

SHRI TAPAN KUMAR SEN: Sir, as far as the indigenous capacity is concerned, whatever you have built since Independence, you have closed down. You have closed down seven fertilizer plants. This Government, in its earlier term, decided by way of in-principle approval...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sen, you are making a statement. You are not putting your question.

SHRI TAPAN KUMAR SEN: *

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please don't make a statement. What you are saying is not going on record.

SHRI TAPAN KUMAR SEN: Why are you not reviving the indigenous fertilizer plants, which are in position?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is the question. Is it? Fine. Thank you. Only this will go on record. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SRIKANT JENA: Sir, we are not linking our fertilizer availability to the international cartel. Rather, we have expanded the ...*(Interruptions)*....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please.

SHRI SRIKANT JENA: For many years, we have been importing fertilizers. So, naturally, it depends upon the international price. What I said is that there is an international cartel, and, we are strategizing how to break this cartel by supplementing and adding other complex fertilizers. Therefore, we have enlarged the basket of the fertilizers to different categories; complex fertilizers and other fertilizers will be available, and, in the process, the dependence will be less on DAP.

At the same time, during 2008, the new investment policy of the Government has encouraged the internal production also. By 2011, we expect 15-lakh tonnes of additional urea production capacity. So far as reviving the old units and the sick units, which are closed down, are concerned, the Cabinet has taken a view, and, very soon, on this matter, the Cabinet is also going to take a final decision. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Q.No.223 ...*(Interruptions)*... No, no please. Q.No. 223

Q.223. The Question (Shri Vijay Jawaharlal Darda) was absent.

Indian education service

*223. SHRI VIJAY JAWAHARLAL DARDA: Will the Minister of HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Indian Education Service is being introduced for better management of schools and higher educational institutions;

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.

(b) if so, the action taken by Government on the recommendations made during 1980s by a Committee set up by the then Minister of HRD to ensure that education administrators should have in-depth insight into education; and

(c) whether Government would ensure that education imparted at block and district level is suitably structured so that children really understand rather than learn by rote, as primary education is a basic input for purposefully pursuing further studies?

THE MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (SHRI KAPIL SIBAL): (a) to (c) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

(a) to (c) There is no decision of the Government for creation of Indian Education Service. Although National Education Policy, 1986 (modified in 1992) provides for the establishment of an Indian Education Service as an All India Service, however, as there was no consensus among the State Governments, the Indian Education Service could not be established. A Sub-Group consisting of four members has recently been constituted to explore the possibility and desirability of constitution of Indian Education Service and submit a report thereon within three months.

The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 provides that the academic authority (to be specified by the appropriate Government), while laying down the curriculum and the evaluation procedure for elementary education, shall take into consideration certain points including (i) building of child's knowledge potentiality and talent, and (ii) comprehensive and continuous evaluation of child's understanding of knowledge and his or her ability to apply the same.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is not present, so, we will take up the supplementary questions. Hon. Minister, you can answer it, and, then, the Members can put supplementary questions.

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to know from the hon. Minister as to what are the terms of reference of this Indian Education Service. Sir, I would also like to know the points on which there was no consensus between the State Governments and the Central Government.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sir, I have already indicated in my answer that there is no decision of the Government on setting up an Indian Education Service. We are at the stage of figuring out whether it is advisable and desirable to set up an Indian Education Service, and, that is the answer to the question.

On your issue as to which States, in the past, did not agree, well, Sir, it has a long history. Way back in 1961, the then Cabinet proposed that we should have an Indian Education Service. In

fact, between 1886 and 1924, there was an Indian Education Service till education became a 'transferred' subject. When it became a 'transferred' subject, then, of course, it was disbanded. But the idea was revived in 1961. In fact, in November 1965, there was a Cabinet decision and a Bill was introduced. But it lapsed. Then, came the Sarkaria Commission and the idea was revived again. The Sarkaria Commission recommended it. Then came the 1986 Education Policy, which has a special paragraph which says that we should have an Indian Education Service. Then the Ramamurthy Committee was set up which said, "we should not have it." Then Janardhana Reddy heading the Sub-Committee of CABE said that we should have it. Then came the 1992 Revised Education Policy. Thereafter, there were consultations with the States. Sixteen States said 'yes'; other States said 'no.' Now you see with the 73rd and the 74th Constitution Amendments with Panchayati Raj taking over education, the whole issue has to be looked at in an entirely different light. I don't know whether it is feasible or desirable, but we are looking into it.

DR. (SHRIMATI) KAPILA VATSYAYAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Sir. And thank you for the reply, Mr. Minister. Perhaps he is aware that there was a Central Educational Advisory Service; and that service was a central service. But it drew upon specialists from different fields. If the consensus is not achieved after the 1986 Policy, is it not a fact that the Government has denied itself the opportunity to have a structured instrument for advising the Government as also administering education?

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Well, the issue as to whether we should revive the Central Advisory Service is another aspect altogether. Since we have formed a sub-Group, which is going to look at the entire issue, as and when the sub-Group gives us its recommendations in this regard, we will certainly look into it and see what can be done. But I personally believe – and the Government has not taken a decision – that with the amendment in the Constitution and education being now handled by Panchayati Raj institutions, it is more important for civil society at the ground level, the family structures, the NGOs, and the parents of children to get involved in education, if education is to move forward. But, certainly, in advisory capacity, we can have lots of people on board and think about it.

SHRI P. RAJEEVE: Sir, I would like to know whether the Government has any plan to shortlist the names of persons, who are eligible for the higher posts of universities, such as Vice-Chancellor, and to make it mandatory. And, if so, whether it curtails the autonomy of the university.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sir, I am afraid it has nothing to do with the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not the question at the moment.

SHRI P. RAJEEVE: Sir, it relates to part (a) of the question which says 'whether it is a fact that Indian Education Service is being introduced for better management of schools and higher educational institutions.' University is part of higher educational institutions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you like to clarify it ?

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Indian Education Service is not in the context of higher education. Now, in the higher education sector, 90 per cent of all engineering colleges are private, and almost 50 per cent of all the medical colleges are private. So, to set up an Education Service to monitor private institutions, I don't think this was the concept conceived in 1961 when the education sector had not expanded in the fashion that it has done today.

* 224 The Questioner (Shri Motilal Bora) was absent.

दवा कंपनियों द्वारा निर्धारित मूल्य से अधिक राशि वसूल किया जाना

*224. श्री मोती लाल बोरा : क्या रसायन और उर्वरक मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि:

(क) दवा कंपनियों द्वारा उपभोक्ताओं से निर्धारित मूल्य से अधिक राशि वसूलने के मामले किस अवधि में होते रहे हैं और कौन-कौन सी कंपनी इस मामले में लिफ्ट पाई गई तथा किस-किस कंपनी द्वारा कितनी-कितनी राशि की अधिक वसूली की गई है;

(ख) राष्ट्रीय औषध मूल्य निर्धारण प्राधिकरण (एनपीपीए) द्वारा उक्त प्रभाराधिक्य की वसूली के लिए क्या कार्यवाही की गई है;

(ग) विगत तीन वर्षों के दौरान प्रतिवर्ष किस-किस दवा कंपनी से उक्त प्रभाराधिक्य की कितनी-कितनी राशि वसूल की गई है;

(घ) दवा कंपनियों से शेष राशि की वसूली और उन्हें शेष राशि का उपयोग न करने देने के लिए सरकार द्वारा क्या कार्रवाई की जा रही है?

रसायन और उर्वरक मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री श्रीकांत जेना): (क) से (घ) एक विवरण सभापटल पर रख दिया गया है।

विवरण

(क) से (घ) सरकार/राष्ट्रीय औषध मूल्य निर्धारण प्राधिकरण (एनपीपीए) द्वारा औषध (मूल्य नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1995 (डीपीसीओ, 1995) के प्रावधानों के अनुसार अनुसूचित औषधों/फार्मूलेशनों के मूल्य निर्धारित/संशोधित किए जाते हैं। कोई भी किसी भी अनुसूचित औषध/फार्मूलेशनों को सरकार राष्ट्रीय औषध मूल्य निर्धारण प्राधिकरण (एनपीपीए) द्वारा निर्धारित मूल्य से अधिक मूल्य पर नहीं बेच सकता है। बहुत सी औषध कंपनियों के बारे में यह पाया गया है कि वे उपभोक्ताओं को दवाइयां उच्च मूल्य पर बेच रही हैं। ऐसे मामलों में एनपीपीए औषध (मूल्य नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1995 (डीपीसीओ 1995) के पैरा 13 में निहित प्रावधानों और आवश्यक वस्तु अधिनियम, 1955 के अनुसार इन कंपनियों के खिलाफ निर्धारित मूल्यों से अधिक मूल्य लेने के कारण कार्यवाही करता है।

27 अगस्त, 1997 को अपनी स्थापना से लेकर 28 फरवरी 2010 तक निर्धारित मूल्यों से अधिक मूल्य लेने के मामलों का पता लगाए जाने के आधार पर एनपीपीए ने औषध (मूल्य नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1995 (डीपीसीओ 1995) के अधीन निर्धारित मूल्यों से अधिक मूल्य पर दवाइयां बेचने के संबंध में 740 मामलों में मांग नोटिस जारी किए हैं जिनमें 2147.01 करोड़ रुपये की अधिप्रभार की रकम (ब्याज सहित अधिप्रभार की रकम) शामिल है। इस रकम में से 28