

27. A & N Islands	361	476	448
28. Daman & Diu	00	30	145
29. Lakshadweep	28	4	11
30. Pondicherry	0	184	356
All India Total	275993	303821	279005

Ⓒ Provisional

12.01 hrs.

RE : VOHRA COMMITTEE REPORT

[Translation]

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (GANDHI NAGAR) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, yesterday Hon. Home Minister had presented the Vohra Committee Report on the floor of the House. We will have an opportunity to discuss it later, because before that Mr. Minister will place an elaborate report or give a statement as per your directive. Some apprehensions are arising out of Vohra Committee Report and therefore a clarification is expedient in this regard as to whether this is the full report of the Vohra Committee ? If not, then whether your permission was solicited not to produce its Annexure before the House because I hold that if any document is presented before the House dubbed as Vohra Committee's report, then it is a report and therefore a full report. If its any part has been withheld and not presented to the House, then House must be apprised of that and your permission should also be solicited for that. I have not got any information to this effect. The Vohra Committee report, in which the Government has tried to furnish information with regard to nexus between Mafia and politicians, accepts that there is a nexus between the two. Besides conceding the fact that there is a nexus between them, the committee, has also categorically asserted that

[English]

"Mafia gangs have been running a parallel Government in the country."

[Traslation]

Nothing else could be more categorical in its assertion than this acceptance of the crude reality. In the report, there is mention of Memon brothers, Iqbal Mirfee and Daud Ibrahim. These three proper names have been referred to. These three are really very notorious mafia dons. No politician has been named by the committee. Most particularly, this is critical of

the Government of Maharashtra. The Government means both politicians and bureaucrats. The people Maharashtra have already given their verdict which is the reflection of people's attitude towards the revelation.

I am raising the question of Parliamentary propriety. May be that I might study it, then it might become perhaps a question of privilege my question is whether the translation of this 12 pages report of Vohra Committee referred to day before yesterday only, cannot be made available to us. We used to think that the report might be running into 200-400 pages but it is in 12 pages only and yet you are not rendering its translation. You have been urged upon not to hold it as a precedent. After that such a situation should not occur. I am incapable to understand it. If the Gvoernment has concealed its those annexure in which their names figure, then I undestand that they have done contempt of this House and since they have not sought your permission to the effect, this becomes really a very serious issue. A clarification to this effect is necessary and must be given today only because this will be debated two to three days later.

SHRI SHARAD YADAV (MADHEPURA) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, Mr. Advani ji has raised the issue that has balsted the headlines in all the newspapers and media that the report has been presented only after having tampered it. I want to remind you that the Government was urged upon to table the report. The Parliamentary Affairs Minister Mr, Vidyacharan Shukla had said that he could not present the report then and there, that was a long report. If you do remember, You must be knowing that he had said that the report had 100 pages and that could not be translated easily, that might take time. But the report presented here is in 12 pages. The way the Indian politics has got criminalised and the way articles are published in newspapers has been focussed on in the report. We had never asked for this report. We had asked for presentation of the entrie report of the Vohra Committee. We had never asked to censor it. This is a very serious issue and eyebrows are being raised all around over it. The Government must

assuage the apprehensions today and State categorically whether the annexure has been withheld and whether some important matters have been dropped from it? If not, then it is all right. If so, then it is wrong. But we want the full report. This is my demand so that the debate could prove effective and meaning full and the people could get benefited and our public life could be cleared.(Interruptions)...

[English]

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (MIDNAPORE) : Sir, the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs may please confirm or deny, as he likes it, that he had said in this House that this Report runs into some 100 pages. This is on record. Now, as my colleagues have said, it has turned out to be only 12 pages. There are reports going around in various quaters that there are some annexures to the main body of the Report. I do not know whether it is a fact or not and he can confirm it or not. If those annexures were there with the original Report of Mr. Vohra, then obviously they cannot be withheld from the House. Otherwise, it will be breach of privilege. The whole Report including annexures must be produced. There are also reports that - I do not vouch for them - Mr. Vohra has made some sort of an assessment of Rs. 60,000 crore. According to him, he has found out, in cooperation with other intelligence agencies, that about Rs. 60,000 crore has been handled in some of these mafia transactions. All these things are supposed to be there in the annexures and all that. So, we are very insistent on this. As Mr. Advani has said, the entire report with all the annexures, if any, must be laid on the Table of the House. Otherwise, we are not going to accept this 12 pages Report which has been given ... (Interruptions)...

THE MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES AND MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA) : Sir, I do not think the apprehensions expressed by the hon. Members are correct. But before saying anything on this matter, I would like to check up with the Home Minister about the particular person.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN (ROSERA) : Sir, with whom will he check up?

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : I will check up with the Home Minister and ultimately inform the House because this needs to be verified from the Home Minister itself. I cannot give offhand information on this point. So, before the day is out today, I will inform the House about it... (Interruption)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN (ROSERA) : Sir, this is the Report. You may kindly go through the

Report. On page 3, there is paragraph No. 3.7. and after that, there is paragraph No.6.1 pertaining of director (IB). Where are the other paragraphs, namely, paragraphs 4,5, and 6? ... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Let the Minister explain it.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P.M. SAYEED) : Mr. Speaker, sir, there is a typographical error in the Report. Even in the original, the whole matter is there. While numbering, the error has crept in. After point 3.7 it has been numbered as 6.1 (Interruption)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : How? Sir, we cannot accept it. This is a breach of privilege (Interruption)

MR. SPEAKER : Now, you please take your seat, You have raised a question. Let him reply and if there is any lacuna in it, I will allow you to ask the question.

Yes, Mr. Minister, you please explain what is the position.

SHRI P. M. SAYEED : Sir, in the original Report also, after point 3.7 it has started from point 6.1. That is the mistake crept in the original Report. So also in the English version. (Interruptions).... If they do not allow me even to explain, how can I?

Sir, we have also checked up the original Report. There also after point 3.7, it goes to point 6.1. It is a typographical error. That is what I wanted to say. Even in the original also, we got it checked up; and nothing has been suppressed. Only in the numbering, the mistake is there.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI : Sir, so far as this particular discrepancy that has been pointed out by Shri Ram Vilasji is concerned, at this point of time we accept what Shri Sayeed says that there has been a discrepancy in numbering of paragraphs in the original Report also. Though I would think that when a Report of that kind is presented to the House that numbering error has to be corrected by the Home Ministry also just as you or your Secretariat has the authority that in case of Bills if there are errors or discrepancy of this kind they can be corrected.

But the principal question is, 'Is this a complete Report?'. And to that, when the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs said that he would like to fine out from the Home Ministry, this authority Mr. Sayeed does not have. Mr. Sayeed has to reply here and now, whether this is the complete Report or not.

This question should be answered. There should be no difficulty about that. In case of the Parliamentary Affairs Minister, he would certainly say that 'I would find out from the concerned Ministry'.

Therefore, my own feeling is, reading by this Report itself there is a reference on page 2 to a report on the nexus between the Bombay City Police and the Bombay underworld prepared by the CBI in 1986. I am sure that this Report would also be a part of the annexure. Normally, every Report presented to Parliament in which a reference is made to an earlier Report which has not been submitted to Parliament earlier would include taht in the annexure. Othrewise, what is the meaning of this? Are we to go on the basis of the truncated Report of this kind? Therefore, Mr. Sayeed at least would be able to answer in categorical terms, whether this is a complete Report or not, whether there are any annexures to this Report which have not been presented to this House on any ground or not. These are the two questions which Mr. Sayeed should answer.. (*Interruptions*)..

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (DUM DUM) : I just draw your attention to one paragraph.

MR. SPEAKER : Please, you speak only after obtaining my permission.

Please, first of all, you take your seat.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : Sir, I seek your permission.

MR. SPEAKER : I have not given you the permission. Please take your seat. I am asking you to take your seat. I am not going to allow.

Please remember that any information you want to get on the record will be allowed to get on the record but if all of you are standing together and speaking, neither I understand nor does the Minister understand and nothing can be recorded.

That is why I allowed some Members; I will allow some other Members also. But I cannot allow all the Members who want to speak on this because there would be an occasion for you ot interpret the report, to speak on the clauses in the report and all those things only to a limited point which have been raised by Shri Advaniji and Shri Sharadji - whether this is a complete report or not. Is there any ambiguity in this question?

Yes, Shri Nirmal Kantiji, what is the ambiguity?

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : Sir, I draw your attention...

MR. SPEAKER : You do not draw my attention, you draw the Home Minister's attention.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : Sir, only through you, I can draw the attention of the House.

MR. SPEAKER : Let it go directly !

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : Sir, there is something unique in what has been mentioned in paragraph 2.2 of this report :

"In the course of the discussion I perceived that some of the Members appeared to have some hesitation in openly expressing their views. I am also seeing and I am conviced that the Government actually intended to pursue such matters. Accordingly, I addressed several personal letters to each of the Members of the Committee seeking their well considered suggestions and recommendations".

The next sentence is, "their responses are briefly brought about below" - this indicates that the entire response must have been appended to this report.

MR. SPEAKER : Let it be explained.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : Sir, the point raised by Shri Advaniji is corroborated from so many angles. This is indicated by the missing paragraphs, this reference and this gap. The Home Minister suggested that it would be a bulky report and he did not know as to how the Hindi translation could be done in one or two days time. All these things conclusively indicate, I underline the word 'conclusively', that there was...

MR. SPEAKER : You come to the conclusion without hearing others' views.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE . Sir, this is my view that I am expressing.

MR. SPEAKER : This is wrong. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : Sir, This Report is not a Committees ' Report.

MR. SPEAKER : Let the Minister reply.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : I, therefore, request.... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI NITISH KUMAR (BARH) : Sir, everybody will repeat the question posed by Shri Advaniji.

MR. SPEAKER : You are right.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : So, let the Minister respond to it.

MR. SPEAKER : Now, you ask your colleague to sit down also.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : Sir, you should demand...

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Nirmal Kantiji, you should sit down now..

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : Sir, I would request you..

MR. SPEAKER : You do not request me. Let me use my own brain.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : The original should be shown to you.

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down now. Let it be explained first.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Now, you will have all opportunities to ask an question. But before anybody says anything, if you are raising your voice and making noise in the House, I do not know, how we would be able to hear what he wants to say. Let us hear him first.

(Interruptions)

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : Sir, I have to check up the matter with the Home Minister. I will also..(*Interruptions*)

Please listen to me for a minute. I will also request him, in case he wants to say anything himself, he could come to the House and inform the House about it.....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (BANKURA). : Sir, I want to ask a question.

MR. SPEAKER : Please let me clinch the issue first.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHRIA : Sir, I have one simple question.....(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Basudeb Acharia, I cannot compet with each and every Member in the House.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHRIA : Okay Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : Now, this okay should be really okay.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : You may now allow me to put a question.

MR. SPEAKER : I think the Home Minister should come here and explain the position. Mr. Sayeed might have seen it or might not have seen it. Since he is sitting here and still not getting up and the Minister of parliamentary Affairs is speaking on his behalf, I presume that he has no ful knowledge. So, we will not like to bruden him. Let the Home Minister come explain the position.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (BALLIA) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to quote the statment of the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs which was delivered day before yesterday. He said:

"Regarding Vohra Report, we have discussed it with the Home Minister. There is no Committee as such but Vohra Report will be tabled in the House. Let the hon. members, who have been asking for it study it. I think that contains about hundred pages.

I think he must have made this statement after verifying it. I also think, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that there is a rule and a tradition that no paper is laid on the Table of the House without dur Verification. The verifacation is done by a person not less than the level of Additional Secretary of the Government of India. No Junior person can do this verification. If this verification was done then how could this thing happen? The Home Minister has come. If he says something, then I do not want to say anything. Let him clarify the position.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr Chandra Shekhar, would you like to complete?

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Every time something happens in the House when it becomes impossible to understand what one should do. The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has made a statement and that statement is on record. They have got a 12-page Report. I have not seen this Report, nor am I interested in it. But I am interested that certain tradition should be maintained. The Minister says that he will verify it was that Report submitted to the House without verification? After laying the Report on the Table, no Minister can say that he will get it. Verified from the Home Ministry. The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs should know whether that was an authenticated Report or a complete Report. The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs says that it is not a Report, it is a Paper, He shoud have at least told you that a part of the paper is being given to the house and not the whole Paper or the Report. The Parliament should not be kept in dark. That is all i want to say.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI S.B. CHAVAN): Sir, only three copies of this Report were prepared; one was given to me, another was given to the Minister of State for Internal Security and the third was given to the Prime Minister. I have tallied both the copies, a copy which was placed on the Table of the House and a copy which was with me in which the signature of Mr. Vohra is there, and as far as my information goes there is no Annexure to this Report. Because of the consistent pressure of different Members, my colleague might have said that there has been some kind of an Annexure. My information is that there is none.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, you were not here. Probably, an impression is created that he has made this statement. He has not made any statement.

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN: Since there is no Annexure, the question of placing it on the Table of the House does not arise.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Mr. chandra Shekhar has just now quoted from the Report. It is quite clear from that quotation the Mr. Vohra had some exchange of letters, as is also said by the Members of the Committee. Mr. Shukla's statement says that there is no Committee as such. Was there a Committee or not?

MR. SPEAKER: We will go into all these things.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: With whom did he exchange those letters and where are those letters?

MR. SPEAKER: If you read the Report that point will become clear.

As far as 100-page Report is concerned, probably the Minister wanted to say something else. If Mr. Shukla wants to say something, I will allow him.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: When we were talking about it in the Committee Room, a question was asked as to how much time it will take to translate the Report. To emphasise that it will take time, I might have said that because I checked up with my colleague and the Home Minister said that it will take two or three days. That is what Mr. Chavan told me.

Therefore, I said that since it contains numerous pages it will take so much time. I wanted to emphasise that thing (*Interruptions*)

[*Traslation*]

SHRI SHARAD YADAV: Mr. Speaker, Sir when I had got up, you asked me to sit down. Now suppose (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Sir, I will give you time to speak..

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Speaker, Sir I have raised question on the basis of apprehensions. Mr Ram Vilas paswan ji has also pointed out one more concrete discrepancies in the report that after para 3.7 there comes para 6.1 and thus para 4 and 5 are missing. The reply of our comes para 6.1 and thus para and 5 are missing. The reply of our Minister of State on Home Affairs is that the discrepancies could be seen in the original as well and that is why the discrepancies have been witnessed in the present impress report as well, He has said that the parliamentary Affairs Minister has said two days ago that it is a 100 pages report and its immediate translation is not possible and his clarification just to impress the House he has mentioned this hardship.

MR. SPEAKER: Sir, No. no. He has not said so.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: How was a 100 page report reduced to a mere 12 page report? Our apprehensions are that there is nothing in it on the basis of which we may call it a substantial report if a committee submits such reports.

MR. SPEAKER: The first question is whether it is a committee or not and the second question is whether the report is complete or not?

[*English*]

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: he calls it a committee. This is Vohra Committee Report. That is the title (*Intreptions*)

[*Traslation*]

It is mentioned therein that -

[*English*]

The Government established a Committee comprised of the Home Secretary as Chairman, Secretary (R) and the DIR as Members.

[*Traslation*]

And still it said whether it is a committee or not? All these things only confirm our apprehensions that some fact is being concealed form the House. What is being concealed?

[*English*]

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Have the members signed the Report?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: No. members have not signed; the Chairman has signed it.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: And he has not shown it to the members of the Committee.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I would plead with you that this matter should not be allowed to rest here. The answers given by the Treasury Benches are totally unsatisfactory. I would Urge you as hon. Speaker of this house to go into this matter

MR. SPEAKER: Go into which matter?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: you can see the original. I cannot call for the original

MR. SPEAKER : Original, I think....

SHRI S. B. CHAHAN : I am prepared to show it to you, Sir.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI : You see the original and satisfy yourself.

[Translation]

whether, infact, there is some discrepancy, some mistake or it has some annexures or not?

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : I will do it.

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR (BARRACKPORE) : Even the so-called original will be tampered. This statement made here is a travesty of truth.

[Translation]

SHRI SHARAD YADAV (MADHEPURA) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want your protection. The clarification given by Shukla ji is vague and ambiguous and also unexpected of a Minister. He did not talk of 100 pages but said that it runs into numerous pages and this is on record. The Parliamentary Affairs Minister i.e. the Government stated clearly that there are 100 pages. Supposing he was ignorant, then he avoidingly said that the report should be placed forthwith. He said so either in ignorance or to avoid this discussion. He should have frankly betrayed his ignorance. (Interruptions)

I want your protection.

MR. SPEAKER : What protection do you need?

SHRI SHARAD YADAV : The Minister should not be careless. India is such a Vast country and is still being run by them. It cannot be run in a casual

manner like that. I am saying so because in his clarification Shuklaji has backtracked from his 100 page statement. Now he says that hc has said 'numerous pages' . How and why did he say 100 pages? Whether he was aware or ignorant? Whether he guessed and if he did not, then why did he say so ? He has to give this clarification before the House or he will be making a mockery of it. You have to ensure that no mockery is made of the House. Secondly, I would not like to add more to what Advaniji said. By going through this report you can perceive whether something has concealed or not and if you are satisfied, the question is solved. The hon. Minister should give a fresh clarification on it.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : We are going into the Report itself. It is because Mr. Nirmal Kanti Chatterjee did the something.

[Translation]

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV (AZAMGARH) : I am raising some more serious issues.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this House runs according to some rules and principles, traditions and conventions. No rule of the House says that the speaker should convene the meeting of the leaders and hold consultations with them. But you have set a good precedent of convening such meetings before beginning of the sessions of in between and as and when you deem necessary so that business is conducted smoothly. The hon. Parliamentary Affairs Minister represents the Government in those meetings. I am only reminding you....

MR. SPEAKER : Chandra Shekherji has rightly said that nothing about the business conducted in the meeting of the Committee should be mentioned here as it creates problems afterwards. You only concentrate on what he said in the House.

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV : There should be scope for exceptions at times.

MR. SPEAKER : There are so many exceptions now that those may tend to become a rule.

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV : At times a serious issue should be permitted as exception.

We as well as the Oppsition party had demanded that the Vohra Committee Reprot should be placed before the House. In response, the Parliamentary Affairs Minister had stated that it was not a committee. Such activities are undertaken in the department in order to elicit information and to run it smoothly. This was totally wrong because this

committee is constituted under a number-by Government order Dated July 9th, 1993 established a committee. First, the House was misled by saying that it was not a committee whereas a committee of five members was set up by a Government order. Secondly, it was said that as it was not a committee but an inter-departmental exercise, it cannot be placed before the House.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : It goes to show that you are not fully informed.

[Translation]

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV : Mr. Speaker, Sir, things were denied and the newspapers reported for a week that there are two opinions in the Government - one that the Committee Report be placed before the House and the other that it should not be placed. The Hon. Home Minister also stated once that there was no need of placing it before the House. But it is good that some demand of the House was met. Good sense prevailed upon the Government and it placed the report before the House.

My submission is that such things give birth to apprehensions due to which the House gets agitated at times. On our part, we do not take any improper and uncalled for actions but when the government commits such blunders, violates the traditions and tries to conceal or distort facts, then, we are oberd to raise such demands. Therefore, I request you to issue directions to the effect that the matte of fact ground realities should be put forth in such meetings. We will not emphasize on disclosing facts which are against the national interest or security but the tendency of concealing every fact should be checked.

[English]

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGHLY) : It concerns the prestige of the House. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN (ROSELA) : Sir, there is one more lacuna here. what is this? I want to know whether it is a serious Report or not. Where is Para 7.47

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (GANDHI NAGAR) : Where is Para 7.4? It is also missing.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN (ROSELA) : You go through Para 7.3. Then comes Para 7.5. Where is Para 7.4?

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (KATWA) : Mr. Vohra should be called here. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : You are very careful in this matter and you should be congratulated for the interest you are showing. I think all these points which have been raised do have relevance. They have to be resolved.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down.

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN (ROSELA) : It is a very serious matter. Criminalisation of politics is the one issue on which we want to have a discussion. Will you discuss this Report?

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (KATWA) : Mr. Vohra should be called.

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down. First of all let us understand and bear in mind whether there were two Reports or three Reports. Limited copies were there. Now Advaniji has very rightly said 'Call the original Report and tally the original Report with this'. The Home Minister also had said that he would make the Report available. I would say that I would request the Home Minister to come to the Chamber with the Report. I will ask the other leaders also to come there so that they can also tally.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY : Mr. Vohra should be called to the House. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : How can you call him? Under which rule you are asking this? *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down. You should argue. Do not shout.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Now, let me know under which rule he can be called. You go through the rules. I am not going to do it by your whims and fancies.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : You give me a notice. I will apply my mind.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY : Do not say it cannot be done.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Give notice. Do not shout like this.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : You give notice, a proper notice. I will decide it.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Give a notice under which rule it can be done. You study it. Give a notice. I will apply my mind.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Whatever you want me to do give it in writing. I will apply my mind and take a decision on it. I am not going to come to a conclusion like this. Give in writing.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : You give a proper notice. I will apply my mind.

[Translation]

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI : Mr. Speaker, Sir, criminalisation of politics is agitating the people. There is no such tradition but even then on your and leaders of Oppositions request the Government agreed to present the report of the committee on criminalisation of politics which was constituted two years back. This is being discussed throughout the world but I feel that though the Government accepts that mafia gang are running a parallel Government but this report does not point out facts in particular. Whether the Government has concealed those facts. It has created apprehensions in my mind. Gradually some more facts also came into light which made our suspicions profound and I think that you also feel so.

MR. SPEAKER : No, no, so far this feeling has not taken deep roots. I will make up my mind after listening to the facts and not before that.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI : I do not say that you have drawn final conclusion. But this Government is deliberately hiding some facts, and for that you say that we have right to move Privilege Motion.

MR. SPEAKER : I said that....*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : I was told that the officers who have furnished this report should be summoned in this House, as is done in a court and one can be summoned here for deposing evidence. If it can be done, please quote the rule under which it can be done. I will look into it.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI : It can be done in the Privilege Committee, if you intend to do that. There is no reason for summoning them here, but this right is reserved with you. You should be satisfied with hon. Home Minister's statement that he would send all the document to you.

MR. SPEAKER : I will not be satisfied with it.

(Interruptions)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI : He said -

[English]

" To the best of my knowledge, there are no Annexures ". To the best of his knowledge, there are no Annexures.

[Translation]

He said that and I felt that he was not ready to say this as State Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs.

[English]

If this is the complete report, I may feel that **Prima facie** it is a case of privilege. This is what I felt. But I did not press it.

[Translation]

Because I felt that Shri Vohra should be summoned by raising issue through a privilege motion. Several members including our former Prime Minister have expressed their apprehensions before the custodians of the right of this House. What's been much more surprising that it is a hundred page report but later on you find a 12 page report only **Prima facie** it tantamounts to breach of privilege.

[English]

He has no explanation as to why he used the words "hundred pages", which he tries to convert today into "numerous pages".

[Translation]

All these facts give way to apprehensions and as a protector of the House you should clarify the apprehension expressed by Members in the Parliament.

[English]

Let this chapter not be closed. ...*(Interruptions)*

DR. KARTIKESWAR PATRA (BALASORE) : Without knowing the facts, the hon. leaders of the opposition parties should not draw any conclusion(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Speaker, Sir, much confusion is being created on this issue because Members of this cabinet have not seen this report themselves. Just now I have seen this committee report. All the members of this committee are related to Home Ministry such as Home Secretary or D.G.s of I. B. it has happened or not but I feel that it happens in Governmental set up that at the time of submitting the report it would have been containing references from the report of I.B. and RAW which might have been deleted later on. Every government does that and it should be done. I would like to say that it will be really difficult to run the Government if we introduce a new tradition of presenting the IB and RAW reports and start summoning officials here. The Minister of State of Parliamentary Affairs would forbid me but I am sorry to say that Home Minister has looked into this aspect. These paragraphs might have been deleted so that all the Members could not know about the whole report. I know the procedure of the Government's functioning but why the Government hesitates in saying so. There are some IB or RAW reports which cannot be supplied to all the Members in this House. It should have been said in the beginning to avoid this confusion.(Interruptions)

ONE HON. MEMBER : I cannot say this.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Sir, this unnecessary controversy is created because every one gives statement without understanding it which further complicates the matter. Better if the persons mentioned, in it and the interested politicians are called to look into the matter. This controversy should not be raised to that extent that RAW and IB officials are summoned in the Parliament. At present judges have started summoning them. I do not know that in this way where the country will go. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Please listen to me, this House is for enacting laws, formulating policies and not for recording evidences. (Interruptions)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN (ROSERA) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I did not know even the name of Shri Vohra. We came across it when the hon. Home

Minister said that Vohra Committee report on criminalisation of politics will be presented in this House. (Interruptions)

I have shown you the 2-3 words of this report of 1993. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Paswanji, you have spoken for two-three times. You have been allocated enough time to speak.

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : I have not spoken of this subject.

MR. SPEAKER : Now on which topic you are speaking.

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : I am saying that I have seen several reports in this House. I am here since 1977. But it is really strange that in the name of a Committee report, a 12 page statement is presented as an authenticated report. He might have furnished the report but I would like to say so simply because on the first day you really had taken seriously the opinion expressed by hon. Members. I think that if the Government had not given assurance in the name of Vohra Committee report, the opposition would have been adamant on the point to discuss the issue of criminalisation of politics. The Government then gave assurance that this report along with its own report on this issue will be tabled. You have said that the report could be given after two days also. I would not like to go into it. (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : May I tell you ? Please do not jump to the conclusion.

[Translation]

Please first of all at least ask them for it.

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Home Minister has said that it was the report. Three authenticated copies have been given, i.e. one copy for the Prime Minister, one for the Home Minister and one for you....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I have not been given....

(Interruptions)

ONE HON. MEMBER : One copy was given to Shri Rajesh Pilot.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : All right.

MR. SPEAKER : Such things create disturbance. You please speak on this issue carefully

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Sir, the Home Minister has said. ...*(Interruptions)*...I apprehend that the earlier report was extensive one and prepared very carefully. Shri Chandra Shekhar is a former Prime Minister. He said that some points could be deleted but it did not mean that the whole report can be replaced. I would like to say that all the Members doubt that it is an incomplete report. How you will clear this doubt. Mr. Speaker, Sir it is for you to remove their apprehensions and now you should give ruling on it.

SHRI RABI RAY (KENDRAPADA) : Sir, we are discussing a very important question here. You are the custodian of the rights of the Members of this House. The House is unanimous on one point that this report has raised certain apprehensions which will send wrong signals in the country about its authenticity. The question is how to remove these apprehensions.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, transparency is the most significant factor in our Parliamentary life. There is apprehension about two-three points. I don't know, if Shir V. C. Shukla stated that it is a 100 page report.

[English]

Did he have access to the Report at that point of time? Did he go through the Report ? I do not know.

[Translation]

Has he gone through the whole report and can he say that it is a 80, 90 and 100 page report?

MR. SPEAKER : He said he had not gone through it.

SHRI RABI RAY : I don't know, but the hon. Home Minister has repeatedly emphasised that there were only three copies of this report of which one

copy was lying with him, the other with the Minister incharge of Internal Security, Shri Pilot and the third with the hon. Prime Minister. Mr. Speaker, Sir, it was reported in the media eight days ago that the report was lying with the Internal Security Minister who could leak it selectively. Therefore, this report of selective leakage raised apprehensions. So, if there was another copy with the hon. Prime Minister, then I request that he should talk to him. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not agree with the plea that Shri Vohra can not be called because there is no privilege motion, but submission is that he has been our defence Secretary and Home Secretary

MR. SPEAKER : Look, don't drag it to this length. It will create problems if somebody complains tomorrow that you to have violated the established procedure.

SHRI RABI RAY : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not saying that he be called in the House.

MR. SPEAKER : If any Member speaks in my chamber that you have violated the established procedure, it will create difficulties.

SHRI RABI RAY : I mean to say that you can talk to the hon. Prime Minister.

MR. SPEAKER : All Right.

SHRI RABI RAY : You can find solution after holding discussion with the hon. Prime Minister. You can even consult the leaders of parties and groups and also call the Prime Minister and take them into confidence. There is no other way out.

[English]

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY : The point is that we never expected great things to come out of this Report. A Home Secretary of the Government cannot give a comprehensive report covering all dimensions and it requires an independent commission to go into it. That is a separate matter. But our point is whether something is done to the Report that has been given by the Vohra Committee by Shri Vohra or anybody else.

I very humbly disagree with Shri Chandra Shekhar that certain portions can be omitted in the of RAW and IB and all those things.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Security.....

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY : What security? You have to expose the criminal nexus between the politicians, bureaucrats and the mafia. Everything has to be exposed. In this report not a single line can be suppressed in the name of security.

That is my point. If the Minister is saying that this is the Report, I think that there is something really very serious. We have to look into it. I do not know.....

MR. SPEAKER : What to do, you advise us.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY : There is nothing wrong in reaching the truth. We can go to any extent. Even if it requires getting a statement from Shri Vohra, I have no objection. We have to go to the root of the truth because outside we are being condemned.

MR. SPEAKER : That means, that which has to be done by the court we have to do here.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY : What can the court do? It is for the Report to do it.

MR. SPEAKER : You have expressed your views.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : No; I humbly, with all due respect, differ from you in this respect. Normally, of course, if it is a question of taking evidence from some officer or some body these things are done in the court. But since the matter has come into the House and so much time has been spent on it, and we do not even know now how you will identify what was the original and what was the copy, we do not know....

MR. SPEAKER : What is your advice?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : My advice is that you have to take some trouble now.

MR. SPEAKER : What trouble? What do I do? What kind of trouble should I take?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Trouble means, there are two or three people concerned with this whole matter, whom you should yourself call. There is no need to involve other people with it.

MR. SPEAKER : No; I would not myself alone take this responsibility because if somebody gets up and says that I am also not making the correct thing.....

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : All right; as you like. We are prepared to cooperate and help you. You should call the people concerned to your Chamber and let us try to get those points clarified. Was there a Committee or not, which is the original, which is the copy, were there any annexures -all these points have to be clarified.

I know Shri Vohra from the time he was the Secretary in the Defence Ministry and to my knowledge he is a very experienced and upright official. He will tell you the points which he could clarify.

MR. SPEAKER : All right, Shri Sharad Dighe.

SHRI SHARAD DIGHE (BOMBAY NORTH CENTRAL) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will appeal to the House that while considering this parliamentary matter we should not lay down any wrong precedent. Today one Party is in power. Tomorrow another Party may be in power. This is the internal report prepared by the Home Ministry and the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs had also made a cautious statement. He said : "I think it contains about 100 pages." He said : "I think". He has said cautiously because he was not sure. But ultimately the report which was placed before the House contains only 12 pages and it is authenticated by the hon. Minister of Home Affairs. Many a time if I, as a Member, produce a document and authenticate it, it is accepted. If you produce any document and say you authenticate it then it is accepted. Here no less responsible a person than the Hon. Minister of Home Affairs authenticates and says : 'I have verified. This is the document.' In fact, the matter should have been stopped there. But it does not matter. Further, doubts are raised because certain discrepancies are there about the paragraph number. So, ultimately about this suggestion that the original copy should be shown to the hon. Speaker and if he verifies, them it should be accepted, I think we should stop it at that. We should not go further and say, 'call Vohra or call this Officer.' That is a very wrong precedent.

I humbly suggest that this is not the work of the hon. Speaker. With great respect to his office, I say that this is not the function of the hon. Speaker to call Government officials, cross-examine them and find out the truth. This is not a court of law. We should stop this here. When the hon. Minister of Home Affairs has authenticated and ultimately if the original is shown to the hon. Speaker and if he is satisfied, then the matter should end. We should accept that this is the final and genuine copy of the report and proceed accordingly. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (DUMDUM) : The report says that he has got three copies printed, but only two copies have been submitted. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Please take your seat. I think we should stop it here. Very learned suggestions have been made. All weighty suggestions will be considered by me very carefully, very meticulously and that which is applicable and feasible will be accepted and accordingly the action will be taken.

Thank you for your contributions.

The House stands adjourned to meet again at 2.00P.M.

12.58 hrs.

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