* is publishing the documents. The Indian Express is giving particulars. The press is supporting. But nobody has come forward to appear before the JPC to give evidence. I ask 'he the *House* have ever the JPC given notification asking the people to appear before the Committee? Not on a single occasion, it has done so. It is not a Petitions Committee. Unless there is summons, you have no right to appear before the Committee. I was a Member of the Committee... (*Interruptions*)... *Time Bell rings*)... I am going to finish, Sir. Sir, I was a Member of the Committee. I asked them to examine ten members. They are not irrelevant. Who are they? They are Bhupat Rai Oza, Mr. Naik, Mr. R. K. Gupta, D.I.G., Mr. Anil Kumar, Director of Enforcement and Director of C.B.I., Mr. Martin Ardo etc. etc. But nobody was called by the Committee for examination. Now you say, nobody has come forward to give evidence before the Committee but you have not honoured the request of the Member. Under what moral ground you now ask the public? .. (*Interruptions*).. You must come forward to accept this fact.

Therefore, now the Opposition ask you to constitute another J.P.C. I am not going to deal with that matter. If it is not possible.... (Interruption).... perhaps, it may be a prestigious issue. I ask the Defence Minister to order a judicial enquiry consisting of Supreme Court judges. Otherwise, Sir I warn you the verdict of Allahabad will be repeated everywhere. With this note of warning I conclude my speech.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I find it rather amusing that in August 1987, in this very House, our friends from the Opposition were demanding the appointment of a Joint Parliamentary Committee. In August 1988 also again they are demanding the appointment of a Joint Parliamentary Committee. And I will not be surprised if in August 1989 also they are found demanding the appointment of a Joint Parliamentary Committee.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): They want a Supreme Court Judge also.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: In the meantime, Sir, we have appointed a Joint Parliamentary Committee and the Joint Parliamentary Committee has already submitted its report. But still, our Opposition friends are where they were one year back. They have not been moving even a little ahead. Yesterday, I was amused to hear Mr. Gurupadaswamy. He said it was a truncated Committee and it came out with a truncated report! Sir, who made it truncated? You demanded a Committee. A Committee was appointed. But you did not join it. You made it truncated. And now you blame the Government saying that it was a truncated Committee. Today you are demanding another Committee. What is the guarantee that if the Government appoints a Committee, you will again not refuse to join it so that it may once again be called a truncated Committee and you get a handle to criticise the Committee, to criticise the report of the Committee and all that? In fact, our friends from the Opposition are not seriously interested in finding out the truth. They are interested only in blaming the Government, in blaming Shri Rajiv Gandhi. And, as some of our friends said, perhaps this

is the only thing that they have got now. This is the last straw for them which they are catching hold of with all their might so that till the next elections it does not miss them or they do not miss it. Before must continue in one way or the other for them. Yesterday, Mr. Gurupadaswamy was very uncharitable when he said that Mr. Shankaranand was made the Chairman; he was made to resign from the Cabinet; he was made the Chairman and after submitting the report, again, he was made a Cabinet Minister. He said, "The game is clear." What game is clear? If a Cabinet Minister is restored to his place what game is clear? I do not know what he wanted to convey. (Interruptions). If an ordinary M.P. is made the Chairman of the Committee and after submitting his report he is made a Cabinet Minister, that you can say there is some game. But if a Cabinet Minister, who has been a Cabinet Minister since 1980, is restored to his place, what is the game in it? Why was he made to resign and become the Chairman of the Committee? Only to lend more credibility to the Committee. He is a senior man, a senior Cabinet Minister. To give more weightage to the Committee, he was made the Chairman.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: On the contrary, the credibility was destroyed by that.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: People without any credibility do not find credibility anywhere. But Mr. Shankaranand did have credibility and still he enjoys credibility. So, to say that there was a game in appointing Shankaranandji as the Chairman of the Committee, as you say, is totally wrong and it is a perverted view, if I may be allowed to say so. Then Shri Gurupadaswamyji said commissions were paid and commissions were bribery. It is yet to be proved that commissions were paid. Only because it has been published in 'The Hindu', you have come to the conclusion that commissions were paid and commissions were bribery also. Some of our friends have already spoken about this. I do not want to dwell on this issue. These agency agreements were signed by Bofors much earlier. You

[Shri P. N. Sukul]

cannot say that they were paid bribery or commission. They were paid as per the agreements executed with them. The Swedish District Prosecutor said that whatever payments were made 5.00 P.M. were not by way of bribery.

He did not call them commissions. These documents which have appeared in 'The Hindu' may be new for you, may be very revealing for you. But the Swedish Audit Bureau had every access to all these documents and they must have consulted all these documents and thereafter they must have come to the conclusion, "Yes, payments were made." But the Bureau never said commissions were paid; nor did the District Prosecutor say it. But my learned friends of Opposition are still going on singing the same song, "Commissions were paid, commissions were paid." It is yet to be proved that commissions were paid. Of course, if there are agencies and if there are agreements with certain agencies, payments are to be made to them winding up charges. And you call them commission! Neither did Bofors say commissions were paid nor did Win Chadha say commissions were paid nor did the National Audit Bureau say commissions were paid nor did the Swedish District Prosecutor say commissions were paid. Only our friends from the Opposition are harping on the same tune and they will go on harping on the same tune. I am sure.

Another charge of Shri Gurupadaswamy was that JPC did not give a chance to Shri Arun Singh, did not call Shri Arun Singh or Shri V. P. Singh or the Hindujas for tendering evidence before the Committee and why. Why should the Committee follow your directions? Every Parliamentary Committee, every Joint Parliamentary Committee, in its very first meeting or second meeting takes decisions about its *modus operandi*, what it will do, how it will proceed, whom it will invite. I have also twice been Chairman of Joint Parliamentary Committees and I am still of one. And I know how a JPC functions. Any Member or anybody cannot dictate to a Joint Parliamentary

Committee to invite this man or to invite that man. The Committee is fully within its right to take a decision whom to invite and whom not to invite for tendering evidence before it. Here on the basis of the information available with the Committee the Committee thought that by calling them no useful purpose would be served. I think that the Committee was within its right not to call.

All the charges of Shri Gurupadaswamy made in his speech yesterday were totally baseless. Now, we know, as I said, that no commissions were paid and a probe is still being made into it. And hats off to Rajiv Gandhi Government that as soon as those documents were published in the Hindu, even before any Opposition man demanded a further probe, a probe was ordered by the Government of Shri Rajiv Gandhi, by the CBI and by the Enforcement Directorate. Shri Rajiv Gandhi did not wait for your suggesting that it should be done. It was done automatically, instantly, immediately. And while that probe is on, you are still going on saying commissions were paid, commissions were paid commissions were paid. You do not want to wait for the report, for the final outcome of the probe that is now being made currently by the CBI and by the Enforcement Directorate.

Now coming to the documents published by The Hindu, what do these documents show ultimately? They show only two things; or, they try to show only two things: (1) that Bofors paid commission to win the 24th March 1986 contract and that money was deposited in Swiss Banks; (2) Chadhas Anatron Corporation had links with Svenska Inc. There is nothing new for you or for us in that. As regards the alleged payment of commission, still it cannot be said, as I said earlier, that it was not winding up charges or it was commission. Nobody except the Opposition is saying that it was commission. Just on the basis of what was published by 'The Hindu' the Opposition started saying and it goes on saying that it was commission. Even before it was published, even before these documents were published even before that, the Opposition was saying that commission was paid commission was paid. Bo-

fors, Mr. Win Chandha, JPC, Government of India and all concerned are agreed that no commissions were paid, but only termination charges were paid, only winding up charges were paid, as per the agreements with these companies. And, as I said, even the Swedish Audit Bureau did not say that commissions were paid.

Now, as regards the role of middle man in such deals who are supposed to get commissions, who took this decision that there would be no middle man in defence deals? That decision was taken by the Government of Shrimati Indira Gandhi in 1980, that there would be no agents in defence deals, no middle men in defence deals. Before 1980, there were middle men in defence deals, there were agents, and commissions were paid and even during the Janata period they were there. But our Opposition friends are not interested in trying to find out who got the commission at that time, how much and whom these commissions were transferred to. There they are not desirous of finding out the truth the actual truth. But, knowing that it was the Congress Government which took this decision deliberately that in defence deals there would be no agents, they are saying this now. You see, our deal was for Rs. 1,700 crores or so and it was at our insistence that Bofors themselves reduced the cost to Rs. 1,400 crores or Rs. 1,420 crores or something like that. Yes, they reduced it. And, what is the commission involved? Only Rs. 64 crores. As compared to Rs. 1,400 crores what is Rs. 64 crores? Not even five per cent... (*Time Bell rings*)... It is only 4.7 per cent of the entire value of the contract. I know that even today, in the estimates of the various departments of the Government, there is always scope for a ten-per cent increase. In every estimate the cost can go up by ten per cent or so. And, Sir, here the payments, the commissions, are to the tune of only 4.7 per cent of the entire value of the contract and our Opposition friends are raising din and dust on this always saying. 'Bofors, Bofors, Bofors'. This is their sense of priority, and this is their sense of proportion.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: Rs. 170 crores were to be paid.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): You need not enter into any discussion with him.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: So, I say that it is only 4.7 per cent of the entire value of the contract and this paltry amount could very reasonably be called termination charges or winding up charges. But it could not be commission. Perhaps the commission amount would have been much more, five or ten per cent even. That is why our JPC very rightly came to the conclusion that no middle man was involved. Nobody admitted that commission was paid, nobody who appeared before the Committee, either the sellers or the buyers or the go-between like Mr. Win Chandha, said that commission was paid and that was why the JPC also came to the conclusion that no middle man was involved... (*Time Bell rings*)..

In the end, Sir, I would only say that here is absolutely no need for another Joint Parliamentary Committee because our Opposition friends, who are now demanding another JPC, will say again, 'The Chairman must be from the Opposition'. Why? Why break the convention? In the matter of appointments to Joint Committees the Chairmen are from the majority party? Why do you want to break this convention?

SHRI N. E. BALARAM: We want a new convention.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: No. You don't have any regard for conventions or traditions. You want to condemn everything. You want to condemn the Prime Minister. Nobody is interested to know the truth.

There is absolutely no need for the appointment of a new JPC. Our Defence Minister is here. In my humble opinion, in the whole world today middlemen are there in such transactions and even today, in all other other Ministries they are. Wherever such transactions take place, middlemen are there. Commissions are being paid regularly. If our that decision goes to make our Opposition friends so much exercise on it, I will request our Government to revise its decision and to

[Shri P. N. Sukul]

have middlemen, if necessary, even in defence deals.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are already there.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): Mr. Balarām, You should take 5 minutes.

डा० रत्नाकार वाण्डेय (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
5 मिनट तक तो हंसते ही रहेंगे ।

SHRI N. E. BALARAM: I will talk on only two or three points.

Sir, even at this stage, unless we take some strong steps to find out the truth about the Bofors deal, I think this issue may come up again and again. It is not because the Opposition wants it, not because the nation wants it, not because anybody wants to malign the Prime Minister; it is because you are trying to suppress the truth, you cannot do it. It will come up again and again. So what I am suggesting is that even at this stage we must take some firm steps so that we need not have another discussion on this subject.

New facts appeared in the Hindu which deepened the suspicion. As I said, I am only talking about three points. The Hindu has totally demolished the theory of winding up costs which was advocated by Bofors, accepted by the JPC, accepted by the Government. This is a new thing. The Hindu has established that even the pay-offs were made in March 1987. It is a new fact. The Hindu has also established that Bofors has lied before the JPC on the question of payment. They said that no payment was made to any Indian on the basis of a commission. These are the main three elements coming up again. And everybody says that the Joint Parliamentary Committee has cleared everything. That is why I said that unless we try to find out the real truth, the difficulty may come up again. The difficulty was not started or created by the Opposition parties—do not take it in that way.

Now, we are talking about the CBI inquiry. The Government has already ordered a CBI inquiry on this question,

I do not know whether it is a fact or not. If it is a fact, then what is the difference between us? You have also got doubts. The Prime Minister got doubts when he read The Hindu. So he asked the Defence Minister to order a CBI inquiry. Some people said: 'What is it? If you are so clear, why did you order an inquiry again?' Don't argue like that. Let us face the reality. You have ordered an inquiry. I would like to ask the Defence Minister at this stage as to what the specific issues referred to the C.B.I. are. What are the specific allegations referred to the C.B.I.? What are the specific complaints referred to the C.B.I.? What are the specific matters referred to the C.B.I. for investigation? I would like to know that. Then only we can know something about it.

The second point is that so many issues have been raised by Hindu. At least some of the points would find a place in the list of issues you have asked the C.B.I. to go into? What is the meaning of asking the C.B.I. to make an inquiry? There is no basic difference between us. (Time Bell rings). I am finishing. (Interruptions). We are worried about the money that has been taken away by the foreign companies. We do not talk of other factors. Now did you give any time-frame to the C.B.I.? Did the C.B.I. give back its report to you in that time-frame? Nothing is known to us. I must say that I am not satisfied with the C.B.I. inquiry. That does not mean that I am against any C.B.I. person. No. I do not know anyone of them except one man who comes from my own place. Excepting him, I do not know anybody in the C.B.I.

Now, what happened to the last J.P.C.? It was a committee composed of like-minded people or yes men and thus suffered from political, sentimental and personal limitations. So, they could not find the truth, nor could they give us a proper report. They could not give us a report because it was a committee composed of like-minded people. I think the Attorney General had taken a different position. I think the Defence Minister also takes that position

[The Vice Chairman (Shri Jagesh Desai) in the Chair]

I am reading that chapter. (*Time bell rings*) I am finishing.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): My only worry is that there are six more speakers.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: We should not be treated like casual labourers.

SHRI N. E. BALARAM: I am finishing, Sir. It reads:

"The Committee pointed out that Bofors had taken the stand that they had paid no commissions, that they had terminated the consultancy agreements in pursuance of the wishes of the Government of India and had, therefore, paid only winding up costs. Reacting to this, the Attorney-General stated:

"Unless we get the terms of the agreement, it is very difficult for us to take any decision. I am not able to see any legal position by which we can proceed. So we are in a very difficult position without knowing the terms of the agreement whether the companies are true companies, or bogus companies, whether the amounts were paid really, and so on. Again we are stuck up for want of material."

This is what the Attorney-General said. Now new materials are coming. Right or wrong, they are coming. You must check them up. I am not saying that all the reports that come in the 'Hindu' are right. I am not arguing on that basis. Some fresh materials have come. Now, some of our friends started attacking the whole press. What happened to our country? The Congress leaders....

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: No one has attacked the press.

SHRI N. E. BALARAM: I was here. I was listening. One gentleman spoke that the 'Hindu' was trying to destabilise the Government. Did he know anything about the 'Hindu'? What does he know about the 'Hindu'? I know. (*Interruptions*) I listened

to his speech, I don't want to enter into a debate. What I am saying is that the entire JPC was stuck up, the entire Government was stuck up for want of facts. Now facts are coming. You say that of course, the CBI is going to make an enquiry. But the same CBI, in the last JPC meeting, was asked to make an enquiry. They were asked to make enquiries. They came back and said, 'we have nothing more to say, we have no idea'. I am not accusing them. I am not saying that the CBI is not capable of finding out the truth. Here, I would say that as long as the present attitude of the Government is there, CBI can't go beyond what they are told. Therefore, they have their own limitations, political and administrative limitations. That is what I am saying. What do we do now? We are in a dilemma. New facts are coming. How do we deal with these new facts? How do we proceed? This is it. You say, Opposition parties—destabilisation, is this the attitude? I don't think this is a proper attitude on the part of the Government. Yesterday, our Minister, Mr. Shiv Shankar was arguing: Whether we could do anything without CBI. Who said that? We never said that, CBI must be there. Some other agencies must be there. All the agencies' assistance must be sought. But that specific probe must be conducted at the initiative of a new Joint Parliamentary Committee. A new JPC must be there. Everybody will cooperate. Why not? A new JPC must be constituted. But it should not be a Committee of like-minded people.

SHRI K. C. PANT: Everyone will cooperate?

SHRI N. E. BALARAM: Why not? Everyone will co-operate means...

SHRI K. C. PANT: That is very courageous on your part, Mr. Balaram.

SHRI N. E. BALARAM: I know, don't disturb me.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): It is applicable to only Mr. Balaram and nobody else.

SHRI N. E. BALARAM: We will co-operate means, we will have our own ideas about that. You understand that. We are not saying that the new JPC must be

[Shri N. E. Balaram]

exclusively of Opposition parties. We do not say that.

SHRI K. C. PANT: It is kind of you, very nice of you.

SHRI N. E. BALARAM: I do not want not to retort. I am not a Minister. So, I do not want to retort. I am an ordinary man; I am an ordinary, humble man. I know you, Mr. Pant, since you were a boy. Don't forget it.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: He was the colleague of your father.

SHRI N. E. BALARAM: I was the colleague of your father.

SHRI K. C. PANT: I withdraw whatever I said.

SHRI N. E. BALARAM: No no. You don't withdraw. You are trained by the other set of people, not by your own father. That is the difficulty with you. I know, I do not want to quarrel with him also. I know, he is a good man. My point is that we are in a dilemma. New facts are coming. I cannot disbelieve the facts that are coming in the 'Hindu' just because somebody is shouting there. I am not compelling you to believe the Hindu, what appeared in the Hindu. That is not my approach. My approach is that now that some new facts have come in, which the former JPC could not go into because it was a Committee composed of like-minded yes-men, let another JPC be constituted. (*Interruptions*). We did not cooperate in that Committee for that reason. Now we think about it. Now one suggestion has been put forward by my friend, Mr. Gurupadaswamy, let there be a new committee. Why can't we have another committee? If we are going to cooperate with it, what is the harm in it? Are we not Indians? Are we not Parliament Members? We are prepared to cooperate. We must utilise the services of the CBI.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Please conclude now.

SHRI N. E. BALARAM: What I am saying is that unless we take strong, prompt steps now, there is going to be trouble. There is a story. There was a raksha called Beeja, Beejasura. I hope you have read it. Somebody tried to kill him. When his head was cut every drop that came out of the head became another head and when one head was cut, ten heads appeared and when ten heads of Beeja were cut, 100 Beejas came up. So, if you think that this Beeja of Bofors you are going to cut and finish, you are mistaken. It will again come up and finish you all. All these Beejas will come up again and again. Do not complain that the opposition is creating so much trouble. It is not the opposition. It is not the Hindu. What has the Hindu to do with your Prime Minister? Do you think that the Hindu is against your Prime Minister? Do you think all the papers are against the Government? You are now controlling the national press. You are now controlling the opposition. You are now controlling the debate. So, you are afraid of what? If your hands are clean, I suggest please come up with a proposal for a fresh probe by a fresh Joint Parliamentary Committee. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Yes Mr. Gopalsamy. But please be as brief as possible. There are still five Members from the Opposition side and the total time given is 20 minutes, that means 4 minutes per Member, but I will be considerate.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Sir, all the previous speakers who were actually allotted 8 minutes or 9 minutes were permitted to speak for more than 20 minutes. Why should I be a casualty?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): As the Congress Party is concerned... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Why should I be a casualty?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): I shall not do injustice to anybody.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: When we people rise to speak, the moment...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : What can I do ?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : ... we rise, you make these observations and we lose our enthusiasm even to participate in the debate.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : Please go ahead.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL : Sir, let the reply be tomorrow.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : Let me see. There are still five Members from the Opposition. So far as the Congress Party is concerned they have withdrawn all except one. I think that it will take at least one hour. I do not know.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL : Let the reply be tomorrow.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY : Mr. Vice-Chairman. Sir, some years ago two names from the Fourth Estate in the USA became very sensational names cutting across the frontiers of continents, i.e., of Woodward and Carl Bernstein, who exposed Watergate and put an end to the political career of the man who was then sitting in the White House. Now, similarly two names have become very popular and famous, the names of Mr. Ram Ms. Chitra Subramaniam of the Hindu, who have exposed the Bofors scandal, and thereby demolished the citadel of the image of Mr. Clean of this country. Sir, we heard a voice on the floor of this House on the 21st April, 1987, "No honest, decent man likes to be called corrupt. If we are found guilty, hang us." That was the word used by the then Minister of State for Defence, Mr. Arun Singh. But Mr. Arun Singh, on 11th May this year stated on the floor of this House: "To my assessment, as I was the Minister of State in the Ministry at that time, there is a breach of faith. They (Bofors) should have told us what they were going to pay; they should have told us what they were going to pay; most important of all, they should have told us why they were going to pay; or they should have paid before the contract was concluded. If they had paid before the contract was concluded, then I would have no argument on breach of faith. Because they paid after the contract was concluded,

I can draw no other inference than that these are contract-related payments. A contract-related payment is a breach of faith." Not only that, he demanded that the money should be refunded by Bofors with damages. Bofors made payments which were described and coded as "commission" in the payment documents and calculated on a percentage basis in relation to deliveries made or to be made by way of fulfilment of the Bofors-India howitzer contract. These pay-offs were made right up to March, 1987 to designated secret accounts of Indian recipients or beneficiaries, and the percentage payments ranged from 0.96 per cent to 6 per cent depending on the items delivered and the agreed-upon mode of distribution. These are authentic reports, not mere stories in the press, with photostat copies of the agreements, facsimile copies of credit notes and remittance documents. What more the Government wants as evidence? Therefore, the story of 'termination negotiations' and 'winding up costs' is a concoction and a cover-up strategy for the management of the crisis after the scandal surfaced through a Swedish Radio broadcast on April 16, 1987.

There is irrefutable evidence in the secret agreements Bofors wrote up between 1978 and 1986 with the mysterious front company Svenska Inc. registered in Panama, and Mr. Win Chadha's Anatronc General Corporation, registered in India, that these were two tracks—a black and a white track, as it were.

Sir, there is Bofors credit note, from the Books of the company, relating to 6 per cent commission to Svenska on material supplied to the Government of India. *The Hindu* has published this document. These documents firmly link Win Chadha:

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

to Svenska payment track. The documents establish that Svenska and Anatronic represented in India the very same set of foreign defence and electronics manufacturers between 1978 and 1986. There is a close correspondence between the dates of the signing of the agreements between Bofors and Svenska on the one hand and Bofors and Anatronic on the other. Significantly, in direct refutation of the Bofors claim that the last of the India-related payments was made in December, 1986, Svenska payments continued right up to the end of March, 1987.

If you look at the records and the documents produced in *The Hindu* you could see similarity between the date of signing of the secret agreements by Bofors with Svenska and Anatronic. On 21st December 1978, Bofors had an agreement with Svenska and on the same date with Anatronic Corporation. Again, on 14th December, Bofors entered into agreement with Svenska and after ten days again with Anatronic Corporation. Again on 10th May 1984, on the same date, Bofors had an agreement both with Svenska and with Anatronic Corporation. Again on 2nd January, 1986 and 13th January, 1986. On these dates, there were similar agreements both with Svenska and Anatronic Corporation. The documents relating to the enabling arrangements and the specific payments through the Bofors Bank, the Skandinaviska Enskilda Banken, strongly suggest that Bofors was well into a process of making payments which would have considerably exceeded the admitted total of 319.4 million SEK had not media revelations caused a major political controversy. Sir, the former Managing Director of Bofors, Mr. Martin Ardbo,

has said that the truth about the Bofors-Indian deal will be buried with him. Mr. Ardbo also told the investigators that the Swedish Government would fall if the full truth about Olof Palme's part in the Indian deal came to be publicly known.

Sir, when it was reported in *The Hindu* about the Pitco-Sangam Limited, the Hinduja's refuted and denied the report. Again, a mass of evidence contained in three types of transaction documents obtained by *The Hindu* from highly authoritative sources establishes that commission payments by Bofors to the three recipient fronts, Svenska Incorporated, Pitco-Moresco-Moineao and A. E. Services Limited are firmly linked to the payments made by the Government of India to Bofors in 1986-87 against invoiced deliveries or as advances.

However, in the case of 'Lotus', 'Tulip' and 'Mont Blanc' coded payments which were made to the Picto-Moresco-Moineao front (over 80 million SEK), a greater level of secrecy is observed. Not only are the names and even account numbers of the recipients withheld, but special instructions are given to the banks concerned: 'If it is possible' do not write who the sender is'. Among the various documents published in *The Hindu* there is a remittance document relating to the code name 'Tulip'; the type of payment is coded '62', the banking code for commissions. The instruction at the bottom translated as: Attention: The sender should not be mentioned or the payment as per instructions given on telephone'.

Sir, the Hinduja's refuted their connections with Bofors, with Pitco. When the contents of the Martin Ardbo diary were published in the Press, when it was revealed that Mr. Martin Ardbo met Mr. Hinduja, he denied it. But there are authentic reports. A photostat copy of

the letter from Mr. Hinduja to Mr. Ardbo, dated 5th February, 1987, says, among other things:

"It was wonderful seeing you again here in London and I hope that before too long we shall have the pleasure of your company."

This proves that Mr. Hinduja had met Mr. Ardbo.

SHRI P. N. SÜKUL: What is the proof?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: In the diary, Mr. Ardbo says: I quote from the notes—

"My threat not from Iron... This is very important.

"Suggest later contact with G."

Who is this G? Last time, when I asked this question, Mr. Chidambaram who was sitting here jocularly said, he cut a joke with me, that 'G' means Gopalsamy. I was not a party to this. I ask this question again. The Martin Ardbo diary was disputed. Now, it has been proved that Mr. Hinduja had met Mr. Ardbo and Mr. Hans.

It has also been established that the Swiss authorities never refused to open the secret Bofors accounts for the Swedish Prosecutor, Mr. Lars Ringberg, who was investigating the suspected bribes paid out to Indians connected with the arms deal. The Swedish Prosecutor withdrew the application before the Swiss had reached any decision. This happened on February 8 this year. Two weeks earlier, Mr. Ringberg had formally announced the closure of his investigation. The reason he gave for his decision was that the Swiss authorities had refused to open the bank accounts, but he did not give any more information to the Swiss authorities. On the contrary, on 25th Mr. Ringberg closed the investigation. Mr. Ringberg, on more than one occasion, expressed his surprise over the fact that a professional inquiry comparable to his own had not been undertaken in India. These are the words of Mr. Ringberg. He also remarked on the fact that he had not been approached for relevant informa-

tion by the Indian authorities. Sir, the Swiss authorities are prepared to give assistance to Swedish Government as well as to the Indian Government.

Sir, the crucial question in this debate is, who are the real recipients, who are the real culprits who have deposited money in the Swiss Bank and how to find out the truth. Last year, when the hon. Prime Minister was holding the portfolio of Finance, when he replied to the debate, I did put a pertinent question and that is, will this Government request the Swiss Government to freeze the accounts as Madam Acquino made a request from Phillipines for which the Swiss authorities agreed and the accounts of Marcos and others were frozen? In reply to my question Mr. Rajiv Gandhi was pleased to state, "We will study what Madam Acquino did, whether Madam Acquino made the request, we will consider what has happened there." Now I would like to ask whether this Government is even now prepared to make a request to the Swiss authorities to freeze the accounts. This is my question. Will this Government request the Swiss Government to freeze the accounts of the Indian beneficiaries or recipients as was done in the case of Phillipines? Secondly, will this Government request the Swedish Prosecutor to make a fresh investigation based upon the published relevant materials in the Hindu, have a fresh probe? May I ask this Government to investigate Account No. 99921 TU of Svenska Incorporated in the Societe de Banque Suisse located at No. 2 Rue de La Confederation, CH—1211 Geneva? It is a specific demand, I will also refer to payments made to 'Lotus'. These were made into Societe de Banque, Suisse, 2 Rue de La Confederation, and a payment was made also on 22nd December, 1986 of SEK 2,550,879. These are the questions. If the Government is sincere and honest, will it try to find out the truth, will it ask the Swedish Government, Swedish Prosecutor to start a fresh investigation? Sir, when the top executive of the Bofors visited this country during the month of September last year, those officials gave the names of Pitco and other companies to the Defence Minister. At that time Mr. K. C. Pant-

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

was the Defence Minister and when I put this question to him, he was pleased to state, "Yes, yes, they gave lot of materials." This is very serious because Pitco was mentioned then and now secret accounts are there, commission money has been paid and whatever was stated by the hon. Prime Minister on the floor of the House has been proved wrong. He said that there was no commission, he said that there was no middleman. Whatever he has said on the floor of this House has been proved wrong. So, he should take the moral responsibility for misleading this House and also for misleading the people of India. The people of India cannot be taken for granted. This amount concerning Pitcos comes to the tune of Rs. 64 crores and the Prime Minister of this country comes to the Parliament and deliberately misleads and misguides the Members stating that there was no commission, no middleman, no payment. Whatever he has said has been proved wrong. He should take moral responsibility. Mr. Arun Singh has proved that he is true to his conscience, because he had said: "If we are guilty, hang us". Now he, felt that somebody was guilty. He felt that Bofors had committed a breach of faith. He might have realised that some one very close and dear to him might be guilty. He is true to his conscience. But at the same time he does not want to expose his that friend. Therefore, I understand that he has sent in his resignation.

DR. NAGEN SAIKIA (Assam): Sir, I associate myself with my friends on the Opposition benches who have spoken on this issue. The Bofors gun has made some irreparable holes in the credibility of the Government. Repeated denials by the Government that there were no middlemen, no Indians involved, no pay-offs, have been proved to be far from truth. The CBI has made it known that the existence of Indian middlemen and the payment of pay-offs are beyond suspicion. It has done great injury not only to the Government but to the image of the whole nation. Before the eyes of the world, our country is known to be a

country of corruption, a country of pay-offs and a country of kick-backs. Therefore the people of India are very much concerned about it.

As already stated by my friends, the documents published in *The Hindu* since April to June are there with all facts and figures before the people. It has now been proved that the Joint Parliamentary Committee which was constituted to go into the matter had worked like an agency of the Government to cover up all the misdeeds of the Bofors and its agents. The repeated demand of the Opposition to make a Member from the Opposition Chairman of the Joint Committee was turned down because the Government apprehended that if an Opposition Member was made the Chairman, many things under the carpet might be uncovered. Now the Government is trying to say that they would ask Bofors to refund Rs. 64 crores. What does it prove? It proves that what the hon. Prime Minister and the Defence Minister have stated in both the Houses that there were no middlemen, no Indians involved, there were no pay-offs—by these words they have misled the House. It proves that JPC was an attempt to cover up the hard truths. It proves that in the most sensitive and the most important deals like that of Bofors, with which the sovereignty and security of the country were associated, the most corrupt practices of taking bribes in the name of pay-offs and kick-backs and winding up charges are being adopted for the benefit of some individuals. In any other country, the Minister would have resigned on this. But in our country, not to speak of resigning, the Minister, including the Prime Minister himself, is very much vocal to prove their innocence. I want to know from the Government whether the Government would admit that it misled the House with wrong information. I also want to know whether the JPC would be reconstituted with an Opposition Member as Chairman of the Committee, whether the contract with Bofors would be reviewed, whether Bofors would be insisted upon to come out with the truth, whether the Swedish Government would be requested to give in-

formation and whether Win Chadha and Hindujas would also be taken to task. I urge upon the Government to come out with the truth in the greater interest of the country. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Shri Chitta Basu.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH (Maha-rashtra): It is now enough. It is already late.

.(Interruptions)...

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, as you might have observed, a case has been sought to be built up by Members opposite that there is no fresh evidence after the report of the JPC. It has also been argued that the JPC report is a holy cow. Also it has been suggested by the honourable Defence Minister that the holier cow would be the CBI. Sir, I am constrained to say that these are nothing but fresh attempts at a cover-up operation, hush-up operation. It would be to the benefit of the Members of the House to recapitulate the fresh documentary evidence which has been made available by the distinct service of *The Hindu*, a patriotic, nationalist, national newspaper of our country.

Sir, *The Hindu* documents have proved that Bofors did pay to its agents abroad in the howitzer deal, and these payments were nothing but unalloyed commission. And the so-called "winding-up charges", which has been the main theory on the basis of which the JPC report stands, has been shattered, reduced to a shambles and destroyed altogether.

Then, Sir, *The Hindu* report has made it abundantly clear that some Indians have acted as recipients or conduits for the payments. It demolishes the claim of the JPC and also of the Government. As you might have known, these commissions were worked out on a percentage basis of the total value of the deal. This is also a fresh revelation. Bofors' claim that it terminated payments in December 1986 is a false one and the payments as the revelation says, continued till 30th

March 1987. This again proves the net propensity of Bofors, and these agreements between Bofors and Anatronics and between Bofors and Svenska display a very striking similarity. This is a new revelation. Mr. Chadha's very close connection with Svenska has also been revealed. Svenska was paid Rs. 36 crores. It has been made clear that Mr. Chadha's services were not worth it. Mr. Chadha was perhaps a conduit. In that case, whom was the money meant for, if he was a conduit?

Apart from all these revelations of the Hindu, there are also other startling facts. Then there are also earlier revelations about Moresco, Pitco, the "Stern" magazine's disclosures and various other things. Due to want of time I don't want to mention them. Therefore, the claim, the argument that there is no fresh evidence which calls for further enquiry falls through. It does not hold water. It is altogether untenable. Therefore, the case remains, there should be a probe into these payments or kickbacks.

Now, Sir, I am very surprised and astonished to know or to learn, to hear the line of defence taken by the Minister of Defence. Sir, if you permit me to say, I have great esteem for him, but the line of argument that he has taken all this time is nothing but deceitful. Therefore, it does not carry conviction either with this House or billions of people outside. His argument leads me to conclude that the Government is still clinging to its earlier decision, a painful, hateful decision of carrying on the operation of cover-up and disinformations. All through the debate, all the time he has merely taken that line of defence which I have characterised as deceitful one.

Sir, I am further astonished to see that the Minister of Defence has shamelessly reproduced what has been said by Bofors. Enough proof I have got with me, by which it can be proved that it has been always practised, it has always been the habit of Bofors not to speak truth. If you allow me to use the word "lie", they have used lies. In spite of knowing it

[Shri Chitta Basu]

fully well, the hon. Minister cannot muster the courage to tell bluntly to Bofors that they are not telling the truth. He is not mustering that courage. It is a shameful performance of the Government of a big nation like India.

I am pained to say that this Government, Rajiv Gandhi's Government considers itself merely a servant and Bofors the master. The Government should be servant of the people. It should not become a servant of a company like Bofors. This pains me most, and, I think, Sir; this will pain you also.

Sir, I am astonished to find that some of the Members opposite have started questioning the authenticity of "THE HINDU" documents. But I have noticed and you have also noticed that the hon. Defence Minister has not challenged the authenticity of "THE HINDU" documents. If he does it today, it is up to him. But, as I have observed, as I have noticed, he has not yet himself denied or rather questioned the authenticity of "The Hindu" documents.

But naturally some of the Members had to do their job and they have done so. He is very silent. The very fact that he has not challenged, it leads to certain conclusion. The conclusion is that the Government have accepted that the Hinduja and Chadha are agents, they received payments. Therefore, he is keeping silent.

The Prime Minister made a comment that no politician has received any payment. Yes, Hinduja are not politicians; yes, Chadha is not a politician. But they received it. Therefore, the comment of the Prime Minister that no politician has received the money indirectly proves the correctness of the Hindu documents.

I would like to raise only one question. He is on record to say that if somebody asks the Minister and the Government the question as to why he has not approached the Government of Switzerland for identification of the real beneficiaries of the money he called it as an unpatriotic act. I am raising that question also, would he call me an unpatriotic person? If he wants, he may. I am also told that the Government did not approach the Govern-

ment of the United Kingdom to furnish all the information regarding the trading practices of the A.E. Services. Why did the Government remain silent on that?

Lastly I would like to say there is no doubt that the Government has been found guilty of suppression of truth. This Government has institutionalised corruption and this Government draws its sustenance from commissions, cut-moneys and kick-backs. If at all the Government is sincere to prove that they are not doing so, then the only way open to it is to institute another JPC to go into the fresh documentary evidence and find out the truth. So far as the CBI is concerned, as I have mentioned earlier, it is not a holy cow. It is nothing but an agency of the Government. It is nothing but a limb of the Government. So, any fact or any decision given by the CBI cannot be trusted. And if you want to build up your trust and if you were to renew your credibility, it is in your own interest that you agree with the proposal of having a second JPC. The JPC is the only Parliamentary institution and the Parliament alone can condone you. Therefore, I think good sense will prevail on them and they will accept the proposal of the second JPC.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: You call it by any name, rose will continue to give its fragrance to all. In this particular case it seems to be all the more apt. Today, the Members opposite were very keen on proving that it was all either termination money or cancellation money but not commission and when that is done they are satisfied. If it is termination or cancellation charge, termination for what? Cancellation of what? A new term for these agents first appeared in connection with Bofors deal, that is, consultants. All these companies are not known to have any knowledge in the field of arms manufacturing or arms dealings and other things. What was the object for the agreement with these companies or whatever they may be called?

The Swedish Audit Bureau without naming the company referred to three payments made by A.B. Bofors. They said that the names were made known to them on the guarantee that names won't be di-

vulged to the Government of India or any other agency. Now, the peculiar thing which the Government of India is doing in this matter from the very beginning, they have been dragging their feet. They are trying to say that the Government of India on its own initiative took up all investigations but the fact is completely the other way round. They need constant prodding either from Swedish Radio or from the Opposition or from the press to make them get information as lotus unfolds itself petal by petal. As you know, in this particular case the identity of lotus in the Swiss Bank is a great mystery and there has been no effort on the part of the Government of India to resolve the mystery. If the CBI is now called in question, it is because of this Government. CBI went on globe trotting to find out the addresses of certain companies made in connection with this contract and it came back with a nil report or rather say by plugging all the loopholes in finding the true identity of these companies. If today nobody feels secure with the enquiry on documents published by the "Hindu" in the hands of the CBI, the Government has to thank itself and no one else. Opposition is the watchdog of democracy and if any question arises regarding the manner in which the country is run, regarding the integrity of the ruling powers because of their diabolical role, they just cannot remain satisfied with the strange statement from the Prime Minister that "I and members of my family are not involved in any financial deal" or producing a certificate from this particular company that the Prime Minister of India has no connection with these things. This is something which the Opposition pointed out was derogatory to the office of the Prime Minister of an independent country that he would have to secure a certificate from a company which trades in weapons of destruction and which in its own country is blacklisted for trading with countries like South Africa and Iraq. This is a record which should not inflate the ego of the ruling party. It should take the issues raised in a proper spirit and try to explain as to what actually happened. The fact remains that Bofors company entered into certain deal with some company whose credentials are not known, whether they were paid

Rs. 64 crores, Rs. 170 crores or Rs. 340 crores. The question is even after the announcement by our Prime Minister and earlier decided by the Defence Ministry that no commission agent should be there in the defence deals, the agreement with Bofors was not abrogated, even after it came to be known that A.B. Bofors entered into this agreement, even after it was known that A.B. Bofors made certain payments, even after A.B. Bofors taking shelter behind the clause of confidentiality. A company's confidentiality is not the same as the Official Secrets Act of the Government and A.B. Bofors was allowed to go scot-free with all these things. Naturally, it raises the suspicion as to what was behind the temerity of the Government of India in relation to A.B. Bofors. Why they are not prepared to just chuck out the agreement? It has been admitted, as the press report goes, by an hon. Member of Indian cabinet, Shri P. Shiv Shanker, to be precise, that India has the wherewithal to manufacture such gun. Again, A. B. Bofors was not the only company which was able to supply these guns. Then, why such soft pedalling with A.B. Bofors? It is something fishy.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Please conclude now.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: It is not a question of affecting the morale of our defence forces. It is not the defence forces who are responsible for the deal. It is the political leadership of the country, who are responsible for this deal and it is under their inspiration that when in the Lok Sabha, the adjournment motion on Bofors was disallowed and on the occasion, when the report was submitted, Doordarshan displayed the functioning of the Bofors gun, how it functions in different areas. I had no occasion to see such a display in connection with a debate in the House but for this. This commissioning of the T.V. which is supposed to serve a particular purpose of the ruling party is a further addition to the minus points of the Doordarshan which is another institution that is further being denigrated by the Government itself. Therefore, I appeal let the Government pay heed to the suggestion of the Opposition that another Parliamentary Committee be formed. If they

[Prof. Sourendra Bhattacharjee]

want to save their faces, in view of the fresh facts available in this connection, a Joint Parliamentary Committee should be formed with a Member from the Opposition as the Chairman, as was proposed earlier by the Opposition. It is not that there is a lack of faith from this side of the House in the Members of that side. But appearances are also important. Therefore, a Chairman from the Opposition, if it vindicates the position of the Government, that will stand on a far more solid ground. Taking that factor into account, I request them to agree to this proposal.

With these words, I thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, for giving me this opportunity.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): The discussion is concluded and the Minister will reply later on. Now, the House stands adjourned and will meet again tomorrow, the 4th August, 1988 at 11 A. M.

The House then adjourned at seventeen minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 4th August 1988.