

party or a group of people. They are our national leaders. I would say that these three individuals belong to the entire nation. No party should try to monopolise them or their contribution.

Having said so, I would also say that these are historical figures. When we are dealing with historical figures, everybody has the right to criticise; whether they agree or disagree, everybody has the right to criticise. After all, if you do not allow this right to these scholars to criticise, obviously, there can be no scholarship; there can be no individual development. It so happens that this individual who has nothing to do with our party—of course, that is not an important thing — has come to certain conclusions.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Let him disagree.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: He has come to certain conclusions. It does not mean that he has done anything wrong. In the scholarly world, we always do it; we contradict each other. What is the harm in that? In fact, I am surprised at the attitude of the Vice-Chancellor. My only request to the vice-Chancellor of the University — he is an old friend of mine — is that he should not suppress this publication because it contains article. That publication should be released without any further delay and we should, actually, promote this kind of contradiction, some debate, on historical figures. It does not harm the image of any of them. If you say one or two things critical of Gandhi, that does not diminish the image of Gandhi. Similarly, it does not diminish the image of Nehru or diminish the image of Subhas Chandra Bose. So, for that reason, we must take a very broad, very scholarly and, also, a very generous attitude when it comes to criticism of some historical figures. So, I would urge upon the Vice-Chancellor of the University, through you, Sir, to release this volume on Subhas Chandra Bose without any further delay. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AJIT P.K. JOGI): We shall now take up the Special Mentions.

### SPECIAL MENTIONS

**Demand for Fulfilment of P.M.'s Assurance for Creation of Uttaranchal/Uttarakhand**

श्री मनोहर कान्त ध्यानी (उत्तर प्रदेश):  
उत्तराखण्ड महोदय, मैं 15 अगस्त, 1996 को भारत के प्रधान मंत्री श्री देवेगौड़ा जी के भाषण का उल्लेख करना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने लाल किले की प्राचीर से पृथक उत्तराखण्ड/उत्तरांचल राज्य बनाने की बात कही थी। महोदय, उस क्षेत्र में एक ऐसा आन्दोलन हुआ है जो सारी दुनिया के लिए एक मिसाल है। यह क्षेत्र अपने आप में सारे भारत की चेतना और ज्ञान का प्रतीक है। इस क्षेत्र में शांति बनी रहे, इस क्षेत्र के लोगों को न्याय मिले, यह बहुत आवश्यक है। पिछले दिनों जैसी घटनाएँ हुई हैं और जिस प्रकार से लोक सभा के दो-दो सेशन होने के बाद भी सरकार ने कोई विधेयक प्रस्तुत नहीं किया है इसकी वजह से उस क्षेत्र के लोगों में निराशा पैदा हो रही है। देश के एक मंत्री ने अभी पिछले दिनों उत्तर प्रदेश की एक सभा में एक ऐसी बात का उल्लेख किया था जिससे वहाँ के लोग बहुत पीड़ित हैं। मंत्री महोदय ने कहा था कि अगर उत्तराखण्ड बना तो देश रूस की तरह बिखर जायेगा। मैं मंत्री महोदय के ज्ञान और अज्ञान के बारे में कुछ कहना नहीं चाहता हूँ, लेकिन यह लोगों को समझना चाहिए कि रूस कई राष्ट्रों का समूह था और भारत एकात्मक राष्ट्र है। इसके कारण वहाँ के लोग दुखी हैं। मैं सदन के माध्यम से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह क्षेत्र सैनिक प्रधान क्षेत्र है और एक हजार से अधिक वर्ष से इस देश की सुरक्षा में उसका योगदान है। आज वहाँ जो निराशा पैदा हो रही है, उससे कुंठा उत्पन्न होगी, घृणा उत्पन्न होगी तो बाकी क्षेत्रों में जिस प्रकार के परिणाम आये हैं, उसी प्रकार के मध्य हिमालय में परिणाम आयेंगे और इससे एक प्रकार की खतरनाक स्थिति पैदा होगी। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि देश के प्रधान मंत्री, चाहे उनकी अवस्था इस सरकार में कैसी भी हो, लेकिन वे आज भी देश के प्रधान मंत्री हैं, देश के नेता हैं इसलिए उनको अपने वचन का पालन करना चाहिए। उनको इसी सेशन में विधेयक लाकर जनता की जो भावना है उसको तुष्ट करना चाहिए और वहाँ के लोगों की समस्याओं का समाधान करना चाहिए। यही कह कर मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह प्रश्न मंत्री ने आश्वासन दिया था लाल किले के मैदान के ऊपर, एक सावरेन कंट्री के सावरेन प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने और हम चाहते हैं कि वे इस बात को साबित करें कि सावरेन कंट्री की जो सावरेनटी जनता में होती है और वह जनता को जो विश्वास दिलाते हैं, उसका वह पालन करेंगे और उत्तरांचल राज्य बनाने का बिल लायेंगे। जैसी कि घ्यानी जी ने मॉग की है।

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Sir, I support the demand for a separate State of Uttaranchal because our demand for full statehood for Pondicherry also is pending. In fact, I raised it in the last session itself. I support it.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: You have been supporting creation of Uttaranchal. Then only Kanyakumari to Kashmir will be unified.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AJIT P.K. JOGI): Mr. Narayanasamy, now please speak on your own Special Mention.

#### Ban by the Supreme Court on Hatcheries in the Coastal Regulation Zone

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Sir, I would like to raise a very important issue which has been a matter of concern to the people of the coastal region. The hon. Minister for Commerce is also interested in the subject.

Sir, the Supreme Court recently passed an order banning hatcheries and prawn culture in the coastal areas of Andhra Pradesh, Orissa, Tamil Nadu, Cochin, Maharashtra, the Konkan region and other places. As per the order, the Coastal Regulation Zone has to be observed within 500 metres of the coastal land and no kind of activity for prawn culture or hatchery should be started there.

Sir, earlier, right from 1985 till the date of this order, several thousands of

hatcheries and prawn culture centres were started by the farming community and some export houses, spending huge amounts of money. The judgement is to the effect that the area should be free from any kind of pollution. That was the reason. It was accepted by some of the State Governments also. They want to implement it, and they want to demolish the hatcheries and the prawn-culture ponds developed by the farming community for years together. These are their main sources of income.

Two, three important things come out of this. Neither the Government of India nor the State Governments have regulated the prawn culture and hatcheries in the coastal region. This was one of the reasons why the Supreme Court intervened. Now, we find that the pollution caused by the prawn culture is not much because on the creek side they have put 100 metres and from the sea side they have put 500 metres. The State Governments are going beyond the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court judgement. Under the pretext of the Supreme Court judgement, they are trying to demolish the ponds developed by the community. A law and order situation has arisen in Andhra Pradesh. When the District Collector went there, the farmers objected to their demolition. The people have been arrested. A law and order problem has arisen there. Now it is spreading to Tamil Nadu, Kerala and other places.

The Government of India has declared the Coastal Regulation Zone. It has got two, three important obligations. Number one, the farming community in the coastal areas is benefited by the prawn culture and hatcheries. Number two, the Government of India is getting foreign exchange worth more than Rs. 3,500 crores by export of these items. Therefore, the Government of India should take immediate steps to protect the farming community by bringing a regulation so that the State Governments can strictly implement this