

(x3/1800/kmr/jr)

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Madam, for the first time he became liable for arrest on a non-bailable warrant on the 5<sup>th</sup> of August, 2015. Therefore, if you move under FEMA and then say let him be physically picked up and deported to India, it may be a difficult proposition to sustain. The British Government did not agree with that. It is only when he is required for arrest here and he evades that arrest that other proceedings like red corner alert or any extradition proceeding or any legitimate cancellation or impounding of passport can thereafter follow. Unless you take the right steps, you would not move in the right direction.

So, where do we stand today? The allegation against Sushmaji is, on a day when there was no arrest warrant against him, there was no criminal case against him, there were FEMA proceedings pending against him, he made some request, right or wrong and she carefully told the High Commissioner that this is not a question of international relationship, you deal with it under your law. They say this is a big crime that you have committed. Unfortunately we are living in a world where in the first instance he is declared a fugitive and an absconder by television channels, not by a court of law, or by some Members of the Congress party because it suited their argument.

Now, what is the strategy? The strategy is that factually, till the 26<sup>th</sup> of May in 2014 you were in power. You had only an old FEMA adjudication proceeding where the principal question is whether transfer of money to South Africa and transfer back - and these are bank transfers - without RBI permission is a violation of FEMA or not. It could be. That is all the proceeding, a proceeding in which he could not be arrested.

Therefore, every step that you took including wanting him to be brought back by physical deportation - the British said this is not permissible in law - you were taking the wrong steps and creating a false cloud as though you were doing something and the present government is favouring him. The truth is to the contrary that you took steps where you could never succeed. The correct steps -

that is registration of case under PMLA, activation of that case, summoning him in that case for the first time, getting a non-bailable warrant against him, moving for a red corner alert against him – these are all steps which will be taken now. Otherwise, a make-believe light blue coloured notice given to domestic airports for a man living in London makes no sense. And that is the step they took.

What is the strategy now? The strategy is that if you argue these facts in a calm environment as we are, then probably you have no legs to stand on. You ran a government for ten years. उन दस वर्षों में क्या था, ये कैसे हमें नहीं डालने पड़े। आपको जब हमने कहा कि स्पेक्ट्रम एलोकेशन गलत हो रहा है, बे-ईमानी से हो रहा है, इसमें 1,76,000 करोड़ रुपए का नुकसान है, संसद में बहस हुई, सी.एंड ए.जी. की रिपोर्ट आई। उसके बाद सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने कांटेक्ट रद्द किए, एफ.आई.आर. रजिस्टर हुई। फिर जाकर हमने कहा कि मंत्री को हटाओ। कोयले के कांड में, उस वक्त के प्रधान मंत्री के पास कोयला मंत्रालय था। आज पता चल रहा है कि उनके साथ जितने सहयोगी थे, जो एम.ओ.एस. थे, सब उसमें शामिल थे। उसमें भी 1,87,000 करोड़ रुपए का घोटाला हुआ। आज जब ऑक्शंस हुई हैं, उससे यह स्पष्ट हो गया। मोदी जी की सरकार ने आते ही कहा कि यह सब ऑक्शंस से होगा। आप कोई आरोप नहीं लगा पाए। स्पेक्ट्रम में हमने तो कोई एफ.आई.आर. नहीं की, सुप्रीम कोर्ट के कहने पर हुई। कोयले के मामले में सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने कहा कि इनके ऊपर कैसे ज़रूर चलाएं और आबंटन रद्द किए। आपकी सरकार के जमाने में कहा और जब वह कलंक आपके ऊपर लग गया, अब एक साफ-सुथरी सरकार दिल्ली में काम कर रही है, so, you make a mountain of what is not even a molehill. जहां चुहिया भी नहीं निकली, वहां उसे आप चुहिया कह दीजिए कि एक हमने डोमेस्टिक एयरपोर्ट्स पर नोटिस था, एक लंदन में बैठे व्यक्ति का, उसकी क्यों मदद की।

Comment [j1]: cd. by y3

(y3/1605/gm-mm)

राहुल जी ने अभी कहा कि क्या आपने प्रेमचन्द्रन जी की रिक्वैस्ट पर कार्रवाई की या नहीं? आपने तो केवल उस एक व्यक्ति की मदद की? सुषमा जी ने उस रिक्वैस्ट पर भी वही की। उस रिक्वैस्ट पर प्रेमचन्द्रन जी को 31 अक्टूबर, 2014 को जवाब दिया- I have had the matter looked into. Shri Madhavan Pillai and two other Indian nationals have been serving life sentence in an Omani jail since 1997 in the case of planned burglary involving murder of an Omani security guard. The mercy petition of the families of these Indians has been regularly forwarded to the local Government for consideration and reduction

of their jail sentence terms. The Indian Mission in Oman has also taken up their cases with the IG of Police, Central Prison in Oman in September, 2014 for consideration of clemency on humanitarian grounds.

The difficulty with Shri Rahul Gandhi is that he is an expert without knowledge. So, without knowing the case, he is presuming that Shrimati Sushmaji only wanted to help one man and not these persons. Exactly the same policy was there. आप बताइए कि उस व्यक्ति को लाने के लिए मई 2014 से पहले क्या हुआ था? Which was the legally sustainable action that your Government took? You can simply use words 'the centre of black money' or 'the symbol of black money' but what steps did your Government take to bring black money lying abroad into India? We have taken some hard steps. Some people who are critics of this Government are criticizing us, saying that these are too harsh steps. But you did nothing. Every step has been taken by us.

You are very fond of saying that there were three monkeys but do not make a monkey out of this country. Without an issue which is an arguable issue, you hold up Parliament, you waste the whole Session and the real reason is that you ran a failed Government. You ran a corrupt Government. Therefore, when things are beginning to look up in India and there is a new confidence, you somehow want to sabotage the Indian growth story.

In order to sabotage the Indian growth story, their best chance was: let me go back on what I had promised – the Goods and Services Tax. So, what was announced by them in 2006 and introduced in 2011, all the proposals which their Finance Ministers had accepted are not acceptable to them. Now they say, we will dissent once it is cleared by Lok Sabha, once the numbers are against you in the other House; we will not allow a vote because a Constitution amendment requires a vote by using just lung power and disturbing the House.

My entire sympathies are with Sushmaji because she is only a scapegoat, a pretext. The real reason was that they wanted to prevent the legislation, particularly the Constitution amendment on the GST. It is very easy to say that

your family members appeared in a case. She has clarified that her daughter appeared with her senior. There were nine other juniors. She was one of that crowd. She has not been paid. She went along with her senior to the Court. Is this the big scandal? There are still many honest people in this country whose children have to work for a living.

The generations of family which has dominated this country's politics have not worked for a living. They have learnt the art of living comfortably without working; some of us have not. Therefore, the Government rejects each of these charges and the question of Sushmaji resigning does not arise. Similarly, I may also clarify that just as this case under Prevention of Money Laundering Act is now pending, they referred to the case of a Member of Parliament and his mother who happens to be the Chief Minister. I am not giving an opinion. I am just stating the fact.

Comment [KR2]: Cd.. by z3

(z3/1810/rsg-bks)

[That was not a part of this Motion but a huge amount of time by both the Speakers from the Congress was spent on that. The first offence is that a loan by cheque was given in one year and it was returned in the next year. So, if I had said that it was a commercial transaction between two people, when a son-in-law of a family got an advance from a real estate company which became a national issue, my predecessor Shri Chidambaram had also said it was a commercial transaction. But in that commercial transaction, there was a lot more than what meets the eye. So, you receive a loan in one year, you give back the loan the next year, and this is a big scandal!

Comment [I3]: SHRI ARUN JAITLEY CONTINUED

You have a company which owns a palace. So, you start a make-believe argument, 'We are now disputing it. This palace is not owned by you.' Is the Congress Party and their spokesman an appellate authority over a civil court which has decided that the palace belongs to Shri Dushyant Singh? कचहरी ने कह दिया उनका है, उन्होंने कहा कि नहीं हम कचहरी के ऊपर अपीलेंट अथारिटी हैं, हमारे प्रवक्ता कह रहे हैं कि आपका नहीं है तो चार दिन उसी की बहस चला दो। Now, if that palace is converted into a hotel, it

is Shri Dushyant Singh's right. If somebody has brought an investment दस रुपये का शेयर 96 हजार रुपये में there is a system of valuation. The value of a company will be taken. If you call another investor to invest in the company, if the promoters call them, ask them to invest in a company, and then whether the investment is overstated, understated or real may be gone into by the authorities. I do not know whether Shri Kharge was repeatedly accusing or complementing me of knowing the law, but I will share some information with him in absentia. There is a very simple logic. Find out the total area of the palace, go and find out the circle rate and you will realise that the valuation of the shares, what it should be. You will get it. I do not want to express a final opinion on it because there is a complaint pending, which will be investigated. But without knowing these facts, to create a cloud and say there is a scandal in it, there are many scandals which have been covered up. All these will be taken up, investigated in a fair and honest manner by the agencies and taken to their logical conclusion, not in the manner in which the gentleman in London was investigated prior to 26<sup>th</sup> May, 2014. That is all I have to say about it.

(ends)

1813 hours

THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT, MINISTER OF HOUSING AND URBAN POVERTY ALLEVIATION AND MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU): I am not adding anything to the debate but as Parliamentary Affairs Minister, this is my responsibility. It has been painful to me for the last few days. The first is on account of Shrimati Sushma Swaraj, an honest and best performing Minister facing this sort of a totally negative propaganda. I thought, it would come to an end today. But today also, I must share with you Madam Speaker, you were sometimes angry when my people were shouting. I agree with you that they should not be shouting. What was it that the people who insisted on the motion doing when Shrimati Sushma Swaraj was speaking in the House? Is this the way to treat a Minister, who too is a woman Minister against whom you made all sorts of allegations for days together? Do you want to tar her image?

You want everybody to keep quiet when you stand up. We have to keep quiet but when a Minister wants to respond you do not have the courtesy. Shri Kharge is a very senior person with so much experience in life. Should he give such a treatment to Shrimati Sushma Swaraj?

The second point is that I am a Parliamentary Affairs Minister. What a Parliamentary Affairs Minister has to do, today some people are giving me advice. I welcome the advice. I have less knowledge than them. I called a meeting on the 20<sup>th</sup>. Forty-one political leaders – it has to go on record – of 29 political parties were present. We discussed various issues. Many of our friends are here. At the end of the day, 28 parties said, the House should function and all issues including this so-called ‘Lalit Modi’ issue also should be taken up for discussion. That was the broad consensus. If I am wrong, Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab is here, Shri Jithender Reddy is here, Shri Rajamohan Reddy is here, Dr. Venugopal from the AIADMK is here, and others are here they can correct me. They said, ‘Yes, it

should be discussed. It is an important issue.’ What was the response of the Government? I said, ‘The Government is willing to discuss each and every issue.’ (a4/1815/rk-gg)

Comment [I4]: CONTINUED BY A4

Comment [KR5]: v. naidu cd

Secondly, our Leader, the Prime Minister of the country was present and he also assured that all the issues will be discussed. What did the Congress Party in that meeting say? It is there in the Minutes. Normally, I do not want to quarrel as a Parliamentary Affairs Minister, it does not behove of my stature also. I am supposed to be friendly with all, which I am trying to be but at the same time I cannot be unfriendly with the truth. The point is, the Congress Party went on record saying that the House will not function unless the Ministers resign. ‘First resignation then discussion’ was the statement made.

After that, we came to you Madam for the hon. Speaker’s customary lunch. Broadly, the Government said the same thing that the Government is willing to discuss each and every issue. They raised certain issues. I do not want to comment on that because it was held under the hon. Speaker’s Chairmanship.

On 30<sup>th</sup> the hon. Speaker had called a meeting again. For the sake of record I would like to recall, on 30<sup>th</sup> July, the Speaker called a meeting requesting Members of Parliament to settle political issues and other issues among themselves but at least for the sake of democracy coming to the well of the House and displaying placards should be avoided. This was the earnest appeal of the Speaker to all. This is what the Speaker has said.

As there was a deadlock and they were creating pandemonium in the House, Madam, on 3<sup>rd</sup> August, I called a meeting of All Party Leaders. Before that, Arun ji made an attempt to talk to them. Informally they agreed but subsequently they said that they cannot come. So, Arun ji dropped that meeting. Naqvi ji has spoken to all of them. On 3<sup>rd</sup>, I called a meeting of Leaders of Opposition Parties and I assured them that as per the rules the Government is ready to discuss each and every issue, including this issue, in whatever manner they want. Admitting a discussion in the House is not in the hands of the

Parliamentary Affairs Minister but in the hands of the Speaker as per the rules. Speaker also goes by rules and precedents. There also, the Congress categorically stated: 'resignation first, discussion later'. Most of the Parties said that we should discuss the matter and the House may be allowed to function.

On 10<sup>th</sup>, Mulayam Singh ji, in this House gave a suggestion to the hon. Speaker to call the Leaders and sort out the issue as other Members are not getting an opportunity to discuss the issues. You were kind enough to call many of the Leaders to your Chamber, including me. I also came and we had a discussion. Mulayam Singh ji said लोकतंत्र का अपमान नहीं होना चाहिए, पार्लिमेंट में बहस होनी चाहिए, ऐसा मुलायम सिंह जी ने कहा, बाकी लोगों ने भी कहा। सुप्रिया जी यहां बैठी थीं, उन्होंने भी कहा था और अन्य लोगों ने भी कहा। बी.जे.डी. शुरू से ही यही मत की था, वाई.आर.एस. कांग्रेस पार्टी, टी.आर.एस. पार्टी, ए.डी.एम.के और बाकी जो पार्टियाँ हैं, उनका यही मत था कि सदन में बहस होनी चाहिए। That was put on record also. But, Mulayam Singh ji confronted and insisted कुछ रास्ता निकालना चाहिए, मैंने इतने दिन आपका साथ दिया, अभी आप साथ दीजिए और हाऊस चलाओ, जो भी आपको कहना है, कह दीजिए, मंत्री ने क्या पाप किया? उन्होंने पूछा तो कांग्रेस वालों ने कहा कि यह तो सब कुछ मालूम है, उन्होंने कहा कि मुझे मालूम नहीं है। हाऊस में चर्चा होने दीजिए, मंत्री को जवाब देने दीजिए और बाद में आपको पसंद नहीं आया तो फिर जो करना है, कीजिए, जो आज आज किया है न उन्होंने, वही काम कीजिए।

Madam, what I am trying to say is, this is not to settle scores or score points. Some people are giving advice outside that the Government should have been a little more flexible. In the meeting they said: "Six Ministers of our Government were forced or made to resign. We are asking only for two Ministers".

With respect to all, there is a small story called Madras Panchayat. Madras is Chennai city. Our friends from the city are all sitting here. One fellow was quarrelling with another fellow saying मुझे पचास हजार रुपये देना, आपने दिया नहीं। फिर झगड़ा बढ़ गया तो भीड़ जमा हो गयी, तब लोगों ने कहा कि झगड़ा क्यों करते हो, आपस में बात करो। उन्होंने कहा कि हम दोनों आपस में बात नहीं करते तो उन्होंने कहा कि एक पेदमंशी, तुलुगु में कहते हैं कि



पेदमंशी, means elderly man, यहां कहते हैं पंच, पंच को चुनो और वह जो कहेगा, उसके अनुसार आप इसको सॉर्टआउट करो तो फिर पंच को चुना गया। पंच ने पूछा कि क्या हुआ। पहले वाले ने कहा कि सर, इन्होंने मुझसे पचास हजार रुपये लिए और वापस नहीं कर रहे हैं। दूसरे व्यक्ति से पूछा कि तुम्हारा आर्ग्युमेंट क्या है। उन्होंने कहा कि सर मैं अभी-अभी ट्रेन से उतरा हूँ। ये कौन है, मुझे मालूम भी नहीं है और मेरा हैंड बैग देख कर यह मेरे साथ झगड़ा कर रहा है कि मुझे पचास हजार वापस करो।

Comment [KR6]: cd

(b4/1820/cs-rc)

Comment [C7]: वेंकैया नायडू जारी

मैंने कभी इनको देखा नहीं, इनका चेहरा भी मुझे मालूम नहीं है। वे जेंटलमैन, जिनको पंच चुना, उन्होंने कहा कि दोबारा रिपीट करो, दोबारा रिपीट किया। बाकी लोगों ने कहा कि आप जजमेंट दे दो, आर्बिट्रेशन कर दो तो इन्होंने आर्बिट्रेशन दे दिया। उन्होंने एक से कहा कि आप कह रहे हैं कि पचास हजार लिया, दूसरे से कहा कि आपका कहना है कुछ दिया नहीं, ठीक है ऐसा करो कि पच्चीस हजार देकर मामला खत्म करो।

She is a better performing Minister who has spent her entire life in the service of the people. A Chief Minister who is a darling of the masses has won three elections in Madhya Pradesh at a very young age coming from an ordinary background. There is a Chief Minister who is so popular in Rajasthan. Without anything, you want their heads and then you want me to agree. It is because six of your Ministers had to resign and at least two of mine should also resign. We will be doing injustice to democracy also.

Lastly, a lot of journalists were also asking वेंकैया जी थोड़ा सा फ्लेक्सिबिलिटी होनी चाहिए। मैंने कहा कि आप बताइए फ्लेक्सिबिलिटी क्या होनी चाहिए? उन्होंने कहा कि उनको कुछ न कुछ वे-आउट देना चाहिए। हमने उन्हें वे-आउट दिया। आज सुषमा जी ने खड़े होकर कहा कि एडमिट करो। अभी आरोप क्या है? इसलिए मैं खड़ा हो गया, आरोप क्या है, उन्होंने कहा कि यह काम पहले ही दिन कर सकते थे। पहले दिन से आप लोग कह रहे हैं कि इस्तीफा पहले चर्चा बाद में, आज पहली बार आपको ज्ञानोदय हो गया, आपने कहा कि बहस और बाद में इस्तीफा। हमने तुरन्त स्वीकार किया। शब्दावली के बारे में भी आपत्ति थी। मैडम, मैं आपके पास आया तो वह भी सॉर्ट-आउट हो गया। सुषमा जी ने कहा है कि कोई भी शब्दावली हो, मुझे कोई आपत्ति नहीं है, मगर आप अध्यक्ष हैं, कुछ रूल्स हैं, नियम हैं और प्रिसिडेंट बनेगा, इसलिए हम सबने मिलकर बात करके उसको शार्ट आउट किया है। हमने उनके कहने से जो श्री-फोर्थ मेजोरिटी से लोक सभा ने लैंड बिल पास किया, उसे सिलेक्ट कमेटी को भेजा। जो जीएसटी बिल

सर्वसम्मति से लोक सभा में पारित हो गया, उनके कहने से, उनके एश्योरेंस पर हमने उसे सिलेक्ट कमेटी को भेजा। हमने रियल एस्टेट बिल, जो मेरा इंपोर्टेंट लेजिस्लेशन है, पहले स्टैंडिंग कमेटी में गया, दोबारा आया, फिर भी उन्होंने कहा कि वैंकैय्या जी फर्स्ट राउंड में, ऑन रिकार्ड है, फर्स्ट राउंड में हम इन तीनों कानूनों को पारित करायेंगे। इसलिए इसको थोड़ा सा वे-आउट दिखाना है, रेफर करो कमेटी को, तो हमने कमेटी को रेफर किया। कमेटी में क्या हुआ, आप लोग जानते हैं। बाद में रिपोर्ट आई, अब कह रहे हैं कि ये नया-नया विषय ला रहे हैं। अभी कह रहे हैं कि जीएसटी के बारे में बीएसी ने टाइम एलॉट नहीं किया। बीएसी ने चार घंटे एलॉट किया। यह दूसरे सदन का विषय है, मैं उसमें पड़ना नहीं चाहता हूँ।

Finally, the people of this country has given such a mandate to our leader, Shri Narendra Modi and to our Government. I am thankful to the Parties, particularly, BJD, YSR Congress, TRS, and AIADMK. Shiv Sena is our partner and our old friend. Akali Dal is also our partner. TDP is also our partner. अपना दल भी हमारा पार्टनर है, लोक जन शक्ति पार्टी हमारी पार्टनर है और कुशवाहा जी की पार्टी भी हमारी पार्टनर है। कुछ पार्टियों के साथ हमारी प्रदेशों में लड़ाई चल रही है, फिर भी लोकतंत्र के हित में उन लोगों ने सदन चलाने में मदद की है, इसलिए मैं पार्लियामेंट अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर होने के नाते उनको धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ। हमारी लड़ाई होती रहेगी, let us argue, discuss, debate and decide but allow the Parliament to function. When they were in power, they pulled the country backwards and now they are in Opposition, they are not allowing the country to move forward. The Prime Minister of India wants to take the country forward.

It pains us that the Ruling Party with this much strength cannot say anything. The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs cannot say anything. My Minister has no liberty to open her heart and answer the allegations. You have not allowed her to do so even on the last day. This is where I am really hurt. It is sad. Today, also what treatment was given to Sushmaji. I feel Rahulji should also be allowed to speak and we should hear him. But Khargeji feels that he alone should be heard and others have no right. लोकतंत्र में ऐसा नहीं होता है। इसलिए मैं उन लोगों से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि कम से कम आगे के लिए, जो जनता का मैनडेट है, mandate is for the NDA to rule the country. You have mandate to sit in opposition. Therefore, you wait for your turn as I told you maybe for 10 years or 15 years or 20 years. You should

have patience. Do not make sweeping allegations. Do not misuse the Parliament to make allegations against the Prime Minister. My Prime Minister is the most powerful leader in the world today. I challenge it. He is respected not only in India but in every part of the world. Wherever the Indian Prime Minister is going, he is respected and hailed. India's prestige is going up. Everywhere in the world India is recognised and respected. (c4/1825/snb-hcb)

Comment [r8]: cd. by c4

Comment [KR9]: Naidu contd.

The Opposition everyday is raising fancy slogans against him. They want to take revenge against the people because people have elected Narendra Modi. It is very unfair. I would like to request the Congress Party which says that they have 130 years of experience and 50 years of experience to rule this country, please allow democracy to function.

Madam, I am sorry I had to quote certain things because as Parliamentary Affairs Minister I had to put the records straight.

Thank you very much.

(ends)