

(b) Annual Report and Audited Accounts of the All India Institute of Speech and Hearing, Mysore for the year 1979-80.

(c) Annual Report and Audited Accounts of the All India Institute of Speech and Hearing, Mysore, for the year 1980-81.

(d) Annual Report and Audited Accounts of the All India Institute of Speech and Hearing, Mysore, for the year 1981-82.

(e) Annual Report and Audited Accounts of the All India Institute of Speech and Hearing, Mysore, for the year 1982-83.

(f) Annual Report and Audited Accounts of the All India Institute of Speech and Hearing, Mysore, for the year 1983-84.

(g) Review by Government on the working of the Institute for the years 1978—84.

(h) Statement giving reasons for the delay in laying the papers mentioned at (a) to (g) above.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-828/85 for (a) to (h)].

**Notifications of the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (Deptt, of Health) under the Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, 1954.**

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: Sir, I also beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Notifications of the Minisry of Health and Family Welfare (Deptt, of Health) under subsection (2) of Section 23 of the Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, 1954 :—

(i) G.S.R. No. 764(E), dated the 15th November 1984, publishing the Prevention of Food Adulteration (Third Amendment) Rules, 1984, (in English and Hindi).

(ii) G.S.R. No. 385(E), dated the 29th April, 1985, publishing a Corrigendum to Hindi Version of Notification G.S.R. No. 764(E), dated the 15th Novembr, 1984, (in Hindi).

395 RS—11

by India

(iii) G.S.R. No. 3(E), dated the 1st January, 1985, publishing the Prevention of Food Adulteration (First Amendment) Rules, 1985, (in English and Hindi).

(iv) G.S.R. No. 142(E), dated the 8th March, 1985, publishing Corrigendum to Notification G.S.R. No. 3(E), dated the 1st January 1985, (in English and Hindi).

(v) G.S.R. No. 11(E), dated the 4th January, 1985, publishing the Prevention of Food Adulteration (Second Amendment) Rules 1985 (in English and Hindi).

(vi) G.S.R. No. 368(E), dated the 18th April, 1985, publishing a Corrigendum to Notification G.S.R. No. 11(E), dated the 4th January, 1985, (in English and Hindi).

[Paced in Library. See No. LT-958/35 for (i) to (vi)].

**REFERENCE TO THE REPORTED NUCLEAR THREAT BEING FACED BY INDIA**

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan) : Sir, I rise to make a mention of the aspect of nuclear threats facing the country and the Government's ambiguous . . . . . (Interruption) Mr. Chairman, could the hon. Minister of Defence please be asked to stay back for two minutes? (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Parliamentary Affairs Minister may ask the Minister of Defence to . . . .

SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN (Tamil Nadu): The Parliamentary Affairs Minister is not here.

SHRI RAMANAND YADAV: (Bihar): It is not necessary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know everything. When I request the Defence

[Mr. Chairman]

Minister to . . . . (Interruptions)  
There is a reason for it. When I  
say . . . . (Interruptions). He will  
have to be there. You go on.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am very grateful to the Chair for this consideration shown to me. It is not a consideration being shown to my persons as and individual Member of Parliament. It is a recognition of the seriousness of the question that I am raising with the permission of the Chair.

Sir, I refer to the nuclear threats facing the country and the ambiguous and somewhat conflicting statements made on the subject by various spokesman of the Government. You have been considerate enough to permit me to raise this as a special mention, though I had earlier sought that this matter be debated and discussed in the form of a Calling Attention. Why, Sir, has the question of debating this subject arisen? It has arisen primarily because of confusion, alarm and ambiguity caused on account of conflicting statements made on the subject by respective spokesmen of the Government.

SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN: The Defence Minister has come.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I requested you to come please . . . .

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: There is the existing nuclear scenario with which we have been living since 1960. Very briefly, the Chinese nuclear capability was established to the 60's. With their testing of missiles their IRBM capability has been established, and that too was estab-

lished in this decade. Pakistan's nuclear weapons programme was really launched in 1975, if, not earlier and we have been living with that nuclear programme for the past decade or so. Information about that programme is available to lay public like me only in bits and pieces and those who are interested in pursuing the subject. There is super power presence in our region, both in the ocean periphery and also on land. And that has a reality for the past decade and a half as well.

As I said, why do I need to mention this as a special mention? It is because of confusion, ambiguity and alarm spread on account of conflicting statements made by responsible members of Government. The Ministry of Defence, for the first time, in its Report in this year particularly makes a mention of the nuclear capability of Pakistan and highlights this as a threat facing the country. The Ministry of External Affairs is silent on this subject. Sir, there is a need to raise this because the Minister himself in a speech in the other House invited a debate and he said that he would welcome it if Parliament were to debate this subject. Finally, the hon. Prime Minister made a specific reference to this threat while talking in a party forum. He also, though in a different context, is reported to have said that the United State must take the initiative to discourage Pakistan from its nuclear programme. The Defence Minister thereafter, Sir, rebutted all this and said that he is authorised to contradict what the Prime Minister has said. Now, this is the scenario in which I am making this special mention, and I have two or three specific clarifications to seek from the hon Defence Minister.

The consequences of such ambiguity, Sir, do not benefit us. They do *not* benefit us as a country. Such an ambiguity in policy lands us in a situation where all the disadvantages accrue. It conveys a wrong message at home, because it spreads alarm, and it conveys a wrong message abroad because of the existing and announced policies on the subject.

I would, therefore, request the hon. Defence Minister that, in the light of what he has said that there ought to be a debate in Parliament, would he, therefore, enable a proper debate to take place? Would he clarify the following 4 or 5 questions?

Firstly, what specific developments have taken place in the last 12 months in Pakistan which have compelled or persuaded the Ministry of Defence to specify this as a nuclear threat facing the country? Whereas the Ministry of Defence specifies that threat, the Ministry of External Affairs remains silent about it. Isn't that an example of ambiguity, that we recognize a military threat but we do not give it diplomatic recognition? My second clarification is, what is the assessment of the nuclear capability of the People's Republic of China and threats from the quarter? Thirdly, what information does the Government of India have about nuclear assistance provided to Pakistan, directly or indirectly, from the following countries: Nigeria, Libya, France, People's Republic of China, USA and USSR? Next question in the light of the recent and conflicting statements made by the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister, What is the Government of India's stand on (a) India ocean as a nuclear free zone, (b) our announced policy

on continued and peaceful uses of nuclear energy, (c) the status of I.E.A. and our nuclear power programme for the Seventh Five Year Plan; and finally, Sir, what is the Government of India's reaction to the recently reiterated Pakistan offer, by Niaz Naik, about no war treaty and treaty of peace and friendship and Pakistan's offer of mutual inspection of nuclear facilities, etc.

I would like to take this opportunity, Sir, of thanking you for showing appreciation to this issue which I am only articulating as an ordinary Member of Parliament.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Minister will send a reply. (Interruptions).

SHRI SURESH KALMADI ((Maharashtra): We want a full discussion. It is an important matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, would you like to say anything?

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): Yes. With your permission, I would send a detailed reply to the long questionnaire which has just been read out. (Interruptions).

SHRI SURESH KALMADI: Let there be a full discussion before the House adjourns on Monday. (Interruptions) The hon. Minister himself said that. We are ready for discussion. It is an important matter. (Interruptions).

SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN: Let the Minister first say what he wants to say.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Since you called me back, I am in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sure you will send a reply. But you offered to reply.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I am prepared to send answers to all the questions that have been put. There was one point, however. I don't think that was a question. That was a point of distortion. There was no question of the Prime Minister and myself making contradictory statements. That is factually wrong. I will send answers to the other questions.

SHRI SURESH KALMADI: There should be a fullfledged discussion before the House adjourns.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will explain the thing. Mr. Jaswant Singh wanted a Calling Attention Motion on this. The work in the House is so tight that I would not accommodate him. So, I gave him this opportunity to make a Special Mention and I asked the Defence Minister also to be present here so that he may hear it. If you convert it into a debate, the purpose will be lost. In that case, I will have to give an opportunity to everybody. The purpose for which this special arrangement was made will be lost. I will appeal to all of you to cooperate with me . . .

#### REFERENCE TO THE INADE- QUATE AIR SERVICE BETWEEN AGARTALA AND CALCUTTA

SHRIMATI ILA BHATTACHARYA (Tripura): Sir, I am raising here an important matter. It is regarding inadequate air service between Tripura and Calcutta and inordinate delay in getting tickets.

The life in Tripura is seriously disrupted due to inadequate air service

and inordinate delay in getting air tickets for Calcutta. People of Tripura have never witnessed such tremendous difficulties in getting an air ticket. It is said that this is due to the introduction of computer system. The system here is lengthy and time consuming. Lasting over ten/twelve days and even then there is no assurance of getting at tickets. The alternative to air travel is the railway link via Assam to Calcutta that takes about for five days.

Sir, air service for Agartala is inadequate and the introduction of more regular Boeing service is of immediate need. Shortage of staff is also a big problem. Demands for special service to ease the mounting pressure remain unfulfilled. Tickets for special flights are offered on the basis of priority for patients, admission seekers, interview seekers, etc. Moreover, a Fokker Friendship (only four in a week) has a maximum capacity of forty passengers. So, the problem far from being eased gets accentuated for those who do not belong to priority categories. The uncertainty for an air ticket, the complicated procedure and the resultant delay and inadequacy of seats take the passengers to the end of their patience. The Chief Minister of Tripura sent a telegram urging the Union Government to take appropriate action to ease the situation as the life in Tripura is seriously disrupted.

Sir, it was hoped that the computer system will ease the difficulties of passengers | ticket seekers, but on the contrary it has added to the problem. Therefore, I urge upon the Government to immediately increase the number of flights of Tripura and see that the computer serves the interest of the people.