

policy uncertainty on the FDI inflows into the country. The comparison of FDI flows to India *vis-a-vis* the potential showed investments shortfall of about 25 per cent during 2010-11 mainly at the back of policy uncertainty. The quality of policy implementation had a role in slowing the flow of investments despite the robust nature of the Indian economy, the study said. In this context, the past years could have had a potentially huge impact on foregone FDI inflows into the country. Therefore, I would like to urge the Government to adopt a coherent policy approach and maintain a stable and investor-friendly business environment in the country.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Now, we shall take up the Institutes of Technology (Amendment) Bill, 2011, and the National Institutes of Technology (Amendment) Bill, 2011, together.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

The Institutes of Technology (Amendment) Bill, 2011

and

The National Institutes of Technology (Amendment) Bill, 2011

THE MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (SHRI KAPIL SIBAL): Sir, I beg to move:

That the Bill further to amend the Institutes of Technology Act, 1961, as passed by Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration.

Sir, I also move:

That the Bill to amend the National Institutes of Technology Act, 2007, as passed by Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration.

Sir, as we are all aware, there were about seven IITs in India, that is, Kharagpur, Mumbai, Delhi, Kanpur, Madras, Guwahati and Roorkee, at the beginning of the Eleventh Plan. And, all these IITs were governed by the Institutes of Technology Act, 1961.

Then, Sir, on 17th July, 2008, the UPA Government took a decision to establish eight more IITs at Bhubaneswar, Gandhinagar, Hyderabad, Patna, Jodhpur, Ropar, Mandi and Indore. While out of these eight new IITs, six new IITs at Bhubaneswar, Gandhinagar, Hyderabad, Patna, Jodhpur and Ropar commenced their first academic sessions in 2008-09, the remaining two IITs, that is, Mandi and Indore, started their sessions in 2009-10. So, all the new IITs have been registered as societies under the Societies Registration Act, 1860, pending their inclusion in the Institutes of Technology Act, 1961. Sir, all the older IITs were incorporated as societies, and when the Act was based, they were made institutions of national importance under the Act. We have to go through this process of constituting

[Shri Kapil Sibal]

societies, registering them under the Societies Registration Act, and then, of course, incorporating them in the IT Act. Also, Sir, the Council of Indian Institutes of Technology, in the 39th meeting held on the 28th January, 2009, approved the proposal of conversion of IT (BHU) into an IIT, while keeping its linkage with BHU in some manner so that inter-disciplinary research could be given further impetus. It was also suggested that the Vice-Chancellor of BHU could be the Vice-Chairman of the new IIT (BHU), but we ultimately decided that he should be, the Chairman for the first three years. Now, the position is that the Act stands amended by Lok Sabha. The Vice-Chancellor of BHU will be, for the first three years, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of IIT (BHU). And, subsequently, he will nominate either himself or any of his nominee as Vice-Chairman so that there is a permanent linkage between the IIT and the Banaras Hindu University. Sir, we want to maintain the integrity of the Banaras Hindu University. We also want to maintain the linkage between the two, and, we also wanted to ensure the cross-disciplinary research through this integrative, governance set-up. As the campus is next-door, naturally, there will be a lot of synergy between what is happening in Banaras Hindu University and in IIT, BHU. Sir, we also wanted to preserve that linkage, and, therefore, the Executive Council of the BHU will send two nominees, who shall be the Members of Board of Governors of IIT, BHU. Therefore, the linkage will be established with the representation of the BHU in the Board of Governors of IIT, BHU.

Sir, three Members shall be nominated by the Executive Council of the BHU to the Senate of IIT, BHU. So, there will be representation in the Senate, there will be representation in the Board, and, there will be a Vice-Chairman of the Board, as nominated by the BHU. Also, we were very concerned about the fact that this linkage, this heritage of the BHU should not be disturbed, and, that this linkage must remain. With that in mind, it was done through a process of vast negotiations within the system, and, I am very happy that the Chancellor of BHU, Dr. Karan Singh, was involved in that process as well.

Now, Sir, the position is that since the Bill was passed in Lok Sabha, the students have already completed their degrees requirements but the Convocation is not being held. The students are waiting for a degree of IIT, BHU because, naturally, Sir, the market prospects of such a degree are always better and, so, the parents and the children are waiting for this.

As I said, Sir, there were no provision in the Act for establishment of a new IIT, and, none of the older IIT did originate through the Act. All of them started in some form or the other, as non-statutory institutions, as universities, or, as registered societies. So, therefore, amendments had to be made in the Act itself.

So, Sir, in a nutshell, this really is the essence of the amendments that I have moved with respect to the Institutes of Technology (Amendment) Bill, 2011. Sir, there are some consequential amendments also. Because of the amendments that I have mentioned, there have to be some consequential amendments which are reflected in various provisions of the Institutes of Technology Act, 1961. For example, in order to declare the eight new IITs, and, IIT, BHU as 'institutes of national importance', consequential amendments were required to be made in section 2, section 4, and, section 5 of the Institutes of Technology Act. It has been done. Certain consequential amendments in the definitions had to be made, which has also been done in section 3.

Sir, because of the special status of the IIT, BHU, a new section had to be added, and, accordingly, we have added section 5(b). A special provision has also been added in section 12 in respect of the Board of Governors of IIT (BHU) because all IITs have a different composition of Board of Governors, but because we wanted to give a special status to IIT, BHU, there had to be a separate provision for the Board of Governors, which will reflect this integrative link between the BHU and IIT permanently. It had to be separately mentioned in the Act itself, and, so, there is a separate section 11 for that.

There is also a special provision in section 14 in respect of the constitution of the Senate of IIT, BHU. As the Senate of IIT, BHU will not be like the Senate of any other IIT, it also had to be done. So, a special provision has been incorporated in the Act.

Sir, section 38 of the Act, which is also proposed to be amended, provides that till such time the Statutes of the new IITs are framed, the new IITs would be governed by the Statutes and Ordinances of the Institutes as in force immediately before the commencement of the Institutes of Technology (Amendment) Act, 2011. It is also proposed to provide for the transition period of IT-BHU to IIT-BHU, Varanasi.

Then, there was a suggestion by the Standing Committee that the zone which will be a part of the IIT, in other words, if the IIT is located in 'x' place, there is a zone of area which will fall under its area of jurisdiction, that had to be set out. So, a new clause 'm' has been put in section 3 so that the Government will notify the zone from time to time.

These, Sir, by and large, are the amendments that have been proposed in this Act. I want to assure the Members of this House, I want to clarify it further that nothing prevents the appointment of the Vice-Chancellor as the Chairman of the Board of Governors. He can also be in part of the zone of consideration. So, it is not as if he will never be considered. What we have done is, we have statutorily decided that he shall be the Chairman for the first three years and ensured that he can thereafter be in the zone of consideration when the Council and the Search

[Shri Kapil Sibal]

Committee decide as to who should be the new Chairman of the Board of Governors of the IIT-BHU. So, any fear in that regard that we are, in any way, trying to be little the significance and importance and, in any way, interfere with the enormous heritage of the Banaras Hindu University is unfounded, and I wish to ensure the House that we certainly have nothing in our mind to that effect and as and when we proceed further in putting into effect the provisions of this Act, if there is any misgiving in any of these areas, we will be very very happy to work with all the Members of this House and revisit it in the manner that the Members consider appropriate. So, this, Sir, is the Bill relating to the IITs.

The other Bill is the National Institutes of Technology Bill which seeks to incorporate the new NITs and the Indian Institutes of Science Education and Research (IISERs) as institutions of national importance. As you know, Sir, the National Institutes of Technology Act, 2007, covered 20 NITs and it has been in operation for some time, since 2007 now. In the mean time, the Prime Minister had announced the setting up of 5 Indian Institutes of Science, Education and Research, called the IISERs. They started their courses in 2008. Three years have already passed, we are in 2012, but they have not got their degrees too. Children are waiting and crying for their degrees. One year has already passed since they completed their degree requirements. We are waiting for this amendment to take place. Lok Sabha has already cleared it and I think the distinguished Members of this House, I am sure, and I know are sensitive to the concerns of the student community because I don't think that we should be responsible for delaying the degrees to students who have worked very hard, who have sacrificed a lot, whose parents have sacrificed for them. Some might have borrowed moneys to study in these institutions. We should be in a position to pass this Bill so that the convocation can be quickly held and degrees be given. Students who are waiting for this. Of course, as you know, this proposal was sent to the Standing Committee and by and large I can say with a sense of confidence that we have by and large accepted almost all the recommendations of the Standing Committee. In the NIT Bill, we have accepted everything. In the other Bill also, the recommendations have been accepted by us. We are working very closely with the distinguished Members of Parliament and the Standing Committee. I have no hesitation to say that we have considered everything that has been suggested to us. Sir, as I was saying, the matter was sent to the Standing Committee and when the matter went to the Standing Committee, in the mean time, the Government announced in 2009 that 10 new NITs would be set up. Then it was suggested that why don't you bring a comprehensive Bill by which five new IISERs are included and ten new NITs are also included. Because our policy was that all the States in India, all the Union Territories in India must have a NIT. Therefore, we have decided to set up 10 more NITs in Arunachal Pradesh, Sikkim,

Meghalaya, Nagaland, Manipur, Mizoram, Goa, Puducherry, Delhi, Uttarakhand. Goa was to cater Daman and Diu, Dadara and Nagar Haveli and Lakshadweep. The Standing Committee has made some recommendations on the setting up of the NITs and has suggested some changes in terms of administrative structure, the composition of the Board of Governors. The Standing Committee suggested that the Board of Governors should be streamlined. They indicated that the Board of Governors that are set up under the ISERs and the Council had very little role to play, and, therefore, the Government's role should be reduced and the Council's role should be made prominent. They also indicated that the Members of the Board of Governors are 16 in number that must be reduced. We have accepted that; we have reduced the numbers as well. They suggested that experts should be nominated. We have accepted that as well. We have reduced the representation of the Government. They also suggested that in many of these bodies, the Chief Secretary has to attend the meeting. Chief Secretaries are functionaries who have many other things to do. Therefore, they rarely come to the meeting. So, it is better to allow the Chief Secretary to appoint his/her nominee. We have accepted that as well. They also said that the Government should not have any role in the nomination of members to be the Board of Governors, and sought change the composition of Board of Governors. We have reduced the number of nominees to two instead of three. We have accepted that. They said we have at least one person should be expert in respect of education or engineering to be nominated by the Council and not by the Government. We have accepted that. Then, they suggested that it is better to reduce the number of secretaries which is five to four representing the Ministries and Department of Government of India dealing with Bio Technology, Atomic Energy, Information Technology and Space, who should be on the council *ex officio*. This suggestion has also been accepted. Then, there was further suggestion that Secretaries and Chief Secretaries of States who are members on the Board don't have time and their nominees should be allowed to represent them. I have already indicated that this too has been accepted. So, the broad parameters of the amendments have been stated. I just wish to state one thing that today in the 21st Century, we must move towards setting up of institutions of quality. Until we are able to do that, until we invest in research and produce institutions of excellence, I don't think that we will be able to compete with the rest of the world. The number of Ph.D. that have been produced in India are abysmally low. We need to increase that. We need to empower our children by giving them grants for research and most importantly we need to improve the governance structure of these institutes. Though these institutions must remain public institutions at the same time, we must give them enough autonomy to emerge as institutions of excellence through the eco system that they must evolve themselves and that kind of autonomy is happening, and I have, in fact, freed many of those institutions. If you ask any Director now,

[Shri Kapil Sibal]

you will realise that they are happy with the fact that we giving them enormous autonomy to move forward quickly.

Faculty recruitment is taking place at a very fast pace today. I am very happy to state this. Hon. Members, if you really look at these institutions, especially the IITs, they almost meet the aspirations of the students belonging to the Scheduled Castes, the Scheduled Tribes and the OBCs.

I must tell you, Sir, that I was actually looking at some of these figures of the intake into the system. I was happy to note that in the IIT system the representation of students is equivalent to the reservation that is provided. The OBCs representation is a little short. But other than that, the SCs and the STs are fully represented. The OBCs are 80-90 per cent represented in these institutions. The inclusive education agenda that the UPA Government was talking about for bringing the OBCs, the SCs, the STs into the system has been achieved. As far as faculty is concerned, I again wish to state that in the humanities, on the entry side, there is faculty reservation right up to the level of Professor. On the science side, there is faculty representation at the initial stage, at the stage of Assistant Professor. And once the Right to Education Act is fully implemented, when we hope to see hundred per cent retention in schools, you will see a jump in numbers of the SCs and the STs both in terms of the student community and the faculty. On the OBC representation side, we don't count all those OBCs who are by virtue of their own levels of excellence admitted in the 'general' category. In a sense, if you really were to look at all the numbers, I think that the inclusive agenda of the UPA Government is showing enormous results and we hope to continue to move along that path.

Sir, I, with these words, commend both these Bills to distinguished Members of this House. Thank you.

The questions were proposed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Dr. Chandan Mitra.

DR. CHANDAN MITRA (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, do you want me to speak now? It is almost one of the clock.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): You start and at 1.00 p.m., we will adjourn the House.

DR. CHANDAN MITRA: Sir, only one minute is left.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Why should you waste even one minute?

DR. CHANDAN MITRA: Sir, the whole train of thought will be disturbed. In one minute what can I say, Sir? There are substantial points that I need to raise.

May I request you that we start after lunch? Sir, it is only one minute to one of the clock. Sir, you can take the sense of the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Okay. We will have a lunch break for one hour and we will meet at two of the clock. We adjourn for one hour and will meet at 2.00 p.m.

The House then adjourned for lunch at fifty eight minutes past twelve of the clock.

The House re-assembled after lunch at two minutes past two of the clock,

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN), in the Chair]

DR. CHANDAN MITRA (Madhya Pradesh): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman. Sir, I rise to discuss the Indian Institutes of Technology (Amendment) Bill, 2011 moved by the Minister. Sir, the area on which I want to focus is with regard to the proposal to upgrade the IT of the BHU to the status of an IIT. Along with that eight others are also being upgraded to IITs but their case I wish to submit is somewhat different from the IT of the BHU which is being upgraded to the status of IIT (Banaras Hindu University) Varanasi from the nomenclature itself. It is very clear that this distinction is something which has to be kept in mind and laws framed accordingly.

Sir, BHU is an institution of tremendous heritage and is part of modern India's evolution as an independent country. It was conceived by the great Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya; and with the support of a large section of people from all over the country it was founded.

Sir, let me with your permission read out the speech that was made by Sir Harcourt Butler, Member, Education, in the then Government, on the 11th March, 1915. Sir Harcourt Butler had said in his speech "My Lord, this is no ordinary occasion. We are watching today the birth of a new and many hope a better type of university in India. The main features of this university which distinguish it from existing universities will be the first that it will be a teaching and residential university." And then he goes on to explain various other factors and in the end he says something which is almost touching in the way he puts it. Sir Harcourt Butler while speaking further said, "I confess that the other day when I was standing opposite to Ram Nagar on the site where your university buildings will, I hope, soon be rising in a stately array and look down the river Ganges to the Ghats of Kashi which sway before me. I felt some pride that I was a member of the Government which had joined in one more large endeavour that combines the ancient and honoured culture of India with the culture of the modern western world. This is in 1915. And what did Pt. Madan Mohan Malaviya say on that occasion? He said, "My Lord, I look forward to the day when students and professors and donors and

[Dr. Chandan Mitra]

others interested in the Banaras Hindu University will meet on the banks of the Ganges to celebrate the 'Donor's Day. And I feel certain that the name will stand at the head of the list on such a day." This is what Pt. Madan Mohan Malaviya said.

Sir, I seek your indulgence to just quote one more observation. It says, "I just want to mention that this is a very unique institution. The Banaras Hindu University is our heritage; it is a part of our heritage. We should not, in any way, want to disturb that heritage. So, what we decided was this. We are aware of the fact that interdisciplinary teaching is very important because there you have a hospital also. We do not want to bifurcate that." Again it was emphasized, "This is part of our heritage. We do not want to break the linkage. We want to make sure that the kind of interdisciplinary character of the institution remains the same." Now I shall tell you who said these words. It was the hon. Minister, Shri Kapil Sibal, who is sitting in front of me, during the debate in the Lok Sabha, who said this.

If you see that from the time of Sir Harcourt Butler and Pt. Madan Mohan Malaviya to Shri Kapil Sibal, there has been continuity in the ostensible aims. But, however, as they say "कथनी और करनी में कई बार बहुत फर्क होता है!", that is exactly we are noticing in what unfortunately the Minister is insisting on attaining through this new amendment. Sir, our main point about the BHU is that it is a university of great distinction. This is a university where among its aims and objects, was the promotion of scientific and technical education in India. This is in 1911 when the Prospectus of the University was issued; and I have referred to the debate in the Legislative Council in 1915 where Sir Harcourt Butler and Pt. Madan Mohan Malaviya participated. Inculcation of scientific and technical temperament in India was part of the objects of the University and the Government of that day promoted it and Governments have been subsequently also promoting it. The Institute of Technology Department of BHU was set up right at the outset. This has been functioning so well. It has provided the best engineers; it has provided a series of scholars, PH.Ds, and made such tremendous contribution when IIT was not even heard of or conceived of. IIT is a post-Independence phenomenon. The IT Department of the Banaras Hindu University was world renowned even before Independence. Therefore, no attempt must be made to curtail or in any way completely submerge the identity of the IT of BHU. This is a matter which has been agitating the minds of the people in this country for a long time. It agitated the minds of the Lok Sabha Members. I have quoted from the Minister's reply to the Lok Sabha debate. I am sure the Minister will remember as to how many Members stood up and made the same point that we are now trying to put across to the Minister that what you have proposed with regard to the role of the Vice-Chancellor

of BHU in this new IIT is something that has a serious potential of disturbing the autonomy and the status of the proposed IIT.

It is, in that context, Sir, that I have moved an amendment, to which I would like the Minister to respond. On Page 4 of the Bill, on lines 12 and 13, that is, in clause 6 (e) (i), the clause, as it stands, reads: “The Vice-Chancellor of the Banaras Hindu University appointed under the provisions of the Banaras Hindu University Act, 1915, shall be deemed to have been appointed as *ex officio* Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Indian Institute of Technology, (Banaras Hindu University), Varanasi under this Act and shall hold office for a period of three years with effect from such commencement.” Sir, I have proposed, in my amendment, that the words ‘and shall hold office for a period of three years with effect from such commencement’ be deleted. If this is done, then, the Vice-Chancellor of the Banaras Hindu University will, permanently, be the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the new institution, the IIT. This will ensure that the continuity of the heritage and continuity of the multi-disciplinary character of the Banaras Hindu University as well as its composite teaching – the fact that several institutes of international repute already exist on the campus – will be retained. Sir, I fail to see the logic of appointing someone as Chairman for the first three years and, thereafter, removing him from the position of Chairman and appointing somebody else. The Minister has tried to explain that this is to ensure continuity. Now if you have to ensure continuity, then, why not continuity in perpetuity? Why continuity for three years alone? Are you proposing that the continuity can be broken after three years? It is like, you are coming into my house, taking a portion of my house and saying that you want to make some improvements on it. Well, I have no problem, but it has to be done under my supervision because the house belongs to me. You cannot say that in that part of the house, I will be subservient to you. This is exactly what has been proposed that after three years there will be a Vice-Chairman who will be elected by the Executive Council and it may have two representatives from the Executive Council and the Board of Governors including, possibly, the Vice-Chancellor. This means that the Vice-Chancellor of the Banaras Hindu University will be working under the Chairman to be named by the IIT Council. Obviously, Sir, he will be the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman will be the Vice-Chancellor of the University. So, this is an automatic kind of demotion. Now, in that Committee of the Board of Governors, it is agreed that the Chairman is really not a person who can take all executive decisions; executive decisions will be taken by others. But if the Vice-chancellor is made the Chairman it will give a sense of comfort and identity and ensure that the continuity is not broken because this University is very, very special. It is very special to every Indian because of its tremendous heritage and the fact that it was set up for industrial and technical education. In that situation, – of course, nobody is opposed to this upgradation and making it an IIT – all that we

[Dr. Chandan Mitra]

have said is, please make this very crucial amendment so that the BHU's role in this new institution remains undiminished and the students of the University also feel totally comfortable that this heritage is not broken.

Sir, there are several other factors, apart from staff being transferred and all other technical details, which I do not want to go into. But there is also the issue of land. When IITs are set up, there is a provision that IITs must be set up on 500 acres of land. Today the IIT of BHU is located on 200 acres. The total campus area is of 1,300 acres. Tomorrow, if there is an insistence that in order to designate this as an IIT, the entire 500 acres of land will have to be given to this Institute, then, what happens? Where will the others go? The other institutes are already there. There is the Medical Institute; there is an Agricultural Institute; there are so many institutions which are located on the BHU campus.

Now if 200 acres are not enough and you take 300 acres more, they are totally built up areas. So, some consideration should have been given to this and if, in the event of a conflict, the Chairman of the Board of Governors is not in a position to hold concurrently the position held by the Vice-Chancellor, Sir, there is a great danger. The IIT Board may say that in order to conform to IIT regulations you please part with 300 acres more. What happens to the rest? Therefore, these are very, very serious concerns. We are not saying anything further about the need to upgrade. You are upgrading all eight others. It is a welcome decision. Students want it. Today, IIT is a brand and all Indians are proud of the IIT brand. But the fact that this is a case apart, this is a different kettle of fish so to speak, is clear in the very nomenclature. The name is IIT, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi. The Government has thus acknowledged that Banaras Hindu University is an integral part and, probably, the dominant part of this Institution and that culture must be retained if you have changed the nomenclature. You can simply make a minor change in who will be the Chairman of the Board of Governors. If that is done, that comfort is to ensure that there is no attempt to curb the autonomy of the University. Sir, I am not saying that the Government is planning this. But tomorrow, suppose, on the model of setting up the IIT, BHU, the Government decides that they will affiliate the medical college of BHU to some other national agency, they will affiliate some agricultural institute to some other national institute. Sir, is this going to be a precursor of breaking up BHU into different, different components and linking them up to national institutions in the name of upgrading, and thereby, destroying the character of BHU? The character of BHU is very dear to the people of India. Not only does it bear the heritage, but it also bears so much of our history. We all know how our national leaders have been associated with it. They have been a part of the history and heritage of BHU. Now, I am not sure; the Government is not prepared to

accept even a minor thing that you are suggesting that in order to maintain the continuity, please retain the Vice-Chancellor of BHU as Chairman of the Board of Governors, which we all know is not a position that can really influence every executive decision, but it feels a certain sense that we know the character will be maintained. I fail to understand the Government's problem in accepting this. I have proposed a very minor change, and there are some consequent kinds of amendments. In the Board of Governors, once the Act comes into effect, the Vice-Chairmen shall be from amongst the elected members of the Executive Council, including its Vice-Chancellor, which means that the idea really is to have the Vice-Chancellor of BHU named the Vice-Chairman, and the IIT decides to have the Chairman. Sir, what is the need for this? That is why we have tried to say that please do not have any such objective in mind and wherever you have proposed that the Vice-Chancellor should be subservient in the IIT set-up to the Vice-Chairman, kindly delete these things. Once the Minister accepts this very minor change, I would like to point out to the Minister that there was tremendous opposition to this in the Lok Sabha. Lok Sabha said that the Government has numbers; so, he refused to accept them, and it got passed. Maybe, it will get passed here also, although, we will have serious objections if it is passed. Without this amendment. Sir the Government should not indulge in this non-cooperation because this is a very genuine and legitimate demand from a very large section of people and this will not really cost the Government anything in terms of what they propose to do in other IITs' or in the BHU. Sir, in this context, in the second Bill, the NIT Bill, my colleagues will throw further light. But I have been going through this. Sir, once again, although the Minister tried to say while moving the legislation that he has succumbed to demands and removed a large number of officials from the various Boards, Sir, it is still far from adequate. You look at the position that has been earmarked.

Clause 9 of the Bill proposed to insert Section 11A after Section 11 of the principal Act. It says:

The Board of every Institute mentioned in the Second Schedule shall consist of the following members, namely:

- (a) the Chairperson to be nominated by the Visitor. The Visitor, of course, if I am not mistaken, is the President of India.
- (b) Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Government of India, *ex officio*...;
- (c) Director of the Institute, *ex officio*;
- (d) Director of Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, *ex officio*;
- (e) Director of one of the Indian' Institutes of Technology, to be nominated by the Central Government;

- (f) two Secretaries to the Government of India, to be nominated by the Central Government representing its Scientific or Industrial Ministries;
- (g) Chief Secretary of the State in which the Institute is located, *ex-officio*;
- (h) two professors of the Institute to be nominated by the Senate;
- (i) two eminent scientists...; and
- (j) Financial Adviser, Ministry of Human Resource Development, *ex-officio*.

On just counting them, I found that there are six Government nominees, including the Chairperson and there are seven non-officials. This hardly gives non-officials any kind of role in that institution. Same is the case with regard to Clause 14. Here, the Minister is proposing to insert Section 30A after Section 30 of the principal Act. It says:

- (1) With effect from such date as the Central Government may, by notification, specify in this behalf, there shall be established for all the Institutes specified in column 3 of the Second Schedule, a central body to be called the Council.
- (2) The Council under sub-section (1) shall consist of the following members, namely:-
 - (a) the Minister in-charge of the Ministry or Department of the Central Government having administrative control of the technical education, *ex officio*, Chairman;
 - (b) the Secretary to the Government of India in-charge of the Ministry or Department of the Central Government having administrative control of the technical education, *ex officio*, Vice-Chairman;
 - (c) the Chairperson of every Board of the Institutes mentioned in the Second Schedule, *ex officio*;
 - (d) the Director of every Institute mentioned in the Second Schedule, *ex officio*;
 - (e) the Chairman, University Grants Commission, *ex officio*;
 - (f) the Director-General, Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, *ex officio*;
 - (g) four Secretaries to the Government of India to represent the Ministries or Departments of the Central Government dealing with bio-technology, atomic energy, information technology and space, *ex-officio*;
 - (h) the Chairman, Defence Research and Development Organisation, *ex officio*;

- (i) not less than three, but not more than five persons to be nominated by the Visitor, at least one of whom shall be a woman, having special knowledge or practical experience in respect of education, industry, science or technology;...

Sir, the hon. Minister himself mentioned that Chief Secretaries do not have time to attend meetings. There are so many Secretaries and Jt. Secretaries packing the various Boards. They will never have the time. Meetings will not be held and they keep on deferring the meetings. So, what is the purpose? In order to centralize everything and bring everything under the control of the Union Government, is it not the technical excellence or the technical autonomy that these institutions enjoy or ought to enjoy are compromised. We believe that this Bill needs to have a serious re-look, because this is something which affects them a lot. We are making new legislation. We are upgrading these institutions. There are no issues about that. We are bringing more things under their ambit. And, when we do that, it is our responsibility that we prepare or make law that will stand us in a good stead, not just today or tomorrow, but for decades to come. While doing that, I think, the Central Government must desist itself from making any attempt to control everything.

In conclusion, I just want to go back to one point on the BHU. I am not making any comment on this.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): You have one more speaker from your party.

DR. CHANDAN MITRA: I am just finishing.

Sir, it is very significant that in the case of upgradation of this institute to the level of an IIT, the same offer was apparently made to Aligarh Muslim University (AMU). Incidentally, the BHU and the AMU are the two universities that are actually mentioned in the Constitution of India as institutions of the national importance. Sir, AMU rejected the offer by saying, 'we are happy with what we have. We have an excellent institute of technology and we don't want to become point of something else. On the other hand, the BHU did not. Therefore, I am, again, humbly requesting the hon. Minister to please have a serious re-look at it and do not stand on the argument that it has been cleared by the Standing Committee. But, there was also opposition in the Committee. There was also opposition in the Lok Sabha. You have numbers. So, you want to push through the Bill. You may succeed in that. But, at the same time, you will be doing a great damage to the heritage and character of the BHU. Kindly desist from doing so. Thank you.

डा. कर्ण सिंह (राष्ट्रीय राजधानी क्षेत्र दिल्ली): उपासभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस वर्ष पंडित मदन मोहन मालवीय जी का 150वां जन्मदिन मनाया जा रहा है। प्रधान मंत्री जी की अध्यक्षता में एक राष्ट्रीय समिति बनी है और मैं Implementation Committee का अध्यक्ष हूँ। मालवीय जी

[डा. कर्ण सिंह]

की बहुआयामी देशभक्ति और देश सेवा के जो कार्य हैं, उन सब के बारे में कार्यक्रम किए जाएंगे। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं चाहूंगा कि संसद सदस्य भी इसमें यथासंभव शिरकत करें। इनका पहले कार्यक्रम प्रधानमंत्री जी के माध्यम से विज्ञान भवन में 25 दिसम्बर 2011 को हुआ था और इसका अंतिम function 25 दिसम्बर 2012 को बी.एच.यू. में होने वाला है। इस प्रकार, यह एक बहुत विशेष वर्ष है, जिसमें मालवीय जी को याद किया जा रहा है। अपने जीवन में उन्होंने बहुत ही अद्भुत कार्य किए। वे बड़े ही प्रभावशाली वक्ता, लेखक, पत्रकार, समाज सुधारक और स्वतंत्र सेनानी थे। महोदय, वे तीन बार कांग्रेस के अध्यक्ष रहे, लेकिन उनका जो सबसे बड़ा प्रयास रहा, जो भीरु प्रयास रहा, वह था बनारस हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय की स्थापना। एक तो वाराणसी का अपना महत्व है ही - गंगा तरंग रमणीय जटाकलापम, गौरी निरंतर विभूषित वामभागम, नारायणप्रियम अनंग मदापहारम, वाराणसीपुर पतिम भज विश्वनाथम। मैं भगवान शंकर का भक्त हूँ, वहां उनका विशेष स्थान है। हालांकि मैं वाराणसी वालों को कहता हूँ कि जब आप कहते हैं कि भगवान शंकर आपके शहर में रहते हैं, यह न भूलिए कि आदिवासी वे हमारे पहाड़ के हैं, वे हिमालय से यहां, वाराणसी आए हैं। वह बात और है, लेकिन वाराणसी का बड़ा महत्व है। वाराणसी में उन्होंने जिस प्रकार के विश्वविद्यालय की कल्पना की और वे कहते थे कि मैं भिखारी हूँ, उन्होंने घूम-घूम कर पैसा इकट्ठा किया और जिस प्रकार का कैम्पस उन्होंने बनाया है, न जाने आप वहां गए हैं या नहीं, लेकिन आज भी आदमी वहां जाकर आश्चर्यचकित होता है कि करीब 100 वर्ष पहले, 1916 में इसकी शताब्दी होगी, किस प्रकार की उनकी कल्पना थी कि इस प्रकार की एक संस्था बनाई जाए। मैं यह भी कह दूँ कि मुझे बी.एच.यू. का कुलाधिपति होने का गौरव मिला है, पहले 6 साल, 1961 से लेकर 1967 तक, जब मैं सिर्फ 30 वर्ष का ही था और अब भी 6 साल पूरे हो रहे हैं। मैं 12 वर्षों तक बी.एच.यू. का चांसलर या कुलाधिपति रहा हूँ। हर दफा जब मैं जाता हूँ, तो मुझे नए आयाम दिखते हैं, मालवीय जी का जो दृश्य था, उसके नए चमत्कार दिखते हैं। पिछली बार मैं महामहिम राष्ट्रपति जी को ले गया था, हम हेलीकॉप्टर से एयर पोर्ट से गए थे, तो पहली बार मैंने हवाई जहाज से दृश्य देखा। वह दृश्य आपको नीचे से नहीं दिखेगा। वह ऐसा दृश्य, **integrated campus**, वह सारा कैम्पस एक अर्ध चन्द्र की तरह बना हुआ है। वह वाकई अद्भुत है। उसमें एक बात समझने वाली है कि मालवीय जी को जो **vision** था, उनकी जो दृष्टि थी, जो दूरदर्शिता थी, उसमें प्राचीन और अर्वाचीन, दोनों विद्याओं का सम्मिश्रण था। जहां संस्कृत और दर्शन के विभाग थे, वहां मेडिकल और इंजीनियरिंग के भी विभाग थे। हर प्रकार की, कोई ऐसी विद्या नहीं है, इसलिए हमारे राष्ट्र गीत में "सर्व विद्या की राजधानी" कहा गया है। हर विद्या है, फारसी भी है, अरबी भी है, संस्कृत भी है, पाली भी है और हर प्रकार की सायंस है और हर प्रकार के आर्ट्स और ह्यूमैनिटीज़ हैं। इसमें अब ऐसा होने जा रहा है कि जो इंजीनियरिंग कॉलेज हैं, मेरी समझ में भारतवर्ष में सबसे प्राचीन इंजीनियरिंग कॉलेज बी.एच.यू. का था, अब उस इंजीनियरिंग कॉलेज को **upgrade** किया जा रहा है और उसको **IIT** बनाया जा रहा है। जब यह विचार पहले उभरा, तो एक विवाद उभरा। लोगों का यह विचार था, मुझे भी उन्होंने पत्र लिखे कि आप इसको कैसे **IIT** बना रहे हैं, लेकिन हमने जब इसको सोचा और लोगों के साथ बैठ कर मशविरा किया, तो एक बात स्पष्ट हो गई कि मालवीय जी प्रगति चाहते थे। मालवीय जी चाहते थे कि जो नवीनतम विचार हैं, उनको अपनाया जाए।

"आ नो भ्रदाः कृतवो यन्तु विश्वतः"

अर्थात् अच्छे विचार जहां से भी आएँ, उन्हें हम ग्रहण करें। इसलिए अगर हम इस इंजीनियरिंग कॉलेज को आई.आई.टी. बनने से रोक देते हैं, तो हम केवल उन छात्र-छात्राओं से ही अन्याय नहीं कर रहे होंगे, बल्कि मालवीय जी की स्मृति से भी अन्याय कर रहे होंगे। हमने ठीक कहा है, इसको आई.आई.टी. बनाइए, लेकिन इसके कुछ विशेष प्रावधान रखिए। जैसा कि मंत्री जी ने बताया, इसके लिए कुछ विशेष प्रावधान रखे गए हैं, जो भारतवर्ष के और किसी भी आई.आई.टी. में नहीं हैं। अब भारत में 16 आई.आई.टी. हो जाएंगे।

पहला विशेष प्रावधान यह है कि बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी का जो नाम है, वह हमेशा के लिए इस आई.आई.टी. के साथ जुड़ा रहेगा। कोई और आई.आई.टी. ऐसा नहीं है, जिसके साथ किसी भी यूनिवर्सिटी का नाम जुड़ा हो, उनके साथ केवल शहर का नाम जुड़ा होता है, जैसे कानपुर, दिल्ली या चेन्नई। लेकिन यहां पर इसका नाम ही 'आई.आई.टी., बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी, वाराणसी' होगा। पहली बड़ी बात तो यह है, जो हमेशा के लिए रहेगी।

दूसरा, मैं आपको बताना चाहूंगा, इस पर बहुत विवाद चला था, मेरे मित्र चन्दन जी ने कहा कि लोगों ने इसका विरोध किया। कहा गया कि आई.आई.टी. टेक्नोलॉजी के क्षेत्र में जो विशेषज्ञ होता है, वही अध्यक्ष चुना जाता है, तो यहां आप वाइस चांसलर को अध्यक्ष क्यों रख रहे हैं। बात-चीत करके अन्ततोगत्वा यह तरीका निकला कि पहले तीन वर्ष बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी के वाइस चांसलर को ही अध्यक्ष रखा जाए, ताकि जो फाउंडेशन हो रही है, ट्रांजिशन हो रहा है, उसमें कोई दुविधा नहीं हो। दूसरी बात, उसके बाद बी.एच.यू. अपने तीन व्यक्ति वहां नॉमिनेट कर सकता है। जरूरी नहीं है कि उनमें वाइस चांसलर हो, उसमें दूसरे लोग भी हो सकते हैं। इसके बाद आई.आई.टी. अपनी पद्धति से अध्यक्ष चुनेगी। इसमें यह भी कोई प्रतिबन्ध नहीं है कि वाइस चांसलर को नहीं चुना जा सकता, अगर वाइस चांसलर कोई ऐसा व्यक्ति हो, जिसे आई.आई.टी. वाले अध्यक्ष बनाना उचित समझें, तो उन्हें भी चुन सकते हैं। लेकिन आई.आई.टी. का एक सिलसिला है, उसमें हमेशा के लिए यूनिवर्सिटी के वाइस चांसलर को अध्यक्ष रखना संभव नहीं होगा।

संसद सदस्यों से मैं एक बात और कहना चाहूंगा कि पिछले दो दीक्षांत समारोहों में इंजीनियरिंग के हजारों छात्र-छात्राओं ने अपनी डिग्री नहीं ली। आप थोड़ा इस बात पर भी विचार कीजिए। उन्होंने कहा कि हम अब बी.एच.यू. की डिग्री नहीं लेंगे, क्योंकि जब तक इस पर आई.आई.टी. की छाप नहीं पड़ेगी, तब तक हमें इसका पूरा लाभ नहीं होगा। आप जानते हैं कि आई.आई.टी. की सारी दुनिया में अपनी एक प्रेस्टीज है, हालांकि बी.एच.यू. की भी अपनी एक प्रेस्टीज है। दुनिया में मैं जहां भी जाता, मुझे बी.एच.यू. के पूर्व छात्र मिल जाते हैं, जो बहुत अच्छा कार्य कर रहे हैं, आधुनिक युग में आई.आई.टी. का जो विशेष महत्व होता है, वह अलग ही है, इसीलिए वे छात्र-छात्राएं अभी बैठे हैं। उनकी नजर हमारी तरफ लगी हुई है। वे चिन्तित हैं, दुःखी हैं। उनको एक साल डिग्री नहीं दी गई, दूसरे साल उन्होंने डिग्री नहीं ली। वे इस बात की प्रतीक्षा कर रहे हैं कि कब संसद इस बिल को पास करे और कब वे आगे जा कर डिग्री लें।

लोक सभा ने तो इस बिल को पारित कर ही दिया। मैं इसमें बहुत लम्बा नहीं कहना चाहता हूं, मुझे बड़ा गौरव है, जैसा कि चन्दन जी ने कहा कि बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी सारे भारतवर्ष के लिए गौरवमय स्थान है। मदन मोहन मालवीय जी का नाम हमेशा स्वर्ण अक्षरों में लिखा जाएगा। लेकिन सभी सदस्यों से मेरी विनम्र प्रार्थना है और विशेषकर जो हमारे अरुण जी बैठे हैं और उनके दल के जो सदस्य हैं, उनसे प्रार्थना है कि इसमें अब आप देरी न करें।

[डा. कर्ण सिंह]

आप देरी करेंगे तो उन छात्र-छात्राओं के हौसले फिर पस्त हो जाएंगे और वे दुःखी हो जाएंगे। उनका नुकसान हो रहा है, क्योंकि आई.आई.टी. की डिग्री से उनको जिस जगह नौकरियां मिल सकती थीं, वे नहीं मिलीं। इसलिए मेरी आप सभी से विनम्र प्रार्थना है, लोक सभा ने बहुत सोच-समझ कर और बहुत बहस करके इसको पास कर दिया है। अब आप लोग भी सहर्ष और सर्व-सम्मति से इसे पारित कीजिए। धन्यवाद।

श्री नरेन्द्र कुमार कश्यप (उत्तर प्रदेश): महोदय, आपका धन्यवाद कि आपने मुझे इस बहुत महत्वपूर्ण बिल पर बोलने का मौका दिया है। इस बिल के माध्यम से सरकार भारतीय विज्ञान शिक्षा और अनुसंधान संस्थान के नाम से जानी जाने वाली पुणे, मोहाली, भोपाल और त्रिवेंद्रम में पांच स्थापित संस्थाओं को राष्ट्रीय संस्थाएं घोषित करने का प्रस्ताव भी लाई है, जिसमें आपने प्रत्येक संस्थान का एक बोर्ड और एक परिषद बनाने का प्रोविजन भी बिल में रखा है तथा तकरीबन 2000 करोड़ रुपए की बात भी इस बिल के अन्दर कही गई है।

महोदय, इस बिल से पहले भी हमारे देश की तकरीबन तीन दर्जन से ज्यादा संस्थाओं को राष्ट्रीय महत्व की संस्थाएं घोषित किया गया। हम यह भी जानते हैं कि यह बिल भी सम्भवतः पास होना है और ये संस्थाएं भी राष्ट्रीय महत्व की संस्थाएं घोषित होंगी, होनी चाहिए। लेकिन, सदन यहां कई बिन्दुओं पर आशंकित रहता है, क्योंकि पूर्व में जो संस्थाएं राष्ट्रीय महत्व की संस्थाएं घोषित की गई हैं उनका वर्तमान स्टेटस क्या है, इसकी जानकारी भी अगर सदन के सामने समय-समय पर आती जाए, तो कम-से-कम सदन और देश राष्ट्रीय महत्व के मसले को समझने में कहीं न कहीं अपने आपको सक्षम महसूस करेगा। जो बजट इन संस्थाओं को आवंटित होता है, उसके सही खर्च की उपयोगिता के बारे में कभी कोई चीज हाउस के सामने नहीं आती। किन लोगों को, कितने छात्रों को इनकी सुविधाएं मिलीं, कितने स्टुडेंट्स इनसे लाभान्वित हुए, ये तमाम चीजें भी अगर समय-समय पर सदन के सामने लाई जाएं, तो सम्भवतः सदन के सामने भी और देश के सामने भी इसकी महत्ता और ज्यादा बढ़ सकती है।

माननीय मंत्री जी, आपने बहुत सारे बिन्दुओं पर अपनी बात रखी है और आप इस आई.आई.टी. विभाग के बड़े ज्ञाता भी हैं, आपको बहुत जानकारी भी है। मैं एक चीज आपसे जानना चाहता हूं, क्योंकि एक साथ पांच संस्थाओं को राष्ट्रीय महत्व की संस्थाएं घोषित करना एक छोटा निर्णय नहीं है, यह बहुत बड़ा निर्णय है, लेकिन सरकार ने इन संस्थाओं को राष्ट्रीय महत्व की संस्था घोषित करने के लिए प्रत्येक में 16 सदस्यीय बोर्ड और 25 सदस्यीय परिषद, दो डिफरेंट-डिफरेंट संस्थाएं आपने इसमें अलग से बनाई हैं। आपने कहा कि एक बोर्ड होगा, इसमें तकरीबन 16 मेम्बर्स होंगे तथा एक परिषद होगी, जिसमें 25 मेम्बर्स होंगे। यह एक अच्छी बात है कि आई.आई.टी. को आप बढ़िया तरीके से मैनेज करना चाहते हैं और देश की जनता को उसका लाभ देना चाहते हैं। इसमें सारे सदन की सहमति और सहयोग आपके साथ है और रहेगा, लेकिन यहां एक सवाल हमारे मन में रहता है कि क्या ये दोनों कमेटीज, जो आप बोर्ड के रूप में और परिषद के तौर पर गठित कर रहे हैं, क्या इनमें रिजर्वेशन की कोई प्रक्रिया लागू करने का या इनमें प्रावधान करने का कोई निर्णय लिया है? चूंकि देश के लिए जो एक बहुत ही उपयोगी और खास तौर से देश का यंगस्टर है, जो आई.आई.टी. में जाना चाहता है, अच्छी एजुकेशन लेना चाहता है, उसके साथ वे सारे वर्ग, सब तबके जुड़ें, जो अभी विकास और समृद्धि से दूर हैं, तो मेरा पहला निवेदन आदरणीय मंत्री जी से यह रहेगा कि कृपया इन बोर्ड्स और परिषदों के बारे में इन बात पर भी अपना मन्तव्य देने की कोशिश करें

कि क्या इनमें अनुसूचित जनजाति, अनुसूचित जाति या पिछड़े समाज के लोगों को रिजर्वेशन देने का कोई प्लान भी आप लोगों ने रखा है? इसके अलावा यह बात मैं माइनोंरिटीज के लिए भी कहूंगा। आज जो तबका शैक्षणिक, सामाजिक एवं आर्थिक रूप से पिछड़ा है, क्या उन लोगों को भी अपग्रेड करके इन Institutions से जोड़ कर कुछ आगे बढ़ाने की कोशिश हमारी सरकार करेगी?

दूसरी बात यह है कि आप जिन संस्थानों को अपग्रेड कर रहे हैं या राष्ट्रीय महत्व के संस्थान घोषित कर रहे हैं, उन संस्थानों में काम करने वाले अधिकारियों और कर्मचारियों का स्टेटस क्या होगा, उनकी पोजिशन क्या होगी? क्या वे यथावत अपने पदों पर कार्य करते रहेंगे या उसमें कोई परिवर्तन लाने का भी विचार इस बिल के माध्यम से होगा? इस पर भी अगर कोई उचित नीति हो, तो इसको भी आप स्पष्ट करने की कोशिश करेंगे।

जहां तक IT-BHU को IIT-BHU में तब्दील करने का मामला है, इस संबंध में मैं यह महसूस करता हूं और सदन भी इस बात को महसूस करता है कि कहीं इसके माध्यम से BHU को बांटने की प्लानिंग तो नहीं हो रही है। इस पर भी सरकार को कम से कम अपना मत स्पष्ट करना चाहिए। बिल आने से पहले भी बहुत सारे छात्रों ने और देश के लोगों ने आशंकाएं की थीं तथा IT के बहुत सारे कर्मचारियों ने प्रोटेस्ट भी किया था कि अगर इसको IIT घोषित कर देंगे, तो क्या यह यूनिवर्सिटी के अधीन काम करेगा? इस संबंध में तमाम तरह की आशंकाएं पहले भी व्यक्त की गई थीं। महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से माननीय मंत्री जी से यह निवेदन करूंगा कि कृपया वे इस बात को भी स्पष्ट करने की कोशिश करें, ताकि लोगों में IT-BHU को IIT-BHU बनाने के संबंध में कहीं न कहीं जो एक भ्रम की स्थिति पैदा हो रही है, वह स्थिति देश की जनता के सामने स्पष्ट हो जाए और IT-BHU का अस्तित्व किसी भी प्रकार से खतरे में न रहे। सदन के सामने अगर कम से कम यह गारंटी आती है, तो शायद इससे देश के लोगों के सामने और ज्यादा clarity आ सकेगी।

मैं इस बिल के माध्यम से माननीय मंत्री जी से यह अनुरोध करूंगा कि हमें कम से कम इस बात का भी ध्यान रखना चाहिए कि जिन संस्थानों को आप राष्ट्रीय महत्व की संस्था घोषित करना चाहते हैं, उनमें कहीं भी रिजर्वेशन पॉलिसी बाधित न हो, इसका विचार भी बहुत जरूरी है। इन संस्थानों के लिए जो भी धन आवंटित होता है, जो उसके परिव्यय पर खर्च होता है, उसकी उपयोगिता सही होती है या नहीं, यह प्रश्न भी आज हमारे सामने है। ये संस्थान जिनके लिए अपग्रेड किए जा रहे हैं, उन्हें इनसे क्या फायदा मिला है, किस तरह से वे इनसे लाभान्वित हुए हैं, आज ये कुछ ऐसे विषय हैं, जिनको देश की जनता भी जानना चाहती है और हम भी जानना चाहते हैं। मैं यह आशा करता हूं कि माननीय मंत्री जी जरूर मेरे इन कुछ सवालों का जवाब देंगे। इन संस्थानों को आप राष्ट्रीय महत्व का बनाना चाहते हैं या IT-BHU को IIT-BHU घोषित करना चाहते हैं ताकि देश के लोग इनके महत्व को समझें और इनका लाभ देश के लोगों को मिल सके।

कई बार छोटी-सी आशंका रह जाती है। इन institutions में एडमिशन के लिए डोनेशन की प्रथा पर कहीं न कहीं चर्चा होती है। गांव से जुड़े हुए जो बच्चे हैं, देहात से जुड़े हुए जो बच्चे हैं, वे इन संस्थानों में एडमिशन लेने का प्रयास नहीं कर पाते हैं, इन संस्थानों में एडमिशन के लिए साहस नहीं कर पाते हैं। मेरा यह भी अनुरोध होगा कि इसमें प्रवेश का नियम इस प्रकार बनाया जाए कि देश का आम नागरिक, आम व्यक्ति या आम परिवार का व्यक्ति भी इन संस्थानों में जाकर अपने आपको इस एजुकेशन से जोड़ सके। (समय की घंटी)

[श्री नरेन्द्र कुमार कश्यप]

क्या इसके नियम में सरलता और शिथिलता लाते हुए प्राथमिकता के आधार पर गरीब बच्चों के प्रवेश की योजना भी इस बिल के जरिए सरकार आगे लाने की कोशिश करेगी, ताकि इस देश के बहुत सारे जो दलित, पिछड़े, कमजोर, किसान, आदिवासी और minorities के लोग हैं, उनको इन संस्थानों का लाभ मिल सके और सरकार को इन सारे लाभ का श्रेय मिल सके? आपने मुझे बोलने का वक्त दिया, इसके लिए मैं आपका बहुत शुक्रिया अदा करता हूँ। धन्यवाद।

SHRI K.N. BALAGOPAL (Kerala): Sir, at the outset, I think we have to accept this Bill because this is only for some technical inclusion through this amendment Bill. So, we can accept the amendments proposed in the National Institute of Technology Amendment Bill, 2011 and the Institutes of Technology Amendment Bill, 2011 except for some reservations about the BHU, the nomenclature and all that. But, Sir, now when we are discussing them in this House this afternoon, a very less number of Members are there. Whatever we discuss in the House – sine amendments are not moved by me, I am not moving any amendment – all this discussion is like a public debate. Generally, the Ministry and the Government are not considering the importance of the discussion in the House. Technically if we are moving some amendments and if we are getting the majority, then only things are going on the record and some amendments are accepted. I am saying this is what is happening by and large. Why I am saying this, Sir, not about this Bill alone, is because whatever the powers and privileges are of Parliament, whether it is Lok Sabha or Rajya Sabha, or State Assemblies, Executive is not caring about the rights of these Houses. I am not going into the details of the experiences which I am having. The other day also I talked about the rules which are lying before this House for the last one year and Executive is making laws on its own. For namesake the Parliament and the Legislatures are making laws. We are making the rules, but the action part is taken over by the rules. The rules are going on in their own way. The Executive-made laws are controlling the country. I am making a general observation about it.

Here when we are speaking about this Bill, I say that it is just to introduce eight IITs and the BHU, the BHUIIT, which is also part of the Bill. Five new IISERs are being introduced. It is a very good move by the Government. There is one new IISER in Trivandaraum also. So, we have to include that because the students who have already completed their Degrees from there are not getting Degree Certificates which is the real issue. Merely naming and merely including the names of these institutions in the Bill will not serve the purpose. Actually for higher education we need to do a lot of things. The Minister is always saying that our GER should be increased from 11.5 per cent to 30 per cent. The Gross Enrolment Ratio is very poor in our country. He is only expecting or dreaming. Now we have 450 universities. We

have to have 9000 universities. For fulfilling this dream actually, we have to infuse more money. But, unfortunately, the Indian Government is spending only 0.5 per cent of the GDP of India on higher education while the US is spending more than 2.5 per cent, Europe is spending 1.2 per cent and Japan is spending 1.2 per cent, etc. So, the technicalities will not help our society to build our education. Sir, we did a lot of things to develop education in our country. Even in the pre-independence period and post-Independence period, our statesmen, founding leaders did a lot of things. That is why there is mention of the BHU and the Aligarh Muslim University. They were all part of the National Movement. After that when the Government came, a lot of institutions were established and our world famous institutions like AIIMS, IITs and other institutions were there in the academic sector. We had very famous PSUs. Challenging the monopolies of big countries like US and other countries, we installed our factories, steel complexes, etc. But unfortunately, Sir, since 1991 the total direction is moving backward. Now we are not spending much money. So, education is nowadays getting that importance. I am happy that the Vice-Chairman, Prof. Kurien, is also from the same stream, from the academia. Yesterday also a student committed suicide in Kottayam because of not getting education loan for completing her studies. This is happening in our country. Education is a very costly thing and it is market-oriented. So, if we are not following the earlier exercise in doing some more things in education, we will lose in the international competition. We are talking about rockets, Agni missiles, satellite launching and for every thing we are congratulating the scientists. But now students are not coming for pure research which is a question to be addressed.

Sir, the Minister has himself said as to why the Government is changing the nomenclature of BHU-IIT. He said, 'it is market-driven.' He said that it is good for the current market scenario in education. He said something like that. It is related to market in some sense because the students nowadays are very much interested to go for it. But, Sir, the students are not going in for pure academic research. So, in the name of creating IITs, we are creating a lot of IITians. But there is a dearth of science education and research. After the Indian Institute of Science, this move of creating five new IISs is very good. Now, many things are in the pipeline. So, we have to give more money. Even the Standing Committee Report says, 'In the name of education upgradation, we have to ensure many more things. Sir, a very dismal picture is made about the faculty. A recent report says that about 385 posts are vacant in the new IITs and 1179 posts of teachers are vacant in the existing six IITs. Sir, if you look at the Central Universities, 3761 posts of teachers are vacant in fifteen Central Universities; and the total posts are 9825. So, this is the higher education scenario. Sir, for making *vidyadhanam sarvadhanam pradhanam*, we have to spend some *dhanam*; the Government has to spend some more *dhanam* for education. Last time, during a meeting of the Standing Committee on Commerce, one

[Shri K.N. Balagopal]

Institute – I think, it was Institute of Designs or something like that – informed us that the total allocation that it gets from the Government is only Rs. 1 crore.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Your time is over.

SHRI K.N. BALAGOPAL: Sir, I am concluding. Sir, the Institute of Design is a well-known world academic organization, and its income is Rs. 24 crore. Only the students who can pay high fees go there; in IITs, IIMs, only such students can go; and if BHU is also made an IIT, then the fees will be very high.

I want to say one thing more.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): But your time is over.

SHRI K.N. BALAGOPAL: Sir, it is said that there is a proposal for making Aligarh Muslim University also an IIT. Sir, the Cochin University in Kerala was earlier named for according an IIT-status. But then the Government proposed the entire University for IIT, not just the technology part of it. We were ready to give the engineering college part or the technology education part for it. That was the issue. It is a long pending issue. During those days, like BHU, there was a proposal for Kerala. I would request the Minister to look into that proposal, if possible. There is a commitment from the Prime Minister of India. When he came for a function, which was organized for commemorating the 50th Anniversary of Kerala, he spoke about it in Trivandrum in a public meeting, in the presence of all Opposition leaders, Central Cabinet Ministers and Chief Minister of Kerala. He said that IIT in Palakkad would be established during the period. We have to fulfil the words of the Prime Minister, which he spoke in Kerala during that function, the one which was organized for celebrating the 50th Anniversary of Kerala. That also is to be considered. With these words, I support the Bill. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI N.K. SINGH (Bihar): Sir, there are two Bills before us. The first is the Institute of Technology (Amendment) Bill, which itself has two parts. The first part deals with the eight new Indian Institutes of Technology in various places and the second part deals with the character of the Banaras Hindu University.

Sir, speaking on the first Bill, before I come to the second Bill, there are some generic issues which the Minister might like to consider. The Parliamentary Standing Committee had suggested that the IIT Act itself is now over 50 years old. He had appointed a Kakodkar Commission to make far-reaching recommendations. Instead of really considering the recommendations of the Kakodkar Committee Report received in 2011, piecemeal legislations are really being brought before us. The Kakodkar Committee Report, Sir, deals in a fundamental way with issues of autonomy of IITs, allowing them the flexibility with rules, finalization of Board members or the Board itself, financial autonomy, an autonomy to be able to fulfil the various aims or

objectives which the Government has in mind. So, I think we would like, to have an assurance from the Minister on how long does he believe that the Ministry will take in coming up with a more comprehensive set of recommendations relating to the working of IITs, in general based on the experience of the last 50 years and the path forward in implementing the recommendations of the Kakodkar Committee Report.

Sir, my second point is about the pattern of allocation of resources in the Eleventh Five Year Plan for the sector. The Eleventh Five Year Plan, Sir, has been grossly underfunded in terms of the requirements. As against Rs. 23,000 crores, so far, only Rs. 16,966 crores have been given, which is far too little than what they had projected from their viewpoint. Similarly, this could be true of the first year of the Twelfth Five Year Plan itself.

Sir, my next point is about the persistent teacher vacancy, which the previous speaker has also alluded to. We know that against a total sanctioned faculty strength of 720 teachers, only 275 teachers are in position, whereas there are a total of 445 teacher vacancies in the new IITs. So, both the new and old IITs are terribly short of faculty, and we would like to have from the Minister some kind of a forward path on how he looks at filling up this huge faculty gap, so as to allow the IITs to come up to the requisite standards.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHANTA KUMAR) in the Chair]

Sir, the second part of this Bill relates to the changes in the character and the composition of the Banaras Hindu University. I need not go into the history of the Banaras Hindu University. It has been very eloquently dealt with by Dr. Chandan Mitra and, of course, even more eloquently dealt with by the Chancellor of the University, Dr. Karan Singh, for whom we all have profound respect, or even what Shri Madan Mohan Malviya had done, on the history and the heritage which the Banaras Hindu University represents. But, Sir, I continue to have persistent doubts about whether an integrated whole of the Banaras Hindu University should, in any way, be tampered with, whether there could not be more innovative ways, and whether the integrity of what this University, in over hundred years, as an Engineering College, has done, should be destroyed. And, therefore, I think that the memorandum submitted on behalf of the Banaras Hindu University, looking at its past, looking at its heritage, and even looking to the future, would really need a serious reconsideration by the Government. I fully endorse, of course, the transitional solution given by Dr. Chandan Mitra in regard to the permanence of the post of the Vice-Chancellor, for him to be the Chairman of the Governing Body, but we need to reconsider whether that, in itself, would be adequate to really fulfill the purpose and challenges that lie ahead.

Sir, I would like to now very briefly comment on the issues of the other Bill, which relate to the National Institute of Technology (Amendment) Bill, 2000. Here

[Shri N.K. Singh]

3.00 P.M.

again, I think there are two or three important challenges. In addition to the shortage of faculty and the issue of the quality of the Indian Institutes of Science Foundation and Research and the budgetary allocations for the NIT, I would like to raise two specific issues for the hon. Minister's consideration. First, in terms of recommendation no. 6 of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on the composition of the Board of Governors, the Minister has assured us that the Board is not going to be excessively dominated by the Central Government, by having too many Secretaries. We haven't seen specific mention of this in the amendments which have been circulated by the Minister, but I take it that in the initial statement that he is to make, he would make the necessary changes before this is really notified.

I would like to have another assurance, Sir, in respect of the admission procedures for the IISCR. The admission procedure currently looks somewhat skewed. There are three streams of admission: the IIT-JEE, the *Kishore Bal Vaigyanic Protsahan Yojana* and also the one per cent students in the 12th Standard examination of the CBSE and other Boards. The admission stream and the eligibility criteria in respect of the three different streams are not necessarily symmetrical and congruous. So, I think that he might like to consider how he would like to prescribe a uniform standard which would overcome the diversity in the eligibility criteria in respect of the various streams of admission.

Sir, I thought that these are some of the more holistic issues which I would bring before the Minister, and he would like to give the House an assurance on the path forward.

Thank you, Sir.

चौधरी मुनब्वर सलीम (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी मैं IIT से संबंधित इस बिल के बारे में माननीय मंत्री जी और अन्य सदस्यों के भाषण सुन रहा था। आदरणीय डा. कर्ण सिंह जी ने और डा. चंदन मित्रा जी ने बहुत ही विद्वतापूर्ण भाषण दिए। मैं आपके माध्यम से माननीय मंत्री जी से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि चाहे बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी हो या अलीगढ़ मुस्लिम यूनिवर्सिटी हो, आपके जो भी एजुकेशनल बिल आएँ, आप कितनी भी महान शिक्षा देने की तरफ चले, लेकिन इनका बेसिक स्वरूप नहीं बदलना चाहिए, क्योंकि इनसे भारतीय जनमानस की भावनाएं जुड़ी हुई हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं जब से इस सदन में आया हूँ, मेरी आयु 3 दिन की है, मैं देख रहा हूँ कि माननीय मंत्री जी जब एजुकेशन के मुताल्लिक कोई बिल लाते हैं, तो मेरे इस तरफ के मुकाबिल दोस्तों का विरोध उन्हें सहना पड़ता है। शायद इसके पीछे यह कारण है कि हिंदुस्तान की एक बड़ी आबादी, जिसके बारे में जस्टिस सच्चर ने कहा कि इनकी हालत बड़ी बुरी है, एजुकेशनल हालत भी बुरी है, सामाजिक हालत भी बुरी है, इसके बावजूद माननीय मंत्री जी के किसी भी बिल में उस आबादी का ध्यान नहीं रखा जाता है। मैं आपके माध्यम से माननीय मंत्री जी से दरखास्त करता हूँ कि आप IIT के मुताल्लिक यह बिल लाए

ہیں اور ہॉیر ایجوکیشن کے لیے جو سمیتیاں بنانے والے ہیں، انہیں پٹھانوں کے ساتھ ساتھ مسلمانوں کی تعلیم کا خصوصی خیال رکھیں، انہیں بھی اہمیت دینی چاہیے۔
چودھری منور سلیم (اتر پردیش) : آپ سبھا اڈمیشن ممبر، انہیں میں اہمیت دینی چاہیے۔

سمبندھت اس بل کے بارے میں مائنس منٹری جی اور دیگر سبھیوں کے بھائن سن رہا تھا۔
 اڈمیشن کرن سنگھ جی نے اور ڈاکٹر چندن مشرا جی نے بہت ہی ودھوائیوں بھائن دئے۔
 میں آپ کے مادھیم سے مائنس منٹری جی سے نویدن کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ جابے بنارس ہندو
 یونیورسٹی ہو یا علی گڑھ مسلم یونیورسٹی ہو، آپ کے جو بھی ایجوکیشن بل آئیں، آپ کتنی
 بھی مہان شکشا دینے کی طرف چلیں، لیکن ان کا بیکس سو روپ نہیں بدلنا چاہیے، کیوں کہ ان
 سے بھارتی جن-مانس کی بھاونائیں جڑی ہوئی ہیں۔

آپ سبھا اڈمیشن جی، میں جب سے اس سڈن میں آیا ہوں، میری عمر 3 دن کی ہے،
 میں دیکھ رہا ہوں کہ مائنس منٹری جی جب ایجوکیشن کے متعلق کوئی بل لاتے ہیں، تو میرے
 اس طرف مقابل دوستوں کا ورودھ انہیں سہنا پڑتا ہے، شاید اس کے پیچھے یہ کارن ہے کہ
 ہندوستان کی ایک بڑی آبادی، جس کے بارے میں جنٹس سچر نے کہا کہ ان کی حالت بڑی
 بری ہے، ایجوکیشن حالت بھی بری ہے، سماجک حالت بھی بری ہے، اس کے باوجود مائنس
 منٹری جی کے کسی بھی بل میں اس آبادی کا دھیان نہیں رکھا جاتا ہے۔ میں آپ کے مادھیم
 سے مائنس منٹری جی سے دوخواست کرتا ہوں کہ آپ اہمیت دینی چاہیے۔ کے متعلق یہ بل لائے ہیں
 اور ایجوکیشن کے لئے جو سمیتیاں بنانے والے ہیں، ان میں پچھڑوں کے ساتھ ساتھ مسلم
 نمائندگی کا وٹیش دھیان رکھیں، تبھی مکمل ہندوستان آگے بڑھ سکے گا۔ دھنیو اد۔

SHRIMATI VASANTHI STANLEY (Tamil Nadu): Sir, as a member of the IIT Council and as a Member of the HRD Committee also, I am really extremely glad that these Bills are being discussed today. The fate of students, who study in these Universities, depends on these Bills which are under consideration. They are dependent on the passage of these Bills, as these Bills enable the new IITs to award degrees. It is unfortunate, Sir, that the students who have already graduated from the new IITs have not received their degrees. I am happy that these Bills are finally being discussed today. As a Member of HRD Committee and IIT Council, I have been closely watching our HRD Minister. Hon. Minister wants to bring in many changes in the educational system. Though the Standing Committee Report has been given on 26th November, 2010 and the Lok Sabha has passed this Bill on 24th March, 2011, it is yet to see the light of the day.

First, I take the Institutes of Technology (Amendment) Bill. It seeks to add eight new Indian Institutes of Technology and then to convert the Institute of

†Transliteration in Urdu Script.

[Shrimati Vasanthi Stanley]

Technology, Banaras Hindu University into an IIT and assign a duty to each Institute to support States or Union Territories technologically in their zones and to address their technological problems. The amendments made through this Bill will be to empower the Central Government to notify these 'Zones' in the country for advising the State Government and the Union Territory included in its zone in the matter of technical education and any technical issue referred by them to the institute for advice; to cast upon the IITs a duty to support States or Union Territories technologically in their 'Zones' and address their technological problems; to incorporate the newly set-up IITs and Indian Institute of Technology (Banaras Hindu University), Varanasi under the provisions of the Act and to provide that till such time when the statutes and ordinances of new IITs and this BHU, Varanasi, come into force, it would be governed by the existing statutes.

Now, I come to the other Bill, that is, National Institutes of Technology (Amendment) Bill. The Bill adds another schedule to include five Indian Institutes of Science, Education and Research established in Kolkata, Pune, Mohali, Bhopal and Thiruvananthapuram as institutions of national importance. The Bill specifies the members of the Board of Governors. In each Institute, a Council shall be established for all the Institutes of Science Education and Research. The amendments are being made to declare all the five IISERs to be the institutions of national importance, and for that purpose, the insertion of Second Schedule in the said Act is being done enlisting therein the IISER and consequential amendments in various provisions of the Act. Then, there is insertion of a new section 11A for the constitution of the Board of Governors for IISER specified in the proposed Second Schedule; the insertion of a new section 30A to establish a common Council for all the IISERs specified in the proposed Second Schedule. Then, the amendment seeks to strengthen the networking of NITs and IISERs by giving representation in their Boards of Governors to the IIT, in whose territory or zone the NIT or the IISER falls and to bring the appointment procedure of the Deputy Director of the NITs in line with that of IITs.

In a country as large as ours, unfortunately, we are lagging behind in providing higher education facilities. I am glad that the Government is taking initiative to meet the growing demand for higher education in the country by establishing institutions of higher education across the country, especially in rural and remote areas. It is indeed the need of the hour. At the same time, Sir, we must not compromise on the quality of education. Merely affixing the title of IIT to new educational institutions and upgrading the existing institutions will not give that prestige to these institutions. They have to strive hard and strike a balance between quantity and quality in terms of education. The IITs have proved to be a boon to our country. They have produced some of the best minds that have represented our

country all over the world. There is much potential that needs to be tapped. I am sure that with the spread and growth of educational-institutions, we will be able to tap the undiscovered potential in the rest of our population.

I would also like to share a few of my concerns here. First is a very grave concern which other hon. Members have also expressed. It is the lack of qualified teaching personnel. The shortage of qualified teachers in both, the existing IITs and the new ones, is plaguing the advancement of education. I urge the Government to examine this matter of vacancies as it is of great significance. I would like to congratulate the Ministry for linking up the National Knowledge Network in this regard. However, absence of adequate number of qualified teachers is an obstacle that must be removed. The Government must encourage the teaching profession as an attractive profession. Incentives must be given to those who are willing to teach even after retirement. I would like to urge the Government to promote Indian educational institutions. We must improve our standards and meet world standards in education. The Ministry should take the task of evaluating the new IITs-then and there and encourage them to meet the global standards. With these observations, Sir, I welcome both the Bills. - .

DR. JANARDHAN WAGHMARE (Maharashtra): Sir, I rise to support both the amendment Bills. But, let me make certain suggestions and observations also. It is a very heartening thing that eight more IITs have been added to the list of existing IITs. Every State and Union Territory must have, at least, one IIT. The IIT of BHU is being included here. The heritage of BHU should be perpetuated.

Sir, the twentieth century was the century of science. The twenty-first century is the century, of technology. Technology has taken a quantum leap in our times. It is because of the tremendous advancements in technology that the tsunami tides of knowledge have been touching all the horizons in all the directions and the sky. Technology has changed the destinies of the nations.

Ours is an age of information revolution – a revolution which will never be followed by any counter-revolution. In the field of science and technology, there can be revolutions, but no counter-revolutions. Science and Technology never follow a retrogressive path. Technology has assumed an unprecedented importance in education and other spheres of life. It has created a wonderland – full of astonishments and amusements. Like Alice, we are awestruck and greatly amazed. Computers, mobiles and i-pads are the symbols of the age of information revolution.

Technology has helped mankind in innumerable ways. It is the driving force behind development. It has boosted agricultural and industrial growth. The electronic world is a world of wonders. All professional activities are prefixed with ‘e’ like e-governance, e-commerce, e-books, e-learning etc. This ‘e’ stands for economy and education. Accomplishments of technology are countless indeed.

[Dr. Janardhan Waghmare]

Sir, technology has reduced distance of space and distance of time beyond one's imagination. It has reduced the entire world to a 'global village'. It has placed the whole universe on the palm of our hands. We find eternity in a grain of sand. We are citizens of the world.

Our IITs and other institutes of technology have been playing a very vital role in imparting technical education of high quality. They enjoy autonomy also. Our IITs are world-class institutions. They have produced intellectual wizards. The technological institutes have proved to be productive.

India needs more institutes of technology. We face five crucial problems, namely, accessibility, infrastructure, expansion, equity, and, faculty. How to make available technological education to weaker sections of the society? How to give them equal opportunity? Why not reserve 25 per cent admissions to the poor in the institutes of technology? Education of technology should be made affordable so that it can be within the reach of the poor. Why not include affirmative action provision in these Bills for those who belong to weaker sections of the society, and, are not covered under reservation.

Ours is a knowledge-based society. We are all knowledge-workers. Institutes of technology should be inclusive. Technical education, too, should be inclusive education, and, that should be our long-term goal. Institutes of technology require quality infrastructure, quality courses, quality textbooks, quality teachers with a sense of accountability and total quality management. Faculty is the most crucial problem. Several teaching posts are lying vacant in IITs and universities. (*Time-bell rings*) Sir, research should be given equal importance in the institutions of technology. Without innovative research, you cannot generate new knowledge. Giving quality education or technical education means giving Alladin's lamp in the hands of students. Thank you very much.

SHRI N. BALAGANGA (Tamil Nadu): Sir, while the discussion is going on both the Bills, I would like to make a few observations on the National Institutes of Technology (Amendment) Bill, 2010. Sir, through this Bill, the Government wants to establish five institutions, namely, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research, at Kolkata, Pune, Mohali, Bhopal and Thiruvananthapuram.

Sir, through you, I would like to mention some points for Government's consideration. Sir, to start with, the name, which is proposed to be given to these five new institutions, is 'Indian Institute of Science Education and Research' and the Government wants to make them as institutes of national importance.

Sir, we already have an Indian Institute of Science at Bangalore which is an Institute of national importance. That being so, why should the Government give a

similar name to the new institutions? Will it not lead to confusion? Does the Government declare that the Indian Institute of Science at Bangalore has been deprived of the stature of an Institute of national importance? Or, does it not do 'science and research' work any more? I request the hon. Minister to enlighten us on this.

Now, I urge upon the Government, through you, to ensure that the new institutes get adequate and full infrastructure so that they act as a catalyst to boost the students' intelligence. There is a general feeling among the public that there is a total lack of infrastructure in most of the colleges of higher learning. This could be seen even in the NITs. As the hon. Minister stated in this Bill, admissions in NITs are based on the ranks secured by the candidates appearing at the All India Engineering Entrance Examination, conducted by the Central Board of Secondary Education. But, if you see the choice of candidates, every candidate wants to pick up some course in 7 or 8 NITs only. All the rest are secondary to them. Even the State quotas are not getting filled up in such States. But they are also called institutions of national importance. I had an opportunity to talk to the student community in this regard recently. They say that the basic reason for picking up few NITs and not joining few NITs depends on the infrastructural facilities and good faculty available at such institutions. Hence there is a dire need to look into the infrastructural needs of the institutes and filling up right faculty for the right job. The Government must encourage the younger minds to take to the job of teaching and research in India. Another reason for the choice of students for some particular courses in some specific NITs is this. Shockingly, about 80 per cent of the PG courses and more than 50 per cent of the undergraduate courses in the NITs are not accredited. This is reported by none other than the CAG in the Audit Report No. 13 tabled in the Parliament. The CAG further reported that there was a severe shortage of faculty. As per the report, Sir, in the seven IITs, out of the sanctioned faculty strength of 4052, there are 1,179 posts still vacant. That means, around 30 per cent of the faculty strength is vacant. In the new IITs, out of the sanctioned strength of 660, about 385 posts are still vacant. That means, about 58 per cent of the posts are still vacant. Sir, the Government has to pay immediate attention to this aspect.

Sir, I have one more appeal to the hon. Minister. After XII standard, students are forced to sit in many competitive examinations for admissions to engineering colleges and various institutes like IITs, NITs, etc. The student community, as a whole, feels that if there is only one examination and on the basis of the scores and ranks in that one examination if courses are offered to different institutes including IITs, NITs and others, it would be good. The hon. Minister may think over it and bring about reforms in this field.

With the above observations, I support the Bill. Thank you.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री शान्ता कुमार): श्री धर्मेन्द्र प्रधान। माननीय सदस्य, यह एक सुखद संयोग है कि आप भी पहली बार बोल रहे हैं और मैं भी पहली बार अध्यक्षता कर रहा हूँ।

श्री धर्मेन्द्र प्रधान (बिहार): धन्यवाद उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय। मैं आपका आभार प्रकट करता हूँ कि आपने मुझे मौका दिया। सरकार दो बिल, आई.आई.टी. (संशोधन) विधेयक और एन.आई.टी. (संशोधन) विधेयक, सदन के पटल पर लोक सभा से पारित करा कर यहां लाई है। यह भी एक सुखद संयोग है कि मैं जिस प्रान्त से आता हूँ और जिस प्रान्त का मैं इस उच्च सदन में प्रतिनिधित्व करता हूँ, जिन आठ आई.आई.टीज के बारे में मंत्री जी ने उल्लेख किया, उनमें इन दोनों राज्यों के भुवनेश्वर और पटना भी हैं। मैं ओडिशा से आता हूँ, मेरी मातृभूमि ओडिशा है और भुवनेश्वर में आई.आई.टी. हुई है। आजकल मैं बिहार का प्रतिनिधित्व करता हूँ और पटना में भी आई.आई.टी. बन रही है। इससे 8 आई.आई.टीज को मान्यता मिलेगी, मैं उस दृष्टि से इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ। आज यह बिल पारित होने के बाद एक रूप लेगा और इससे पूर्णांग आई.आई.टी. बनने वाली है और इससे आठ राज्यों में आठ केन्द्र स्थापित होंगे।

मैं अपने वरिष्ठ सदस्य एन.के. सिंह जी की बात को थोड़ा आगे बढ़ाता हूँ कि आपने चालू पंचवर्षीय प्लान में जो बजटीय व्यवस्था की है, वह पर्याप्त नहीं है। आपने उन आठ राज्यों में सपने दिखाए हैं। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, बिहार और ओडिशा जैसे प्रान्तों में मेधा की कोई कमी नहीं है। देश जानता है कि सुपर 30 के नाम से बिहार के गरीब विद्यार्थियों ने अपनी बौद्धिक क्षमता की ऊंचाई स्थापित की है। 30 के 30 गरीब विद्यार्थी आई.आई.टी. पहुंचते हैं। आनंद जी नाम के एक साधारण व्यक्ति ने वहां एक इंस्टीट्यूट चलाते हुए एक कीर्ति स्थापित की है। जब ऐसे सारे प्रान्तों में आई.आई.टी. जाएगी, तो हमें सिर्फ आई.आई.टी. का ढांचा नहीं चाहिए, बल्कि पूर्णांग आई.आई.टी. चाहिए और जल्दी ही चाहिए।

इस बिल का जो दूसरा पार्ट है, वह यह है कि बी.एच.यू. के मूल चरित्र में परिवर्तन नहीं करना चाहिए। इससे बढ़िया बात क्या हो सकती है कि इस देश के एक बड़े विद्वान, जो आज हम सभी की प्रेरणा के केन्द्र हैं, मान्यवर कर्ण सिंह जी इस उच्च संस्था के चांसलर के नाते हैं। मैं बड़ा प्रभावित हुआ। जब भी हम कर्ण सिंह जी को सुनते हैं, बड़े प्रभावित होते हैं, आज भी प्रभावित हुए, लेकिन सरकार की कुंठा किस बात की है, सरकार किस उलझन में है कि अगर उस संस्था की सारे विषयों पर सहमति है, कई सारी बारीकियों में कुछ चीजें ध्यान देने के लायक हैं, तो सरकार को क्या आपत्ति है, सरकार किस ज़िद में अटकी हुई है कि बी.एच.यू. के वाइस चांसलर 3 साल क्यों, एक विशेष प्रावधान करके बी.एच.यू. के जो वाइस चांसलर रहेंगे, वे न आई.आई.टी., बी.एच.यू. के डायरेक्टर भी रहेंगे? इसमें क्यों आपकी ज़िद है? इसमें आपको क्यों आपत्ति है? सरकार इसको क्यों प्रतिष्ठा का इश्यू बना रही है? एक विशेष प्रोजेक्ट इसके लिए भी किया जा सकता है। इससे बी.एच.यू. का चरित्र भी बरकरार रहेगा।

मैं मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहूंगा कि अलीगढ़ मुस्लिम यूनिवर्सिटी, जिसके बारे में मेरी पार्टी के नेता चंदन दा ने संकेत भी किया, क्या उनके मन में उसके बारे में ऐसी कोई कल्पना है, क्या वे उसके बारे में ऐसा सोच सकते हैं? बी.एच.यू. और ए.एम.यू., दोनों अपने आपमें अलग identity के संस्थान हैं। इस देश की शिक्षा आंदोलन की संस्कृति, शिक्षा आंदोलन के जनक मदन मोहन मालवीय जी ने इसे स्थापित किया था। क्या ए.एम.यू. के किसी कॉलेज को सरकार की छूने की हिम्मत है? तब आप बी.एच.यू. में ऐसा क्यों कर रहे हैं? मैं मान्यवर मंत्री जी के लोक सभा के वक्तव्य को पढ़ रहा था। उन्होंने कहा कि हजारों यूनिवर्सिटीज चाहिए, 16 आई.आई.टीज पर्याप्त नहीं हैं, और आई.आई.टीज चाहिए। आप बी.एच.यू., आई.आई.टी. को मान्यता दीजिए, लेकिन आप बनारस में एक और आई.आई.टी. बनाते। डा. कर्ण सिंह जी के बारे में क्या कहा जाए, इतने बड़े

व्यक्ति हैं, लेकिन उन्होंने थोड़ा डराया कि दो साल से विद्यार्थी को सर्टिफिकेट नहीं मिला। मेरे जैसे राज्यों में विद्यार्थी चार-चार साल से अपेक्षा किए हुए हैं कि हमारी आई.आई.टी. पूर्णांग हो जाए। आप देश की उच्च शिक्षा की संस्कृति के संरक्षक हैं। और संस्थान हों, और इंस्टीट्यूट हों तो अच्छा रहेगा। मेरी पार्टी की ओर से सरकार को सुझाव है कि मेरे नेता चंदन मित्रा जी ने जो अमेंडमेंट दिया है, सरकार उसको ग्रहण करे। वह अच्छा रहेगा और सबके पक्ष में रहेगा। अच्छा रहेगा कि एक और अलग इंस्टीट्यूट किया जाए और बी.एच.यू. के मूल चरित्र के साथ छेड़छाड़ न की जाए। आज भी आई.आई.टी. का जो ब्रांड है, आई.आई.टी. की जो मान्यता है, इसमें किसी को कोई भी **dispute** नहीं है। बी.एच.यू. का भी आई.आई.टी. अलग रहे, लेकिन उसके समाधान के नाते वाइस चांसलर स्थायी रूप में बी.एच.यू., आई.आई.टी. का डायरेक्टर भी रहे। यह जो संशोधन है, उसको मान लेना चाहिए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, एक और विषय है, जो बिल आज आया है, उसका मेरे प्रदेश से एक नाता है। अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी के एन.डी.ए. के शासन काल में यह कल्पना आई थी। उन दिनों एच.आर.डी. मिनिस्ट्री में यह प्रस्ताव था कि नेशनल सायंस इंस्टीट्यूट, बंगलुरु की तर्ज पर देश भर में कुछ और उच्च वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संस्थान खोले जाएं।

उसमें भुवनेश्वर का भी एक केन्द्र के रूप में चयन किया गया था और घोषणा भी हुई थी। उन दिनों डा. मुरली मनोहर जोशी जी एच.आर.डी. मिनिस्टर थे, उन्होंने स्वयं घोषणा की थी। लेकिन यूपी.ए.-1 सरकार के आने के बाद, उड़ीसा जैसे राज्य के साथ जो समझौता किया जा चुका था, सरकार उसे उठा कर कोलकाता ले गई। अच्छी बात है, कोलकाता में आपने इंस्टीट्यूट खुलवा दिया, लेकिन अब उसके साथ आप भुवनेश्वर को भी तो जोड़िए। मेरे राज्य में सूर्य मन्दिर है। मेरा राज्य वैज्ञानिकों का स्थान है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, जब सूरज उगता है, तो उसकी पहली किरण जा कर कोणार्क मन्दिर में सूर्य देवता के पैर के नीचे गिरती है। मेरे राज्य के इतिहास में, वहां की सभ्यता में इतने वैज्ञानिक थे कि सदियों पहले उन्होंने ऐसी कृति खड़ी कर दी। हम भी यूपी.ए. सरकार की प्रशंसा करेंगे, मंत्री जी की वाहवाही करेंगे, अगर वे उस संस्था को, जो अटल बिहारी वाजपेई जी ने सोची थी, भुवनेश्वर में भी स्थापित कर दें।

इनकी सरकार के बारे में हम एक बात कहेंगे कि ये बातें बड़ी-बड़ी करते हैं, लेकिन काम ज्यादा नहीं करते। हिन्दी में एक कहावत है, यह 'बड़बोलों' की सरकार है। इनकी प्रतिवद्धता उच्च शिक्षा के प्रति, मौलिक अनुसंधान के प्रति दिखाई नहीं देती। उन दिनों एन.आई.टी. बिल के रूप में एक अलग ब्रांचा इसलिए आया था क्योंकि जो रीजनल इंजीनियरिंग कॉलेजिज थे, उनको एक जातीय मान्यता दी जा सके, इसीलिए इस संस्था का निर्माण किया गया था। अब आप साइंस को या वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान को उसके साथ क्यों जोड़ रहे हैं? आपकी **National Institute of Science and Educational Research** की जो कल्पना है, यह अच्छी कल्पना है। यह भी अपने आप में एक ब्रांड हो सकती है, लेकिन टेक्नोलॉजिकल इंस्टीट्यूट सिर्फ इंजीनियरिंग विभाग के होते हैं। विज्ञान के बारे में आज सभी ने कहा कि इसमें फैकल्टी का अभाव है, फैकल्टी कम है। मेरे सी.पी.एम. के मित्र बाल गोपाल जी ने कहा कि सेंट्रल यूनिवर्सिटी में लगभग 9000 शिक्षक चाहिए, 3000 वेकेंसीज खाली हैं। मंत्री जी ने लोक सभा में उत्तर देते हुए कहा कि फैकल्टी की बहुत कमी है, लेकिन यह कमी कब पूरी होगी? अगर आप आधे-अधूरे मन से एक लिमिटेड एपरोच लाएंगे, तो यह काम नहीं हो सकेगा, आपके स्लोगन में तो यह हो सकता है। वैसे स्लोगन देने में आपसे ज्यादा माहिर और कौन है? विशेषकर आपकी सरकार में आप जैसे मंत्री सिर्फ स्लोगन पर ही काम करते हैं, इसकी तुलना हम नहीं कर सकते। लेकिन आप कुछ काम भी तो करिए, कुछ

[श्री धर्मेन्द्र प्रधान]

ठोस कदम भी उठाइए। आज इस देश में अनुसन्धान, फंडामेंटल रिसर्च घट रहा है। अगर सरकार इस सदी के प्रारम्भ में और दूसरे दशक की शुरुआत में यहां संसद में बैठ कर कह रही है कि देश की उच्च शिक्षा में मौलिक अनुसन्धान बढ़ाना चाहिए, तो **National Institute of Science and Educational Research** को आप एक अलग संस्था बनाइए। राजनैतिक दृष्टिकोण से आपने भुवनेश्वर को काट कर जो अलग कर दिया है, उसे फिर से जोड़िए।

चन्दन मित्रा जी ने एक और विषय का उल्लेख किया, मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूं। आप कहते हैं कि **limited governance** होनी चाहिए। शब्दों का संयोजन तो आप अच्छा कर लेते हैं। जैसे अगर कोई कपिल सिब्बल जी को सुने, तो मोहित हो जाएगा कि अरे! कितनी बढ़िया बात की है, **limited governance, independent, autonomous**. अब चीफ सेक्रेटरी वहां नहीं जाएंगे, उनकी जगह आप कोई नुमाइंदा भेजेंगे लेकिन उस इंस्टीट्यूट में, जो आप सिक्किम में खोलेंगे, उसमें भारत सरकार के तीन-तीन विभागों के सचिव जाएंगे। आपकी बहुत बढ़िया कल्पना है। फिर भी आपको यह कहने के लिए मुझे मोह होता है कि आप बातें बनाना छोड़ दीजिए। देश में बौद्धिक क्षमता रखने वाले लोगों की कोई कमी नहीं है। देश भर में उद्योग के क्षेत्र में, विज्ञान के क्षेत्र में बहुत सारे बड़े-बड़े व्यक्तित्व हैं, आप उनको पार्टिसिपेट करवाइए। आप कहते हैं कि हम भागीदारी की सरकार चलाते हैं, कॉमन मिनिमम प्रोग्राम चलाते हैं, आपने एक नैशनल एडवाइजरी कमेटी भी बनाई है। राजनीतिक उद्देश्य से ढिंढोरा पीटने के लिए एक मंडली को आप नैशनल एडवाइजरी कमेटी बना देंगे और **Autonomous Educational Institute** चलाने के लिए आपको सचिव चाहिए। देश भर में आपको कोई और बुद्धिजीवी लोग, वैज्ञानिक लोग नहीं मिलते हैं। आप इस मोह को छोड़िए और काम करिए।

ये दोनों ही बिल सैद्धांतिक रूप में अच्छे हैं, लेकिन ये बिल सीमित होकर रह जाएंगे, आपका प्रस्ताव, आपकी मंशा सीमित हो कर रह जाएगी, अगर आप इसे एक छोटे मन से देखेंगे।

पहले बिल का समर्थन मैं इसलिए करता हूं, क्योंकि उसका लाभ हम भी लेने वाले हैं। उसका लाभ ओडिशा, बिहार और अन्य राज्य लेने वाले हैं, क्योंकि इसमें भुवनेश्वर, पटना, रोपड़, मंडी इत्यादि होंगे। इन सभी इलाकों में आईआईटी होंगे। यह अच्छी बात है। लेकिन बी.एच.यू. के बारे में सदन में जो सुझाव दिया गया है, उसे आप स्वीकार कीजिए और विरोधी दल का सुझाव मानिए। आप इस अमेंडमेंट को ठुकराइए मत, उसे आप स्वीकार कीजिए। एन.आई.टी. बिल में भुवनेश्वर को स्वीकार करने का अटल जी का जो पुराना सुझाव था, उसे भी आप इसमें जोड़िए। प्रशासनिक अधिकारों को बैकडोर से चलाने का आपका जो मोह है, उसे आप छोड़िए। देश के विद्वान लोगों के हाथ में उसको दीजिए।

आपने मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया, इसके लिए धन्यवाद।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री शान्ता कुमार): आपके प्रथम भाषण के लिए आपका बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

डा. राम प्रकाश (हरियाणा): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय मंत्री जी ने जो दो बिल सदन के समक्ष प्रस्तुत किये हैं, उनका मैं स्वागत करता हूं और समर्थन करता हूं।

सर, एक बिल 'The Institutes of Technology (Amendment) Bill, 2011' है। यह **Institute of Technology Act, 1961** के मातहत कुछ संस्थाओं पर लागू था। आठ नयी संस्थाएं खोली गई हैं। उनको आईआईटी. का दर्जा देने का जो प्रावधान यहां किया गया है, वह सराहनीय है। तदनुसार एक्ट में यत्र-तत्र कुछ संशोधन करने जरूरी हैं, उनकी व्यवस्था भी इस बिल में की गई है।

मैंने सभी माननीय सदस्यों को बड़े ध्यान से सुना है। मैं भी आपकी तरह सम्माननीय मदन मोहन मालवीय जी के प्रति बहुत श्रद्धा रखता हूँ और इसलिए जो बात आदरणीय डा. कर्ण सिंह जी ने भी कही, मंत्री जी ने भी कही और दूसरे साथियों ने भी कही, आई.आई.टी. और बनारस हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय के परस्पर सम्बन्ध की जो व्यवस्था रखी गई है, मैं उसकी सराहना करता हूँ। मैं एक बात कहना चाहूँगा कि किसी भी संगठन में किसी विश्वविद्यालय का कुलपति सदस्य तो हो सकता है, लेकिन किसी विश्वविद्यालय के कुलपति को दूसरे संगठन में नम्बर दो का अधिकारी न बनाया जाए, पदाधिकारी न बनाया जाए। वह उसका सदस्य हो सकता है। क्योंकि विश्वविद्यालयों की अपनी गरिमा है, आई.आई.टी. की अपनी गरिमा है, कौन छोटा है और कौन बड़ा, यह बहस पैदा नहीं होनी चाहिए और विश्वविद्यालय के जो कुलपति हैं, उनका सम्मान भी पूरा रहे, इस बात की ओर मैं ध्यान आकर्षित करता हूँ।

सर, दूसरा बिल 'The National Institute of Technology (Amendment) Bill, 2010' हैं। आज 29 National Institute of Technology हैं। इन पर 'NIT Act, 2007' 15 अगस्त, 2007 से लागू है। इस एक्ट के अनुसार ये राष्ट्रीय महत्व के संस्थान हैं। इनमें प्रवेश सी.बी.एस.ई. द्वारा ली जाने वाली All India Engineering Entrance Examination में जो रैंक मिलता है, उसके आधार पर होता है। पांच अन्य संस्थाओं को, जो अपनी-अपनी जगह बहुत महत्व रखती हैं, उनको इस एक्ट के अधीन लाने का प्रावधान किया जा रहा है। ये उच्च कोटि के संस्थान हैं। माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी की जो विज्ञान-सम्बन्धी सलाहकार समिति है, उसकी भी यह सिफारिश है। मैं नहीं समझता कि इस पर किसी को ऐतराज हो सकता है। इन्हें राष्ट्रीय महत्व के संस्थान घोषित करने की जो इच्छा व्यक्त की गई है, मैं उसका हार्दिक स्वागत करता हूँ। Board of Governors में इनके प्रतिनिधित्व का प्रावधान तर्कसंगत है, युक्तियुक्त है। बिल में कोई और मूलभूत परिवर्तन नहीं किया गया है और समय की मांग को पूरा करने का प्रयास किया गया है। मंत्री जी ने इधर ध्यान देकर जो विद्यार्थियों के प्रति संवेदनशीलता और वक्त के तकाजों के प्रति जो जागरुकता दिखाई है, मैं उसका भी स्वागत करता हूँ। परन्तु, उन्होंने एक बात कही, जिसकी मैं सराहना करूँगा, कि सरकारी ऑफिसर्स का प्रतिनिधित्व जितना कम किया जाए, एक्स-ऑफिशियो सदस्यों की संख्या जितनी घटाई जाए, उतनी कम है।

[उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन) पीठासीन हुए]

मैं सब का सम्मान करते हुए यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि ब्यूरोक्रेसी की महिमा अपरम्पार है। सी.वी. रमन जी को सी.एस.आई.आर. के एक अधिकारी ने पत्र लिखा और उनकी प्रोग्रेस रिपोर्ट मांग ली। सी.वी. रमन जी क्या प्रोग्रेस रिपोर्ट देते? उन्होंने अपने छोटे अधिकारी को बुलाकर पूछा कि आज तक मुझे सी.एस.आई.आर. से कितना पैसा मिला है? जितना पैसा मिला था, उतने का चेक काट कर अपने पत्र के साथ जोड़ कर लिख दिया, "My progress report is enclosed." उस समय एस.एस. भटनागर CSIR के Director थे, वे एक वैज्ञानिक थे। जब यह पत्र गया, तो उन्होंने नेहरू जी को contact किया। मैं नेहरू जी के प्रति नतमस्तक होता हूँ, क्योंकि उन्होंने इस देश में परम्पराएं स्थापित कीं। उन्होंने सी.वी. रमन के नाम निजी पत्र लिखा और उसमें उन्होंने लिखा कि अति व्यस्तता के कारण स्वयमेव नहीं आ पा रहा हूँ, मैं एस.एस. भटनागर को भेज रहा हूँ और जब भी मैं उधर आऊँगा, तो आपसे जरूर मिलूँगा। तब जाकर वह बात शांत हुई। मैं यह बात इसलिए कहना चाहता हूँ, क्योंकि अगर आप अनुसंधान को ब्यूरोक्रेटिक जंजीरों से मुक्त कर देंगे, तो आप एक ऐतिहासिक पग उठाएंगे। यह नितांत आवश्यक है, आप इस काम को जितना कर सकेंगे, मैं इसको उतना बढ़िया मानूँगा।

बात आई कि अध्यापक नहीं मिलते, पीएच.डीज नहीं हैं। मुझे एक बात की बहुत चिंता है,

[डा. राम प्रकाश]

वह यह है कि आज शिक्षा का स्तर गिर रहा है और Ph.D. का स्तर तो बहुत ज्यादा घट रहा है। आज Ph.D. सस्ती है, गाजरें मंहगी हैं। आज प्रशानिक अधिकारी अपने पद का लाभ उठा कर और कुछ राजनीतिक पार्टियों के लोग अपने महत्व का लाभ उठा कर Ph.D. की डिग्री ले कर उन लोगों का उपहास उड़ाते हैं, जिन्होंने मेहनत करके Ph.D. की डिग्री ली है। इसलिए, इसको इतना सस्ता मत बनाइए। अगर कम संस्थान खोलने पड़ते हैं, तो कम संस्थान ही खोले जाएं, लेकिन उपयुक्त human resources के बिना संस्थान खोलना, Ph.D. का इस तरह मजाक बनाना घातक होगा। मैं यह समझता हूँ कि आप इस तरफ पूरा-पूरा ध्यान देंगे, ताकि इस प्रकार का कोई काम ठीक ढंग से किया जा सके। यह जरूरी नहीं है कि हर आदमी के नाम के साथ Ph.D. लगा कर कोई उसकी गरिमा बढ़ जाएगी। बिना Ph.D. के भी आदमी बहुत काबिल हो सकता है। मेरे पिता जी सामान्य हिन्दी जानते थे, Ph.D. की डिग्री लेकर या यूनिवर्सिटी का प्रॉफेसर बन कर मैं उनसे कोई बड़ा नहीं हो गया, बल्कि मैं उनकी मेहनत की वजह से आज आपके सामने खड़ा हूँ, इसलिए जहाँ मैं इन दोनों बिलों का स्वागत करता हूँ जहाँ मैं इस बात का समर्थन करता हूँ, वहाँ शिक्षा में गुणवत्ता बनाए रखने के लिए जितना ज्यादा से ज्यादा काम किया जाए, उसका समर्थन करता हूँ। नाम बदलने से संस्थाएं बड़ी नहीं बन जाएंगी, अपनी पीठ खुद थपथपाने से कोई काम नहीं बन जाएगा। मुझे इस बात का दुख है कि हिन्दुस्तान की विश्वविद्यालयों की रैंकिंग विश्व की विश्वविद्यालयों की रैंकिंग में कहीं नहीं है। हमारे जो रिसर्च जनरल निकलते हैं, उनका कुछ impact factor नहीं है, संभवतः 0.5 सबसे ज्यादा बड़ा impact factor है। क्या उनके अंदर पत्र छाप कर हम कोई ज्यादा बड़ी रिसर्च कर लेंगे? हम trained man power तैयार कर रहे हैं।

महोदय, मैं यह बात कह कर समाप्त करना चाहूंगा कि जिस वक्त विदेश को अपनी industries के लिए मेहनतकश मजदूर चाहिए थे, तो वे उन्हें भारत ने दिए। जिस वक्त उन्हें अपनी laboratories चलाने के लिए trained man power चाहिए थी, छनछनाते चांदी के सिककों के बदले में हमने उन्हें वह दी। मैं एक रिसर्च पेपर पढ़ने के लिए कनाडा में गया। वहाँ एक व्यक्ति ने यह कहा, “If you have a research scholar from India, he is worth his weight in gold.” मेरा सर इस बात से ऊंचा नहीं हुआ, बल्कि इससे मेरा सर झुका कि वह व्यक्ति जिसको हिन्दुस्तान में काम करना चाहिए था, वह आज दूसरों की laboratory की शोभा बढ़ा रहा है। हमें इस बात पर गंभीरता से विचार करना चाहिए और शिक्षा में गुणवत्ता लाने के लिए ज्यादा से ज्यादा कदम उठाने चाहिए। मान्यवर, आपने मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया, मेरी पार्टी ने मुझे मौका दिया, मैं सिर झुका कर धन्यवाद करता हूँ।

SHRI KUMAR DEEPAK DAS (Assam): Sir, I would like to make some observations on the NIT (Amendment) Bills. Sir, the Statement of Objects and Reasons for the amendment Bill, in connection with NIT (Amendment) Bill, proposes to insert a new Section, 11A, for the constitution of the Board of Governors for Science Education and Research Institutions, besides a new section to establish a common Council for all the Institutes of Science Education. The amendment Bill also seeks to strengthen the networking of National Institutes of Technology (NITs) and the Indian Institutes of Science Education and Research by giving representation on their Board of Governors to the Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) in whose territory or zone the National Institute of Technology or the Indian Institute of

Science Education and Research falls. Sir, before giving comments, I just want to take this opportunity to request the hon. Minister to take initiatives to give effect to the observations and recommendations forwarded by the Standing Committee. The Standing Committee has given recommendations on some important issues which will help in efficient working of these institutions. Some officers of the Ministry for Human Resource Development shall be the *ex-officio* Members of the Board. It has been stated here. It is understood that these officers may also be nominated to other similar bodies. Due to their preoccupation with manifold assignments, it may not be possible for them to attend the meetings. As a result, both the Department and the State Government invariably remain deprived of useful inputs due to absence of their representatives on the Board. So, I therefore, feel that a viable alternative could be to authorise designated nominees of such members to attend the meetings of the Board, in the event of their being not present, due to unavoidable circumstances. Sir, the Government has proposed more regulations and more steps to improve the education system in India. This is a welcome step. Sir, the National Knowledge Commission and the Yashpal Committee have estimated that the country requires at least 1000 more universities and 10,000 more colleges. Now, the number will increase simultaneously. The quality of institutes also needs to be benchmarked and continuously improved, which would include attracting and training of high-calibre teachers. The new regulation will facilitate the spread of technical education in under-represented areas. It is a fact that nowadays only 5.7 per cent people of rural areas study beyond secondary level and only 17 per cent in urban areas do so. Sir, again polytechnics are also proposed to be taken away from the control of the State Government and put under the care of AICTE. These are some suggestions made by the hon. Minister. This might impart uniformity to education, but I want to know from the hon. Minister for Human Resource Development the details of the steps to be taken for AICTE which needs to be more efficient. Sir, recently, we have gone through some CAG Report. CAG Report has stated that more than half of NIT courses are not accredited. As a result, most seats remained unfulfilled in two undergraduate courses and 12 PG courses that were introduced in NIT, Durgapur, Silchar and NIT, Kurukshetra, Bhopal, Silchar and Surathkal respectively. This is just one example. There are many other inter-related matters which are yet to be dealt with. If that is done early these NITs would function more efficiently.

Sir, with these few suggestions, I request the hon. Minister to go through them and other valuable suggestions made by the other hon. Members on these Bills and take necessary action.

With these words, I conclude my speech and once again thank you for having given me time to speak on these Bills. Thank you.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sir, first of all, I would extend my gratitude to distinguished Members of the House who have given their very valuable comments

[Shri Kapil Sibal]

while dealing with the two amendment Bills that 1 proposed for consideration of this House.

Sir, at the outset, I wish to state that many of the suggestions that they have given are welcome and we really want to move in the direction through which we can enhance the quality of our higher educational institutions and, of course, try to bridge...

श्री साबिर अली (बिहार): सर, आज बिहार से हमारे जिले...(व्यवधान)...कम-से-कम 5 हजार लोग दिल्ली में धरना, प्रदर्शन कर रहे हैं। सर, मंत्री जी ने वायदा किया था कि मोतिहारी में ...(व्यवधान)...सर, यह हमारे बिहार के चार जिलों के लिए burning issue है। इन्होंने बिहार में झगड़ा शुरू करा दिया है। ये कहीं कुछ बोलते हैं, कहीं कुछ बोलते हैं। ये बिहार को बांटना चाहते हैं।...(व्यवधान)...सर, यह हमारे जिले के लिए burning issue है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): You know that the Minister is replying. ...(Interruptions)...

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद (बिहार): सर, मंत्री जी को मोतिहारी के बारे में...(व्यवधान)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): I will give you time ...(Interruptions)...Let him finish his reply. ...(Interruptions)...Let him finish his reply. ...(Interruptions)...Ravi Shankar Prasadji, let the Minister finish his reply. After that, I will allow you...(Interruptions)...I will give you time. ...(Interruptions)...That is correct.

श्री शिवानन्द तिवारी (बिहार): सर, एक तरफ गया और दूसरी मोतिहारी...(व्यवधान)...यहां धरना हो रहा है। मंत्री जी, स्थिति स्पष्ट करें।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Tiwariji, how can I allow you when the Minister is replying?... (Interruptions)...Ravi Shankar Prasadji, you know the rules. ... (Interruptions)...The Minister is not yielding. ... (Interruptions)...The Minister is not yielding and you are simply raising it. ... (Interruptions)...No, no. Please sit down... (Interruptions)...I will allow you later if you want... (Interruptions)... मैं आपको टाइम दूंगा। अभी आप बैठिए...(व्यवधान)...No तिवारी जी प्लीज। No, Tiwariji. No, no. Please. Nothing will go on record... (Interruptions)...It would not go on record ... (Interruptions)...तिवारी जी, अगर आप बोलना चाहेंगे तो मैं बाद में आपको टाइम दूंगा। आप बैठिए, नहीं-नहीं...(व्यवधान)...

SHRI SHIVANAND TIWARI: *

SHRI SABIR ALI: *

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD : *

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Minister is not yielding ... (Interruptions)... नहीं, प्लीज आप लोग बैठिए। He is not yielding... (Interruptions)... I will give you time. Take your seats.

SHRI N.K. SINGH: *

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: *

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P J. KURIEN): Please take your seat. आप बैठिए। Let him finish his reply. आप बैठिए। It would not go on record ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SABIR ALI: *

SHRI N.K. SINGH: *

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): It is not going on record ...*(Interruptions)*...it is not going on record...*(Interruptions)*...No, no. Take your seat.

SHRI SABIR ALI: *

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: *

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV (Bihar): *

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): आप बैठिए। Now, Minister, please continued. आप बैठिए। Mr. Ali, take your seat.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sir, as I was saying that I am deeply obliged to the distinguished Members of this House who have given their valuable suggestions. We want to really bridge the quality gap that exist in higher education and, I am sure, the suggestions made by distinguished Members will go a long way in taking this agenda forward.

Sir, first of all, let me deal with the issue raised by Chandan Mitraji, who is not here now.

श्री शिवानन्द तिवारी: एन.के. सिंह साहब हैं।

श्री कपिल सिब्बल: हां, उनकी भी बात करूंगा। उन्होंने कई महत्वपूर्ण बातें कही हैं।

He raised the issue that the integration...

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Mr. Minister, he is here.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: ...should become a permanent feature, because the Vice-Chancellor of the Banaras Hindu University should permanently be made the Chairman of the Board of Governors. There seems to be some misunderstanding, because a distinguished Member, Pradhanji, who made his maiden speech today, seems to think that the Director and the Vice-Chancellor are one and the same thing. In fact, the Vice-Chancellor of the Banaras Hindu University is not going to be the Director...

SHRI DHARMENDRA PRADHAN: Sir, please do not go by the words I used; go by the spirit of it.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Okay, okay. I just wanted to make sure that we understood the suggestions properly.

SHRI DHARMENDRA PRADHAN: I can't argue with you, Sir, you are such a great man.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: No, no. it is not an argument.

Sir, I just want to mention one or two things. We are also very concerned that the character of the institution should, in any way, not be disturbed. As my senior colleague, Dr. Karan Singhji, mentioned, this was something that was debated within the University itself for quite some time. 'Some of the problems that might arise in the future, as you know, Sir, is that the position of a Vice-Chancellor in a university is equal to the status of a Director of an Institute. That creates a very piquant situation because, if you have a Vice-Chancellor of a university who is superior, who is the Chairman of the Board, and there is a Director of an Institute working under him, that may create some of the problem's which, in fact, Ram Prakashji also mentioned. We should not compromise with the status of the Vice-Chancellor or the Director in this fashion. So, we thought that it would be better, for the first three years when the institution is growing, for the purposes of laying a strong foundation, to have the Vice-Chancellor as the Chairman of the Board and, then, allow the Vice-Chancellor to nominate somebody else in his place as the Vice-Chairman...*(Interruptions)* One minute. I am explaining. Just one minute. I am trying to explain, Sir, to the distinguished Members of this House. We may have a difference of opinion. But this is the honesty of our opinion and you are right in your opinion. However, there is an opinion here. Then, as you know, Sir, normally, when you select a Vice-Chancellor of a university, of course, he may be a technical person, a highly qualified technologist; As far as the appointment of a Director of an IIT is concerned, he is always a technologist. So, I don't want a situation where this kind of personality clash occurs in the future of a growing IIT. So, therefore, it is best for the propose arrangement to continue. If, in the course of three years, we find that any changes are required, we will certainly have a discussion with you and, if necessary, make those changes also. But, as a first step, let this continue for the next three years; let this arrangement continue. If you find it is not workable, or, if there is any problem within the BHU, we can always revisit it. But I think there are philosophical and operational reasons why this should be done in the manner that I have suggested and, at the same time, retain the integrity and the heritage of the IIT, BHU. This is precisely why the name has not been changed, and that is precisely why it is called IIT (BHU) Varanasi and that is why it is in the same campus. There is no problem about land because in many of the IITs, at present, we do not have 500 acres. In fact, we do not have the luxury of 500 acres for the future IITs that we may be going to build. We are not going to have that luxury. So, we will have to change the nature of the institution in terms of its physical structure. We probably will have to go high rise in building those structures, and there is enough space in the 300 acres that we have within the BHU to build a world-class institution. So, I don't think there should be any fears on this count and I would like to assure the Members of this House that, in the next three years, we will be looking at how

the integration is taking place, how the character of the university is being maintained, how the issue of cross-disciplinary research, which Chandanji mentioned, is going on and, if we feel that integration, is not proper because of the fact that the Vice-Chancellor is not likely to be a Chairman of the Board, we will certainly consider that suggestion and you can rest assured that we are serious in all these things because we ourselves want to maintain the high character and the heritage, as Dr. Karan Singhji pointed out, of the institution.

So, I request you, Sir, in the context of this, let this experiment move forward and let us see how it functions. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHANDAN MITRA: Just a minute, if you permit me.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: If you don't mind, let me just finish it first.

Now, Sir, the other issue, and this again is a very important issue which has been raised by several distinguished Members, is the problem of faculty. It is true, Sir, that there is a gap between the sanctioned posts and the posts which have been filled up. But a part of the reason for this gap is also because the expansion in the higher education sector is taking place at a very fast pace. Our Gross Enrolment Ratio was almost 12 per cent a few years earlier but, today, it has moved up to 17 per cent.

Because, a large number of young people are going into the school sector, I dare say that by 2020, it will move up to 30 per cent. If it moves up to 30 per cent instead of 17 per cent children going to college and university, you will have about 40-45 million children going to colleges and universities. Can we, in ten years, produce the faculty that is necessary to meet the demands of the increasing number of children who go to colleges and universities in the years to come? I honestly say, Sir, it will be a very difficult task. This is not something that we can build faculty in the next 2-4 years. So, we will have to think of innovative ways to deal with this situation. I believe, we have thought of those innovative ways to deal with this situation. I might suggest that for example, – I have got figures for the IITs, I do not want to really trouble you with lots of figures – the total number of sanctioned posts is 5,142. These are the figures as of 30.11.2011. The total number of positions filled is 3334. This is in the IITs themselves. The situation in Central Universities is also the same. The situation in States is even worse. There, the gap is 40 per cent. So, we have to work together in this. The State Education Ministers, the State Chief Ministers and the Government of India's Education Minister should sit together and see how to fill this gap.

A distinguished Member – I think, Mr. Balagopalan – mentioned that the NITs are in a poor state. Sir, yesterday, I was in Jalandhar. I visited the NIT in Jalandhar. Sir, it is a world-class institution. I request him to go and visit that institution. The National Knowledge Network is available in that institution. Children can take classes from faculty members in other high quality institutions, sitting in their own class. They can interact with the teachers. The best of faculty anywhere in the world, through the

[Shri Kapil Sibal]

4:00 P.M.

National Knowledge Network, would be connected to every child studying in any university course, anywhere in the country. Many institutions have already been connected. Almost 400 universities have been connected. My distinguished colleague tells me that almost 18,000 colleges have been connected. What does that tell you? We can solve this problem through technology while we encourage people to do post-graduation and post-doctoral courses in India so that by 2020 we build up the faculty. We have to think of these interim arrangements. In the next six months or so, 35,000 colleges would be connected. In the next six months or so, 604 universities would be connected through the National Knowledge Network with 100 Mbps capacity. It means, the faculty anywhere in the country would be available to students anywhere in the country. But, Sir, there is a caveat to that. The caveat is that we need to change our administrative structures. In some colleges and some universities, you have a three-year degree course. In some other universities, you have a semester system. How does a child who is moving through the semester system take access to the faculty member who is teaching somewhere in a three-year degree course? So, we need a national consensus. Sir, I am ready to be blamed for anything. But, I am trying very hard to build that national consensus. I am trying very hard to build that quality. I have four pending Bills in Parliament. One of the distinguished Members talked about accreditation as to why courses have not been accredited. That is precisely what are of the Bill says. We have to set up a National Accreditation Regulatory Authority under which all courses and all institutions would be accredited for quality. But, that is exactly, Sir, how this Government is moving forward. What we need is a national consensus; what we need is support from the Opposition; what we need is a desire to look towards the future of the children of our country. I am ready to take blame for any shortfall. I am a humble man, Sir, trying to serve in my little capacity, in the interest of the future of education in this country and I am ready to be pilloried for any wrong that I do. But, the one wrong I do not do is that whenever I make a policy, I do not think of politics; I only think of the future of the children of this country.

That is the only thing I think of. The face of that young student is always before my eyes when I make legislation, and when I introduce legislation. So, I request you that all the issues that you have raised about quality are being addressed; all the issues that you have raised on transparency are being addressed. N.K. Singhji, a very distinguished and a very, very thoughtful Member of this House rightly said that we need to revamp the whole IIT Act, and he is absolutely right. When this Bill was introduced, the Kakodkar Committee Report was not with us. In fact, the Kakodkar Committee gave its report in 2011, whereas the Bill was introduced in 2010. We have now constituted an Empowered Committee to implement the recommendations of the Kakodkar Committee so that we have a comprehensive Bill looking at the 21st century, and the challenges that we have to meet in the 21st century in the field of higher

technology, that the distinguished Member talked about. And it is with that in mind that we need to change the governance structures. I have already, while that is pending, liberalised the entire IIT system. Sir, the Government should no longer involved in appointing any Chairman of the Board of Governors. I am asking that the Board of Governors themselves should request names for appointment of the Chairman. I don't interfere in that process, and I am doing this through executive action. In the IIMS, Sir, I do not interfere in the appointment of Directors at all. The Search Committee decides who the Director is going to be. They give me three names, and sometimes they give me one or two names. I accept it. I have never made an exception. I have personally never made an exception. So, while those legislations are being drafted, while the future of the country is being looked at in the perspective of the challenges of the 21st century, we, through executive action, are liberalising and bringing autonomy into the education sector. You can ask any Director of any IIT, any director of any IIM, any Member of any Council of any of these institutions and you will have the answer for yourself. The Government of India does not any longer interfere in these processes. That is why in the National Commission for Higher Education and Research, I have suggested that even appointment of Vice-Chancellors should be made through a transparent process. So, the Government of India should not be appointing Vice-Chancellors. It should be appointed by academic authorities, a collegium of academic people, who should have a list of eminent academics, from where the Vice-Chancellors should be picked. We are moving in that direction, but, Sir, we need support from the distinguished Members of this House.

SHRI H.K. DUA (Nominated): Some of the State Chief Ministers do interfere...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sir, I do not want to comment. Sir, I am ready to take any criticism on myself, but I am not ready to criticize anybody else because I don't think I will ever get my reforms Bills passed, if I start criticizing others. Everybody is very helpful. The State Chief Ministers are exceptionally helpful, and, if anybody has any objection to anything, I will go out and talk to the State Chief Ministers.

Sir, distinguished member, Tiwariji talked about Bihar. I have rung up Nitish Kumarji; I have requested him for an appointment; I am willing to sit with him and decide as to what we should do about the Bihar Central University as well. We have no problems. I think in terms of what the future of the children of Bihar as to what they need, what they require, and, I certainly have no problem in talking with Nitish Kumarji. I have already talked to him; I have already rung him up, and said, "Let us sit together, and let us see how this can be done". N.K. Singhji also talked about the NITs. Actually, there is Section 11(a), which is already introduced in the Act, which specifies the amendment that I talked about at the beginning when I sought to introduce the Bill for consideration of this House. Yes, you are right about allocation of resources. But, if you look at the history of this country, Sir, if you look at the period of the UPA Government, UPA-I and UPA-II, compare the allocations made in higher education at any time in the history of this country and you will find that the

[Shri Kapil Sibal]

commitments that this Government, the UPA-I and UPA-II has made on higher education have never been made in the past in the history of this country. Yet, it is not enough. I say that we need more investments. But, Sir, investments will only come through economic reforms. I, again, seek your help there. Let the Finance Minister's proposals for economic reforms take place, we will then get growth, we will then get extra money, we will then get extra investment, and we will invest more in the social sector, especially in the education sector. I request the Communists, the Left Parties to support the economic reforms. That is how you will get more money. (*Interruptions*)

Sir, a distinguished Member also mentioned about representations of SCs and STs in IITs and other institutions. Let me just tell you that in all, and these are the figures of 2011, for SCs the total number of seats available for them in all the IITs put together is 1,191 and 1078 have been filled which is a matter of great pride. We have not merely talked about it, Sir. Somebody said that we give only slogans. No, Sir, not only we give slogans, but we implement slogans also. These are the figures of 2011. Sir, you talked about Scheduled Tribes. The total number of seats available for them is 544 and the total number of seats filled is 537. It is a matter of great pride that we are implementing the agenda of UPA-I and UPA-II on the ground. The total number of seats for OBCs is 1982 and the total number of seats filled is 1,760. We are short by about 200 seats. This does not take into account OBCs who have come in the general category. But I assure this House that when I come back with figures to you in a few years from now., we would have also actually fulfilled the dreams of the OBCs. We are absolutely committed that unless the less privileged, the disadvantaged and the Muslim community are supported by us and we empower them through education, the kind of inclusive society that India needs, India wants and India dreams will never happen. Sir, Janardhan Sahib very rightly mentioned the role of the technology. I think we should not look at the future by remembering the past or by delving into the past. The past should give us inspiration because of the nature of the great leaders of the past, who were inspirational leaders, who had dreams for India. But the dreams of India and the way in which we are to realize those dreams changes and I have changed because the nature of the society has changed, the nature of interaction of the society has changed. Therefore, we need to look at the changed India through the eyes of the young. That is how we should move forward. The role of technology is there, which is extremely important. Ram Prakashji rightly said that it is a sad day because the quality of doctorate in this country is relatively poor. I can assure him, Sir, that now we are insisting that not only we are giving better fellowship and remuneration to those who are doing research, but we also have several schemes for enhancing the quality of our teachers. Hopefully in Twelfth Plan, we will be able to improve the quality of at least 10,000 faculty members. We have several plans which are partly given effect to and partly they are going to be implemented. Sir, another issue which Shri N.K. Singh ji raised was how IISERs are admitting students. I made some enquiries

and I can tell him that the process of admission is as follows. 40 per cent of positions are offered on the basis of the IIT-JEE test, 20 per cent of the seats are offered on the basis of the KVP Yojna and 40 per cent of the balance are on the basis of the top one per cent performers of all the State Boards. A written test is done by the Indian Institutes of Science Education and Research. This is the idea because this is a five year course. We get students from all streams of the country and it has been a wonderful experience for us because now we have realized that if you take the top one percentile from the 12th Board, the quality of the students is as good as the one emerging from the JEE, etc. then we can move on to a single test. There also we need the support of the distinguished Members of this House. One distinguished Member said why should children have to sit for multiple tests and that is absolutely right. We are moving towards the single test because we want the burden on students to be lessened from the 17-20 tests and from these coaching factories that are now operating in some parts of the country. Sir, Najmaji will appreciate this. You know the best students in the country, if you go to any university, are girls. You go to any course, it is the girl who is always the topper. Then, how is it, Sir, that we don't have any girls in IITs? The reason is simple, because, parents can't send their 12th Pass girls to Kota for getting coaching. They fear, how they will send a single girl there. So, girls don't get coaching. They are the best in schools. They are on top of the class in 12th Board. But they can't get into the IITs. We must change that, Sir. We must get women into our educational institutions. The brightest minds will take forward the future of India. It is already in the hands of women. I hope it continues to be in the hands of women.

With these words, Sir, I am grateful to the distinguished Members of this House. I request the distinguished Members to pass the Bill.

DR. CHANDAN MITRA: Sir, I would like to seek a small clarification from the hon. Minister. The first point is,...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): No, no. Please.

DR. CHANDAN MITRA: Sir, I will be brief, to the point.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Please put questions only.

DR. CHANDAN MITRA: Yes. Sir, the point I want to make is that the hon. Minister's reply has not been able to allay the fears, although he was at his persuasive best today; we saw him in a different avatar than we normally see him'. But while appreciating that, I would tell him that he has not been able to allay the fears. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: And, we want that avatar to continue in future as well.

DR. CHANDAN MITRA: Yes, we hope, it will. I see a marked transformation.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Before the powerful and distinguished Members of this House, I am a humbled man, Sir.

DR. CHANDAN MITRA: Sir, the point that I and several other distinguished Members, my Party or Alliance Members, even others, were emphasizing right through was about the special character of BHU. How will you ensure that character is not compromised or diluted? The Minister has not allayed the fears. My question to him is this. If you are saying that you are prepared to revise this arrangement of having the Chairman of the Board of Governors being the VC of BHU for three years, and, then, if necessary, you are willing to continue or make some arrangement, then, why don't you do it now? Since it is a very, very minor issue as far as we see it, it only leads to a suspicion that you may have some other plans under your sleeve. Therefore, the larger point I made was, if you say the medical school will be taken out of the BHU's ambit, the agricultural institutions will be taken out of its ambit, are you not laying the foundation stone for a vivisection of BHU which has such a great tradition also? It is worth pointing out that 2010 – that's the last one I have – survey of top universities, Banaras Hindu University is number one among all Universities in India. JNU is number two and the Delhi University to which the hon. Minister, the Leader of the Opposition, I and other colleagues belong is actually number three. So, what you are doing with BHU, which is number one University in India, according to Nielsen India Today Magazine, is that you don't trust that University and you don't trust the Vice-Chancellor of the University to run the Institution.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Okay. That's all. You have made your point.

DR. CHANDAN MITRA: Sir, there is one more point. I am very sorry to say that my amendment has not been accepted on technical ground. You say that a notice has to be given one day earlier. Last three days were holidays. How do you expect me to fly and open the locks of this place and place an amendment? I gave it this morning at 10 o'clock.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): You could have given it earlier.

DR. CHANDAN MITRA: Sir, this is not fair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): The Bill was circulated early.

DR. CHANDAN MITRA: Therefore, Sir, I am pressing that...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. NAJMA A. HEPTULLA (Madhya Pradesh): The Chairman can allow it. ...*(Interruptions)*..

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): You know the Rules.

DR. NAJMA A. HEPTULLA: I know the Rules. That is why I am saying that the Chairman can relax any rule and allow it. ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. CHANDAN MITRA: Sir, I want to press this amendment. You can relax the rule because there were public holidays. There were public holidays. How could it have been given? ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Please. *(Interruptions)*... Please.

DR. CHANDAN MITRA: Sir, the Minister must allay the fears that you are diluting the character of BHU. He has not been able to allay the fears. He has not been able to allay the fears, Sir.

SHRI N.K. SINGH: Sir, Dr. Karan Singh made a very passionate intervention and said that he believed that the character of the BHU is not going to be destroyed by the proposed changes. Would the Minister like to say on how he really believes that the BHU, which has a legacy, a history and a glorious past, is not going to be dismembered by this Bill and by subsequent action?

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Sir, the Minister would recall that the BHU had a great legacy of association with India's Freedom struggle. That is what for Dr. Madan Mohan Malviya had laid the foundation stone for. This privilege is rarely available to other Universities. Therefore, its distinguished character needs to be maintained. How does the Minister propose to do that?

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sir, I have already said it. There are several factors which I have already placed before the distinguished Members. Number one, the name is IIT (BHU), Varanasi; number two, permanently, there would be a Vice-Chairman of the Board, and he will be a nominee of the Vice-Chancellor; number three, three nominees in the IIT/BHU senate will be from BHU; number four, nominees of the Executive Council of BHU will be in the Board of Governors of IIT-BHU; and it is the same campus; the disciplinary and cross-disciplinary research would continue. In fact, we are not changing anything about the BHU. It is the IT-BHU which is under a new name; it is IIT (BHU). That is all! So, the character remains the same, and I assure that if there is any inkling, any evidence in the next three years that the character is changing, we both are here; we will make sure that we take steps.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): I shall first put the motion moved by Shri Kapil Sibal for consideration of The Institutes of Technology (Amendment Bill), 2011, to vote. The question is:

That the Bill further to amend The Institutes of Technology Act, 1961, as passed by Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration.

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): We shall now take up Clause-by-Clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2 to 10 were added to the Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): We shall now take up Clause 1. There is one Amendment (No. 2) by Shri Kapil Sibal.

CLAUSE 1 – Short title and commencement

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sir, I move :

(No. 2) That at page 1, line 3, for the figure “2011” the figure “2012” be substituted.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

Clause I, as amended, was added to the Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): We shall now take up the Enacting Formula. There is one Amendment (No. 1) by Shri Kapil Sibal.

Enacting Formula

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sir, I move :

(No. 1) That at page 1, line 1, for the word “**Sixty-second**”, the word “**Sixty-third**” be substituted.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

The Enacting Formula, as amended, was added to the Bill.

The Title was added to the Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Now, Shri Kapil Sibal. *(Interruptions)*

DR. NAJMA A. HEPTULLA: Sir, this is regarding the amendment that was supposed to have been moved by Dr. Chandan Mitra. On technical grounds, the Chair has neither accepted it nor is it agreeing to our request for waiving of the rules and allowing that amendment to be taken up. So, that leaves us with nothing else to do.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): I have already given the ruling. The Bill was already in circulation. It is not as if the Bill was given two days back. It was already in circulation. The amendment could have been given earlier. So, there is no cause for changing the rule. Thank you for the advice. *(Interruptions)*

DR. CHANDAN MITRA: You could have made it ...*(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): No, no. Let us not ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: If it were an amendment brought in by the Government side, it would have got moved on the same day! I have been a Minister and I know that Government's amendments are accepted on the same day.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): I have already given the ruling.

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Sir, I appeal to the Minister to accept it. *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): I have already given the ruling. *(Interruptions)* Dr. Mitra, I have already given the ruling. I am sorry. Now, Mr. Kapil Sibal.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sir, I move:

That the Bill, as amended, be passed.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): The question is:

That the Bill to amend the National Institutes of Technology Act, 2007, as passed by Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration.

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): We shall now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2 to 19 were added to the Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Now, we shall take up Clause 1. In clause 1, there is one amendment (No.2) by the hon. Minister:-

Clause 1 – Short title and commencement

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sir, I move:

(2) That at page 1, line 4, for the figure “2011” the figure “2012” be substituted.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

Clause 1, as amended, was added to the Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Now, we shall take up the Enacting Formula. There is one amendment (No. 1) by the hon. Minister.

Enacting Formula

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sir, I move:

(1) That at page 1, line 1, for the word “Sixty-second”, the word “Sixty-third” be substituted.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

The Enacting Formula, as amended, was added to the Bill.

The Title was added to the Bill.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sir, I move:

That the Bill, as amended, be passed.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Now, we take up the Marriage Laws (Amendment) Bill, 2010.

The Marriage Laws (Amendment) Bill, 2010

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI SALMAN KHURSHEED): Sir, I beg to move:

That the Bill further to amend the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 and the Special Marriage Act, 1954, be taken into consideration.

Sir, the Marriage Laws (Amendment) Bill, 2010 was introduced in this august House on the 4th of August, 2010. The purpose of the Bill is to amend the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 and the Special Marriage Act, 1954 to include amongst the grounds of divorce the additional ground now of irretrievable breakdown of marriage. This is