

at Brij Chaurasi Kosh in Deeng and Kama Tehsil of District Bharatpur, Rajasthan;

(b) whether the Supreme Court, Rajasthan High court and the Department of Archaeology have declared the mining illegal;

(c) whether Government will conduct an enquiry regarding the ongoing illegal mining despite the ban thereon and the matter being in the knowledge of the Minister of Mines of Rajasthan Government;

(d) whether the illegal mining will be stopped keeping in view religious and environmental issues; and

(e) if so, by when and if not, the reasons therefor?

**THE MINISTER OF MINES (SHRI SIS RAM OLA):** (a) to (e) As per information furnished by State Government of Rajasthan, saints are opposing mining in the Braj area. The State Government has been negotiating with saints through the Collector, Bharatpur to resolve the issue. State Government has informed that Supreme Court and Rajasthan High Court have not declared this mining activity as illegal. On the the apprehension of Archaeological Survey of India regarding effects of pollution on protected monument of Deeng and Kama Tehsil, State Government has informed that no mining/blasting is being carried out in the vicinity of these monuments and also no permission is being granted. State Government has also informed that mining activity has been stopped in 500 metres area on either side of the Braj Chaurasi Kos parikrama marg since 27.1.2005, mining operation has been stopped in 17 mining leases and at present no mining operation is being undertaken in 500 metre area on either side of the parikrama marg. State Government has been regularly monitoring illegal mining activities. Committees at Block and District level have been constituted. During the current year, 15 First Information Reports (FIR), 59 complaints have been lodged and 146 cases have been detected. Beside this, 115 vehicles have also been impounded. Rs. 7,32,870 towards penalty was also realized.

### **Right to Education Bill**

**\*291. SHRIMATI SHOBHANA BHARTIA:** Will the Minister of HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether his Ministry's most ambitious project the Right to Education Bill has run into serious trouble as the State Governments do not feel

confident about Minister's assurance that the Centre would meet the major share of expenditure to be incurred on its implementation;

(b) if so, the main objections raised by the States in this regard;

(c) the States that have raised the objections;

(d) the assurance given by the Ministry to the States regarding its commitment; and

(e) by when, a final decision for introducing the Right to Education Bill will be taken?

THE MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (SHRI ARJUN SINGH): (a) to (e) The Constitution (Eighty Sixth Amendment) Act, 2002 provides for insertion of Article 21A to make education a fundamental right for children in the age group 6—14 years. The Act will come into force on such date as the Central Government may, by notification in the Official Gazette, appoint.

The Government has formulated the Model Right to Education Bill for enactment by State Governments and Union Territories. The Model Right to Education Bill has been circulated to the States and Union Territories for their comments.

Comments have been received from the States/Union Territories of (i) Assam, (ii) Bihar (iii) Chhattisgarh, (iv) Chandigarh, (v) Gujarat, (vi) Haryana, (vii) Karnataka, (viii) Kerala, (ix) Madhya Pradesh, (x) Meghalaya, (xi) Orissa, (xii) Punjab, (xiii) Puducherry, (xiv) Rajasthan, (xvi) Tamil Nadu, (xvi) Uttar Pradesh, and (xvii) West Bengal.

The main objections raised by the States and UTs relate to the following issues:

1. Linkage of SSA funding with State/UT enactment of model Right to Education Bill or modification of existing States/UT Acts
2. Making elementary education first charge on revenues of each State Government, next only to law and order
3. Financial liability for free and compulsory education to be borne by the States/UTs

The Central Government has in the last three years significantly enhanced the budgetary allocations to State Governments as part of its commitment towards universalisation of elementary education.

### **Amendments in MMDR Act**

†\*292. SHRI LALIT KISHORE CHATURVEDI: Will the Minister of MINES be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government propose to make amendment in the schedule of Mines and Minerals Development and Regulation Act (MMDR Act), 1957 on the basis of recommendations made by Hoda Committee;

(b) whether this will not encourage the monopolistic tendencies; and

(c) whether this will not affect the system of taking decision by the State Governments on their own and their autonomy?

THE MINISTER OF MINES (SHRI SIS RAM OLA): (a) to (c) New Mineral Policy on the subject is under consideration of the Government. State Governments are the owners of the minerals and grant mineral concessions. Prior approval of the Central Government is required only for grant of mineral concessions in respect of minerals mentioned in the First Schedule of the MMDR Act, 1957.

### **Setting up of additional IISERs**

\*293. SHRI VIJAY KUMAR RUPANI: Will the Minister of HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government propose to set up more Indian Institutes of Science Education and Research (IISER) in addition to Pune and Kolkata;

(b) the number of IISERs proposed to be set up in the Eleventh Five Year Plan;

(c) by when these new IISERs will be set up and commence their activities;

(d) whether Government plan to set up an IISER in Gujarat soon;

(e) if so, the details in this regard; and

(f) the criteria for setting up an IISER in the country?

---

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.