

[Dr. Karan Singh]

unconfirmed report. They said that they were quoting an unconfirmed report of the PTI.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: They never used the words 'unconfirmed report.' They did not say it.

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai): Yes; I also heard it. It said simply: 'PTI report.'

DR. KARAN SINGH: The All India Radio quoted the PTI report. The report happened to be wrong. The report was not correct.

श्री कंवरलाल गुप्त : रेडियो को कहना चाहिये था कि रिपोर्ट गलत निकली। यह नहीं कहा गया।

12.44 hrs.

CUSTOMS TARIFF BILL

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PRESENTATION OF REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

SHRI R. K. AMIN (Dhandhuka): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House do extend the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill further to consolidate and amend the law relating to customs duties upto the 1st April, 1971."

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House do extend the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill further to consolidate and amend the law relating to customs duties upto the 1st April, 1971."

The motion was adopted

12.45 hrs.

[At this stage some visitors from the Public Gallery raised some slogans].

12.46 hrs.

PREVENTION OF INSULTS TO NATIONAL HONOUR BILL*

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI K. C. PANT): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to prevent insults to national honour.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to prevent insults to national honour."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI K. C. PANT: I introduce the Bill.

SUPREME COURT JUDGES (CONDITIONS OF SERVICE) AMENDMENT BILL*

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Supreme Court Judges (Conditions of Service) Act, 1958.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to amend the Supreme Court Judges (Conditions of Service) Act, 1958."

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (मधुबनी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस विधेयक का विरोध करता हूँ। इसके पहले इसी तरह का एक विधेयक भ्राम्य था जिस में हाई कोर्ट के जजों के एलाउन्सिस की बात कही गई थी। मैंने जो उस वक्त कहा था उसी को मैं दोहराना चाहता हूँ। विधेयक चाहे हाई कोर्ट के जजों से सम्बन्धित हों या सुप्रीम कोर्ट के जजों से, जहाँ उनके एलाउन्सिस आदि बढ़ाने की बात होती है, वह कोई सोशल निसिसिटी से प्रेरित नहीं होती है। वह फिजूल खर्ची की बोटक है। जहाँ तक सुप्रीम कोर्ट के जजों के

एलाउन्स बढ़ाने या उनको छुट्टी में तनख्वाह आदि देने का सवाल है, आप तो जानते ही हैं कि यहाँ जजों के कारनामों के खिलाफ इम्पीचमेंट की बात चल रही है। न कोई यह सोशल निसैसिटी की बात है और न ही इस विधेयक की कोई जरूरत है, इस वास्ते मैं इसका विरोध करता हूँ और प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि सरकार इसको विदङ्गा कर ले। यह फिजूलखर्ची का एक नमूना है।

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): I support Shri Shiva Chandra Jha.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to amend the Supreme Court Judges (Conditions of Service) Act, 1958."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA: I introduce** the Bill.

12.48 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE: DELHI UNIVERSITY (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE AND DELHI UNIVERSITY (AMENDMENT) BILL—*Contd.*

MR. SPEAKER: The House will take up further discussion of the following resolution moved by Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta on the 27th August, 1970, namely:—

"This House disapproves of the Delhi University (Amendment) Ordinance, (Ordinance No. 4 of 1970) promulgated by the President on the 20th June, 1970".

The House will also take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Dr. V.K.R.V. Rao on the 27th August, 1970, namely:—

"That the Bill further to amend the Delhi University Act, 1922, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration".

Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao may now continue his speech.

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION AND YOUTH SERVICES (DR. V. K. R. V. RAO): I should like to be as brief as possible, because even the hon. Member who introduced the statutory resolution disapproving the ordinance began his speech by welcoming this legislation, and he was not against permission being given to the Delhi University to register private candidates within the territorial jurisdiction of the university and permit them to appear for the university examinations as private candidates.

The hon. Member made a series of other observations. He roamed over the whole field of Delhi University and Delhi University education. I am not quite certain how far all that he said was really relevant to the resolution that he introduced, and I do not think that it is necessary for me to reply in detail to the various things that he has stated. But there are one or two points that I would like to mention. To begin with, I should like very strongly to repudiate the allegation that was contained in the hon. Member's speech regarding the alleged partiality shown by the vice-chancellor of Delhi University in regard to some orders passed in taking disciplinary action against the students. I want to assure the House that the vice-chancellor of the Delhi University has been functioning in a very efficient manner, and we in Delhi have been by and large saved from many of the troubles and disturbances which have affected other universities. I would like this House to join me in giving moral support to the vice-chancellor in the very difficult task that he is facing in running this university. We are all aware how difficult it is these days for Vice-Chancellors to run Universities. Dr. Raj has been doing a fine job. I do not think we should say anything in this House which would cast doubts on his impartiality or objectivity. In actual fact, the disciplinary action taken was taken after examination by a committee appointed by the Vice-Chancellor. The action was also discussed in the Executive Council and it was on the confirmation of that Council that it was taken. So I should like to go on record as having strongly repudiated the

**Introduced with the recommendation of the President.