SUBMISSIONS BY MEMBERS

Regarding reported remarks on the Indo-US Nuclear Deal by the Indian Ambassador in Washington, D.C.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA (Jharkhand): Sir, thank you very much for allowing me to speak on this subject. I am happy that sanity has finally prevailed and we are able to discuss as coolly as possible the import of the remarks which have been made by our Ambassador in Washington. Sir, the expression 'headless chickens' was a very colourful expression, and that is why it caught the imagination of this House and the media outside. But that was just one remark or one of the remarks that the Ambassador made. There are many more remarks in the copy that we have, and they are all, if not equally colourful, perhaps, equally bad. Sir, he has come out openly in favour of the Indo-US Nuclear Deal. He can. He is the Ambassador of India. But what is most objectionable is the fact that those of us who happen to be opposed to the deal have been upbraided by the Ambassador. And while, some of the remarks have been, in this report, assigned to him, some others, as we all know, have been assigned to senior diplomatic observers in Washington. Now, it is clear that these senior diplomatic observers are not from the U.K.; they are not from Japan. The senior diplomatic observers will be Indian diplomatic observers, and when there was a telephone conversation between this correspondent and the Ambassador, it is clear that it is the Ambassador who has made the remarks.

Sir, I will quote only a few of these remarks. He says, "Slam the critics of the Deal," particularly the BJP, saying, "They had obviously made up their minds to oppose the Agreement even before they saw the veritable iron clad 123 Agreement." And this is where I am mentioned, Sir, I don't feel myself distinguished by this mention, it is not like being mentioned in dispatches. "If you remember, people like former Minister, Yashwant Sinha reacted even hefore they saw the text. So, obviousiy, they had made up their minds in advance irrespective of even what we got" Then, he goes on to say, "According to this observer, it was beyond his comprehension that the BJP could be so irresponsible with the statement such as abrogating the Agreerment, if it assumed reins of power. The opposition is supposed to be responsible and here they are talking of, 'If we come to power, we will abrogate the Agreement." And finally, Sir, I would like to draw your attention to the remark which was made that the statement, such as those warning of abrogation of the agreement is absolutely going against, flying against your own national interest and the way you are perceived. It means, in other words, that all of us who happen to have another view on the Indo-U.S. nuclear deal are acting against the national interest, which means that we are anti-national; and, therefore, we are unpatriotic people. We have no business opposing this deal if we are patriots of this great country, India! Sir, this is the dividing line today. This is the most painful part of it.

We have had discussions in this House, we have had divisions in Indian Parliament, but never before have the patriotism of those who are opposed or hold another view, has been commented upon or challenged. And it is not my friends sitting in the Treasury Benches who are challenging my patriotism. It is, unfortunately, the Ambassador of India in Washington who is saying that the BJP is not patriotic because we have said what we have said. So, apart from the 'headless chicken' remark, these are some of the most objectionable remarks which the Ambassador has made.

Now, I would like to mention to you from the proceedings of this House, what happened yesterday. The hon. Minister for External Affairs came here and made a statement. He read out the communication which had been sent by the Ambassador. And what did he say? He said, 'I had off the record conversation with the correspondent and that he has been misunderstood or misquoted or quoted out of context.' And then he says, "some other comments attributed to this off the record conversation were, however, made by me in my personal capacity". Then, the hon. Minister said, that if he received further information, he would come back to us.

Today, Sir, The Hindu has published what the correspondent said. The correspondent has very clearly said, " I unambiguously and unequivocally stand by my report and state categorically that nothing in it was deliberate, malicious or misunderstood or quoted or misquoted, because I have nothing but the highest respect for him"—that means, the Ambassador so, the correspondent has denied this, this is neither quoted out of context nor is it misquoted nor is it deliberate or misrepresentation, nor is it off the record, nor is it personal; these are not personal remarks, Sir. When you are talking to any media person, all of us know, even in politics, more so in Government, that you have just one persona, and the Ambassador's persona is that he is the Ambassador of India in Washington. He does not have a personal capacity, especially when he is talking to the media. So, how does he say that they were his personal remarks, off-the-cuff remarks? They were not personal remarks, they were not off-the-cuff remarks. Yesterday, the External Affairs Minister told us that he has apologised unconditionally. He has said that if he has unwittingly said something, then he is apologising! He is putting a condition, it is not an unqualified apology, Sir.

These are the facts, Sir, which have emerged. Yesterday, when I pressed my notice for breach of privilege, the hon. Chairman ruled that it was premature. I abided by that, Sir. Today, I am pressing that notice of breach of privilege, because it is not any more premature, everything has been said and done on this issue. All the statements are before us yesterday the Leader of the Opposition made a very important point when he said that he served the Republic. He does not merely serve a political party, he does not serve merely the Government. He is the representative of the Republic of India in Washington. He therefore, carries a certain responsibility on his head. He cannot, therefore, identify himself with just one point of view and then make all kinds of remarks against all those of us who happen to be either in the Opposition or in the other side and tell us that we have no business of saying or doing what we are doing. Sir, if this kind of interference is made by serving officials, and I am saying this with a great sense of responsibility because myself served in the Civil Services for 24 years and I know what the rules of the game are, the bureaucracy is supposed to be nameless, it is supposed to be faceless, it is supposed to be entirely in the background, it is not supposed to take political sides in a political debate and, if this is the manner in which the bureaucracy of this country will start taking sides in political debates, Sir, then I am sorry to say that it will be a very sad day for our parliamentary democracy. Therefore, Sir, I have moved a notice of breach of privilege. I had suggested yesterday which I think received wide support because an issue of breach of privilege has never been a contentious issue in this House, and I would like to tell you when I joined this House, Sir, many year ago as a new Member I was once arrested and put in prison in Chandigarh and

leaders of all political parties, I will be intricate 'the leaders of all political parties' cutting across political parties line, everyone stood up in this House, I was not even present, and decided to take action against the Chandigarh Administration for the manner in which I was treated by them. Then I quoted yesterday how the whole House converted itself into a Committee of Privilege, we had called the former member here to the Bar of the Hosue, and he was admonished by the Chair. Now I am repeating, Sir, my demand is (1) that the Ambassador should be recalled forthwith. He should not be allowed to stay in Washington in the present capacity even for one day. He says he made tactless remarks. Should we have a tactless Ambassador in an important world capital like Washington at this point of time? The second demand that I am making is, again I am repeating that this House, Sir, convert itself into a Committee of Privilege and the Ambassador after he has been recalled should be produced before the House. He should appear at the Bar of the House, Sir. (Time-bell) Sir, my request to you that you ought to admonish him on behalf of all the Members of Parliament because it is our honour, our dignity, Sir, of which you are the protector, which has been sullied, which is at stake. Thank you.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Puducherry): Sir, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak. I heard with rapt attention our senior colleague Yashwant Sinhaji. He was basing his entire argument on a newspaper report and also on the Rediff report which has been there. We have been hearing the voice from the hon. Members from various sides. Sir, I would like to submit that first of all the authenticity of that version whethor it was official briefing or not has to be confirmed. The hon. External Affairs Minister yesterday morning and also in the evening when he came told this august House that if he made that statement it is unpardonable. He also made an observation to that effect. Sir, when the issue of this nature has been raised and in this august House some of the hon. Members are trying to twist the facts saying that the reference, which he has made saying headless chicken, he is referring to the Members of Parliament with which I totally disagree. I also went through the total version, which has been there, and it has not been specifically referred to the hon. Members of Parliament. Sir, I would like to submit two issues. One, when the hon. External Affairs Minister came to this House and after talking to him he clearly stated in this House that he did not make an official Press conference and when he was talking on the sidelines with the correspondent which was quoted, sometimes it was misquoted. He said that he has been quoted out of context. This is number one. He also said that if he hurt the sentiments of the hon. Members of Parliament he apologises. When he came to that level and it was told by the hon. Foreign Affairs Minister in this august House and the Members of Parliament were going on harping upon the same issue again and again and imputing themselves that the version has been imputed on them, it is quite unfortunate. I would like to say, Sir, in this august House that there are a number of issues, which are concerning the people of this country, and they have to be discussed in this august House. But, unfortunately, in the name of one small issue, minor issue, every issue of importance to the public has been just ignored and we are discussing an issue — they may consider it relevant — which according to me is a trivial issue. Therefore, Sir, I submit to the august House, first of all, let them verify. They are only quoting the newspaper reports. They are building their argument only on the basis of newspaper reports and saying that this was told and that was told. Therefore, Sir, I submit that unless and until authentic version of the Ambassador is known, we

cannot draw any conclusions, we cannot come to any conclusion, we cannot draw any judgment on this issue. Therefore, Sir, I submit that — whatever Shri Yaswant Sinha said — if he made a personal reference and if he has made it against the hon. Ex-Foreign Affairs Minister it is regrettable, if it has been there. I agree with you. Unless and until the authenticity is proved we cannot argue on it. Thank you.

श्री उपसभापति : श्री अमर सिंह।

श्री अमर सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश) **:** धन्यवाद, उपसभापति महोदया। अभी-अभी मैंने अपने साथी श्री यशंवत सिन्हा जी का वकतव्य सुना। इन्होंने अपने वक्तव्य में कहा कि मीडिया रिपोर्ट पर भरोसा नहीं करना चाहिए और मीडिया रिपोर्ट पर भरोसा करके हमें अपना मन्तव्य नहीं बनाना चाहिए। दूसरी बात इन्होंने कही कि यह बहुत मामूली बात है। यह बहुत ही छोटी बात है और इस छोटे मुद्दे के ऊपर हम संसद का बहुमूल्य समय नष्ट कर रहे हैं। मुझे इस बात का बड़ा कष्ट है, बहुत दुख है संसद के सम्मान और गरिमा तथा किसी भी साथी सांसद के सम्मान और गरिमा से महत्वपूर्ण मुद्दा और कुछ नहीं हो सकता। अगर संसद की गरिमा ही नहीं रहेगी तो संसद की, उसकी कार्य प्रणाली की, महत्ता क्या रह जाएगी।

सवाल अब मीडिया रिपोर्ट तक नहीं है, सर। अगर मीडिया रिपोर्ट को हम गलत मानते हें तब फिर तो माननीय राजदूत जी की क्षमा याचना भी गलत है। अगर उन्होंने कोई गलती ही नहीं की, तो माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी के मार्फत उन्होंने किस बात की क्षमा याचना ककी? अगर उन्होंने कोई गलती ही नहीं की, तो फिर वे दुखी किसलिए हैं, सॉरी किस बात के लिए है, क्योंकि उन्होंने तो कोई गलती नहीं की? इसमें हमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं हैं।

उनके पूरे वक्तव्य में डिबेट और ड्रामा, बी. जे. पी. यशंवत सिन्हा, इन नामों का उल्लेख है? डिबेट कहाँ हो रही है? जब कोई आदमी एक बार गलत बात करता है, तो गलती को उस तथ्य को छुपाने के लिए सौ गलतियाँ और करता। इसके बाद उन्होंने कह दिया कि समाचार पत्रों में हमने समाचार पत्र के पत्रकारों के लिए बात कही है। तो क्या किसी अधिकारी को, किसी राजदूत को पत्रकारों की भी लानत-मलामत करने का अधिकार है? और कौन-सा पत्रकार कह रहा है? अंग्रेजी के जितने लब्ध-प्रतिष्ठित राष्ट्रीय अखबार है, सब माननीय राजदूत के पक्ष में है। कौन- सा अखबार खिलाफ में लिख रहा है, यह मुझे पता नहीं हैं हर अखबार तो अच्छा-ही-अच्छा लिख रहा हे। अखबार की नजर में खलनायक तो वे लोग हैं, जो इस इंडो-यू.एस. न्यूक्लियर डील के विरूद्ध हैं। डिबेट इस हाउस में हो रही है और आपकी नजर में हम जो यहां कर रहे हैं, यह थियेटर है और हम ड्रामा कर रहे हैं। हम ड्रामा कर रहे हैं और डिबेट हो रही है। हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी के 60 सालों बाद भी अक्ल नहीं आई हैं। हमारी साथी वृंदा कारत जी बैठी हैं, प्रशांत चटर्जी जी बैठे हैं, इन्हें अक्ल नहीं आई हैं। तो अब हमारी स्थिति यह हो गई है, नारायणसामी जी, कि हमें, वृंदा कारत जी को, यशंवत सिन्हा जी को- यशंवत जी, जिसे आपने नेमलेस और फेसलेस कहा है, तो नेमलेस नहीं है, फेसलेस भी नहीं। इनके नाम का भी पता चल गया है और चेहरे का भी पता चल गया हे। इन है। यह बताएँगे कि आजादी के 60 सालों बबाद स्वाभिमान कैसे आए। यह बताएँगें कि आपको मसौदा कब पढ़ना है और उस पर कब मन्तव्य करना है। वह बताएंगे कि संसद कैसे चलेगी और कैसे नहीं चलेगी? यह आप की नजर में छोटा मामला हो सकता हैं, लेकिन मेरी नज़र में यह मामला न धर्मनिपेक्षता का है, और न सांप्रदायिकता

का है, यह मामला देश का है और देश की संसद की गरिमा का है। यह मामला श्री यशंवत सिन्हा जी का नहीं हैं, हमारे एक साथी सांसद का है। यह मामला श्रीमती वृंदा कारत और श्री प्रशांत चटर्जी का नहीं है, हम सब का है। महोदय मैं श्री प्रशांत चटर्जी और श्री यशंवत सिन्हा जी द्वारा मूव किए गए प्रिविलेज मोशन का पुरजोर समर्थन करता हूं। महोदय, एक ऐसा व्यक्ति जो स्वयं कह रहा है कि वह tactless है, उसे tacts का पता नहीं है, वह तो एक बहुत बड़ा खतरा हैं कि अमेरिका जैसे देश में एक tactless आदमी बैठा है। आप वहां एक अआदमी भेजिए और आदमी को हटाइए। उसे वापस बुलाइए और उसने जब गलती मान ली है तो उसे बचाइए मत, उसने जब गलती मान ली है तो उसके अपराध की उसे सज़ा दीजिए। उसे वहां राजदूत रहने का कोई अधिकार नहीं हैं।

उपसभापति जी, हमारे साथी नारायणसामी जी और प्रणव मुखर्जी जी ने जो बयान दिया है, उस बयान से मुझे एक पद याद आ रहा है जिसे मैंने बहुत पहहलें पढ़ा था। आप की स्थिति, रोनेन सेन जी के बारे में कुछ इस तरह से हैं, कि "इस बोझ को मैं सिर पर उठा भी नहीं सकता, रास्ते में इसे छोड़कर जा भी नहीं सकता"। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): Sir, India's Ambassador to the U.S., Mr. Ronen Sen, attacked the Indian Parliament and the Parliamentarians. What for? It is because we are discussing and many of us are opposing the Indo-US Nuclear deal. It is because of that our ambassador has attacked the Parliamentarians. This is highly objectionable. Already, our party has strongly condemned these utterances and acts of the Indian ambassador in the U.S. They are highly defamatory, highly objectionable and it is against the Indian Parliament. What he has remarked, apart from headless chickens, in an interview, not within the four walls of his bedroom, is, "I can understand such a debate immediately after the Independence. But, sixty years after the Independence, I am really bothered that sixty years after Independence they are so insecure that we have not grown up. This is lack of confidence and lack of self-respect." Mr. Narayanasamy, you don't feel shame. But, we feel shame for this. We should take note of it...*(Interruptions)...*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Nothing will go on *record...(Interruptions)...* देखिए, जो डिबेट हो रही हैं, उसे आप खामोशी से सुनिए।

SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE: He has further said, "In the near future we will see quoting about President Bush." We know President Bush. We have seen him in Iraq and Iran. The naval joint exercises are going on. We know him. We know the American people. Even Mr. Bush has little in the hearts of his own countrymen with what he is doing now. He has further said, "In near future we will see such a friend and supporter as this President, absolutely there is none." He is not a friend of Indian Parliament; he is a friend of President Bush. The question arises: Whose Ambassador he is? We wanted to know this since yesterday. The Leader of the Opposition had every right to speak, but you did not give us an opportunity to speak. Shri Sitaram Yechury was also here. He also wanted to speak yesterday on this. But he too could not speak. We would like to know what action the Government is proposing to take against him. Why is he there even today? After hearing Shri V. Narayanasamy, I regret to say that I could not find in his speech what the External Affairs Minister Shri Pranab Mukherjee has said. "His remarks are unacceptable".

Whose brief he was holding? Whom should we believe? Mr. Pranab Mukherjee's

Statement was that what he said was unacceptable to the Cabinet? We would like to know what the decision of this Government is. Our party wants to know this. Mr. Sen has admitted that he had actually made the derogatory remarks against the hon. Members of Parliament. He had personally said this. So, we demand that Mr. Sen be called back forthwith and should be asked to explain his conduct on this floor. I also want to know from the hon. Minister of External Affairs what action he proposes to take against him to uphold the dignity of this House and the dignity of the hon. Members. I have also given, along with some Members, a Privilege Motion against him.

DR. V. MAITREYAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, thank you for the response, even though a delayed response. At least, there was a delayed response. But from what I could gather from Mr. Narayanasamy's reaction, I am very confident what the response of the Government is going to be towards this official. Probably, we can expect, in the coming days, that Mr. Ronen Sen may be promoted or may be given some awards. That may be the response of this Government, I presume. The official has made derogatory remarks against parties, opposing the nuclear deal. By his remark, he has taken over the onerous responsibility of being the spokesperson of the United States of America, the U.S. President, George Bush, and also the spokesperson for the pro-nuclear deal lobby. Other officials of the Government are also dabbling in the affairs, as far as this nuclear deal is concerned. Why is this happening? I don't think that we can take these remarks, by the Indian Ambassador in the US and other officials, as off the cuff remarks of some officials. And, I see, this view cannot be taken in isolation. There is a saying '^aTT ^TTvirr H^TT JT^rr |' And, our Prime Minister is on record saying that those who are supporting this nuclear deal are patriots. What does that mean? Are we, who are opposing this Bill, least patriotic or unpatriotic and *? *...(Interruptions)...* I say this with all the might at my command that... *(Interruptions)...*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no, don't use this expression.

DR. V. MAITREYAN: No, Sir, it is on record. I can't withdraw that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, it is not on record because it is unparliamentary. ... *(Interruptions)*...

DR. V. MAITREYAN: I say it with all the might at my command that my party leader, Madam Jayalalitha, my colleagues in my party, my colleagues in the UNPA, my colleagues in the NDA, my colleagues in the Left; and I are all patriots. I want to say कि हम माई के लाल हैं, हम इसी धरती पर पैदा हुए हैं, इसी धरती पर पले हैं और इसी धरती पर बड़े हुए हैं। यदि हम पैट्रिऑट नहीं हैं, तो इस देश में और कोई पैट्रिऑट नहीं हो सकता है। I strongly condemn the remarks made by the Indian Ambassador. And, I demand — this demand has already been made, but there has been no action from the Government side — that the Indian Ambassador should be recalled forthwith and necessary action be initiated against him. A Privilege Motion should be initiated against him at the earliest, not like the other Privilege Motions, which are kept pending for months and years. I place these views for active consideration and a proper and quick response from the Government.

* Expunged as ordered by the Chair

SHRI D. RAJA (Tamil Nadu): Sir, finally, some order could be established in this august House and a meaningful debate has been allowed.

I now come to the subject. It is well-known that the Left is opposed to the Indo-U.S. Nuclear Agreement. We oppose the Agreement. In fact, we have asked the Government not to proceed further with operationalising the Agreement. When there is a debate on the entire Agreement, the Left will be able to place its viewpoints once again.

Here the subject which has come under question or under debate is this. What did our Ambassador speak in Washington? Yesterday, the Minister made a statement or gave a clarification in which he said that the veracity of it would be found. I wonder why the Government could not check the veracity of the Ambassador's statement till this minute. But the Ambassador has given some apology. This apology is not enough. It is not convincing at all. It is of no use blaming it on the media. Indeed, it is known that the Ambassador spoke such things. I agree with some of my colleagues, but, it is not an issue whether the expression is colourful or not colourful. That is not the important issue which I find because yesterday also somebody called me and said, "You are also one of the headless chickens." I said, "First of all, I am not a chicken. Secondly, I come from a place, that is, that part of the country where people were supposed to have ten heads. Maybe, the other nine heads are haunting the Ambassador." Whatever it may be, joke apart, the problem here is that the Ambassador represents the Government of India. The Ambassador represents our great nation; India. He should know what he speaks and what he does. He should not cross the limits. He should not exceed his brief. As my colleague read out, this is the portion which is really wounded everybody. It has really hurt the strong feelings not only of the Members sitting here but also the people outside the Parliament I am really bothered about this portion. "....60 years after Independence, they are so insecure, that we have not grown up, this lack of confidence and lack of self-respect" I do not know how the Government understands this statement How can the Ambassador say that sixty years after Independence, we have not grown, we have not gained confidence and we have not gained self-respect? Then, what is the role of the Ambassador serving in such a country, the United States of America, with whom we are trying to have an Agreement? I think, this is the most derogatory and objectionable thing that the Ambassador has spoken. This is highly condemnable. Nobody should have spoken such a thing, particularly, our Ambassador. He should not have spoken such things.

The entire House, I think, even the Government cannot tolerate this; I agree with the Minister when he said that it is unacceptable and unwarranted. He did not go to the extent of condemning it. He thought he would check the veracity of the statement. By this time, the External Affairs Minister and the Government must have checked the veracity of the Ambassador's statement. So, having said this, I think, the situation is so untenable that the Ambassador cannot continue as Ambassador in Washington. The situation is so untenable. I do not understand why the Government is still reluctant to make a statement that the Government would actively consider to pursue some course of action that includes the recall of the Ambassador forthwith. I do not know why there is reluctance on the part of the Government. Because it is not an individual's issue, it is not one party issue, it is nation's pride, it is nation's image in the comity of the outside world. After 60 years of

Independence, if Ambassador says, "we have not grown; we have not gained self-confidence; we have not gained self-respect", what sort of image he is creating for India in the United States of America, or, in the outside world! This is the issue this House has to take note of. (Time-bell) I think the Government will have to pursue a course Of action that includes recall of Ambassador, and there should not be any more reluctance. The Government should come out forthwith what it proposes to do with the Ambassador. This situation cannot be allowed to continue like this. I sincerely appeal to the Government that it should come out with a proposal and tell the House, tell the Nation, that this Government doesn't tolerate such utterances of any Government servant. In case of the Ambassador who is serving in the United States of America, he must be called back.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI D. RAJA: Sir, I would like to say one small thing that I have given a Notice for Privilege.. I do not know what is the position of that Privilege? I think the Chair will give due consideration to that Motion. Several other Motions are also there. The Chair should give due consideration. Thank you, Sir.

प्रो. राम देव भंडारी (बिहार) **:** माननीय उपसभापति जी, सबसे पहले मैं आपका धन्यवाद करता हूं और माननीय सांसदों का भी धन्यवाद करता हूं, मैं भी अपने आपको इसमें जोड़ता हूं कि हम सभी के सौजन्य से शांतिपूर्वक सदन की कार्यवाही चल रही हैं।

उपसभापति जी, समाचापत्रों मे अमरीका में जो भारत के राजदूत हैं, उनके रेफरेंस में सांसदों के बारे में कुछ ऐसी छपी हैं जिनसे उनके सम्मान को ठेस लगती है और वे अपमानित महसूस करते हैं। मैं भी इस बात को महसूस करता हूं कि अगर इन बातों में सच्चाई हे, तो ये बड़ी अशोभनीय बातें हैं। मैं सरकार को और विदेश मंत्री जी को धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूं कि सदन की भावना को देखते हुए उन्होंने न सिर्फ एक बार, बल्कि दो बार सदन में आकर इस संबंध में स्पष्टीकरण दिया और जैसा राजा साहब कह रहे थे, उन्होंने कहा कि यह unacceptable है और unwarranted है। सरकार ने इस बात को बहुत गंभीरता से लिया है और आगे भी इस संबंध में जांच करने के बाद जो कार्यवाही होनी चाहिए, वह सरकार अवश्य करेगी, ऐसा हमारा विश्वास है, मगर इस समय, इस स्थिति में हम recall करने की बात कर रहे हैं या उनके खिलाफ संसद में कार्यवाही करने की बात कर रहे हैं, वह होनी चाहिए, मगर ऐसे नहीं। उन्होंने माफी भी मांगी है, जैसा अखबार में छपा है अब माफी दी जाए या न दी जाए, आप सरकार को एक बार मौका दीजिए कि सरकार इस बारे में और जांच करे और आकर स्थिति स्पष्ट करें। अगर इसमें सच्चाई है,उसमें सांसदों का अपमान करने की बात है, तो निश्चित रूप से उनके खिलाफ कार्यवाही होनी चाहिए। इस बात को भी ध्यान में रखना चाहिए कि उन्होंने माफी मांगी है और सरकार उनके उनके संबंध में और भी कार्यवाही करने जा रही है। धन्यवाद।

SHRI RAVULA CHANDRA SEKAR REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, we feel that the Indo-US nuclear deal is detrimental to our National interest. Many public representatives who are present in this august House are opposing the deal. We are not happy with the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister in this regard. He said, "This is the final decision. We cannot go back." I think in a coalition era, there is no word called "last word", but, still, he chose to say that it is the final agreement;

there is no question of going back. It is up to the UPA constituents to support or oppose the deal. As far as we are concerned, we are in UNPA, we oppose the deal itself. As the things stand, what made the Ambassador to make derogatory remarks against the people who are opposing the Bill? He says, "If the deal is not through, our credibility will be zero." He thinks that we are not patriotic to the nation. We expect an immediate action from the Government on the remarks made by the Ambassador. The comments are not only unwarranted but also uncalled for. Sir, we are not here to hear his teachings or preachings. We expect an action from the Government. He should be called back immediately for his misconduct, and this issue should also be viewed from the angle of breach of privilege. Thank you.

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह (झारखंड)**:** उपसभापति महोदय, मुझे अफसोस है कि मैं अपने ही राजदूत के खिलाफ यहां बोलने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूं। यह अफसोस इसलिए मुझे ज्यादा है कि जब कोई देश का राजदूत दूसरे देश मे होता है तो वह भारत के 100 करोड़ लोगों का प्रतिनिधित्व करता है, वह किसी सरकार का प्रतिनिधि नहीं होता है। लेकिन पिछले दो दिनों से जिस तरह से इस पूरे मसले पर सरकार कर रवैया रहा है और जो बात यशंवत सिन्हा जी ने कही है, उन सारी बातों को देखकर मुझे ऐसा लगता है, क्या सचमुच हम लोग इस काबिल हैं, जिन बातों का जिक्र एम्बेसडर ने अपने बयान में किया है? यहां दो लोग कम से कम विदेश विभाग के पुराने पदाधिकारी बैठे हुए हैं, एक का नाम हैं नटवर सिंह जी और दूसरे का नाम है मणिशंकर अय्यर जी और शायद वह PMOमें मणिशंकर अय्यर के successor भी थे। जहां तक मुझे याद हैं, अगर मेरी याददाशत सही है तो वह इनके successor थे, ये इनके उत्तराधिकारी थे।...(**व्यवधान**)...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA (Jharkhand): They were working together. ... *(Interruptions)...*

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह: जी हां...(**व्यवधान**)... नहीं वहां में जब आप बने...(**व्यवधान**)...

पंचायती राज मंत्री, युवक कार्यक्रम और खेल मंत्री तथा उत्तर-पूर्वी क्षेत्र विकास मंत्री (**श्री मणिशंकर अय्यर**) : वह मेरे साथी थे...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह : आप चले गए , उसके बाद वह वहीं कर गए ...(**व्यवधान**)... उसके बाद ये चले गए फिर वे मौजूद रह गए...(**व्यवधान**)...। मैं वही कह रहा था कि ये चले गए और वे वहां पर रह गए और बाद के दो और प्रधान मंत्रियों के साथ भी वे रहे। उपसभापति महोदय, मैं इस बात का जिक्र इसलिए कर रहा हूं क्योंकि आज मुझे यह समझ में नहीं आता, यह जासे उनका बयान है, यह बहस करना सरकार के लिए कोई मायने नहीं रखता कि उन्होंने यह बात किसके लिए कही है। जिस में पूरी बात इस राजदूत ने कही है, ऐसा लगता है कि वह भारत का राजदूत नहीं है, वह अमेरिका का राजदूत है। सरकार के मंत्री यहां बैठे हैं, इसकी एक-एक लाइन आप पढ़िए। बुश कितना समझदार आदमी है, वह कहता है कि इसमें कितनी transparency है। पहली बार अमेरिका ने इतना बड़ा दिल दिखाया है?हम छोटे दिल के लोग हैं, उसके कहने का मतलब है कि भारत के लोग छोटे दिल के हैं। अमेरिका का राष्ट्रपति और अमेरिका बड़े दिल का है। हमारे राजदूत को यह बात कहते हुए शर्म नहीं आती हैं? उस राष्ट्रपति पर यकीन करते हो...(**व्यवधान**)...। उस राष्ट्रपति पर यकीन करते हो, उपसभापति महोदय, जिसने संयुक्त

राष्ट्रसंघ में असत्य बोला और कहा कि इराक के पास weapon of mass destruction है, इसलिए उस देश पर हमला होना चाहिए। उस राष्ट्रपति पर हमारे राजदूत को यकीन है और भारत के संसद सदस्यों पर उसका यकीन नहीं हैं। ऐसे राजदूत को एक सैकण्ड के लिए भी रहना देश के लिए खतरनाक है। जिस राजदूत पर देश का विश्वास नहीं हो, वह राजदूत, राजदूत रहने लायक नहीं है। यह बात किसके लिए कही गई हैं, मीडिया को कही गई हैं? हमें अफसोस हुआ कि हमारे विदेश मंत्री कहते हैं कि मीडिया के लिए ये बातें कही गई। यह मैं पहली बात सुन रहा हूँ कि यह मीडिया से बात कर रहा है और उसी को कह रहा है। मीडिया से ही बबात कर रहा है और उसी को headless chicken कह रहा है। यह बात कभी समझदारी की हो सकती है? उपसभापति महोदय, मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि पांच-पांच दस-दस हजार रूपए की घूस के लिए हमने अपने संसद सदस्यों को इसी सदन से एक सैकण्ड में बाहर निकाल दिया। इसलिए कि उसमें सब दलों के लोग थे। इसलिए कि हम सब लोग इस सदन की गरिमा बढ़ाने के लिए प्रतिबद्ध थे और इस सदन की गरीमा को गिराने वाला एक* यशंवत सिन्हा जी के बारे में लिखता है, जो यशंवत सिन्हा जी को लेने के लिए लंदन के हवाई अड्डे पर 12-12 घंटे खड़ा रहता था, मुझको लेने के लिए 6-6 घंटे खड़ा रहता था। इस राजदूत को यह हिम्मत हो रही है कि हम सब लोगों के बारे में कहे कि 60 साल में हमने क्या सीखा है और क्या खोया हैं। हां, हम खो रहे हें। सीखे क्या? यह तो नहीं जानता। लेकिन सरकार के लोगो से मैं कहना चाहूंगा, खासकर यहां जासे गंभीर लोग सरकार ककी तरफ से बैठे हुए हैं, कि इस तरह के* से बचकर रहिए। हमारे डी. राजा साहब पूछ रहे थे कि इसकी ताकत क्या है? हटाते क्यों नहीं हैं? यह आप लोगों पर प्रश्नचिहन लगा रहा है। मैं नाम नहीं लेना चाहता। इसकी ताकत कहां हैं,मुझे मालूम हैं। मैं 17-18 साल से इस व्यक्ति को व्यक्तिगत तौर से जानता हूँ और इसकी ताकत, इसककी शक्ति कहां हैं, मैं यहां पर उसको छेड़ना नहीं चाहता। डी. राजा साहब मैं आपको बता दूंगा, मैं सदन में नहीं बताना चाहता, लेकिन मैं सरकार से इतना जरूर कहूंगा कि अगर इस आदमी की ताकत को रोकनें के लिए आपने लगाम नहीं, लगाई तो* की यही खासियत होती है कि वह दिन को रात बताता हैं और रात को दिन बताता है। दोस्त वह होता हैं, जो दिन को दिन बताता है और रात को रात बताता है। माफ कीजिएगा नारायणसामी साहब, हम सब लोग आपके दोस्त हैं। अगर मि सत्ता में होतें, तो ये लोग यह बात आपके लिए कहते। आज हम सत्ता में नहीं हैं, तो हमारे लिए कही है। मैंने तो कहा आपसे कि यह वही राजदूत है, जो बारह-बारह घंटे यशंवत सिन्हा के लिए खड़ा रहता था हवाई अड्डे पर। मेरे लिए छः-छः घंटे खड़ा रहता था और आज हम ही को ज्ञान पढ़ा रहा है। उस समय हम सबसे ज्ञानवान पुरूष थे और हमको कहता है कि ज्ञान पढाना चाहिए। इसलिए अगर सचमुच सदन की गरिमा को रखना है और सचमुच भारत के प्रजांतत्र की ताकत और शक्ति को बरकरार रखना है, तो ऐसे * को एक सेंकड के लिए इन्होंने तो एक दिन दे दिया... एक सेंकड के लिए भी अमेरिका में यह भारत का राजदूत नहीं रह सकता है, यह सदन के सारे लोगों ने कहा है, यह सदन की भावना है।

उपसभापति महोदय, नारायणसामी जी ने क्या कहा, मैं नहीं जानता। सदन के बहुसंख्यक लोग और अन्य अभी जो लोग बोलेंगे, उन सब लोगों की भावना है, इसलिए मैं सरकार से कहता हूं कि अगर आपका प्रजातंत्र में यकीन हैं, अगर आप डेमोक्रेसी में यकीन करते हो तो, सदन की गरिमा का ख्याल रखते हुए इस लोकतंत्र को बचाने के लिए ऐसे* राजदूत को एक सेंकड में वापस बुलाया जाए और जो यशंवत सिन्हा

* Expunged as ordered by the Chair

जी ने कहा कि यहीं कटघरे में खड़ा करके, आप उस आसन से, उस आदमी को डांट-डपट करके तुरंत यहां से बाहर कीजिए, धन्यवाद।

SHRI R. SHUNMUGASUNDARAM (Tamil Nadu): Sir, we are one on this issue. We are one in condemning the irresponsible statement made by any Ambassador of India. Whether he has said 'headless chickens' or 'tailless monkeys', the phrases are not important. What is of importance is that he should have exercised some restraint. In democracy, divergent views are highly valued, respected and discussed. Nobody can condemn that, and especially, a representative of the largest democracy of the world.

Sir, we are really proud to be a democratic country where we respect opposing views, but I only wish this discussion, which is taking place today, had taken place yesterday in a calmer atmosphere. Whatever it is, I am happy that this discussion is taking place and all of us are condemning this statement in one voice.

Sir, I would also say that if such a statement has been made by the Ambassador of India, holding this august House or any Member in contempt, we should not hesitate in calling him, condemning him and in taking appropriate action. Yesterday, the hon. Minister for External Affairs had made a statement. He had said that he condemned that particular statement. We welcome that. Shri Yechury, on behalf of the CPI(M), had made a request that it should be properly followed up.

Therefore, Sir, we wish to state that if the statement made by the envoy is found to be true, then it is a matter of great insult to our parliamentary system that makes it a privilege issue and he should be called and reprimanded before this hon. House.

DR. BARUN MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Sir, it came as a shock to all of us that the Indian Ambassador posted at Washington dared to make such statements about Parliamentarians, particularly when the Parliament Session is on and the debate is on about the Indo-US Nuclear deal. He has made such remarks at this juncture and it goes against the prestige of this august House. It is no more an issue whether or not he has made such a statement. There is no categorical denial of the fact and the Ambassador himself after his statement has not categorically denied that he has not said it. He simply tried to escape by saying that he has been misquoted. I feel that it is not proper. When somebody makes some statement and when he is on the wrong foot, he only makes the media scapegoat. It is not a fair business. We appreciate that the hon. External Affairs Minister made the statement yesterday saying that his statement is unwarranted and unacceptable. Following his statement the Government must take immediate steps against the Ambassador. Sitting in Washington, he should not make such remarks. I wonder whether he is making the Government policies or the Government here in the Cabinet is making policies. He has definitely crossed his limits and we must not tolerate it. Merely by apologising, the matter cannot be ended as such because then it will be very easy for someone to make offence and say that he apologises. Once he has made some wrong statement, once he has gone beyond his jurisdiction and once he has made so derogatory a remark about Parliament, I think, some sort of necessary action must be taken against him. He should be immediately recalled. We wonder why the Government is still waiting for it. The more the delay will be there, the more the controversy will start. So, it is high time for the Government to take action. We demand that the Ambassador should be recalled immediately and necessary action should be taken against him.

श्री तारीक अनवर (महाराष्ट्र) **:** उपसभापति महोदय, सदन की भावना से अपने आपको जोड़ते हुए मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि इस सदन में बैठे हुए लोगों में सेक कोई भी इस बात से सहमत नहीं होगा कि जहां तक इस सदन की गरिमा का सवाल है, उसमें कोई कमी, किसी तरह की कोई ठेस या उसके ऊपर किसी तरह का आरोप और प्रतयारोप लगाया जाए। मैं यह समझता हूं कि प्रणव मुखर्जी जी ने कल आकर इस बात को स्पष्ट किया था कि अगर राजदूत ने इस तरह की कोई बात कही है तो सरकार उसके खिलाफ कार्यवाही करेगी। मैं समझता हूं कि इस बात का पता लगाना चाहिए और इसककी सच्चाई में जाना चाहिए। अगर राजदूत ने इस तरह की कोई बात कही है जिससे आज इस सदन की भावना को ठेस पहुंची है तो अवश्य उनके खिलाफ कार्यवाही होनी चाहिए। इसमें किसी तरह का कोई संकोच करने की जरूरत नहीं हैं क्योंकि यह बात बिल्कुल सच है कि यह हमारे लोकतंत्र और इस सदन की गरिमा का सवाल है। इसलिए सरकार को जल्दी से जल्दी इस बात का पता लगाना चाहिए कि क्या सत्य है और जो बयान उन्होंने दिया है, उसमें कितनी सच्चाई है। यह ठीक है कि उन्होंने माफी है मांगी है लेकिन अगर बयान देने के बाद उन्होंने माफी मांगी भी है तो मैं समझता हूं कि वह क्षमा के पात्र नहीं हैं। इस तरह की गलती, वह भी एक ऐसे राजदूत के द्वारा,जिनको इस सरकार में काम करने का बहुत अधिक अनुभव है, वे अगर इस तरह की गैर-जिम्मेदाराना बात करते हैं तो उनके खिलाफ कार्यवाही होनी चाहिए।

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI (Maharashtra): Thank you, Sir. Unfortunately, Sir, I don't have the advantage of the paper that Shri Yashwant Sinha was referring to, that Shri Chatterjee also had in his hands and so what Shri Digvijay Singhji was referring to. I do see the point that Shri Narayanasamyji made that there is little proof that has come before the House and we are dealing with a blue-eyed boy of the Indian Foreign Service and, therefore, we ought to be more careful. I think, what words he actually used for the Parliamentarians or for any other person, is not a matter of importance. Whether he said it to the media in a formal press conference or in a private conversation or private discussion is also not important. The fact that cannot be denied by even Mr. Narayanasamy is that he was responsible for an act of indiscretion which, in diplomatic circles, is called *faux pas,* which has actually resulted in disturbance of this House for three days and which has, certainly, resulted in India's image outside being tarnished. I think recall of the Ambassador is extremely important not only to uphold the prestige of this House but even to give a message in the United States that this Parliament cannot be taken for granted and the decision that we make will finally be made in this House. So, I support the immediate recall of the Ambassador.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister of State for Parliamentary Affairs, Shri Suresh Pachouri.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE (Uttar Pradesh): Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: See it has been agreed that only the leaders of the political parties will speak. We had a useful debate. There are other Members who also want to speak on this issue...*(Interruptions)...* Please, co-operate.

कार्मिक, लोक शिकायत और पेंशन मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री तथा संसदीय कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (**श्री सुरेश पचौरी**) : उपसभापति महोदय, इस सदन के सजग

सदस्य सम्मानित यशंवत सिन्हा जी से प्रारम्भ होकर बात मुझ तक पहुंची है। अमेरिका में भारतीय राजदूत ने जो कथित टिप्पणियां की हैं उसके प्रति सम्मानित सदस्यों ने अपना मन्तव्य व्यक्त किया है और संसदीय कार्य राजय मंत्री की हैसियत से मुझे यह बात कहने में कोई सकुचाहट नहीं हें। कि जहां तक सदन के सदस्यों के सम्मान का प्रश्न है, सदन की गरिमा का प्रश्न है, हमारी लोकतांत्रिक व्यवस्था की यही विशेषता रही है कि जब ऐसी स्थिति निर्मित हुई तो चाहे यह सदन हो, चाहे दूसरा सदन हो हमने राजनीतिक पार्टियों की सीमाओं को पार करके समुचित कदम उठाए और इसलिए मैं इस बात को आज के मौके पर इस सदन के जो सम्मानित सदस्य हैं, उन्होंने जो बातें कहीं हैं उनको गंभीरता से सुनते हुए इस बात को कहना चाहता हूं कि जहां तक यू. पी. ए. सरकार का प्रश्न है, जब सदन के सदस्यों के सम्मान और स्वाभिमान की बात आएगी, सदन की गरिमा की बात आएगी तो उसको यह सरकार सदैव बहुत गंभीरता से लेगी। जहां तक कोई नौकरशाह हो या कोई राजदूत हो, उसके आचरण और दायित्व का प्रश्न है, तो मुझे यह कहने में भी कोई संकोच नहीं हैं कि ये लोग जब अपनी जिम्मेदारी या कर्त्तव्य का निर्वहन करें तों संविधान के दायरे में रहते हुए देश हित को ध्यान मे रखते हुए अपने कर्त्तव्य का निर्वहन करें। इन बातों को ध्यान में रखते हुए उन्हें अपने उत्तरदायित्व का निर्वहन करना चाहिए और जो उनका कथन हो वह भी बहुत संयमित ढंग से मर्यादित ढंग से होना चाहिए मैं इस बात का पक्षधर हूं। मैं इस बात को आगे बढ़ाते हुए यह भी कहना चाहता हूं कि यह बात केवल नौकरशाहों तक सीमित नहीं रहनी चाहिए, राजदूतों तक सीमित नहीं रहनी चाहिए, राजनीतिक पार्टी के लोग हों या मीडिया के लोग हों, उन पर भी लागू होनी चाहिए कि जब कभी कोई गंभीर मसले हों तो हम लोग किस गरिमामय ढंग से उस पर अपना मन्तव्य व्यक्त करें। जहां तक जो बिन्दु माननीय सदस्यों ने उठाएं हैं, उस विषय में सरकार की ओर से आपने मुझे निर्देशन दिया है कि मैं कुछ कहूं और प्रारम्भ में ही आपने यह बात कह दी थी कि रूल्स और प्रिसीडेंस से हटकर आप इस बात को उठाने की अनुमति दे रहे हैं, वराना मैं रूल 238 (V) का जिक्र करता या कौल एंड शकधर में जो पृष्ठ-918 पर उल्लेख है कि ममात्र किसी समाचार पत्र में प्रकाशित बात को जब तक कि कहने वाला उसको substantiateनहीं करे, उस पर विचार विमर्श नहीं किया जाए, उसका जिक्र करता लेकिन आपने प्रारम्भ में ही या बात कह दी। लेकिन आपने प्रारम्भ में ही यह बात कह दी, तो आपकी बात का आदर करते हुए, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि ...(**व्यवधान**)...

SHRI N. JOTHI (Tamil Nadu): Sir, it is a matter of public demand. ... *(Interrutptions)...*

श्री उपसभापति : आप छोड़िए। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: आप बोलिए, मैं बैठ जाता हूं...(**व्यवधान**)... आप बोलिए। आप बोलिए।...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री एस. एस. अहलुवालिया : इसी समाचार पत्र का जवाब देते हुए श्री प्रणच मुखर्जी सदन में आए।...(**व्यवधान**)... उन्होंने वहां से जवाब मांगा और उसका जवाब यहां दिया।...(**व्यवधान**)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. Let us not start one more debate. *...(Interruptions)...* One minute. Please *...(Interruptions)...* You have to listen as they have listened to you. *...(Interruptions)...* That is his view. *...(Interruptions)...*

श्री एस. एस. अहलुवालिया : सर, सदन की कार्यवाही जरा सीधी भी करिए।...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री उपसभापति : करेंगे? ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री एस. एस. अहलुवालिया : ऐसा है कि वह कह रहे हैं कि समाचार पत्रों का उल्लेख नहीं होना चाहिए।...(**व्यवधान**)... समाचार पत्रों का ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री उपसभापति : यह उनकी ओपियन है।...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री एस. एस. अहलुवालिया : सर, बात खत्म करने दीजिए।...(**व्यवधान**)... बात को खत्म करने दीजिए।...(**व्यवधान**)... वह तो yield कर गये।...(**व्यवधान**)... वह तो कर गये।...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री उपसभापति : इसका मतलब यह है कि मैं रेगुलेट नहीं करूं...(**व्यवधान**)..

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Unless and until the veracity is*...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI N. JOTHI: How long will you take to verify the veracity*...(Interruptions)...*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no. This is not allowed. *...(Interruptions)...* Nothing will go on record. *...(Interruptions)...* Mr. Narayanasamy, *...(Interruptions)...* Mr. Narayanasamy, please listen to me. No, no*...(Interruptions)...* You see, Mr. Suresh Pachouri has yielded. That is why*...(Interruptions)...*

एस.एस. अहलुवालिया : श्री प्रणव मुखर्जी ने किस चीज़ का जवाब दिया था। विदेश मंत्री जी ने इस सदन में आकर किस मांग का जवाब दिया था, यह बताने की कृपा करें। वह क्या समाचार पत्र नहीं था। वह दो-दो बार आए, वह एक दिन में दो बार सदन में आये।...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री उपसभापति: अहलुवालिया जी, आपने जो कुछ कहना था, वह कह दिया।...(**व्यवधान**)... हर word पर,unless it is unparliamentary, I cannot ask the Minister, don't say this, don't say that. *...(Interruptions)...*

...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज (मध्य प्रदेश) **:** आप उनको जवाब पूरा करने दीजिए।...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री उपसभापति : आप बोलिए।...(**व्यवधान**)..

श्री सुरेश पचौरी : आप बोलिए। आप बोलिए।...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री उपसभापति : पचौरी जी, आप बोलिए। आप बोलिए।...(**व्यवधान**)... पचौरी जी, आप बोलिए। आप कॅपलीट कीजिए।...(**व्यवधान**)... आप बैठ जाइये। आप बैठ जाइयें।

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : सर, मंत्री जी अपना वक्तव्य पूरा करें।

श्री सुरेश पचौरी : सर, मैं यह विनम्रतापूर्वक आग्रह कर रहा था कि एक अच्छे वातावरण में, एक सौहार्दपूर्ण वातावरण में इस मुद्दे पर सभी सम्मानित सदस्य अपनी-अपनी बात कह रहे थे। और मैं सोचता हूं कि इसका पटाक्षेप भी उसी वातावरण में होना चाहिए। जहां तक सम्मानित सदस्य यशंवत सिन्हा जी ने इस मसले कासे विशेषाधिकार समिति को सौंपने का प्रश्न उठाया है, मैं इस संबंध में अदब के साथ

यह कहना चाहता हूं कि यह पीठासीन अधिकारी के अधिकार क्षेत्र की बात है, इसमें सरकार न तो कुछ कर सकती है और न कोई टिप्पणी कर सकती है।

जहां तक अन्य बातें, जो उठायी गयी हैं, यद्यपि विदेश मंत्री जी ने बहुत कुछ कल उन बातों का उल्लेख किया हैं, फिर भी कुछ रह जाता है या जैसे प्रो. राम देव भंडारी जी ने या हमारे दूसरे डीएमके के साथियों द्वारा जो बातें कही गयी हैं कि उनकी पुष्टि कर ली जाए और पुष्टि के बाद जो समुचित कदम उठाया जा सकता है, उस दिशा में सरकार विचार करें, तो इस संबंध में मैं सदन की जो एगीमेंट से संबंधित बात है और वह रह जाती है, तो माननीय उपसभापति महोदय, मैं इस सदन के सामने बड़े अदब के साथ यह बात रखना चाहता हूं कि इस विषय पर सरकार चर्चा कराने के लिए तैयार हैं। बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी में भी इसके बारे में बात हुई हैं, जब चर्चा होगी, उन बिंदुओं को उस समय भी उठाया जा सकता है। इसलिए यह जो आज की बात है, वह राजदूत और उसके आचरण तक ही सीमित रहे। जहां तक सरकार की ओर से कोई कार्यवाही किए जाने का संबंध है, जो माननीय सदस्यों ने अपनी भावनाएं व्यक्त की हैं, उन भावनाओं से मैं माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी को अवगत करा दूंगा।

DR. V. MAITREYAN: The whole House is *... (Interruptions)...*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No clarifications will be allowed because it has not been taken up under any Rule. I cannot ask the External Affairs Minister who is not present. He has said that he will inform the External Affairs Minister about the sentiments of the House. The matter should end here. *...(Interruptions)...* Now, we shall take up*...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, they *... (Interruptions)...*

DR. V. MAITREYAN: Sir, except Mr. Narayanasamy, everyone is ... *(Interruptions)...*

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: No, no. *...(Interruptions)...* It is not going to ... *(Interruptions)...*

SHRI RAVULA CHANDRA SEKAR REDDY: Sir, the Minister has just ... *(Interruptions)...*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has said that he will info*rm...(Interruptions)...* That is what he has*...(Interruptions)...*That matter is over. *(Interruptions)* Now, we shall take up The Inland Vessels (Amendment) Bill, 2005. Hon. Minister for Shipping, Road Transport and Highways, Shri T.R. Baalu to move the Bill. *(Interruptions)*

GOVERNMENT BILLS

The Inland Vessels (Amendment) Bill, 2005

THE MINISTER OF SHIPPING, ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS (SHRI T. R. BAALU): With your permission, I beg to move: