

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I enjoy the peace in the House sometimes after so much of storm.

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR: You enjoy peace otherwise also.

प्रो. विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा : महोदया, यह राज्य सभा का सेशन एक दिन बढ़ रहा है या नहीं। आप इन्फार्म कर दीजिए क्योंकि मैबंस के आर भी प्रोग्राम होंगे।

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: There is no such proposal as yet.

THE UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1997.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we will take up the Bill to be withdrawn. Otherwise, we will keep the Minister arrested in this House.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND DEPARTMENT OF CULTURE (KUMARI SELJA): Madam, I move for leave to withdraw the University Grants Commission (Amendment) Bill, 1991.

उपसभापति : आप बताइए कि आप इसे क्यों विद्वद्धा कर रही हैं?

KUMARI SELJA: Madam, this Bill was introduced with a dual purpose in mind, to empower the UGC to prescribe by regulations, the terms and conditions of service of the employees of the Central universities and also to provide for enhanced penalty for setting up and running bogus universities.

After that, we asked the UGC to take a fresh look at it. The UGC set up a sub-committee. The sub-committee gave its findings. With regard to the first, there were sharp reactions amongst the community all over, especially in Delhi. Keeping that

in view, the sub-committee recommended that this was not really required and that we should go in for more consultation between the UGC and Central universities to resolve such issues of service of teaching and non-teaching employees.

As regards the second part about enhanced penalty for fake universities, that is an important issue, and we propose to bring in a fresh Bill to that effect.

The question was proposed.

प्रो. विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा:(दिल्ली) : यह जो फेक यूनिवर्सिटीज का मामला है, वह इतना सीरियस होता जा रहा है कि लोग फेक यूनिवर्सिटीज के नाम पर लगातार सब जगह एडवरटाइजमेंट करते हैं, इश्तिहार देते हैं और उसके बाद लाखों आदमियों को छलते हैं, उनसे पैसा खाते हैं और वह सर्टीफिकेट पर नौकरियां ले रहे हैं। इसलिए आपका यह कहना कि हम फेश बिल लाएंगे, यह पिछले कई साल से, 20-30 साल से फेक यूनिवर्सिटीज का मामला चल रहा है और उसके लिए अगर आपको इसे विद्वद्धा करना था तो आप इसे विद्वद्धा करते समय फेश बिल ला सकती थीं। इसमें ऐसी कोई प्रॉब्लम तो थी नहीं। अब यह सेशन निकल जाएगा क्योंकि इस सेशन में तो सिर्फ एक दिन बचा है और एक दिन में आप इसे कैसे लाएंगे। आप जब इसे विद्वद्धा कर रही थीं तो उसके साथ ही बिल ले आतीं। वह आज नहीं आया, कल आया। कल हाउस एक्सेसटेंड होगा या नहीं पता नहीं है। फेक यूनिवर्सिटीज का मामला गवर्नमेंट कैबिनेट डील कर रही है। जो कि पिछले 30-40 साल से चल रहा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि बहुत गलत तरीके से इस मामले को डील किया जा रहा है।

दूसरा यह है कि दिल्ली यूनिवर्सिटी के टीचर्स का भी मामला है। इसके लिए दिल्ली यूनिवर्सिटी टीचर्स के साथ, डूटा के साथ और दूसरे लोगों के साथ कंसल्टेशन करना चाहिए। उनके साथ जिस तरह का व्यवहार होता है वह गलत तरीका है। बिल्कुल ही गलत तरीके से यह बिल लाया

sequence of events. We asked the UGC to take a fresh look in view of the reactions among the teaching community

As far as the second part is concerned, I do not think there is any difference of opinion about the fake universities and the new legislation is ready with us. That Bill is to be introduced. So, I do not think there is any such confusion about that and I may be allowed to withdraw the Bill now.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If the Bill was brought in 1991, why has it been brought on the last day for discussion today?

श्री विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा : एक लाख रुपए में फेक यूनिवर्सिटीज की डिग्री बिक रही है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let me ask. The knows that degrees are being sold. What I am asking is that in 1991 the Bill was brought to the House, because you were concerned about the fake universities and fake degrees. And the people were getting jobs on the basis of those fake degrees. Now, when the Bill was brought and you were thinking of discussing something, my point is, in the first place, why this matter was not discussed in the earlier part of the session. Today you are withdrawing it. Again you are going to bring in a fresh Bill. What is that fresh Bill?

KUMARI SELJA: Madam, there are two aspects to the UGC (Amendment) Bill. One is regarding the term and conditions of the service of the employees of the Central Universities. That evoked a sharp reaction among the teaching community. So, we asked the UGC to take a fresh look at this and they set up a sub-committee. Hence this time period between 1991 and now. They asked why, instead of amending the UGC Act, we could not have a mechanism by which

there was more consultation between the UGC and the Central Universities. We accept that.

Now, the second part is regarding the fake universities. We had made an amendment in that by which, we want to enhance the penalty. We want to enhance it further because of the seriousness of the situation. I think Members of the House shared that seriousness and concern. So, we want to further enhance the penalty. Hence I want to bring a fresh Bill to that effect. So, I may be allowed to withdraw the Bill.

श्री राघवजी (मध्य प्रदेश) : उपसभा-पति महोदय, यह आपके प्रश्न का उत्तर नहीं है कि यह फेक एंड में क्यों लाया गया है जबकि पूरा बजट सेशन बीत गया (व्यवधान)

कुमारी सेलजा : इसमें कोई दो राय नहीं है The concerns were shared equally by the Government and by all the Members.

इसमें कोई कनफ्यूजन की बात नहीं है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will explain to you. She has brought a Bill for two reasons. One is the University Grants Commission (Amendment) Bill, 1991. There was a problem of the employees of the Central University. So, there was some consultation going on. The second question was of the fake universities and fake degrees. There are two different aspects. Now, she has already introduced the Bill. I think the Bill is under circulation. Perhaps, Members might have got it. If not, you will be getting the copy. In the light of that, she is withdrawing this Bill. The Bill which she has introduced will take precedence in the next Session. But I only want one thing that in the next Session, please insist on every-

body bringing in the Bill in the first part of the Session because it is a very serious matter.

KUMARI SELJA: Okay, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So, now has she the permission to withdraw the Bill?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

The Bill was, by leave, withdrawn.

**RE. PROCEEDINGS AGAINST
FORMER CABINET SECRETARY
FOR WRONG ADVICE ON SECURITY
COVER TO SHRI RAJIV
GANDHI.**

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairperson, I would like to state at the very outset that I do not want to enter into any partisan controversy. Yesterday, Mrs. Jayanthi Natarajan and many Members of this House belonging to almost all parties have expressed a great concern at the inordinate delay that took place, that is still taking place in disposing of the case of Rajiv Gandhi's assassination. Madam, we are all equally concerned about the prompt need to punish the guilty in a deterrent fashion.

Madam, now, I would like the House to give me a patient hearing and listen to me in a non-partisan way.

Madam, I would like to raise a matter relating to the action that is contemplated, in fact, that has been initiated against some senior officers. We all know that the SPG legislation was enacted in June, 1968. When this piece of legislation was brought I happened to be a Member of the Eighth Lok Sabha and I opposed it

on the ground that such a piece of legislation was not obtaining in any part of the democratic world. The President of the United States of America is taken care of by the usual methods.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shrimati Kamla Sinha) in the Chair]

The security of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom is taken care of by a unit in the Scotland Yard. We have also raised the issues, what would happen to the Office of the President and the Office of the Vice-President. At that time, we have also raised the issue as to whether this would apply to Shri Rajiv Gandhiji just in case he ceases to be the Prime Minister. At that time, the Government spokesman or the Minister, Mr. Chidambaram clarified categorically that an extra-ordinary situation occurred in the country, the Government was, therefore, convinced about the need to have this legislation and this security contemplated under the SPG law would be confined to the Office of the Prime Minister, whoever held that office. Madam, I am recalling all this because it is very important to understand the problem in proper perspective. Rajivji ceased to be Prime Minister in November, 1989. At that time, a problem arose as to what kind of security should be given to him as an ex-Prime Minister, as to what level of security should be given to him. There were talks between Mr. B. G. Deshmukh, who was then the Principal Secretary to the Prime Minister, and Mr. Chidambaram on a number of occasions and the matter was settled. Madam, I am quoting from the memoirs of the Former President, Mr. Venkatraman, in this context. He said in his memoirs,

"The Congress people mounted a campaign on this issue. A member of delegations called upon the President and urged that security should not be measured in terms of expenditure and the Government was deliberately ex-