

I do not know whether Mr. Rajiv Gandhi will follow his father's footsteps or he will choose his mother's footsteps. But I would expect Mr. Arun Singh to accept my proposal, this small suggestion of mine, and agree to set up a Parliamentary Committee. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhandare. You can start and then we will adjourn for lunch.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE (Maharashtra): Mr. Chairman, I am a little sad when I rise to speak because I felt there were far more important questions which could be discussed, like the killings in Punjab, the agitation over Babri Masjid...

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: We have been debating. (Interruptions)

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: Sir, may I continue afterwards? They are not allowing me to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House is now adjourned for lunch and we will meet again at 2.30 p.m.

The House then adjourned for lunch at thirty minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-three minutes past two of the clock. Mr. Chairman in the Chair.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

II. Regarding the incident of fire which damaged some of the units of the Directorate of Extension under the Ministry of Agriculture and a shed belonging to the Food Corporation of India on the 19th April, 1987, Pusa Complex, New Delhi.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI G. S. DHILLON) Sir, A fire broke out on 19-4-1987 at about 9.20 A.M. which damaged some of the units of the Directorate of Extension and a shed of the Food Corporation of India. The cause of the fire is being investigated and the extent of the damage is being assessed. Preliminary assessment indicates that the damage to property, other than the civil structures, maybe about Rs. 50.00 lakhs in the case of the units of the Directorate of Extension and about Rs. 1.36 lakhs in the case of Food Corporation of India. No injury or loss of life has been reported.

Senior officers from both the departments have visited the site of the fire.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION ON PURCHASE OF GUNS FROM BOFORS OF SWEDEN — Contd.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: Thank you, Sir. As I was just mentioning before the recess, there are very very more important questions and yet when I find that the opposition is insisting on raising this question into the merits of which I will go a little later, I tried to ask myself what is the reason for this. I look at the coincidences but I fail to be convinced that these are mere coincidences starting from Fairfax. Admittedly, it was the result of a fight between two industrial houses, a dog-eat-dog fight, which engulfed, unfortunately because of throwing in of a towel by a press baron, all the democratic institutions in our country. It engulfed the press, it engulfed the Government and it also engulfed the Members of Parliament and I had occasion to say that we must put a stop to this sort of our participation in private feuds.

[Shri Murlidhar Chandra Kant Bhandare]

Then came the submarine deal which we discussed yesterday. And I cannot imagine anything which was more without substance than what was discussed yesterday. I am really amazed that when the Opposition has nothing to say, when they fail to convince, the only thing they can do is to stage a walk-out. I have looked in vain into the reports today appearing in the newspapers as well as in the reports here to find something of substance and I find that the only banner headline is that the Opposition staged a walk-out. And when I asked, why is it that they are doing it, I am reminded of what I myself said in this House on 21st November, 1983. (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: You ignore all interruptions. And don't record any interruptions.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRA-KANT BHANDARE: I am reminded of what I myself said in a debate which took place in this House on a discussion on defections. The Moily tapes were the hot topic of the day and I beg your permission to read what I said: 'I am convinced that these tapes are fabricated, that these tapes are doctored'. And I ended by saying: what is the motive and what should be done? And I said: "Let us not pollute our atmosphere with things which are nothing but a political stunt to save a weak and tottering government which has got only 62 of the seats as against 81 of the Congress". Well, the political stunt paid. The Moily tapes were the Waterloo for the Congress (I) Party in the Assembly elections. The same game is being played now because occasionally the political stunts do play some role in the fortunes of the country and the parties. I have here Justice Desai's Commission of Inquiry Report on Moily tapes saying exactly what I said about the tapes on 21st of November,

1983. Because when you look at it, you must look at the motive. Why are they raising it? And this is really the motive — Fairfax, the submarine deal and Bofors. I will not be surprised and I am foreshadowing it. I do not want this House to be engulfed on such unsubstantiated charges, on such vague accusations, on such slender evidence to waste either the time of the House or to take the people of this country for a ride. It was Dr. Geobbelts who said that a falsehood, if repeated ten times, becomes truth. This is precisely what the Members of the Opposition are trying to do. But I am sure they will neither succeed in this House nor with the people of this country.

Then I come to the most important aspect of the issue. I must confess Sir, that I was considerably agitated when I read that these very 155mm guns which were acquired from Bofors were tried during the "Operation Brasstack" in Rajasthan and they failed. I felt so uneasy. I had a sleepless night on that day and I was wondering whether we could be taken for a ride like that. In a debate of this nature, there are only two things which are relevant. The first thing is, whether we get the quality which we purchase. Because, if we do not get the quality we are sending our jawans, our officers in uniform, to sure death in the battle they are going to fight, and this is, by all accounts, uncondonable, unpardonable. To my great surprise I find that not one Member — and there are very very responsible Members—have made a reference to the inferior quality of these weapons. That itself speaks a lot for the honesty, integrity and efficiency of our Government.

Now I come to what is to be probed into. I will come to the Parliamentary probe later, but what is to be probed into? You have a Swedish Radio report which is denied (a) by the Indian Government (b) by the

Swedish Government and, last but not the least, even by Bofors. Now, if all parties who had a say or a hand in the deal were themselves to deny it, I just fail to understand what case is left for making any probe at all. Therefore, what concerns me today as a democrat, as a citizen of this country, as a Member of Parliament who has an undying faith in this institution of Parliament is, Mr. Chairman, Sir, should we not have some norms, some guidelines prescribed for initiating a committee for a probe into a matter? Could we say, there is a rumour in the bazaar and we will set up a committee here? Could we say that there is a news item like the Brasstacks here — which is denied the very next day — and we will set up a committee? I think, as very, very important and responsible. Members of this august House, it is our duty not to rush in — and I will tell you why. I say that, in a minute. Because, if we are to rush merely on rumours, if we are to rush in merely on press reports which are subsequently denied or radio reports which are subsequently denied, then we are acting on non-existing material. After all, when a committee meets it means waste of public time and public money, and I did expect my very senior and very, very esteemed colleagues in the Opposition to at least pinpoint what was the basic material on which a probe could be conducted by the committee which they intend to appoint at the end of this debate. I entirely agree with the honourable Member, Mr. Gurupadaswamy, that things are becoming very, very intriguing; they are becoming very, very confusing. Why? Because the report was made on the 16th of April over the Swedish Radio. Today we are on the 21st of April here in Delhi. The other day, the gentleman, if I spell his name correctly...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don't bother about his name.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRA-KANT BHANDARE: I am sorry, I

won't refer to his name. This gentleman who is supposed to be the correspondent of the Swedish Radio, is here in Delhi, and he is threatening to make more and more disclosures. But why is he not lessening our task, why is he not lessening the burden of the Opposition, by just making those revelations? This is really very intriguing, this is very confusing and this is making things "curiouser and curiouser." We have the denial of the Swedish Government, the Indian Government and the Swedish firm of Bofors but there is no disclosure coming from this source. But what is more important is what I read here. The gentleman says that he would be meeting top Opposition leaders to get their views on Bofors payment. Now I want to know as to how many of the top leaders of the Opposition who are sitting on the front Benches here he has met, what he has told them and what he has not told them, to what extent he has fulfilled their expectations or to what extent he has disappointed them. Why not take the House into confidence? It is my charge against the Members of the Opposition that you are concealing things. You know that the truth is in favour of the Government, but you are playing a political stunt. I am within my parliamentary privilege.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Is it within his rights?

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRA-KANT BHANDARE: The gentleman has met you, the gentleman has told you that he has nothing to say.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: He is wrong. (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing will go on record. I have to decide. All of you, please sit down.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA (Andhra Pradesh):*

*Not recorded.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No innuendo.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: No innuendo.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no innuendo. I will protect all of you. No innuendo, nothing. You are debating some very hard facts.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: I am sorry.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: You said we should not believe in newspapers but you are believing them.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: Sir, what I was saying, let me get back to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Nirmal Chatterjee is saying that you said that they should not believe newspapers but that you were believing newspapers. This is what he says.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: No, no. What I said is that when they contradict themselves, they should not be believed. When they are motivated, when one of the press barons had a personal interest...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I only explained you what he said to show that it is another argument.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: I do not proclaim. But I am also a champion of all kinds of liberty including the freedom of the press. We want a strong press because without a strong press we cannot have strong democracy in this country. We are not afraid. We welcome. In fact, I may tell you, Sir, I am one of those who like to read something against themselves.

The best point which could be made after the 16th when the broadcast came till today was the revelation of the names. Here are the names,

and here is this. But nothing is revealed that really should end the debate, the discussion here.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: That is reserved for tomorrow's discussion.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: The most important point which I want to insist on as a parliamentarian responsible to this House, as someone who immensely loves this House, is that we will not appoint a committee, nor will we even make a demand for appointment of a committee if it is merely going into what is called a fishing or a roving enquiry. I do not want to say. But there is a very nice book which I read in 1960, called "The Trial by Tribunal." It has got a whole chapter on how the parliamentary committee in U.K. performed till 1911 since when they have been abandoned. But the system has failed there. I looked with considerable patience to find out what the circumstances were, what the precedents were, what the previous occasions were when a parliamentary committee was appointed, and I found that there was none. I found that for the Mundra Deal there was no parliamentary committee appointed. Only one parliamentary committee was appointed by the provisional Parliament to investigate into the personal conduct of a Member who was guilty of misdeemeanour and misconduct. I have got all those things here. The Kuo Oil Deal was investigated by the COPIL. The Jeep Scandal was investigated into by the Public Accounts Committee. The Tul Mohan Rao case was investigated by the CBI. The Jayanti Shipping Co. was not investigated by a committee. If there is any reason why we have not done so in the past, there must be good reasons that the system does not work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One more minute.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: I must point out at this stage, unfortunately the Resolution which was accepted by this august House on the 10th of August, 1978 was for appointment of a parliamentary committee to go into the allegations of corruption against the family members of two of the past, previous Prime Ministers of the country, and it was the Janata Government which did not appoint a committee. You never felt any qualms at that time despite the fact that the House had passed that Resolution. It is, therefore, when I read it in the press, I feel it is motivated. It is, therefore, when I read from the speeches of the Members from the Opposition who speak with two voices, with such hypocrisy that I sometimes feel that I am listening to devils quoting the scriptures.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: But it was allowed at that time, not this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: One or two minutes more.

The next point is that howsoever I may look there are no facts at all. If I may give the illustration of an inquiry and an investigation and a trial, there is not even material for an FIR, what is called the First Information Report, on which some investigation can be started. If I were to go and register these facts with any police authority, they would not even act on it because there is no ground whatsoever. No names are given, no amounts are disclosed. Nothing is given. Everything is in thin air. Tomorrow I can issue a statement saying I find so many people have taken this. Then you can start anything you like. I think this is not the case. Mere rumours have no place in starting an inquiry.

There is one more point which I want to insist on viz. procedures. Checks and balances in our country are both the strength and weaknesses of our system. They give a strength because when, particularly the foreign countries come and deal with us, they know that nothing can be done outside the framework of those rules. They have been so brilliantly and aptly described yesterday and explained by the hon. Minister of State for Defence that I need not repeat them. But they are meant to eliminate corruption. We have in our country Article 14, right to equality, where, if a man, who deserved a contract is not given a contract, he can go to the court of law, whether he is a citizen of this country or not, and say that he was not given that contract because of an unfair discrimination.

Then there is a question of the Swiss banks—Lotus, this and that. I can give any name. I can say tomorrow well the name is 'Lamp'. I do not say that, but who prevents you from giving any name? If 'Lamp' is a myth, are you sure that the Lotus is not a mirage? Therefore, the point which I am making is that those who are thinking that if the parliamentary team were to land in Switzerland, or in Zurich, which is the main banking centre or in Geneva, they would get anything, they are mistaken. I will tell you that hundreds and thousands of Jews went to gas chamber in Germany. They had their funds locked up in Swiss banks under what are called 'numbered accounts'. A joint representation was made by all the countries, including USA, UK, France Germany and other countries requesting the Swiss Government that they would trace the rightful heirs and the money which is held in that account should be given over to them. And the Swiss Bank and the Swiss Government refused. The money still lies locked up and probably by now is preserved in a computer in Switzerland.

[Shri Murlidhar Chandrakant Bhandare]

land. So, please do not make arguments for the sake of making arguments. Be conscious of the realities of the situation and do not think that even if we were to send a team of our officers, we would get anything out of the Swiss banks. If that be so, even the mighty Government of USA could not get anything out of the mafia accounts.

Now, I would come to the more substantial thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why don't you reserve more substantial thing to the last? Your time is up.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: I am finishing Sir. Only two minues.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: We had a debate, an intensive debate, for three days in November on 8th, 10th and 14th on security environment. Everybody here and I said this is an issue which cuts across all the parties. And I have got the debates here. Everybody said yes there is a threat which was never before there to the security environment of our country. Everybody talked about destabilisation and it is only when people say that this is a coincidence which I am not prepared as a logical man to accept as a coincidence because this coincidence is far too strange to be accepted, it shows a certain pre-conceived plan and I find that if those arguments hold true today what we say about security environment I do not want to name the countries, it is easy for one man to name one country—that security threat is from all the parts, not one part or the other.

Sir, I would only say that we have a proud record. We have been elected on the promise of a clean Government. We have fulfilled our promise. We have done what was not done ever before. The action which we have taken against black-marketers, action against the FERA violators, action against all those who indulged in economic offences, is far too well-known for me to recall and I do not think that any one individual is responsible for that. The credit must go to the Government and credit must go to the head of the Government, that is, our Prime Minister. There is only one thing which I want to say, I understand that this is an effort to soil his image. But this effort which is based on rumour, this effort which is based on falsehood this effort which is based on innuendous, this effort cannot succeed. The people of this country are far too sagacious to understand that this Government which has reduced the price in the Bofors deal by Rs. 500 crores which is an admitted fact cannot be guilty to any such thing. But there is no ready remedy against dis-information. Sir, today it is very difficult to come by a national symbol. Fortunately our party and Prime Minister are a national symbol of unity, a national symbol of integrity, a national symbol of progress of our country, a national symbol of peace for our country and for the rest of the world which we have been able to achieve and I am in excellent company because I want to end by what has been written by one of the most eminent journalists in the country today and this is what he says and with that quotation I will end. "Despite all that has happened in the last two decades there is no alternative to the Congress if we wish to preserve any kind of central authority under a democratic system. And there is no alternative right now to Mr. Rajiv Gandhi in the Congress. We the Congress (I) and this country, that is, Bharath will preserve

this national symbol of unity, integrity, peace and progress."

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, we have a dictum which you very well understand, Sir, Satyam Vada Dharmam Chara, speak the truth, practise the path of righteousness. By a slight change of emphasis, Sir, you can call Satyam Vada Dharmam Chara, kill the truth and imprison the righteousness. That is exactly what happened in the Minister's statement, Sir, which I would like to elaborate a little later, Sir, as we all know, when the Fairfax issue exploded, when the defence deal was exposed, the Government, maybe reluctantly, came forward to order enquiries or continue enquiries. While ordering a judicial enquiry in Parliament, the Prime Minister himself said "in spite of all the clarifications given, doubts still persist

3.00 P.M.

controverted still linger on. Therefore, to clear all these doubts, I have decided to order a judicial inquiry". Similarly, on the submarine deal also, though it was ordered by the erstwhile Defence Minister, the Government has announced that it would be continued and whosoever is responsible, the truth will be brought out.

But, Sir, in this case, from the date it was announced by the State Radio of Sweden, we only find nervousness and panic in the ruling party. Sir, we have seen 106 great men being flown from all over the country to Delhi for a sudden, urgent conclave to express solidarity with the leader and to castigate the so-called forces of destabilization and the "conspirator". Sir, why this nervousness only in this case and why this hesitation only in this case to order an inquiry and why only in this case, the question of destabilization, the question of foreign forces, foreign elements, all these extraneous considerations

are being brought into this and parties have been accused. One young leader of the ruling party yesterday held a press conference and even identified my party as one of the parties of the right reaction along with two other parties of course. A ruling party, which day in and day out is giving concessions to the monopolists and the multi-nationals, which is amassing hundreds of crores of rupees through shady deals speaks about socialism and for the poor and you call a party which is working for the poor as a right reactionary party! It is a shame and I do not want to go into that and divert myself from the subject. But it is unfortunate that the young leader characterised my party like this. I strongly repudiate that and condemn that.

What is the provocation for all this? What have we done? What the Opposition has done? Yesterday, the Prime Minister taunted us that we have not done our home work. Sure, in this case, we have not done. We are not taking the credit. I must confess. If for all these exposures, somebody has to take the credit, the order of priority should come to the press, to Mr. V. P. Singh, to the persons outside the country and lastly we come because we are raising these issues in the Parliament and pressing for a full discussion and details to be placed before the Parliament. We are not taking credit for anything else. We have not brought out any new facts. We are not James Bond to unearth secrets. You are taunting us that we have not been able to produce evidence. What evidence? On the one hand, you refuse to associate us with any inquiry and on the other, you want us to produce evidence in support of our allegations! This is a funny thing. Sir, it is like this. If a conscientious citizen finds a dacoity being committed somewhere and some constables and a head constable are also participating in the loot and he comes to the thana and reports and the Thana officer says,

[Shri Murlidhar Chandrakant Bhandare]

"give me the number of the head constable and the numbers of the constables and the names of all the fellows involved in the loot and the list of the items being looted, give me all these evidences, then only, I will take action". Is it expected from a citizen who has given the first information report? It is just like a FIR. You are there to investigate. What for this Government is there? What for the Government machinery is there? What for the intelligence agencies are there? What for your embassies are there? Why are you maintaining such a big outfit? And you ask us to produce evidence I take serious exception to the last sentence of the Minister's statement where he says:

"If any evidence is produced involving violations of the law, the matter will be thoroughly investigated and the guilty, whoever they may be, punished."

—"If any evidence is produced..."—
Who will produce? All the information is with you. There is a charge against you and it is for you to investigate and clear yourself. If you are honest, if you are sincere, if you care for the country's interests and your prestige, it is for you to investigate and clear yourself, not for us to produce, not for newspapers to produce evidence. It is unfortunate that you are depending upon radios and newspapers. The moment you got a tip-off, why did you not take information and investigate? Today there is enough information for you. In this gun deal one of the people in Sweden gave out a date—November 13, 1986—on which date three payments were made, three transfers were made, by the Scandiviska Enskilda Banken in favour of somebody in Switzerland, that is, in the Suisse Banking Corporation, Geneva, in an unidentified account. Three payments were transferred: one 8.4 million kroners; the second 8.4 million kroners and the third 12.9 million kroners. The

three transfers were made on a single day November 13, 1986. On December 22, 1986, 2.5 million kroners were again transferred, totalling more than 32 million kroners. This is the information you got from some source—may be authentic, may not be authentic. But did you ever try to find out from the Swedish Government or Swedish sources or from our embassy, how far it is correct, whether such transfers have been made, because the banking laws in Sweden are not so strict as in Switzerland? At least if you got such confirmation in Sweden, half of your confirmation is there. You may not get similar confirmation from Switzerland, but at least you could have got confirmation from Sweden. If it had been an announcement by Radio Pakistan or some other country hostile to us or some other country who you think is trying to destabilise you, some radio of that country had broadcast this, we could understand that there was a sinister design behind this. What has Sweden got against us? It is the friendliest country with whom we have got the best of relations. It is a deal which was negotiated between two Prime Ministers; even the present Swedish Prime Minister was involved in that after the death of the previous Swedish Prime Minister. He also knows the deal. You could have requested him saying "we have got this information, please check it and let us know whether these transfers have been made". Has it been done? If not, why has it not been done? And you ask for evidence from us! Who should produce evidence if you are failing in your duty?

The second evidence is, some firms are there, some agents are there. The existence of agents is not being denied. The Minister himself said in his statement that Bofors had admitted that "they did not employ any representative or agent in India for the project; however, for administrative services, e.g. hotel bookings, transportation, forwarding of letters, telexes,

etc., they use the services of a local firm". Now, what is that 'etc.'? "Etc." includes so many things. Will anybody admit that the firm is being used for giving kick-backs and for influencing politicians and bureaucrats in the country? Will they write on paper? Everybody will say, that is an agency they are using for administrative purposes. But what did you find from that firm? Did you ask them, did they ever meet the Indian politicians or bureaucrats? How many times did they go to the Defence Ministry, how many politicians they met, what is the agent's connection with a retired Air Marshal who was employed in the Cabinet Secretariat? Is he related to somebody higher up in the Finance Ministry, a bureaucrat in that Ministry? Did you check up? Don't you know that there is a firm in London with which are connected very highly placed Indians close to this ruling class, the ruling family, and who are associated as executive directors, as senior consultants, for firms like IMS, a London firm, and who also try to influence the Government of India or Defence deals. Then why do you deny this and say that agents did not exist? The agents are there. Did you ever keep a watch on them? This is not the first time that they have operated in this country. You banned them as far back as in 1980. Mr. Chairman, Sir, you were the Defence Minister and you yourself banned their entry. If they are still operating, why did you allow them to operate? What is the nature of their activities? So, this is the matter which you should have inquired into. Why did you not inquire into these things? Is it not sufficient information and evidence? Why did you not pick up these things?

Here also, Sir in the Minister's statement there is a sentence that "any violation of this policy, any breach of this policy, by anyone will be severely dealt with". Now, Sir, the Company has itself admitted that it has employed an agent here. If he

is employed by a firm, for any purpose, whatever be the ostensible purpose, it is a breach of contract and why did you allow that breach of contract to go unpunished and unnoticed? Why did you not take any action against the firm for that breach of contract, for appointing an agent in spite of giving a concrete understanding that it will not appoint any agent?

Then, Sir, there is another question also. When Mr. Marcos fell, the Philippine Government requested the Swiss Government to freeze all the accounts of Mr. Barcos in the Swiss banks and it was done. Why is this Government hesitating to make a similar request to the Swiss Government to freeze all the accounts relating to the unaccounted and hidden money of the Indians in the Swiss banks? Make an effort at least to show your sincerity. Whether you are successful or not is not the concern. Did you ever make a request to the Swiss Government to freeze all the accounts held by the Indians there and, if not, why not? What is your reply? Why has it not been done? What is your response?

Sir, now I come to the question of Defence spending and I come to the fundamental question of policy. Sir, in this year's Budget, an amount of about Rs. 12,500 crores has been allotted for Defence. I do not grudge that. If I talk more about it or if I say something more about it, I know that there will be objections. Even the Prime Minister himself has said that anybody talking against this is anti-national and unpatriotic and I do not want to risk that charge. But there should be somebody to oversee what is happening to these thousands of crores of rupees. You cannot keep it away from the purview of the highest forum of the land, that is, this Parliament. The Prime Minister has said that the Public Accounts Committee is there to look into these things. He is completely wrong. You yourself know, Sir—you were the

[Shri Murlidhar Chandra Kant Bhandare]

Finance Minister—that the Public Accounts Committee *suo motu* cannot go into any deals and any expenditure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You should not drag the Chair in anything that you say.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPEN-DRA: I am saying only harmless things. It is only some harmless things that I have said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No reference to the Chair, either good or bad.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPEN-DRA: All right, Sir. I will amend it and I will say, "Any Finance Minister knows".

Now, Sir, the Public Accounts Committee can make an inquiry or take note of any deal only when the Comptroller and Auditor-General makes an adverse comment and the Comptroller and Auditor-General gives his comments nearly on 800 to 900 subjects every year concerning the entire working of the Government of India, of all the Departments, and out of that Defence may be having a few items. Out of these, again, the PAC is supposed to take up one or two or three or four or five items only and all the rest of the dealings are away from the purview of any committee or any scrutiny. Therefore, anybody can fiddle with that, and anybody can play with this money and do whatever he wants. And that has been happening. Today this is not the first time that these deals have been entered into. They are perhaps not very much experienced in entering into these deals. Probably Mr. V. P. Singh was over-enthusiastic in bringing something out. Otherwise these things have been happening for the last several years.

SHRI ARUN SINGH: Sir, I may be permitted to correct a factually incorrect statement. I believe a reference was made to a company called IMS in the UK. I think I am right. I may say that it is a UK Government

company. It has nothing to do with any private individuals.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPEN-DRA: On their behalf who is working? That is the question I raised.

Sir, there is a complete mystery about these defence purchases only in this country. Everybody knows abroad as our friends have rightly pointed out. Our enemies know what we are buying. The suppliers know what we are buying. Everything is published in the journals when we buy something. But only the Parliament is kept in the dark. The Consultative Committee is kept in the dark. Nobody knows in this country. They presume that nobody knows in this country and abroad. Why such veil of secrecy, Sir? And particularly this is done with a motive because here is the opportunity for the ruling party to corner funds and, therefore, they do not want anybody to enter this field. And Mr. L. K. Jha in the morning gave a very strange argument. He says that a Parliamentary Committee cannot be objective: it functions with prejudices on party lines. Sir, it is a very unfortunate argument coming from such a senior Member. There is the Public Accounts Committee, there is the Public Undertakings Committee, and there is the Estimates Committee. In all these committees our experience has been that the members function without any party loyalties there, in the national interest.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): He never said that it would function on party lines.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPEN-DRA: You kindly see. He said that they carry on their prejudices on party lines. It is not a fact. Can't you trust a few parliamentarians in these matters? You can trust bureaucrats. You can trust so many people abroad. You can trust your Embassy people. You can trust your suppliers.

But only when it comes to parliamentarians, you disbelieve them, and you think that they cannot keep these secrets. If the committee is unwieldy still you can appoint a small committee of MPs—10 people or a dozen people from various parties. You can keep the majority Members from your party. But why can't you appoint a standing committee for overseeing defence purchases—to scrutinize, to oversee? We are not asking them to finalise the deals. Like the PAC it can supervise these things. Why can't you do it? Why don't you agree to such arrangement? And if they are not agreeing, there is some motive behind that.

Then, Sir, lastly, I will conclude by saying that it is not a question of party affair or of ourselves trying to take advantage of the situation. When this controversy dies down, if at all it dies down, if you look back, what will you find? The image of the country in shambles, the prestige of the highest office of Prime Minister in shambles and the Government's credibility in shambles. Do you want that? And when we are suggesting a parliamentary committee to go into these deals, it is a very reasonable request. Why is the Government adamant in refusing that? We are not asking for anything else. We also want to help you to find out the truth. Why are you hesitating to agree to such a request? That itself shows that your hands are not clean, your minds are not open and you are guilty. Thank you.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA (Himachal Pradesh): Sir, it is with deep anguish that I rise to participate in the discussion on a matter, which will apparently help the calculated campaign on the part of certain forces of destabilisation which are out to destabilise our system and to subvert our democratic institutions. A lot of valuable time of this august House—and in fact of both the

Houses—which could have been well utilised, for purposeful deliberations, which could have been used to discuss the real threats being faced by the nation, is being used to debate a non-issue. It is being used to embarrass the Government in furtherance of a well-conceived conspiracy and valification campaign. It is indeed unfortunate that our friends in the opposition, whom I cannot call naive or gullible, are consciously and willingly walking into the trap of those forces which are upset because of India's strength, because of India's prestige in the world, because of India's independent foreign policy and the esteem in which the nation's leader, Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, is held all over the world.

Sir, the nation's attention is being distracted deliberately from the real issues and the real threats. This is the *modus operandi* of the forces of destabilisation? If the nation is alert if the nation is conscious and is in a position to take immediate steps, they know that the conspiracy cannot succeed. There is a diabolic conspiracy of the forces of neo-imperialism, fundamentalism and right direction to destabilise the system. Our friends in the opposition have themselves referred to it. They say that they have raised it on various occasions. But when we point it out and when we point it towards the evil nexus, they dispute it. What could be the motive? The forces of destabilisation have been raising their ugly head time and again. This is not the first time that this nation has become a victim of this conspiracy. If we look back, ever since our Independence, there have been constant attempts to weaken our country and to destabilise our country. During the period of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and during

[Shri Anand Sharma]

the Prime Ministership of Shrimati Indira Gandhi has forces of right reaction and the forces of subversion did launch those undemocratic and violent agitations. They tried to create a situation in which the nation could be plunged into chaos and anarchy. That is exactly what is happening today. There was a time when this Government, the Congress Government and our late Prime Minister pointed out towards those attempts. She cautioned the nation. But our friends in the opposition said: "No, there is no conspiracy to destabilise this country." But the subsequent tragic events proved that they were wrong. They were proved wrong at what cost? This nation had to pay that cost.

Sir, those who are against this country know what should be done to confuse the people and to destabilise the country. I may point out that there have been some developments in the recent past. There has been the pumping in of sophisticated weapons right across the border. Weapons are being accumulated. Tension is increasing in the Indian Ocean. Nuclear presence of imperialist powers is on the rise. Nuclear bases are being expanded in our vicinity. Organised terrorism has been introduced in this country. They are being armed to commit acts of terrorism. There is a perceptible spurt in communal violence and there is a campaign of vilification to malign this Government. I do not treat these to be isolated developments or more coincidence. They are a part of this conspiracy and we must be aware of that. Sir, those who are behind it, they know that it is the Congress Government which is the symbol of India's unity, strength and independent foreign policy. They know that Rajiv Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India,

is the standard-bearer for this nation. He is the symbol of strength. They know that as long as that symbol remains, as long as the Congress Government remains, it will be impossible for such forces to destabilise the country. They are aware of that fact and also conscious that the Prime Minister of India enjoys the support, the confidence of the Indian masses, they are aware of the fact that his Government is pursuing those policies which are aimed at eradicating corruption, his Government has taken those initiatives which have proved the credentials of that Government to ensure a clean, healthy public life. Sir, this is a deliberate move to malign the Government through insinuations, through innuendoes, through statements made at different forums. Sir, it is not the Bofors gun purchase which we are discussing. In fact, now the discussion is about this conspiracy. And I wish the friends in the Opposition open their eyes. Instead of believing rumours, if they could believe reality which they are over-looking, it would have been very good for the country.

Sir, the hon. Minister has today given the details of the purchase of the artillery system. I need not go into the details, the justification of the purchase for the defence requirement. These are technical and defence matters. But certainly the technical viability was considered by the concerned Defence officials who are involved. They certify the technical availability of the weapons. As the Minister has said, the price is negotiated by a Committee which in this case comprised of very serious civil servants — four or five Secretaries to the Government of India — and also very senior, high-ranking Defence officials. Now, what is being done? On the one hand an attempt to unravel the Defence secrets of the country and on the other to malign all of them, all of those who have been involved, to cast asper-

sion on their integrity. On what basis? Sir, it has been categorically stated by the Government after this statement appeared that the Government of India, as a matter of policy, has done away with middlemen as far as Defence purchases are concerned. The Government of India has denied even the remote possibility of any such kickback or anything taking place. The Government of Sweden has denied it. The Ambassador of Sweden has denied it. Their Assistant Trade Secretary who was involved in the negotiations has denied it. All those who are involved, they have denied it. And what our friends on the other side are believing? One journalist whom I accuse is managed by the forces of imperialism and destabilisation writes something and they all believe it, and the Government of India is not to be believed. I do not blame them. We all know that it is a motivated, malicious campaign. You will not believe. But my friend, Mr. Upendra, just now mentioned that the Government of Sweden is a very friendly Government. Why do you disbelieve then the statement of the Government of Sweden, why do you disbelieve the statement of their Ambassador? I am not talking of any other statements. Sir, one Hong Kong-based journalist — in fact, Sir, the timing has to be seen—according to my information, applies for an Indian visa in November and comes to India now. From New Delhi he sends a story to Stockholm which is broadcast there, and it comes back to us. And our friends immediately jump at it, demanding an inquiry instead of checking the authenticity of that statement. Sir, it is a very unfortunate situation a very irresponsible act and that betrays the real motive. Sir, an hon. Member today, in the morning, even went to the extent of giving code names and the name of the bank. Sir, this is like fiction. Somebody says 'Lotus'. Tomorrow won't be surprised if somebody says 'Rose', or somebody says 'peacock,

and we will run around in circles to have an inquiry. What is the purpose of an inquiry. Any inquiry for that matter? There has to be some specific accusation? There has to be charge which is substantiated by incontrovertible evidence. But, Sir, in this case there is no accusation, there is no charge. There is only a vague allegation, a motivated allegation managed by the forces of destabilisation. what we try to do, let us have an inquiry. Inquiry in vacuum is unheard of inquiry on what? Sir, today there have been references in the evidence who has to provide the evidence. The friends on the other side have repeatedly said it is for the Government to provide evidence. Sir, now this is a very strange situation. One person makes an allegation. Government asks for the details—he says no. Government is asking for any specific nature of charges—he says no. What does it show and what do they want? They want to destabilise the country, they want to distract the nation's attention. This is all that they want. For weeks and weeks and months and months this is all that they have been doing.

Sir, even under the principles of natural justice the burden of proof is on the accuser. The onus of proof cannot be shifted. If you have the evidence come out with it. Otherwise, please do not walk into a trap or do not become a party to this conspiracy to destabilise the country, to malign the Government. There is no case for an inquiry. And Sir, if I may say after the categorical statement of the Prime Minister, whose clean image has upset these forces, whom are they trying to malign through these insinuations? After his categorical statement that the Government shall not spare anybody involved in corruption howsoever high the person may be, is there any scope for any further debate or discussion? But if they persist

and as they were hinting they will walk out, what does it mean? They want to dramatise, they want to sensationalise, they want to mislead the nation. It does not augur well for our democratic system. The institutions are being destroyed. The credibility of the political leadership is being destroyed. This is subversion.

MR. CHAIRMAN; In three more minutes you must conclude.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, I will conclude in one minute. In view of this situation the developments on our sub-continent declare conspiracy to destabilise this country. what has been objected to by the friends on the other side repeatedly referring to a resolution of the Congress Working Committee. The Congress has a commitment to this nation. The Congress is committed to preserve the unity and integrity of this country. It is for the Congress which has the mandate or the people and which has the leadership of our Prime Minister to defeat the evil designs of this conspiracy of the nation's enemies. Why should not the Congress Government do that? I would not like to go into the details about it. But this nation shall not tolerate any attempt to weaken and destabilise us. We shall not allow the image, the credibility of the nation's learner and standard bearer to be maligned, to questioned through such campaigns of vilification. And one thing more. Today, we must pay serious attention to the threat to the defence and security of this country. Instead of doing that, or questioning Pakistan's nuclear weapons programme and its acquisition of sophisticated weapons, our friends are questioning the justification of the increase in our defence expenditure. They have not asked Zia-ul-Haq what amount of the GNP and what percentage of it is being spent by Pakistan on their defence. They have

not questioned their need or justification of accumulating all these weapons. What is being tried to be done is to discuss in the streets the defence secrets of this country. I would urge upon the Government that under no circumstance—while there is no need for an enquiry, as I have stated and my esteemed colleagues have stated earlier—should the Government allow the defence secrets to be discussed in the streets. The Government has to take steps to protect the security of the country. Where certain elements are becoming a party to the conspiracy, the Government and the Congress Party have a duty to defeat that conspiracy, I do hope that there are those elements in the Opposition, those parties in the Opposition, who have always condemned the forces of imperialism and right reaction, who, claim that they have been cautioning the Government against destabilisation. I urge upon them not to become a party to this conspiracy, whether willingly or for political reasons. Thank you.

श्री प्रमोद महाजन (महाराष्ट्र) :
सभापति जी, विदेशी षडयंत्र के इस माडल में स्वदेशी भाषा में आपके माध्यम से कुछ विचार रखना चाहता हूं। सरकार की ओर से बोफर्स वांड की जांच करने से इंकार करने के लिए तीन मुद्दे रख जा रहे हैं। पहला रक्षा सामग्रियों की खरीद में भारत सरकार किसी विचौलिए को अन्तर्गत नहीं देती। दूसरा, जांच के लिए आवश्यक प्राथमिकता तथ्य नहीं है। यदि विपक्ष के पास कुछ सबूत हों तो दें ताकि जांच हो सके। तिसरा, हमारी राजनैतिक प्रणाली को बदनाम और विखंडित करने का यह अंतर्राष्ट्रीय षडयंत्र है।

सभापति जी, जहाँ तक अंतर्राष्ट्रीय षडयंत्र की बात है, यह हमारा सरकार का बहुत ही पुराना रिवाज है। इसकी पिन भी पुरानी है, रिवाज भी पुराना है और सालों साल बचने के कारण यह बड़ी बेमर्र कावाज दे रहा है जिस पर आज कोई विश्वास नहीं करता। सरकार

भा. इसके शर्षस्थ नेता जब खुब अपने कामों से अपने आपको संवट में पाते हैं तो यह कहना शुरू कर देते हैं कि देश खतरे में है। स्वयं का पार्टी को या स्वयं को या स्वयं की सरकार को देश मानवर जब भी अपने आपको खतरे में महसूस करें तब देश को खतरे में मानना यह कितना उचित होगा, यह मैं उनके विवेक पर छोड़ देता हूँ। अष्टाचारी शास्त्रों का भांडा पढ़ने से दुनिया में कोई देश कमजोर नहीं हो सकता। व्यक्ति कमजोर हो सकता है, नेता कमजोर हो सकता है, सत्तारूढ़ दल कमजोर हो सकता है, विपक्षी दल भी कमजोर हो सकता है, लेकिन अष्टाचार के बाहर आने से देश कमजोर होता है यह अपने आप में समझना बड़ा मूर्खत्व है। यदि हम मान लें कि कोई अंतर्राष्ट्रीय षडयंत्र है जिसके हम सब शिकार हो रहे हैं तो मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जांच करके हम उस षडयंत्र को रोक सकते हैं। अगर हम जांच न करें तो बिना जांच किए अंतर्राष्ट्रीय षडयंत्र के नाम पर जांच की रोशनी लोगों के मन में निर्माण हुए संदेहों को बल देना है, कम करना नहीं है।

मुझे दिय, रक्षा सामग्री की खरीद की पद्धति में बल और आज रक्षा राज्य मंत्री ने विस्तृत चर्चा की है, जिसे दोहराना मैं नहीं चाहता। हमें कौन से शस्त्र चाहिए यह सेना तय करती है। वह शस्त्र किस गुणों के चाहिए यह सेना तय करती है। विभिन्न देशों से आया हुआ इन शस्त्रों पर विचार कर उन गुणों के आधार पर ये शस्त्र उचित हैं या नहीं यह सेना तय करती है और उसके बाद इस पद्धति के अनुसार सरकार का एक समिति कीमत तय करके उसके खर्च करती है। मुझे लगता है सरकार अपनी पद्धति पर इतनी सन्तुष्ट है कि यह मानती है इस पद्धति में कोई गलती नहीं हो सकती इसलिए कि इसमें गड़बड़ होने की कोई सम्भावना नहीं है। पद्धति भगवान ने नहीं बनाई हमने बनाई है और सरकार विस की भी हो यह मानवीय है कि इस सारी पद्धति में दोष हो सकता है। इस सरकार ने बार-बार यह कहा कि

हम बिचौलियां को अनुमति नहीं देते और मैं सरकार के इस वयान पर विश्वास करता हूँ कि अधिकृत रूप से किसी भी बिचौलिये को हमारी सरकार मान्यता नहीं देती। लेकिन बल ही हम ने इस सदन में चर्चा की कि जर्मनी से लाई पनडब्बियों पर सात प्रतिशत बर्नशन लेने की बात हमारे ही दूतावास की ओर से आई जिसकी जांच हमारी सरकार खुद कर रही है। इसका अर्थ यह हुआ कि एक ठीक ढंग की तथ्यावधि पद्धति होने के पश्चात् भी बिचौलिये का होना संभव है। यानी न होना भी संभव है और होना भी संभव है इसलिए सरकार को यह दावा करती है कि बिचौलिया ही नहीं सकता मैं इतना ही मानता हूँ कि सरकार अपनी ओर से किसी बिचौलिये को अधिकृत रूप में नहीं मानती है। लेकिन हम देख रहे हैं कि दो वर्षोद्योग के उद्योगपति में जब लड़ाई छिड़ जाती है तो पूरा देश हिलने लगता है। अब इतने बड़े शस्त्रों का भण्डार हम खरीदते हैं तो निश्चित रूप से कोई न कोई व्यक्ति भले ही भारत सरकार अपना अधिकृत बिचौलिया माने या न माने कोई ऐसा व्यक्ति हो सकता है, जिसकी सम्भावना है, जो आवर यह वहे कि मैं भारत सरकार के शर्षस्थ नेता के नजदब हूँ और मैं आपका सचिव पदो स्वता हूँ। जो शस्त्र भण्डार बेचने वाला है यदि उन्हें यह विश्वास है कि यह व्यक्ति हमारा सारा वा सारा व्यापार पटा सकता है तो उस व्यक्ति को पैसा देने की सम्भावना से सरकार कैसे इन्कार करती है। हो सकता है कि सरकार की जानकारी में न हो, सरकार का अपनी नियुक्त विया हुआ बिचौलिया न हो। लेकिन बीच में कुछ व्यक्ति ऐसे आ सकते हैं जो अपने आपकी सरकार का प्रतिनिधि मानें और जिससे हम शस्त्र खरीद रहे हैं वह उन पर विश्वास कर। अगर ऐसा स्थिति जैसा कि इसमें होने का संदेह है निर्माण हुई है तो इसकी जांच से विपक्ष का फायदा नहीं है। अगर इसकी जांच हो तो एक तो रक्षा सामग्री की खरीद की पद्धति में सम्भावित दोषों को हम दूर कर सकते हैं और ऐसा कोई बिचौलिया या सरकार या सरकार का नेता या अंतर्राष्ट्रीय षडयंत्र के अनुसार

[श्री प्रमोद महाजन]

हमें बदनाम करने की कोशिश कर रहा है तो उसके भा. भंडा फूटने की सम्भावना इस जांच के द्वारा है। जांच न करने से लोगों के मन में जो संदेश है उसको भी अधिक बन मिता है। इसके साथ रक्षा राज्य मंत्रा के वक्तव्य में एक वाक्य के बारे में संश्लेषण चाहूंगा। उन्होंने स्थानिक फर्म की चर्चा की है। बाफर्स ने किसी स्थानिक फर्म का, फोन करने, पत्र लिखने आदि छोटे-छोटे काम करने के लिये नियुक्ति का है। मैं रक्षा राज्य मंत्री जी से चाहूंगा कि वह अपने उत्तर में इस फर्म का नाम बता दें। यह फर्म कौन सी है, इस फर्म का मालिक कौन है क्या यह मालिक रक्षा सामग्री में और किसी समय इसके पहले क्या बिचौलिया के रूप में काम कर चुका है? मैं इसके साथ ही एक सवाल और जोड़ना चाहता हूँ कि क्या बाफर्स का कोई अधिकृत बिचौलिया यहाँ है? सरकार न मानते हो हम उसे अधिकृत न मानते हैं लेकिन अगर बाफर्स उसे बिचौलिया मानता है तो क्या यह बिचौलिया और स्थानिक फर्म का मालिक एक ही है? अगर ये दोनों एक हैं तो इस प्रकार का संदेशपूर्ण शुरू हुआ कागजों का त्रिभुज पता नहीं कहाँ तक पहुँच जायेगा? क्या इससे हमारा सुझाव खारे में नहीं आता? इसका भ. संश्लेषण आप जरूर करें। सरकार विनास से सत्ता मांग रहा है और कल रक्षा राज्य मंत्रा जा अत्यंत दुःख मन से बात रहे थे। जब भा. किस सम्मानिता व्यक्ति पर दल पर या सरकार पर आरोप लाते हैं तो दुःखाना स्वाभाविक है और इस लिये उन्होंने कहा कि आपने कुछ प्रमाण-पत्र नहीं दिये हैं और यह सब है। लेकिन बाफर्स काण्ड में जो आरोप लगाये गये हैं और भारतीय समाचार-पत्रों को कितन ह. गाल दें ये आरोप भारतीय समाचार-पत्रों ने नहीं लगाये हैं। आप किस भा. प्रेस बैरन को कितन भी गाल दें बाफर्स काण्ड के आरोप किसी प्रेस बैरन ने नहीं लगाये हैं, किसी गिरोही दल ने नहीं लगाये हैं, ये आरोप स्वीडिश सरकार के रेडियो ने लगाये हैं। रेडियो ने यह नहीं कहा है कि बिचौलिया है। उन्होंने केवल अपने सहायक का हवाला देते हुये इतना ही कहा है कि इसमें

20 करोड़ रुपये किसी भारतीय के नाम से स्विडिश बैंक में जमा किये गये हैं। इसका

खण्डन भारत सरकार ने जरूर किया है, गा. ब. गया है, बबुनिवाद बताया है। यह कहा गया है कि इसका खण्डन स्व. डिश सरकार ने किया है। स्व. डिश सरकार ने इसका कोई खण्डन नहीं किया है। स्व. डिश सरकार ने भारत सरकार को जानकारी दी है उसमें केवल इतना ही कहा है कि इस मामले में कोई बिचौलिया नहीं था। बात इतना स्वीडिश सरकार का प्रमाण-पत्र आपके पास है। विदेश पड़ोत के खिलाफ लड़ाई लड़ने के लिये आ. को विदेश सरकार के प्रमाण-पत्र को आवश्यकता पड़ता है। इसीलिये आ. को यह चरित्र-प्रमाण-पत्र मिला है। यह चरित्र प्रमाण-पत्र केवल एक मुद्दे से संबंधित है कि इसमें कोई बिचौलिया नहीं था। स्वीडिश सरकार ने कम इस आरोप का खण्डन नहीं किया है कि हमारे रेडियो का खबर गलत है। इसके साथ ही मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि बाफर्स ने जिसने आने तापें खर द हैं उन्होंने भी यह नहीं कहा है कि हमने पैसा नहीं दिया है केवल इतना कहा है कि पैसा नहीं द. हैं। लेकिन कम शन दिया है या नहीं न तो इसका पुष्टि क है और न ह. इसका विरोध किया है। इसलिये यह एक त्रिकोण बन जाता है। एक तरफ तो हमारा सरकार है और दूसरी तरफ स्व. डिश सरकार है और तीसरी बाफर्स बेचने वाल कम्पनी है। जहाँ तक स्व. डिश सरकार या बाफर्स और भा. सरकार के बीच कोई बिचौलिया का सम्बन्ध है वह नहीं है। लेकिन बाफर्स ने जिसका कम शन दिया है या नहीं दिया है कुछ नहीं बताया है। हमारा सरकार कहता है कि हमने कम शन नहीं दिया है। हम सरकार का बात पर विश्वास करने के लिये तैयार हैं, सत्ता रुद्ध दल ऐसा ही कह. स. है। लेकिन जिस प्रकार का चर्चा हिंदुस्तान में चल रहा है उसको देखते हुये, इस सरकार के बयान पर जब स्व. डिश सरकार और बेचने वाला कम्पनी भी यह नहीं कहता है कि यह समाचार गलत है, तो इस सरकार के बयान पर विश्वास करना मुश्किल हो जाता है। इस लिये विपक्ष द्वारा संसद य. समिति बैठाने का मांग की गई है। अगर सरकार को

लगता है कि संसदीय समिति कोई ऐसी समिति है जिसके कारण कुछ बात बाहर चली जाएगी, देश को खतरा पैदा हो जायेगा, यद्यपि हम इस बात में विश्वास नहीं करते हैं, लेकिन तो भी अगर संसदीय समिति पूर्वाग्रही लगती है राजनैतिक लगती है, आपको उसके निर्णय पर विचार करना कठिन लगता है; तो आप संसदीय समिति मत बैठाइये। मैं भारतीय जनता पार्टी की ओर से यह प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि आप इसकी न्यायिक जांच करवा सकते हैं। यह जरूरी नहीं कि संसदीय समिति हो। लेकिन न्यायिक जांच करवा कर सरकार अपने आप को इससे मुक्त कर सकती है।

अन्त में केवल इतना ही कहना चाहूंगा कि गत तीन सप्ताहों में तीन काण्ड इस देश ने देखे हैं। एक फेयरफेक्स, दूसरा जर्मन पनडुब्बी और तीसरा बोफर्स। इन तीन काण्डों के संबंध में सरकार की प्रतिक्रिया का अध्ययन करना मनोरंजक भी होगा और उद्बोधक भी होगा। फेयरफेक्स के संबंध में सरकार ने उच्चतम न्यायालय के दो न्यायाधीशों की जांच समिति बैठाई है, ऐसे तथ्य निकालने के लिये जो सरकार को पहले से ही ज्ञात है। जर्मन पनडुब्बी के सम्बन्ध में विदेशी दूतावास से टेलेक्स आया और इसके आधार पर और इसी संदेह पर जांच की गई है। रक्षा मंत्री बदल गये। लेकिन जांच चलाने का इरादा सरकार ने प्रकट किया है और यह जांच अन्तिम निर्णय तक जाएगी, यह कहा है। जिसके तथ्य सरकार के पास हैं, सरकार उसको जांच करवा रही है। जिसमें एक दूतावास से पत्र आता है उसके लिये आप अपनी ओर से जांच करवाते हैं और जिस बोफर्स के बारे में, जो शायद हाल के इतिहास में सबसे अधिक महत्वपूर्ण रक्षा सामग्री की खरीद है उसके सम्बन्ध में जब भी जांच की मांग की जाती है आप कतराते हैं, झिझकते हैं। आपका यह कतराना, आपका यह झिझकना लोगों के मन में संदेह का निर्माण करता है। इस सिलसिले में हमारे रक्षा मंत्री श्री विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह जी बदल गये, उन्होंने त्यागपत्र दिया। महोदय, रक्षा मंत्री ने त्यागपत्र गविवार को दोपहर 12 बजे दिया और बम्बई तथा दिल्ली से प्रसारित संडे आबजर्वर में जो 11

जुलाई... (व्यवधान)... 11 अप्रैल, गलती के सुधार के लिये मैं धन्यवाद देता हूँ की खबर जो रात में छपी, तब तक रक्षा मंत्री ने त्यागपत्र दिया या नहीं इसका किसी को ज्ञात नहीं था, तो जो यह खबर है इसको मैं उद्धृत करके इससे जो प्रश्नचिह्न उत्पन्न होता है उसकी ओर आपका ध्यान आकर्षित कर अपने विचार समाप्त करता हूँ। इसमें यह कहा गया है कि :

"Defence Minister has Swedish guns up his sleeve". "The probe ordered by defence Minister V. P. Singh into the purchase of German submarines in 1983-84 is not half as "sensitive" as the one Singh threatens to order if the Congress (I) does not cool the heat on him. The really sensitive probe would be into the purchase of several hundred 155 mm Howitzer guns at a total cost of Rs. 3,100 crore—the single biggest armament deal by this country in recent years."

Then it says further: "If a probe is ordered into this deal it would virtually mean a probe on the Prime Minister by V. P. Singh".

क्या रक्षा मंत्री के तुरन्त हटने का केवल यही कारण था कि अगर वे सोमवार तक रह जाते तो इस झील में भी इन्क्वायरी का आर्डर करते जिससे कि इसमें भी आपको पीछे हटना मुश्किल हो जाता। जैसा कि जर्मनी से पनडुब्बियों के खरीद के मामले में पीछे हटना मुश्किल हो गया वैसा ही इसमें होता। इसलिये मैं अन्त में इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस सारे संदेह को देखते हुये आप इसकी जांच करवायें। यह इस सरकार के लिये, देश के लिये और जिस संसद का सदस्य होने के लिये कल रक्षा राज्य मंत्री अपने आपको मायूस महसूस कर रहे थे उसको गौरवान्वित करने के लिये भी यह उचित होगा कि आप इस सारे मामले की जांच करवायें। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I rise to speak with not a little trepidation. I am among the junior most Members of this august House and perhaps because of relative inexperience I might have mislead something very important. I all humility, I would like to submit that it seems to me that today we have a case very similar to that of a blind man searching in a dark room for a black cat which is not there. But this is, as I said, Sir, perhaps because of my inexperience and lack of knowledge I might be missing something very important. And I would like to share with you a few thoughts on this matter.

Sir, over the past few days, and not just in this discussion alone we have heard considerable rhetoric, full of sound and fury. We have heard about the alleged incompetence of Government, we have heard about the alleged corruption of Government and we have heard a great deal, for more than necessary, about the Congress Party itself. That was the better part. We have also heard, Sir, most of the rhetoric being concentrated upon relatives of Ministers who are not members of this august House, about officers, about civil servants who cannot get up here and defend themselves and about officers in uniform who cannot come here and give a fitting reply to the allegations that have been hurled at them so indiscriminately. In my humble opinion this is not only an abuse of parliamentary privilege but also a total misuse of the basic norms of parliamentary democracy which is the bed-rock of our system today.

Sir, I would like to assert that it is not the Government which has failed in its duty or in its promises but it is the Opposition, in my opinion, which has failed to perform its role of constructive, meaningful and

well-in formed dissent. All that we have heard is empty rhetoric. Not a shred of evidence, not a single fact, not a single charge. They have proclaimed, Sir, that they are nationalistic, that they are patriotic, that they have the interests of the country at heart and all that they want to do is to weed out corruption. Sir, I respectfully agree and, therefore, I wish to raise what, according to me, ought to be the crux of the matter.

Of what we are now talking about, corruption, if any, is only one part of it. We are now talking about the purchase of 155 millimetre guns from a Swedish company called Bofors. I have heard with considerable interest all that has been said in this House and I have read what has been debated in the other House. Not a single Member from any side has raised a single question about the effectiveness of these guns, not a single Member has gone into the question of whether Government was entitled or correct or the committee appointed was right, in buying these guns. Sir, in my humble opinion, these are the vital questions. Arms are acquired for a specific purpose. If there is no specific purpose which is in keeping with the security, integrity and interests of this country, then those arms must have been acquired to fill somebody's pockets, to unjustly enrich somebody. Therefore these are the questions we have to ask before going into a roving, unsubstantiated, enquiry into charges that don't exist, before conducting these by arguments and debates, by innuendoes, without any basis. I would like to ask the Rajya Raksha Mantri certain important questions about this particular contract, about what has been bought by the Government.

I would like to ask, firstly, why were these arms purchased? Was it to meet a specific threat, was it to meet a specific need? Did our country need to buy these arms, or were these arms bought simply for

the purpose of filling some body's pockets or filling up his Swiss Bank Account? If there was a specific need, then we were justified in buying these arms. Secondly, Sir, I would like to ask, if there was a need, why this particular weapons system, why not any other system? Why did you go in for these 155 millimetre guns? Was there a specific reason for this? Thirdly—it is part of the third part—what about our enemies, what about our adversaries across the borders? Have you considered what they possess? Are we in a position to meet, effectively, whatever arms they possess? Is it in that context that you decided to buy these guns? Because, if these guns were totally useless in the context of what our adversaries possess, then there might be, possibly, some substance in alleging that this deal went through just to fill somebody's pockets. If, Sir, Pakistan or China had far more superior and sophisticated weapons, was there—I ask myself—anything wrong in buying these 155 millimetre guns or was the Government simply performing its duty as best it could to protect the integrity and unity of our country?

4 P.M.

Then Sir, one question further is, if the 155 mm guns were necessary, could we not make them ourselves? Why is it that we have to buy them from Bofors, from Sweden or any other country? And if we could not make them ourselves, why did we not go to some of our friends, socialist countries, could not use a rupee-convertible currency to buy those guns? This is one more question. In my humble opinion, these are vital questions. None of these questions have been raised. I have tried my best to go a little into these questions and find out if any answer could possibly be obtained.

I am not going to talk about destabilisation. Sir, there is no doubt that Pakistan is indulging in considerable sabre-rattling across our bor-

ders. There is equally no doubt that we have to protect ourselves. To the best of my information, Pakistan already has 155 mm guns, and if those are trained across the border towards us, is it right and proper that we have 5.5" guns which are totally obsolete to meet this threat? Therefore, nobody can deny that there was specific need to buy these guns.

A further question that may arise is: what has been the experience of our Government with Bofors? Bofors is not, I presume, a fly-by-night company, a shady company. Bofors is not, I presume, a company that is known to manufacture substandard weapons that will put our country in danger. What has been the experience of the Government with Bofors till today? If we have had good experience, if we have got other arms from Bofors, if they have worked well in the past, I assert that there is no reason why we should not go back to Bofors to buy arms because they have been tried and tested suppliers. There is absolutely no reason for Bofors to pay bribe to supply goods that they have always supplied us even in the past.

Sir, speaking in the Lok Sabha, the hon. Raksha Mantri said this with reference to the question of why it was not possible for us to manufacture these guns indigenously. And I crave your leave to quote just a few lines:

"I was interested in this because I think it is a valid point, it is a valid question. It arose in my mind when I went through the papers. I understand that when the requirement for 155 mm guns was projected to the DRDO, the DRDO was then engaged in the design of two important guns requires in the services—the Indian field gun MK2 and MBTD Arjun

[Shrimati Jayanthi Natarajan]

Gun of 120 MM calibre. In spite of the DRDO's eagerness to take up this project, it was felt that it has available infrastructure to only handle two guns at the same time. Now these questions were also important. So, it is not as though the question was not gone into. It was gone into, but those who know best the technical details, decided that they would like to concentrate on the other two guns. That was their priority, and that is the reason why it has happened. We have gone in both for importing this gun and for manufacturing it within the country. The transfer of technology is a part of this particular deal."

Sir, if there is a specific and immediate need that this kind of gun should be immediately used in the country for our defence purpose, if it was not possible to manufacture this gun indigenously, if it was not possible to acquire it from some other source and if our experience with Bofors has been consistently good, then, Sir, I am sorry, I fail to see the point of the debate except on the vague and unsubstantiated allegations of corruption.

Sir, with great respect, I would like to say that on this issue of corruption in my limited experience as a lawyer I have heard about an accused being innocent until proved guilty. I have never heard of a Government, let alone an accused, being called guilty until proved innocent. This is unknown and foreign to the concept of the rule of law.

Here we have in this deal three major sources: One is The Government of India. The other is the Government of Sweden. And the third the Bofors. All the three of them have said that there are no bribes and that there is no commission.

At least the Government of Sweden has said that there is no commission. On the other hand you have one Hong Kong based Reporter of a Swedish autonomous radio corporation who says that there was a code name Lotus, that certain amounts were paid to key Defence figures and to certain highly placed politicians. I fail to see how it is nationalistic or patriotic to firmly refuse to believe the Government of India, the Government of Sweden and the company itself, but simply choose to believe an uncorroborated, fake and unsubstantiated report of one correspondent, who is based in Hong Kong and comes conveniently to Delhi at a convenient point of time and files a report from Delhi to Stockholm. I can only say in all humility either those who believe him are gullible or they have a vested interest in simply believing what he wants to say.

One more point again about corruption. Quite apart from the rhetoric that we have heard, I take pride in saying that my Government has been categorical in its denial. In an extraordinary display of *bona fides*... (Interruptions) Would you like to say something?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing. You must address the Chair. You should not address anybody else in this House.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Our Prime Minister has stated time and again that we have the rule of law. If somebody is guilty, simply point out the direction to us and no matter how high he is, he will be punished. But there is no reply because there is not anybody like that. In a further extraordinary display of *bona fides* our Government has gone to this Swedish Reporter and to the radio corporation and asked for the details of the documentation that they claim to have. I understand that they refused to part with it. They refused to part with it, I presume, because there is nothing to part with

or it is a part of the carefully orchestrated move to destabilise the Government; and you accuse us of raising the bogey of destabilisation!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Thank you. Sir. I would not take further time.

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश) : आदरणीय चेयरमैन महोदय, गत 15-20 वर्षों से लगातार यह सुनते आ रहे थे कि भारत में जितनी भी कमती मशीनों का आयात किया जाता है, जो रक्षा मन्त्रालय के सौदे किये जाते हैं... (व्यवधान)

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Their work is over. They are leaving.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now the exodus must be silently done, not publicly.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: If this way it is done, there will be exodus of these men from the country.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I said exodus must be silent.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: The Prime Minister came to hear Jayanthi Natarajan. And as he has left others are also leaving.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, you are also leaving?

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: No, no, he is sitting.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: This shows there are so many vacancies in the Cabinet.

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : सभापति महोदय, मैं दुबारा प्रारम्भ करता हूँ। पिछले 15-20 वर्षों से यह सुनते रहे हैं कि रक्षा मन्त्रालय के सौदों में जो कीमती मशीनें बाहर से देश में आती हैं, उन पर भी भारी कमीशन लिया जाता है। सरकार ने 1980 ई० में, तत्कालीन प्रधान मंत्री, श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी जी ने, 1980 के पश्चात् कमीशन पर पाबंदी लगाई।

जाहिर है कि 1980 से पूर्व कमीशन लिया जाता था। कौन कमीशन लेता था, कौन कमीशन एजेंट मुकर्रर करता था, कमीशन का वंटवारा किस प्रकार से होता था, क्या माननीय रक्षा मंत्री जी इस पर प्रकाश डालने की कृपा करेंगे? 1980 के पश्चात् जब से बंद किया था फिर ये गंभीर शिकायतें आई और ये शिकायतें कोई इस तरह के लोगों ने नहीं कीं, बल्कि शिकायतें भारत सरकार के बोन में स्थित राजदूत ने की हैं। इसी 11 मार्च, 1987 को टेलेक्स के द्वारा भारत सरकार को सूचना दी कि 30 करोड़ रुपया एजेंट को दिया गया, जिसकी जांच के आदेश तत्कालीन रक्षा मंत्री ने किये और प्रधान मंत्री ने जिसकी जांच की रिपोर्ट देने का आश्वासन दिया। मान्यवर, यही नहीं बोफोर्स जिसका 1500 करोड़ रुपये का सौदा 25 मार्च, 1986 में हुआ था उसके सम्बन्ध में बताया गया कि देश के प्रधान मंत्री और स्वीडन के तत्कालीन प्रधान मंत्री स्व० ओल्फ पाल्मे के बीच बात-चीत हुई। जाहिर है कीमत पर बात नहीं हुई जैसा कि आज बताया गया। यह भी जाहिर है कि क्वालिटी के ऊपर भी कोई बात-चीत नहीं हुई क्योंकि वह एक्सपर्ट टीम ही क्वालिटी को देखती है। शायद एजेंट नहीं रखे जाने के बारे में बात हुई? जब भारत सरकार यह तय कर चुकी थी कि एजेंट नहीं रखे जायेंगे तो क्या दो प्रधान मंत्री इस वजह से बात कर रहे थे कि एजेंट नहीं रखे जायेंगे? अगर यह एजेंट नहीं रखे जाने का तय हुआ तो फिर जो 20 करोड़ रु० या 32 मिलियन क्रोनर्ज एजेंट को रिश्वत के रूप में धन दिये जाने की शिकायत उठी, वह क्या इन लोगों ने की है? नहीं, यह शिकायत भी स्वीडन देश के राजकीय रेडियो ने की है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : राजकीय नहीं है।

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : श्रीमन्, क्या यह आप की आज्ञा से बोल रहे हैं?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don't interrupt Mr. Vermaji.

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : तो मैं यह कह रहा था कि जो 1500 करोड़ रुपये के माल में

32 मिलियन क्रोनर्ज को रिश्वत दिये जाने की चर्चा है कहा जाता है कि हिन्दुस्तान के चोटी के राजनीतिक नेताओं के लिये रिश्वत दी गई। दी गई होगी या नहीं दी गई, लेकिन जो मैगनस नेलसन नाम के रिपोर्टर हैं उन्होंने यह कहा है कि हमारे पास इस बात के प्रमाण हैं, डाक्यूमेंट्री एवीडेंस हैं। जब मान्यवर, भारत सरकार ने डिनाई किया और स्वीडन सरकार ने डिनाई किया तब भी उस आदमी ने यह कहा कि Mr. Nelson reasserted...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not necessary to refer to some other person. You can say some correspondent.

श्रीवीरेन्द्र वर्मा : सभी कह चुके हैं इसलिये मैं मान्यवर, यह कह रहा हूँ कि जो बातें हमने नहीं कहीं नेलसन ने कही हैं और री-असर्ट कर रहा है कि मैं बात से हटने वाला नहीं हूँ और मेरे पास डाक्यूमेंट्री एवीडेंस है जो तथ्य मैं दे रहा हूँ स्पेसिफिकली उसने कहा कि 13 नवम्बर, 1986 को तीन किशतों में और 22 दिसम्बर को एक किशत में 32 मिलियन क्रोनर्ज उमने देने की घोषणा की है। मान्यवर, यह न हमारी तरफ से है, न आपकी तरफ से है। पहला भी आपके दूतावास की तरफ से है और यह भी एक विदेशी आप के मित्र राष्ट्र, हमारे देश के मित्र राष्ट्र के रेडियो के प्रतिनिधि की तरफ से है। तो डिस्टेबलाइज क्या हमारा दूतावास जर्मनी से बैठकर कर रहा है या डिस्टेबलाइज हमारे मित्र राष्ट्र के रेडियो का प्रतिनिधि कर रहा है? मेरी समझ में यह नहीं आता।

इसके अलावा मान्यवर, बोफर्स एक निजी कम्पनी है, उस प्राइवेट कम्पनी के ऊपर न स्वीडन सरकार का अधिकार है और न भारत की सरकार का। मान्यवर, सब को जानकारी होनी चाहिये कि जिन देशों को काली-सूची में स्वीडन ने डाल रखा था, यह बोफर्स कम्पनी इजरायल या साऊथ अफ्रीका या ईरान जैसे देशों को हथियार सप्लाई करती रही और उस समय करती रही, जबकि मान्यवर, स्वर्गीय ओल्फ पाल्मे सुलह संधि के अध्यक्ष थे ईरान और ईराक

की लड़ाई में, तब भी यह कम्पनी हथियार सप्लाई करती रही।

मान्यवर, एक सज्जन एडमिरल अलगनता, वह जांच कर रहे थे कि किन हालात में उन काली सूची वाले देशों को हथियारों की सप्लाई की। जब उसकी जांच कर रहे थे तो उसी समय यह तथ्य प्रकाश में आए कि 32 लाख क्रोनर्स रिश्वत एजेंट मिस्टर चड्ढा जो दिल्ली के हैं, जिसकी मान्यवर कम्पनी है एनाट्रोमिक जनरल कारपोरेशन, को मिले और आज चड्ढा साहब भी भाग गए हैं हिन्दुस्तान से। अब पूछेंगे कि क्यों भाग गए चड्ढा साहब, कैसे जाने दिया, कैसे पासपोर्ट उनका बना, उन्हें क्यों नहीं रोका गया? मान्यवर, इसके अलावा साब स्वीडन की ही कम्पनी है, जो ट्राली सप्लाई करती है, जो माउण्ट करती थी इन तोपों को। उसके यहां एक ब्रदर-इन-ला हैं, उन ब्रदर-इन-ला के हाई-आफीसर्स से ताल्लुकात हैं, उनके यहां एम्फोर्समेंट डायरेक्टोरेट आफ फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर के लोगों ने छापा मारा... (व्यवधान)...

श्री एन० के० पी० सल्वे : ब्रदर-इन-ला साला भी होता है, बहनोई भी होता है... (व्यवधान)...

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : बहनोई समझ लीजिए। तो छापा मारा और बहुत आवश्यक कागजात उनके पकड़े। तो यह बात तो पहले से चल रही है। मान्यवर, इतना ही नहीं, सैन्य अभियंत्रण विभाग, जो हमारे आर्मी का महत्वपूर्ण विभाग है, जिसके कर्नल मिस्टर...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will not allow this kind of thing.

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : यह तो सारे अखबारों में आ चुका है। सारे हिन्दुस्तान के अखबारों में आ चुका है। मेरे पास भी यह अखबार मौजूद है... (व्यवधान)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: May be. You are not supposed to quote newspapers.

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : अच्छा नाम नहीं लेता क्योंकि हिन्दुस्तान के सारे अखबारों में आ चुका है।

MR. CHAIRMAN: You quote newspapers and newspapers quote you.

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : तो मान्यवर, 20 करोड़ के घोटाले की शिकायत सां. बी. आई. को सैन्य अभियंत्रण विभाग के कर्नल के सम्बंध में मिली। वह जिस समय इलाहाबाद में थे, 1500 खरीद के आर्डर को चेक किया जा रहा था, 20 करोड़ के घोटाले का पता चला और आज वह दिल्ली में हैं। उनको सस्पेंड क्यों नहीं किया गया? माननीय मंत्री जो इस पर भी प्रकाश डालेंगे। यह 20 करोड़ घोटाले का आदमी और सस्पेंड न हो, सी. बी. आई. की जांच भी चले। वेस्ट लैंड हेलीकोप्टर की खरीद के मामले पर भी घोटाला हुआ, उस पर भी प्रकाश डालने की कोशिश करें।

मान्यवर, मैं आप की आज्ञा से, पी. एं. सी., जिसका मैं भी एक सदस्य हूँ, पी. एं. सी. ने इन रक्षा-सौदों के संबंध में अपनी कुछ संस्तुतियाँ की हैं कहां गड़बड़ी है, कौसे गड़बड़ी होती है माल के मामले में भी, कीमत के मामले में भी। मैं रक्षा मंत्री महोदय से प्रार्थना करूँगा कि उसको पढ़ें और उसके अनुकूल कार्य करने की कोशिश करें। मान्यवर, रक्षा मन्त्रालय पर हमारे देश का सबसे अधिक खर्चा होता है और इसकी सबसे बड़ी आवश्यकता भी है। मैं खर्च को चुनौती नहीं देता। लेकिन जितना आनात किया जाता है, जितना बड़ा कमीशन उसके ऊपर लिया जाता है, उसके सिलसिले में मान्यवर, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि उसको रोकने की कोशिश की जानी चाहिये।

मान्यवर, जहां तक फेयर फैंस का सवाल है...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You want to discuss everything.

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : फेयर फैंस के मामले में भारत सरकार ने जूडिशियल कमीशन सैट अप किया है। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से और सदन के नेता जी हाउस में बैठे हैं उनसे

जानना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के अमीर आदमियों का, हिन्दुस्तान के पूँजीपतियों का या फर्ने आ फिल्म स्टारों का या पॉलिटीशियंस का रुपया विदेशों बैंकों में है, उसकी जांच के लिये आप क्या कार्य कर रहे हैं? तीस महीने के लिये आपने जज बैठाये हैं, जांच उनके सुपुर्द है। वे जांच तीन दिन में भी कर सकते हैं, लेकिन क्या यह भी कोई जांच आप करायेंगे कि विदेशों में जो हिन्दुस्तान का पैसा है, अपने देश के विकास के लिये हम विदेशों से रुपया उधार लेते हैं, लेकिन जो हमारे देश का रुपया बाहर जमा करके गद्दारा कर रहे हैं, उसकी भी आप जांच करायेंगे, मैं यह भी निवेदन करूँगा कि विदेशों में जिन लोगों का भी इस गरीब देश का पैसा जमा है उसको जब्त किया जाए और उसे जब्त करके देश के विकास और निर्माण कार्यों में खर्च किया जाए।

माननीय मंत्री जी क्या इस पर भी प्रकाश डालेंगे, कि पिछले तीन महीने से जब से रक्षा मंत्री श्री वी. पी. सिंह थे जो ऐजेंट थे उनके पत्र व्यवहार, उनके टेलीफोन आने बंद हो गये थे रक्षा मन्त्रालय में? क्या यह बात सही है और अगर सही है तो वह कब से आने बंद हुए, कब से उन पर कानूनी-वाही की गई? (समय की घंटी)

मान्यवर, मैं खत्म कर रहा हूँ। मैं आखिर में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि व्यक्ति से बड़ी पार्टी है, पार्टी से बड़ा देश है, चाहे हम इधर बैठते हों या उधर बैठते हों। चाहे हम किसी दल के हों, आप अपने दल के हित में, देश के हित में, हमारे हित में नहीं, अपने हित में क्या सच्चाई सामने आने देंगे? श्री राजीव गांधी ने राजनीतिक जीवन शुरू किया तो इस देश की जनता ने, देश के बुद्धिजीवियों ने, उन्हें मिस्टर क्लीन की पदवी दी थी और मिस्टर क्लीन ने जो पदवी कमाई है वह उनके हित में, उनकी पार्टी के हित में, देश के हित में क्लीन बने रहें और इस प्रकार के लांछन न लगे। हमें पता नहीं किसके नाम से रुपया जमा है, लेकिन स्विस् बैंकिंग कारपोरेशन के नाम से लोटस कॉड के नाम से यह रुपया जमा है, किसका रुपया जमा है, हमारे पास कोई स्पेसिफिक बात नहीं है। इसलिये जल्दी से जल्दी इन बातों

[श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा]

की तरफ वे ध्यान दें। केवल एक प्रार्थना मैं आप से कहूंगा कि इस बात की जांच संसदीय कमेटी के जरिये से कराई जाए क्योंकि सब तरफ से प्रेशर उसमें आयेंगे तो निष्पक्षता के साथ जांच नहीं हो सकेगी। तो यह जांच संसदीय समिति करे जिससे कि देश की जनता जो कि सर्वशक्तिमान है, जिसकी बदौलत आप सत्ता में बैठे हैं, जिसने आपकी सरकार बनाई, उसको किसी प्रकार का संशय न हो कि हमारी सरकार ईमानदारी और निष्ठा के साथ काम कर रही है या नहीं। **धन्यवाद।**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now Gen. Aurora.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA (Punjab): Sir, I have nothing to say. I think enough has been said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, thank you. Now Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta; ten minutes for you.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman. I have been listening to the speeches of the leaders of the Treasury Benches. They have been speaking on the question of destabilisation for the last 48 hours. In my opinion, destabilisation cannot condone corruption. On the other hand, corruption breeds destabilisation. If you are serious about fighting destabilisation then you have to be above suspicion, you have to be open and you have to be above board. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, Sir, that there has been a shift, a reactionary shift, in the policy of the present Government. It has opened the doors to the multinationals, to the foreign multinationals, it has given massive concessions to the monopoly concerns, it has refused to touch black money and it has imposed heavy burdens on the masses of the common people. As a result, the country has moved further to the right, at least in the economic sphere, on account of which the Government led by Mr. Gandhi has

earned the appreciation of the Reagan Government and some of its papers. Let me quote now, Mr. Chairman, from one journal. As far as Mr. Rajiv Gandhi is concerned, here is its testimonial from a Washington-based journal, "The Heritage Foundation": the ideological citadel of Reaganism. In an analysis of the Indian economic situation, issued long ago, it paid a compliment to Mr. Rajiv Gandhi:

"One bright sphere in Indo-US policies is economics. Mr. Gandhi's nudging India away from the socialist policies of his mother and grand father, Jawaharlal Nehru, who was India's Prime Minister from 1947 to 1964, he (Mr. Rajiv Gandhi) has called for free market reforms..."—and the document enthusiastically says, Sir—"...and supply-side economic principles are working in India."

This is the testimonial, a character certificate, from no other power than America, from one of the many journals of America. Therefore, with such a policy and with such a shift in the reactionary direction, you cannot put down destabilisation. Of course, by raising the bogey of destabilisation, you can definitely put down the demand for a probe, an all-out probe. But you cannot earn credibility which seems to be at the lowest at the present moment of time.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, imagine the unique coincidents in time. It has been stated by the Swedish Radio that a part of the bribe was deposited in the last month of the year. What was the time? That was exactly the time when the elections in Kerala and West Bengal were knocking at the doors and the ruling party was in need of huge sums of money to conduct its election campaign. Therefore, Sir, this is an important coincidence. There was a speaker on the other side who has just said that

there are three or four factors in the whole situation. One is the Government of Sweden, another is the Bofors Company and the third is the Government of India. But that speaker has forgotten the fact that there is another factor also and that is the Swedish Radio. Why do I say this? I take this statement of the Swedish Government in this regard with a pinch of salt because the Swedish Government, under the umbrella of international neutrality, has been patronising this Bofors Company for illegal trade in arms. It is quite a well-known fact that the late Prime Minister of Sweden knew about it and he could not stop this Company from trading and it is reported—I do not know to what extent it is confirmed—that his assassination is particularly linked with the illegal smuggling of arms particularly into Iran and Iraq. Therefore, the statement of the Swedish Government is no testimonial for me at least in this regard.

Sir, in my opinion, the Company of Bofors is the criminal and the Swedish Government is the abettor. It is important to note that the revelation about the illegal trade being carried on by this Company was not made by the Swedish Government, not by the Swedish policy, not by any other Swedish governmental agency, but it was made by the State Radio. It is the State Radio, of course. But it is run on Government money and it is under the Parliament's control and the Government cannot pressure it. So, it is the Swedish Radio which brought out the news and it is the correspondent of the Swedish Radio who had made the revelation and who had brought out the material regarding illegal smuggling. And it is that Swedish Radio which has been giving out consistent news that...

Radio. You must come to the subject. I can understand your referring to it. But...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: I am coming to the subject.

My point is that the news of the Swedish Radio cannot be taken as unfounded or baseless, because it is the Swedish Radio which has made a serious revelation about illegal arms deal that was continuing. The revelation was made in 1985, while the contract was entered into in 1986. Therefore, my point is that the Government of India went into this arms deal in 1986, knowing fully well the notorious character of this firm, and thus the Government of India has betrayed its international policy of neutrality and peace. Going in for an arms deal with a notorious firm on the part of the Government of India which leads the international movement for solidarity and peace and neutrality is quite inconsistent. Therefore my question is: why has the Government of India given up its political philosophy and political consideration? What else the factor? What else was the consideration that prompted them to enter into a deal with this notorious firm? The argument that there is no middleman and therefore there cannot be the question of any commission is untenable. Sir, the Swedish Radio has again declared that it can give the numbers of the Swiss Bank Accounts. The Swiss Government might have denied, that firm might have denied and the Government of India might have denied, but the Swedish Radio is consistently saying that it can even name the persons... (Time bell rings) Such a categorical statement makes our nation humiliated in the eyes of the world, and this humiliation can be ended only by an authoritative probe. And such an authority is there only with the Parliament of India. A parliamentary probe will be an authoritative probe and an authoritative probe will be able to bring out the

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have spent 10 minutes on Sweden and Swedish

[Shri Gurudas Das Gupta]

truth that may enable us to exonerate the Government from the charges that have been levelled against it. Our national dishonour will be duly dispelled if an authoritative probe is done by no other institution than by the Indian Parliament.

Therefore, Sir, I once again urge upon the Government to institute an authoritative parliamentary probe which can dispel the dishonour, which can restore the credibility of the Government.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Baharul Islam.

SHRI BAHARUL ISLAM (Assam): May I come to the front row near the mike? (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Only with the permission of the Chair can a Member shift his place.

SHRI BAHARUL ISLAM: I was listening carefully to all the speeches made by the hon. Members of the Opposition. The burden of the speeches is that a Swedish Radio correspondent supplied a story to a private radio of Sweden, and that news has been circulated all over the world. The news is to the effect that senior politicians and Defence personnel have been bribed in connection with certain arms deal with a firm called Bofors. Now, the contention of the hon. Members of the Opposition was that we want a clean public life. There is the charge of corruption against the senior public men and Defence personnel. Therefore, an Inquiry Committee should be constituted. They have particularly mentioned that an Inquiry Committee consisting of Members of Parliament of different political parties should be constituted. I would like to ask as to what is the subject-matter into which this committee will make inquiries. In a court of law, such a piece of information, viz information

circulated by a News Agency, would not have been taken any notice of at all for the simple reason that it is hearsay. Some sort of evidence, if not tangible evidence, will be necessary to take cognizance of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is the difference between a court of law and the Parliament.

SHRI BAHARUL ISLAM: In fact, I was going to mention it. The hon. Members of the opposition will say that this is not a court of law and that this is Parliament; therefore we are entitled to take notice of this because we want a clean public life. Some of them were saying that Caesar's wife should be or must be above suspicion. Now the basic question is this. Is it possible on the part of anybody to prove his innocence in cases of such allegations? If it is said that Mr. A, a Leader of the Opposition, has committed murder of B, what will he do? If he has not committed the murder, he can say that he has not committed it. He is innocent. How can he prove his innocence? Now our Defence Minister and the Prime Minister has categorically stated that it is absolutely false, malicious and mischievous. But how can they prove their innocence? Now, they are suggesting the constitution of a Parliamentary Committee. One of the hon. Members said that the Parliamentary Committee cannot arrive at truth. There is no insinuation against it. I will also submit that a Parliamentary Committee cannot at all come to truth in such a matter. Two illustrations were given. One was about the Public Accounts Committee and the other about Estimates Committee. They had inquired into such matters. But in the case of Estimates Committee and Public Accounts Committee, the Members of Parliament are not involved. They are like Judges. Some allegations are made about the omission or commission by certain contractors, officers, etc. and the Members of the Committee sit like Judges. They can arrive at the truth objectively. Here we are involved. You are the accusers. You are the prosecutors and we are the prosecuted. Can the Prosecutor and the accused be

Judges in their own case? The result will be that the battle will be transferred from the floor of the House to the floor of the Committee room. The leaders of the opposition will be contending that we have committed this corruption. We will be saying that we have not committed the corruption. So, the truth cannot be arrived at all.

It has already been submitted that these defence matters are very sensitive. The Government has the privilege to conceal certain things from the knowledge of the Members of that particular committee. Even the courts, in certain cases, cannot compel the Government to divulge certain information if that divulgence leads to insecurity of the State. The Government has that privilege. Therefore, it will not be possible for any Parliamentary Committee to arrive at the truth in such matters.

Secondly, is there any *prima facie* case? There is no *prima facie* case. Now a suggestion has been put forth from the Government side that we suspect or in other words, we have reasonable belief that some foreign agencies which are hostile to India, who are inimical to India, are working in such a way so that the Government of the country is destabilised. They are saying it and you are crying wolf. In my humble opinion it is a reasonable belief. And this reasonable belief is drawn from certain earlier inferences, illustrations. If you kindly permit me, Sir, I can give two illustrations. I myself came across two such illustrations. In 1983 as everybody knows there were some killings in Assam between pro-election and anti-election agitators. (Interruption) About 200 Muslims were killed and about 100 non-Muslims were killed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You people forget that he was a Judge and he is not accustomed to interruptions.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Sorry, Sir, for the interruption.

SHRI BAHARUL ISLAM: About 1,000 non-Muslims were killed. Out of them 500 were tribals. The others were non-tribal non-Muslims. An

International Muslim Conference took place at Baghdad. See where is Assam and where is Baghdad? And the name of that conference was World Muslim Conference, and the apparent object of that Conference was to try to bring out conciliation between Iraq and Iran, to terminate that war. It was learnt very confidentially that interested parties, I may name Pakistan, with some other bigger powers behind it was trying to bring out some reference to Assam killing saying that there has been a genocide of Muslims in Assam and, therefore, the Government of India should be condemned as it failed to protect the lives of the minority. See the connection. And I attended that conference. Then I explained in detail. The matter was not allowed to be raised. Once it is raised, the mischief is done. Nobody will try to understand what the truth is. This was during the time when Mrs Indira Gandhi was the Prime Minister. Then in 1962 or 1963 one small incident took place in West Bengal. That was a small quarrel between two groups of young people. On the one side were a few Santhal girls. They were selling certain articles in a village market. The purchasers were a few Muslim boys. Then a small quarrel took place. The girls went back home and reported to their menfolk that they were insulted by these boys. A few youngsters of those Santhal people went and set fire to about two or three Muslim houses. There the matter ended. Then the Deputy High Commissioner of Pakistan sought Nehru's permission to visit that place. Nehru was a large-hearted man, a very magnanimous man. He said, 'well, we have nothing to hide. Ours is a very open society. Go and visit the place.. The Deputy High Commissioner visited the place. He came back. He was satisfied that there was nothing communal, that it was a small incident between two groups of young people. Then a few days later, the High Commissioner of Pakistan sought Nehru's permission saying, 'I

also want to visit that place'. Nehru said, 'all right, go and visit the place'. He visited. He went back to Pakistan. A news item was published that thousands of Muslims were butchered in India. The matter was raised in this House. I was a Member of this House at that time. Prime Minister Nehru was sitting. With all humility, I asked him: 'May I know, Sir, whether the leader of the Muslims of India is you or Liaquat Ali?' He said that it was a silly question. I said, "it may be a silly question, but I am very serious. Why do you allow the leaders of Pakistan and nationals of Pakistan to visit India to enquire into a quarrel between two communities?" Ultimately, from that time, Pakistan leaders have not been allowed. This is how the international inimical forces operate in order to destabilise the Government of India. Pakistan is very near. Day in and day out they try to espouse the cause of the Muslims of India as if they can save it. How can they? India is a very powerful, secular, socialist, democratic country. Pakistan is not. It is a theocratic country ruled by a military dictator. They are afraid that the people of that country may demand a secular democracy as in India. Therefore, always they try to say that Islam and Muslims are in great danger. And naturally innocent Muslims of India think, 'oh' Possibly they are our brothers; they are Muslims.' Pan Islamism may enter into the minds of innocent Muslims of India. This is how they are operating. Therefore, we reasonably believe that certain foreign powers who are very jealous of India—India everybody knows has made great progress . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your time is nearing completion.

SHRI BAHARUL ISLAM: Sir, please give me two-three minutes more because I speak only on few and far-between occasions. This is how these

forces operate. Now, great progress has been made in the country. India is today the ninth most highly industrialised country in the world. We have progressed in the international field. Our reputation in the international world has risen. India has become the leader of the Non Aligned block. Do you think that the capitalist block or countries inimical to India can tolerate this? Therefore, they will try to play a game in many ways. Therefore, we reasonably suspect that some forces behind this radio news are playing the game. We must beware of them. I do not suspect the *bona fides* of the Hon. Members of the Opposition. They are great patriots. But we must not only be patriots, we must not only love our country and the people, we must also know how to love our country. It is a known fact that many children in India die due to the innocence and ignorance of the mothers and not as many die due to plague and other diseases. Not that everybody does not know that mother is the greatest lover of the child. Similarly, you may be very honest in your heart of hearts, but you may be wrong in the *modus operandi* of your love. Therefore, we must be very careful about these forces. Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Gopal-samy, ten minutes. Just a minute. Mr. Minister, how long will you take for the reply?

SHRI ARUN SINGH: Half-an-hour.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: Sir, the hon. ex-Judge was wrong on facts. India is 27th industrialised country in the world and not 9th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When he said it, it was 9th. . .

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: Absolutely right.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Sir, deduct this one minute from my time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One minute deducted..

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr. Chairman, Sir, without taking even ten minutes' rest, you have been sitting in the Chair, you have been regulating the debate and the debate of today is of a high order.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): Because of the Chairman,

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not speak. It is the Members who speak.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: It is like the olden days' school master. He has regulated and we have obeyed his order.

Sir, I am not here to call this Government guilty. I am not here to say that you have committed a fraud or you have committed corruption. But, Sir, the air is thick with suspicion and distrust. The previous speaker, the hon. retired Judge says, it is not possible to prove innocence. Yes, of course. A judge is a different man from the executive. That is why the powers of judiciary were not given to the executive in a democracy. It is not easy to sit in the saddle of power. There is a couplet in Tamil:

MANPATHAI KAKKUMTHEN-
PULAM KAVAL THUNPAMALLA-
THU THOZNUTHAGAVIL

That means: To sit on the saddle of power, to hold the reins of power is a great hardship, is a great burden. To shoulder it is not a pleasure.

Therefore, Sir, when suspicion has arisen, when the integrity is suspected, it is for the Government to clear the suspicion. Today the credibility of the Government is suspected. Today the integrity of this Government is suspected. Today, the honesty of this Government is suspected. Sir, the very first sentence of the statement of our hon. Minister, Mr. Arun Singh, is not correct, because the Swedish Radio broadcast described, the kickbacks perhaps have been paid to senior Congress-I politicians and key Defence

figures. Sir, I do not want to repeat what my previous speakers have substantiated with press reports.

Sir, the Swedish Radio again said that "it had access to documents showing that Bofors had paid commissions, information it said it had checked with the company's bank, Skandinaviska Enskilda Banken" and four instalments were deposited in the bank, three on 13th November and again the fourth on 22nd December.

Sir, it will be very relevant in this context to draw the attention of the Government to press reports that appeared in 'the Statesman' on 19th April. Here, Mr. Magnus Nielsson who denied that the report originated from Delhi, says: "...his report of April 16 had said that the commissions paid last year were only a part of the total payment made to Indian contacts.

Mr. Nielsson quoted sources in Bofors to say that, in all, the Swedish company would pay commissions totalling to a couple of hundred million Swedish Kroners. The report went on to say that it was unclear what portion of the money had been paid to the agent for the work done by him and what portion went towards pure bribing."

Sir, speaking to Insight, Mr. Nielsson said that denial by Bofors had to be studied carefully as it only said that it had not paid any bribes. Mr. Nielsson said that his sources in the company had told him that bribes were paid by the agent and not directly by the company.

Meanwhile, in a carefully worded statement, a spokesman for Bofors told Associated Press that "it did not bribe or contribute to bribes paid in connection with the deal". The spokesman, however, refused to confirm or deny whether commissions had been paid to help finalise the deal. "Those reports about commissions I am not prepared to go into", he told Associated Press.

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

Because of the report and because of the broadcast, the suspicion is very much there not only in India but throughout the world.

Sir, Mr. Gurupadaswamy, when he made his speech, said about the proverb that we used to say that Caesar's wife should be above suspicion. Suspicion is a very dangerous thing. It becomes a cancer in the body politic. When suspicion arises in the minds of the people, when suspicion arises in the minds of the men in the street, it is a very dangerous. Therefore, because of these reports, a suspicion has arisen. You may be innocent, as you say. But what is wrong or what prevents you to order a Parliamentary probe?

Mr. L. K. Jha when he spoke, said many things. But I want to draw the attention of the Government to one thing. He said there are magazines and newspapers who are not free from the press barons and the proprietors, when we demand freedom of the press, and that is why a senior editor of a particular newspaper has resigned.

But Sir, that editor has not given any reason for his resignation. I can say that he has resigned because he has been a Doon school friend of a VVIP. Mr. Jha says that the editor has been pressurised and, therefore, he has resigned. Sir, our hon. friends from the other side have said many things. They said that the Opposition is not concerned about the purchase of weapons. The hon. lady Member from my State did put some questions about the quality of weapons. We are not here to question the quality of weapons. I am not questioning the quality of weapons. I am not opposed to the purchase of weapons from other countries. When we need, when the defence of the country is in peril, when the security or the sovereignty of the country is in peril, we will be second to none in raising our voice and extending our solidarity and support to the Government. (*Time-bell rings*) But

Sir, when they raise their voice from the housetops that there is a possibility of leakage of defence secrets, when they shout about national security, have they forgotten that it was from the Prime Minister's Secretariat, four years, military secrets were pilfered and passed on to foreign intelligence agencies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gopalsamy, you have to conclude now.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I am concluding. Only one more point I would like to make. This Swedish company, Bofors, had been dealing with blacklisted countries like South Africa. Our hon. Prime Minister raises his voice and advocates sanctions against, South Africa. At the same time, we negotiated this deal with a company which has had clandestine deals with South Africa. Is it not double standard? Should we not have checked the antecedents of this company?

Sir, one last point. Our hon. friends ask, why should we order a probe because there is no *prima facie* case. Sir, the Swedish Government is not at all involved in this. You did not have any negotiations with the Swedish Government. Because of the clandestine deals by this company, Bofors, there is speculation that the former Head of State, the late Mr. Olof Palme, was assassinated because, otherwise, some of the major deals might have been exposed. Not only that. One authority who was in charge of investigating this died under mysterious circumstances. That reminds me the fate of Nagarwala.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are saying totally irrelevant things. I am calling upon the next speaker.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: One last sentence. Sir, You have great regard for Lord Rama. Sir, Rama did not suspect Sita but he wanted to clear the suspicion in the minds of the public. Therefore, he asked Sita to

enter the fire. In the same way, if the Government is honest, if it is not guilty, why should it not agree to the demand by the Opposition for the setting up of a Parliamentary Committee? Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not Rama. I am Venkataraman. Now, Mr Chitta Basu. Ten minutes.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, Sir, let us, to start with understand the genesis of this debate. The genesis of this debate is the disclosure by the Swedish State Radio. The main burden of the disclosure, Mr. Chairman, is that the Swedish firm, Bofors, obtained a big export order by paying bribes to senior Indian politicians and key defence figures through secret Swiss bank accounts. This is the burden of the disclosure by the Swedish state Radio. Mr. Chairman, Sir, this disclosure has got three very distinct ingredients and these ingredients are:

(1) bribing of Indian politicians and key defence figures (2) the defence figures; (2) the secret secret Swiss Bank account; and (3) that, it is not a deal between the Government of India and the government of Sweden. It is contract between the Government of India and a private company, Bofors, whose antecedents are not above board as many Members have already mentioned about this and I refrain from discussing this.

Now the plea of the State Defence Minister is simple. It is very simple that the Government has banned middleman. Therefore, in this deal there was no middleman or agent approved by the Government of India. I agree I concede that this is the factual position, but here the question is about bribing Indian politicians. The question is of bribing key defence personnel. Bribing and paying legal commission are not the same thing.

Sir, the defence Minister's assertion, however, emphatic it may be, does

not rule out completely the existence of any middleman during different stages of transaction. I again concede that they may not have been approved by the Government but your assertion, Mr. State Minister, does not rule out absolutely the existence of some middlemen or intermediaries during different stages of the transaction.

Now the Swedish Radio's disclosure implies that there were some agents working on the Swedish soil, working at the biddings of the Bofors and presumably, I again concede, not approved by this Government, arranged for the bribing of Indian politicians and some key defence figures, and that too in an under-cover operation code, named 'Lotus'. Here comes the question of the functioning of the Swiss Bank Sir, I know that the general belief is that secrecy wall of Swiss Bank is impregnable. This is the general feeling. It cannot be demolished and the veil of secrecy is impossible of being lifted at all times and without exception. This is the general belief amongst us. I think the Government should take a different view about it because in all humility I wish to state that the position is not absolutely correct. Even the Swiss Bank recognises certain exception and one of the exception is that banks must yield information to the Swiss Federal Police if the information is reasonably required for investigation and punishment of a Swiss Federal crime. This is the exception. Again, bribing even the public servant of a foreign State on the Swiss soil, is a crime under the law of Switzerland. This point is to be taken note of and, Mr. Chairman, I think you understand the implication of this.

On this premise a conclusion can be drawn very safely that if the authorities are properly moved, that is, if the Swiss authorities are properly moved, they are not only entitled but

[Shri Chitta Basu]

bound to furnish necessary information and the Bank cannot plead for immunity. At the same time no corrupt politician in Switzerland can also dare to interfere with the investigation process and in that process facts will undoubtedly come out. Now I want to implore the Minister that the Government has got some duty in the context of this exception that I have mentioned earlier — if the Government is really honest and wants to conduct an honest probe, even to understand whether there is a *prima facie* case or not, I am not in a position to establish a *prima facie* case. Let me accept my inability because I have not got access to all the papers, nor am I on the pay roll of any multi-national company or any company associated with the deal. So it is quite impossible for me to come with specific charges against you. I am not venturing for that even. But if you are honest, if you want to have a probe, then clues are here and you can approach the Swiss authorities under that exception rule. That is what I want. The Government of India should lodge a proper complaint about the offence of bribes paid to Indian public servants or their corrupt nominees or appointees who are working on Swiss soil. Then and then alone the mystery of "lotus" code can be unravelled and if "lotus" code is unravelled, Mr. Minister, you will have a *prima facie* case. And if that *prima facie* case is available, I think it would force you to have an enquiry into the matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Three minutes more.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: That is all right, Sir. It is in the interest of the Prime Minister, it is in the interest of the whole Cabinet, it is in the interest of the Congress Party to take recourse to these methods because that may dispel the cloud which is gathering around the credibility of the Government.

Sir, the Prime Minister is involved. I take up this point last because I know there may be some shouting from that side.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There will be none.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: I am guaranteed. I know you are there, Sir. But it is admitted in the statement of the Minister himself that at a particular stage of these negotiations Prime Minister was involved. I do not say that he was bargaining for the price. I do not say that he was also concerned about the standard of the arms that were to be supplied or purchased. But it is admitted that a particular stage of negotiations, the Prime Minister of our country was involved and I plead that the details of what transpired between the two Prime Ministers may be made public, because if it is made public then we can have an impression that the Prime Minister and his interests, individual or otherwise, are not involved, or had no influence on the deal itself. I am not after the blood of the Prime Minister. I am not after the blood of any of them. But what I am after is truth, the absolute truth, and that also in the interest of fighting forces of destabilisation, because I am no less interested to fight and combat the forces of destabilisation. If you are really interested in defeating the forces of destabilisation, don't point to this side of the House. Please point your finger within yourself, within your party, within your Cabinet. And you should consult your conscience if it is still left with you and your party. Therefore, Sir, again I join my dear friends on this side to demand a full-fledged inquiry so that the truth may come out in the interest of the nation and in the interest of fighting the dangerous forces of destabilization of our country. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Thakur, five minutes please.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: In five minutes, on what can he speak?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He also wants to go an record.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR (Bihar): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I hope you will be flexible in this case as in others.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, always. If I say "five minutes", you will stop at least after seven or eight minutes.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR:
Thank you very much, Sir,

Mr. Chairman, Sir, when I rise to speak this afternoon, it is not one of the better occasions to be persuaded to be in that position. Sir, the issue is serious and concerns the security of the nation, but, unfortunately, the treatment it has received has been rather trivial. Yesterday, Mr. Jaswant Singh, a senior Member of the House and a person who knows more about these things—for obvious reasons—made, in a different context, a statement that triviality should not involve us. But, precisely what we have witnessed today—the whole day is that the time of this august House and the energy of people which could have been expended better, has been spent on this triviality and nothing but triviality. I think Mr. Jaswant Singh also mentioned that in such discussions honour and dignity of the country are involved and, precisely for that reason, there should be a much greater reason, a much deeper basis, a more authentic kind of a consideration, to allow some of these kinds of debates to go on in this august House.

I think the issues involved are two: Number one is the technical part and the other, the commercial process of price negotiation. Those who cared to listen to Mr. Arun Singh, the honourable Minister of State, yesterday, would appreciate and concede that there couldn't be a more blow-by-blow account of the processes of technical decision-making and price negotiation. If you look at the composition of the committee and the level of the people involved and the rigour and the seriousness of the whole scheme, I think we should be grateful to the Government that it has come out with so much detail on such a sensitive issue. The question to ask in the technical context is, do we know our choice and is the choice made on rigorous technical considerations by competent persons? The answer is, very clearly and loudly, yes. The next ques-

tion is: Commercially are we negotiating with a competent set of people through due processes and, in the process, are we making a benefit so far as the price levels are concerned? I think the facts are known—it has been reported—and if you go through the process of the kind Mr. Singh shared with the House, there can be no two opinions that this kind of rigorous bargaining would definitely end in bringing gains to the nation, and precisely in this case also this must happen and this has happened.

I think the Government, with regard to middlemen or kick-back and other kinds of things, has made a very clear policy. It was made in the context of earlier discussions and it has been reiterated not only by the Minister in charge but by the prime Minister himself. There has been a categorical denial and also a firm kind of undertaking, that if somebody, if not today, tomorrow, or much later, is identified to have bypassed that Government policy or tried to play tricks with that Government policy, action will be taken and the person brought to book.

श्री रामअवधेश सिंह : लेटस का नाम
फैकट है कि नहीं? ... (व्यवधान)

SHRIMATI JAYNTHI NATARAJAN:
We seek your protection from this Member, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You must have some unruly people also. Otherwise, life will become very dull.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: I know this gentleman. He is a good friend, and outside he is very sensible. I think there is some body chemistry with reacts in that particular seat and which makes him react the way in which he does. I suggest that he should move from that seat to some other place. Then, maybe he will be more quiet and calm.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Therefore, he tried to occupy this seat yesterday.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: The way the Government of India has responded must go on record. There was a demand yesterday in the Lok Sabha that the Government should come out with time allocation for discussion. I think in this House the Opposition demanded that there should be suspension of the question hour for that discussion. Yesterday in the Lok Sabha...

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not necessary. I want to tell the hon. Member, except points of policy etc. you don't discuss what happened in the other House and in this House. Please proceed.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: I appreciate that. I am not going into the substantive aspect of that. I am only saying that from the point of view of the Government the response has been good and unhesitating to the extent that it agreed to the procedural change in the business of the House, that it conceded to discuss it immediately and came out with a *suo-motu* statement. That should establish the credibility and the seriousness and the concern of the Government to bring probity in the public life. (Time Bell rings)

If I may continue.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Only one minute more.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: O. K. Mr. Dipen Ghosh has talked about the forces of destabilisation. I think, for a change the Treasury Bench is in agreement with him. He is looking for an illustration. Here is a good occasion to find one and probe further. So, from that point of view, could there be a better timing and sequence of the events in recent days, which could prove that the forces of destabilisation are active? I think, here I may bring to the notice of the House...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: It has been reported that the Swedish journalist concerned was contacted by somebody and asked a question of the

kind which Mr. Anand Sharma, our colleague asked, "You had a visa for visit in November and how come you have come so late?" It is reported that he has answered that the timing of the Fairfax and the scope for meeting with people whose names have come up in this controversy are perhaps the persuading factors in bringing him to this country as this time rather than the time which he had asked for. (Time bell rings)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your time is over. Please sit down. Mr. Saikia.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: Mr. Chairman...

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. Please sit down. Mr. Saikia has been called.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: Mr. Chairman, may I conclude.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. You have concluded. Chair has concluded your speech.

SHRI BAHARUL ISLAM: Mr. Saikia is from Assam, not from U.P. or West Bengal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are not now engaged in an enquiry about Mr. Saikia. We are engaged in a different enquiry.

SHRI NAGEN SAIKIA (Assam): I am the last speaker in today's discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You also finish in six Minutes.

SHRI NAGEN SAIKIA: I am a junior Member of this House also. I have only a few points to make.

My esteemed colleagues on the Opposition Bench have already very rightly pointed out the important aspects to be enquired in the whole affairs, and the Members of the ruling party have been trying to deny all these things. They have been trying to deny that there should be an enquiry into the statement given by the hon. Minister of defence.

He has said that the news item is baseless. It is completely malicious and mischievous, but in the news it has come out that the Correspondent is going to publish a list of the recipients. The question is if tomorrow the list of the recipients is published then where the prestige of the Government will remain, where the prestige of the nation will remain? In the statement he has said that nobody was authorised to take commission or irregular payment and no agent was there. The whole thing is not concerned with commission agent, rather very clearly with bribery. Our esteemed colleague Mr. Dipen Ghosh has very rightly pointed out that nobody bribes publicly with permission of the Government. It is done under the carpet. The Prime Minister of India has been speaking of clean administration and cleanliness in everything. Now a rare opportunity is coming to the Government to prove its cleanliness. If the present Prime Minister like his predecessors tries to justify that the corruption is a global phenomenon, then, of course, the people of this country will come forward with brooms in hands to clean the country.

The esteemed colleague, Shri Ghosh, has pointed out that to buy arms from a firm which supplies arms to our enemy country is itself a matter to be scrutinised. It is greatly harmful to the country.

Sir, I want to know two little points from the hon. Minister. One is whether the Government knows that the blueprints of the submarines supplied by West Germany were smuggled by Bofors to South Africa? If it was known to the Government, what action is going to be taken by the Government in this case? Another point is this. It is coming in the newspapers that in Sweden itself Bofors is facing a hard time for illegally supplying arms to the Middle East. I would like to know whether the Government of India knows these things and what steps the Government of India is going to take. What reaction it is expressing in this regard also? The Government of India should come forward with an open mind and it should declare that the whole matter will be probed by a parliamentary committee in the greater interest of the country, for its pre-

sent and for its future; and those who were and who are behind these dirty games will be exposed to the country and will be punished under the laws of the Country.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: May I make a submission, Sir? With your permission I have to make a request. We know the statement of the Minister and also know that he has to reply to the points raised by us. But our main demand, as you know is for a high parliamentary inquiry on this deal. So, if he agrees to our main demand, the rest of the things we can go through later. I would like to know whether he is going to agree to it or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How can you ask for it in advance? You are a seasoned Parliamentarian.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: If the Parliamentary probe is not accepted with this demand...

MR. CHAIRMAN: How can be?

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: No Sir. At the same time, in that case we cannot associate ourselves with the operation of cover up. We can associate with him in order to bring out the truth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please hear me. I do not know what the Minister is going to say. Nor can you know what he is going to say. You must hear the whole thing. If it is not satisfactory, you can say something. Until then please don't disturb.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: No, Sir. At the time he is agreeable to constitute a Parliamentary probe or not. At least he can say that. He can say whether he is going to constitute a Parliamentary inquiry or not.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: He can start with that...(Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: I must follow the procedure. The Parliamentary procedure is after you have made all the points, the Minister will examine it...(Interruptions). You see, the correct Parliamentary procedure is, after the Opposition and others have made the point, the Minister will sum up. He will see with which he agrees and with which he does not agree. How can you say he must first say with which he agrees and without his speech...(Inter-

[Mr. Chairman]
ruptions). He will have to make his speech.
(Interruptions). You will have time to do
what you want to do. Mr. Minister
please.

SHRI GOPALSAMY: Sir, we want a
Parliamentary probe. (Interruptions).

SHRI RAM AWADHESH SINGH:*

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Sir, they have
also started shouting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ram Awadhesh
Singh, please sit down. Nothing will go on
record.

SHRI RAM AWADHESH SINGH:*

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have not granted
you permission. Only Minister should
speak. Don't write. Don't record.

SHRI ARUN SINGH: I am not yeild-
ing. I am not hearing what the hon. Mem-
ber is speaking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is right. Your
leader has spoken. You cannot have ano-
ther chance. Now Mr. Minister.

SHRI ARUN SINGH: Mr. Chairman,
Sir, may I start by joining my colleague,
Mr. V. Gopalsamy in extending my per-
sonal thanks to you for to day I think
all Members will join me on this particu-
lar thing. May I also thank all the Mem-
bers who have participated in this debate?
Sir, from my point of view the quality of
the debate has been high, various points
have been made and lot of people have
come out... (Interruptions)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please don't see that
side Please see me always.

SHRI ARUN SINGH: All right, Sir,
Most of these points will require response
which I will definitely give. Yesterday,
Sir, Members on the Opposition benches
prefaced many of their remarks by their
search for truth. Today I am grateful to
them for not repeating what they did yes-
terday. Yesterday they did not wait for
the answer to their search. There have
been no significant questions raised on pro-
cedures neither in terms of the technical
evaluation processes nor in terms of the
price negotiation processes. I will not
waste your time and the Hon. Members'
time in detailing or in repeating what I
have said yesterday on that subject. To
my way of thinking as I have understood
the debate, no basic question was

raised in terms of Government's policy
on dealing with the commission
agents, a policy which in this
particular case has been reconfirmed by a
foreign government and a foreign com-
pany. I feel personally sad that one Mem-
ber thought it fit to question the *bona
fides* of the late Mr. Olof Palme. I believe
that Mr. Olof Palme both as an individual
and as the head of the government was a
true friend of this country and gave assur-
ance... So I will not attempt to refute any-
thing about this. I am not worthy of justi-
fying Mr Olof Palme. I also believe that a
large portion of the debate has got some-
what mis-directed because as I have under-
stood it today, the fundamental question is
the same on both sides of the House. Per-
haps this has not been debated as a poli-
tical discussion, but discussed as a subject
of significant national interest in which
attitudinal problems of party *versus* party
had not featured. Perhaps, we could have
achieved some objectives without some of
the invectives. Sir, a basic question has
been framed by most of the Members of
the Opposition. They agree that Govern-
ment is not charged with guilt. There is
no accusation of guilt. There cannot be
any accusation of guilt because there is no
evidence by which guilt can be
framed. Therefore, there is no
charge of guilt. The charge, therefore, if
any, lies in the concept of protection of
the guilty. If I may quote Mr. Gurupadas-
wamy, and I think, as a matter of national
interest, common to all of us, who are
Members of a Parliament, in both Houses
of Parliament, this is the question. Is there
somebody who is guilty and is there any
process by which at that guilt is being
sought to be hidden. (Interruptions) One
minute, please. Let me deal with it I did
not. Interrupt you Mr Dipen Goash There-
fore, as I said, I do not think that this
debate needed to proceed along partisan
lines. The question, therefore, starts as I
see it and I believe, there is consensus of
the House around one question, has any-
thing been paid? From that first question,
we derive all the consequential questions
If yes, then what, when, to whom, how,
why and where? Therefore, the funda-
mental question is, has anything been paid?
Our submission and the submission I have

specifically made in my statement is that from Government's point of view, both in terms of the price negotiation processes on the one side and in terms of the communication of a concept, communication of a decision, communication of a policy, in both situations, Government have made it abundantly clear, both to the company and to the Government of the country in which that company is based that no payment should be made. Therefore, the question still remains—has anything been paid? In order to deal with this question, we have, as has rightly been pointed out by Members, a statement, an announcement, if I can put it that way, on a Swedish Radio Broadcast which suggest that yes, something has been paid. As hon. Members on the other side have said, if it is our policy, if we have so declared it and if we have so communicated it, if that communication has been understood and we have said that yes, it has been understood, we have received confirmation of that understanding, then, if anything has been paid, there must be something wrong with that payment. We do not dispute that. We are in agreement with you because our starting point is that nothing should be paid. Our problem is, which is also your problem that as of now, at this moment of time the Swedish Radio broadcast has not gone any further in assisting us to discover whether anything has been paid. (Interruptions). Please don't interrupt.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: That is why, we are asking to constitute a Parliamentary Probe.

SHRI ARUN SINGH: Sir, I did not interrupt anybody.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him say just as you said what you wanted to say. Let him say what he wanted to say. If there is any point... (Interruptions). Whatever Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta says will not go on record. As a rule, now, please note, whoever says anything without his name being called, he will not be recorded. Let me tell you, if you want I will give you one or two opportunities to seek clarifications. That is much better than merely shouting. Now let the Minister continue.

SHRI ARUN SINGH: Please allow me to progress my arguments. What I understand is the Swedish Radio said -- and my understanding may be incorrect in which case I should be corrected -- that some money has been deposited in a secret bank account in the Swiss Banking Corporation under some code name called Lotus. That is what they have said. And they have said that they have further evidence which may or may not reveal what the bank account is, who Lotus is and what money has been paid. There has been some suggestion of the amount of money so credited to this account named Lotus in the Swiss Banking Corporation. What I am basically postulating, therefore, is that in the question, "Has anything been paid?", a suggestion has been made that some thing has been paid. That is why we are having this debate and that is why there is need for furthering this concept of discussing this and looking at this. I would also submit respectfully to all that this has got nothing to do with party lines because it is this Government's declared policy that nothing should have been paid. Now let us proceed from here. One of the unfortunate implications or accusations -- accusations may be too strong a word -- that has been raised today is -- and, in fact, one honourable Member on the other side actually said bluntly, "if you don't agree to having an inquiry, you are all thieves and so on and so forth"; not in that unparliamentary form but in a more parliamentary way...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: You have something to hide.

SHRI ARUN SINGH: I repeat that the question "Has anything been paid?" is a question of common interest to your side of the House and our side of the House: it is of common interest to the House; it is of even greater interest to Government because it is Government's policy that nothing should have been paid. And that is the hinge on which the debate hangs today. Let me first start by making it absolutely clear that we as Government are

[Shri Arun Singh]

most interested to know whether anything has been paid. We as Government, if we find that something has been paid, will definitely pursue each of these questions. What? When? Where? How? To whom? And why? How do we initiate this?

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA:
That is our question.

SHRI ARUN SINGH: A case has been made by one honourable Member that *prima facie* evidence is not available, there is need to look for *prima facie* evidence. And it has also been suggested that a probe is to be set up to examine whether a probe needs to be set up. In order to make this position somewhat easier for everybody, let me tell you what we have actually done so far. That will make the position clear. In our opinion, as a Government we have received a commitment both from the Company and from the Swedish Government that nothing has been paid. In fact, it was a commitment that nothing was payable, because the commitment was received before the contract was signed. So we received a commitment that nothing was payable. Now the first thing we have to ascertain is whether what we believe is a commitment or is not a commitment. Because there is no point in having a unilateral belief in a commitment if the other chap does not believe in the commitment. So what do we do? What we have done is we have asked the Swedish Government whether they believed that there is a commitment, and the Swedish Government confirmed that in their belief there is such a commitment. There is such a commitment. We have, therefore, both through their ambassador here and our ambassador in Sweden, asked the Swedish Government, in the light of their concept and their agreement that there is a commitment that nothing is payable, to let us know what the Swedish Radio is basing its statement on, what information is available in Sweden, what they are in a position to find out and whether they would communicate those findings to us. The Swedish Government have agreed to this request

and they have promised a speedy investigation and reversion to us. So, I would submit to you that the first step, as the honourable colleague, Mr. Chitta Basu said, towards establishing whether there is any *prima facie* evidence for anything having been paid has been taken by us. I would submit that it is incumbent on all of us to wait and see whether there is anything in this.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Will you share it with us in Parliament?

SHRI ARUN SINGH: Let me complete what I have to say. I will come back to your queries later. There is another possibility. I do not for a moment suggest that we forget the other side. The famous radio network and its correspondent have promised us, meaning the world, for the last five days, that tomorrow, the day after tomorrow, the next day, the next day thereafter, they will produce documentary evidence. Correct. Let us take them at their word.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: But you are provoking them.

SHRI ARUN SINGH: No. Why should I provoke them? I accept their bonafides and I accept their statement as it stands and I am sure that if they have any documents, they will produce them. One, we have organised with the active assistance of the Swedish Government that the Swedish Government will look into the matter and confirm back to us and, two, asked if the same person who has broken the story or the same set of people who have broken the story are in a position, at any point of time later, to confirm their story with documents. Only then we will know whether we have a *prima facie* case. So far as Parliament is concerned, may I inform the honourable Members that under no circumstances is it our intention to conceal anything from Parliament?

I would like to make one basic point about Defence because this point has been made. There is much that we can improve in terms communications, communication between products, processes, plans for Defence and Parliament, and there is much

that can be improved. But no impression should be sought to be given that we do not operate under the control of Parliament, Sir, this is untrue. We are as much controlled by Parliament as any other Department of the Government of India. We are subject to parliamentary review, we are subject to parliamentary debate, we are subject to the deliberations of the parliamentary standing committees and we are very much a part of this Government and this Government is responsible to Parliament. So, no impression should be sought to be conveyed that this is not so. What we can discuss -- perhaps the right moment will come when the Demands for Grants come up for discussion -- is how this can be improved. The second point that I want to make is that the concept that we are the people who believe in secrecy because we want to hide everything from everybody is, I am sorry, totally incorrect. Sir, I spent a considerable amount of time on this and I do not want to bore the Members at least on this side of the House on this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no. You go ahead.

SHRI ARUN SINGH: I say this because yesterday I discussed in some detail as to how it is that we talk about secrecy in Defence. Let me assure everybody present in this House, Sir, all Members of this House and Parliament as a whole, that secrecy in Defence does not mean condonation of corruption in Defence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SHRI ARUN SINGH: So, I fully agree with the honourable Members on the other side who have said that corruption is a crime and it must be rooted out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SHRI ARUN SINGH: Corruption anywhere, corruption anywhere including corruption in Defence. So there is no dispute between us on this issue. When we talk of

secrecy in defence, we talk about it for totally different reasons. We talk of secrecy about technical specifications. The problem about technical specifications. That is the real problem. I would like to share this problem with Members of this House. I think what I am going to say is not something which is untrue. The problem about technical specifications, Sir, specially technical specifications that appear in books is that they are not technical specifications which the user has. It is only the user who has the genuine technical specifications, because the book published figures tend to be averages or claims of manufacturers; and never in any product, whether you take a beauty soap or you take a high performance aircraft, is the claim of the manufacturer necessarily the correct claim. And, therefore, Sir, technical specifications known to users in the country of use are secrets. In fact, one of the problems of espionage, one of the fundamental purposes of espionage, other than the destabilisation of political system, is to unearth these military secrets. Military secrets are principally these technical specifications of equipment. And, therefore, when we talk about secrecy in defence, it is not with the intention of concealing corruption. I would be most grateful to the hon. Members if we could in fact discuss how we can improve communications, and not level charges which cannot actually stand in logic.

I would submit that we have spent two days, and virtually 11 and half hours, of debate on two defence acquisitions. We have discussed them from every possible angle—acrimoniously, interestedly, inter-party cross debate; we have done it in every form and fashion. We have discussed it sometimes at a level where -- yesterday, not today—insinuations have been made against people, against Defence officials, civil servants in Defence, Ministers and everybody as being vicious, corrupt...

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Nobody said that.

SHRI ARUN SINGH: I am not giving names. Insinuations have been made. I would like to make one point, Sir, which I believe is of interest to everybody. Sir, the easiest way — and there are Members on the other side of the House who have been senior Ministers in the Government at the Centre and there are Members who have been senior Ministers in the States; so they know what I am saying is true — the easiest way of not being controversial is never to take a decision. *(Interruptions)* There can never be a problem if you do not decide. And I assure you, and I say this with a sense of responsibility, that more debates like this where there is no evidence, will lead to potential paralysis, paralysis at all three levels. No honest, decent man likes to be called corrupt. I was asked by some friends on my side of the House: why I take personal exception, there is nothing personal in this, Parliament is discussion, Parliament is debate, there is no personal insinuations? But to me, being accused of, being corrupt is personal. This has nothing to do with being in power. The burdens of power, the pain of power, is something I understand. I accept what Mr. Gopalsamy said. But if somebody accuses me of corruption, it is personal accusation. I take it personally. I am sorry I do not have your maturity. I do not have your experience, I do not have the length of political service that you have. Therefore, I look at it as to how my colleagues would respond. My colleagues are the people who have the privilege of working in the Ministry which I serve. My colleagues are the officers in uniform, civil servants and those people who are being accused for the last two days, for 11-1/2 hours worth of debate. At least insinuations are being made that they may be corrupt. Sir, for those people who cannot defend themselves. I stand to defend them. I say that please allow us to work. If we are found guilty, hang us. But don't paralyse us by insinuations without evidence.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Sir, I would like to seek a clarification.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No second round of debate. Only Mr. Dipen Ghosh.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Our Minister of State for Defence has stated that the Swedish Government has been asked to investigate and that investigation report is awaited. The newsmen of the Swedish Radio has promised in the newspapers that he would submit list of persons and other documents. Therefore, certain other prima facie evidences may be available. In this background, I want to know from the hon. Minister whether (a) he is prepared to share that investigation report with us in Parliament when he receives it from the Swedish Government and (b) as soon as this investigation report and other evidences are available, will he be prepared to constitute a Parliamentary Inquiry Committee to go into the details? This is my specific question. Let him answer.

SHRI ARUN SINGH: I do believe, Sir, that I have been very unfair to my colleague, Mr. Dipen Ghosh. I have not given him the opportunity to walk out. Otherwise, tomorrow...

(Interruptions)

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I have asked you a question. You have stated that you would not be going to oblige me by giving me an opportunity to walk out. Thereby, you are evading a reply.

SHRI ARUN SINGH: I am coming to the reply. But I said that I must allow him.....

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Sir, on a point of order. Sir, he has protested that insinuations were made against him and his colleagues. Is it not an insinuation against the Members of Parliament?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He started a very good speech, but concluded it with a wrong sentence.

SHRI ARUN SINGH: May I reply to the specific question?

far as the first question is concerned, mainly. Insofar as the second question is concerned, it is too premature to say anything. That is all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The debate is over. There are still some 5 or 6 minutes left. I will ask Mr. Aladi Aruna to start the debate on the working of the Ministry of Human Resources.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: On a point of order. We have not decided anything that we shall sit beyond 5.30 P.M.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your point of order is up held. The House stands adjourned till 11 O'clock tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at fifty-four minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock, on Wednesday, the 22nd April, 1987.