

**COMMITTEE
ON
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES**

(1990-91)

(NINTH LOK SABHA)

SEVENTH REPORT

(Presented on
4 JAN 1991



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

November, 1990 / Kartika, 1912 (Saka)

Price: Rs. 2.00

LOK SABHA

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES

Corrigenda to Seventh Report, Committee on
Government Assurances (1990-91).

(Ninth Lok Sabha)

<u>Page</u>	<u>Para</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Correction</u>
(v)	3	8	<u>for</u> 15 October, 1990 <u>read</u> 13 November, 1990
7	Item 3	7	<u>for</u> 'once' <u>read</u> 'on a'
0	2.1	4	Keep (a) to (e) in " "
0	2.2	4	Keep (a) to (e) in " "
30		39-40	<u>for</u> 'policy matters' <u>read</u> 'policy makers'
31		7	<u>for</u> 'for girls' <u>read</u> 'to girls'
32	3	1	<u>for</u> 'in the Draft of' <u>read</u> 'the draft of'

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
REPORT	1

MINUTES

Minutes of Sitting held on 5 March, 1990	27
Minutes of Sitting held on 13 November, 1990	32

**COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT
ASSURANCES***
(1990-91)

Dr. Vijay Kumar Malhotra—*Chairman*

2. Smt. Subhasini Ali
3. Shri Het Ram
4. Shri Kamal Nath
5. Shri Mahabir Prasad
6. Dr. Mahadeepak Singh Sakya
7. Shri Haribhau Shankar Mahale
- **8. Shri V. Krishna Rao
9. Shri Kusuma Krishnamurthy
- ***10. Dr. P. Vallal Peruman
11. Shri Amar Roypradhan
- ***12. Shri Sanford Marak
13. Shri C. Srinivasan
- §14. Shri Ramji Lal Suman
- **15. Shri Surya Narain Yadav

SECRETARIAT

Shri R.C. Bhardwaj —*Joint Secretary*
Shri G.C. Hallan —*Director*
Shri A.N. Chopra —*Under Secretary*

* The Committee was nominated by the Speaker w.e.f. January 19, 1990 vide Para No. 125 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated 19 January, 1990.

** Nominated by Speaker w.e.f. 17 July, 1990 vice Shri Bhajaman Behera ceased to be a member of the Committee consequent upon his appointment as Minister of State w.e.f. 21 April, 1990, vide Para No. 611 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated 17 July, 1990.

*** Nominated by Speaker w.e.f. 8 August, 1990 vice Sarvashri J.P. Agarwal, Dr. Debi Prosad Paul and P.K. Thungan resigned from the membership of the Committee on Government Assurances, w.e.f. 7 August, 1990, vide Para No. 680 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated 8 August, 1990.

§ Ceased to be a member of the Committee w.e.f. 21 November, 1990 consequent upon his appointment as Minister of State.

INTRODUCTION

1. The Chairman of the Committee on Government Assurances, as authorised by the Committee, do present on their behalf this Seventh Report of the Committee on Government Assurances.

2. The Committee (1990-91) were constituted on 19 January, 1990.

3. The Committee (1990-91) at their sitting held on 5 March, 1990 took the evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education) regarding non-implementation of the assurances given in reply to USQ. No. 6223 on 7 April, 1988 about Seminar on Vedic Mathematics, USQ. No. 2886 on 1 December, 1988 about teaching of Sanskrit under CBSE and USQ. No. 1901 on 9 March, 1989 about States imparting free education to girls. At their sitting held on 15 October, 1990, the Committee considered and adopted the draft Seventh Report.

4. The Minutes of the aforesaid sittings of the Committee form part of the Report.

5. The conclusions/observations of the Committee are contained in the succeeding Chapter of the Report.

6. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the officials of the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education) who appeared before the Committee.

NEW DELHI;

13 November, 1990

22 Kartika, 1912 (Saka)

DR. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA

*Chairman,
Committee on Government Assurances.*

R E P O R T

(i)

Assurance regarding Seminar on Vedic Mathematics

1.1 On 7 April, 1988, Dr. A.K. Patel, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 6223 to the Minister of Human Resource Development:—

- “(a) whether a seminar on Vedic Mathematics was recently held at Jaipur;
- (b) the names of Indian and foreign scholars who participated in it;
- (c) the organisations and institutions associated with the seminar and whether the National Council on Educational Research and Training had any role in it and if so, in what way;
- (d) the highlights and the outcome of the seminar; and
- (e) how it proposes to extend the benefit to school boys and college students all over the country?”

1.2 In reply to the above question, the then Minister of State in the Departments of Education and Culture in the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Shri L.P. Sahi) stated as follows:—

- “(a) A Workshop on Vedic Mathematics was held at Jaipur from 25th March to 28th March, 1988.
- (b) The names of the participants are given in the Annexure—I.
- (c) The following organisations/institutions were associated with the Workshop:
 - i) Rashtriya Veda Vidya Pratishthan.
 - ii) Indian Council of Philosophical Research.
 - iii) Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan.
 - iv) Rajasthan University.
 - v) Pondicherry University.
 - vi) National Council of Educational Research & Training.
 - vii) Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan.
 - viii) Navodaya Vidyalaya Samiti.
 - ix) Department of Electronics, Government of India.

Eminent Professors of Mathematics from various universities and other scholars connected with Vedic Mathematics also participated in the Workshop. NCERT deputed a member of its staff.

- (d) The Workshop discussed various aspects of Mathematics which created awareness on various issues involved in understanding the

significance of Vedic Mathematics and in introducing Vedic Mathematics in the curriculum of mathematics. The workshop recommended:—

1. A Multidisciplinary committee consisting of experts from the fields of Mathematics-Vedic, traditional and modern, experts in Computer Science, representatives of the Government and other experts may be formed. The Committee shall produce the basis of the second Workshop which is felt to be necessary before any action is taken to implement Vedic Mathematics (VM) at different levels.

The Committee shall examine the following issues, either as a whole or through sub-committees to arrive at final recommendations.

- i) Suitability of VM for introduction at school level and all its ramifications e.g. inclusion in text books, training of teachers, logically consistent explanations of VM techniques, teaching aids, etc.
 - ii) To study ways and means of encouragement, by which research in VM can be carried out to understand its potential and limitations at University level.
 - iii) To suggest multimedia strategy to increase overall awareness of VM and to explore the role of voluntary organisations for this.
 - iv) To examine the possibility of providing centralised/regional facilities for training and information, dissemination and promoting research in the field of VM.
 - v) To write to the department of Electronics (Government of India) to support development of VM educational software in Indian languages, and to provide financial support to the projects on VM/application in development of computer technology, such as knowledge based algorithms, VM based computer architecture, etc.
 - vi) any other relevant issues raised during the deliberations.
2. The Minister of Human Resource Development should provide all necessary support to enable effective functioning of the Committee.
 3. The Ministry should prepare a time bound programme for preparation of the report of the above Committee and organisation of the goal-oriented workshops.
- (e) Government will take action on the final recommendations on the subject as may be received from the Expert Committee.”

1.3 The reply to Part (c) of the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by 6 July, 1988.

1.4 As the assurance remained unfulfilled, the Committee decided on 9 February, 1990 to take the oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education).

1.5 Before the evidence, the Ministry of Human Resource Development, in a brief note submitted to the Committee on 26 February, 1990, stated as follows regarding the steps already taken for the implementation of the assurances:

“The Expert Committee on Vedic Mathematics met on 2nd January, 1990 and considered the recommendations of the Round Table Discussion held in February, 1989. In regard to the recommendation of including Vedic Mathematics as enrichment material by the NCERT, it was suggested that the matter may be taken up with the Director NCERT. Accordingly the matter was taken up with the Director by the Member-Secretary, Rashtriya Veda Vidya Pratishthan who in turn has entrusted the work to the Department of Mathematics in the NCERT.

In the meantime Dr. Narender Puri of the University of Roorkee has prepared Manuscripts of books on Vedic Mathematics for class LKG to Class III. The suitability of these books to be used as enrichment material or text will be examined by the Expert Committee.

The Rashtriya Veda Vidya Pratishthan is organising a four day Seminar on Vedic Mathematics in collaboration with IIS, Bangalore in the month of April, 1990.

The Expert Committee has also recommended that a monograph may be got prepared on any one selected *Sutras* as a pilot project. In the meantime the Pratishthan has sanctioned fellowship to Mrs. Ranjani Chari of the Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan to work on Vedic Mathematics and its possibilities of being introduced in the school curriculum.

Dr. Narender Puri will also be working on a book on Vedic Mathematics for Engineers and Shri D. Kulkarni, an expert from Pune, is compiling a book on Vedic Mathematics for bankers. The Roorkee University has submitted two project proposals to the UGC and DST. Shri Om Vikas, Director, Deptt. of Electronics has been entrusted with the work of preparing a status paper on the use of Vedic Mathematics on computers.”

1.6 The Committee took the evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education) at their sitting held on 5 March, 1990.

1.7 By way of a general statement on the delay in implementing the assurance regarding Seminar on Vedic Mathematics, the representative of the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education) stated during evidence:—

“So far as the assurance regarding Vedic Mathematics is concerned, we have again submitted a statement in detail. At an earlier stage, we had submitted to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs and also the Assurance Committee that by the very nature of the assurance, we had rather serious difficulties in implementing it

within the time because the question was of the action which the Government had to take to implement the recommendations of an Expert Committee that had been constituted in pursuance of a seminar that had been held in March, 1988. A Committee was to be constituted, it was to give a series of recommendations and they had to be considered by the Government and appropriate decisions taken. On that basis, we had requested that the matter may not be treated as an assurance, because it was difficult to implement it within any stipulated time. The recommendation was rather general in nature.”

1.8 During evidence, the Committee sought to know whether the Expert Committee on Vedic Mathematics was a Government Committee. The representative of the Ministry of Human Resource Development clarified as under:

“It has been constituted by Rashtriya Vedic Vidya Pratishthan. It is a society registered under the Societies Registration Act. The Member-Secretary of this organisation is Shri Kreet Joshi. It is fully funded by the Government. The Pratishthan has been created on the basis of an Act. The Government of India will contribute a corpus fund of Rs. 10 crores over a period of time and interest earnings out of this corpus can be utilised by this Pratishthan.

In terms of various Mathematical formulae we have additions or subtractions or divisions or any kind of Mathematical calculations, but it is stood by the experts in Vedic Mathematics, i.e. the *sutras*”.

1.9 The Committee were further informed by the witness:

“Yes, it has been formed by the Government. It has been constituted by the Rashtriya Veda Vidya Pratishthan. The Chairman of that Pratishthan is the Human Resource Minister. Because it is a Registered Society, we do not interfere in its academic activities. The people who are associated in this Committee are Scholars in Mathematics. In fact the Jaipur Seminar was attended by 46 persons, most of whom are specialists in Mathematics.

* * * * *

The fellowships have been offered for the people who are experts in Mathematics and who would go into the rationale of the *sutras*. It is because we have to make a beginning. The scientific foundations of the same are not available as of Law.”

1.10 The Committee enquired about the outcome of the whole exercise and in the reply the representatives stated:—

“According to the report that we have received from the Member-Secretary of the Rashtriya Veda Vidya Pratishthan, the Commit-

tee has been constituted only recently. The Pratishtan has serious financial problem. We have to put them in the right track. We have done it only recently. It is too early for us to make an assessment of the outcome of the work done on the basis of fellowships.”

1.11 The Committee desired to know about the basis for funding to the Pratishtan and whether all conditions required were fulfilled by the Pratishtan. The witness stated that they had given the amount to the Pratishtan for carrying out various activities and it was a corpus fund so they could not outright utilise that money.

1.12 The Committee desired to know whether this workshop was organised by this society. The representative informed that they took the initiative and the Pratishtan were the main organisers.

1.13 The Committee enquired whether Government had ever thought about deputing one or two Professors, who could monitor the whole affairs of this Pratishtan and their contribution to the world of Mathematics. In reply, the witness stated:

“The activities of the Pratishtan frequently come up for review in the committee. We will ensure that people do not just end up drawing salaries. We will ask for the results of the research conducted. Research has to be conducted. They will ask NCERT for enrichment material, and for advice as to what extent Vedic Mathematics can be included.”

1.14 The Committee further enquired that in the name of culture and tradition, much money is spent and Government has been paying for it. In reply, the witness observed:

“I will give you the example of one of the activities. There are various Vedas, including the Sama Veda. It has to be chanted in a particular style; and people who are experts in this, are dying out. In order to ensure that the tradition is preserved for posterity, Rashtriya Veda Vidya Pratishtan is taking certain steps to audio tape the chantings by scholars.

Government is helping in the creation of a corpus. They are having a programme for taperecording the chants. This is only one of the activities.”

1.15 The Committee desired to know the results as the Government had spent a lot of time and money. The witness replied that the Committee was set up only recently. Specific activities had to be undertaken by them and sought time as they would meet once in three months.

1.16 Regarding reasons for neither implementing the assurance nor for asking any extension of time for the fulfilment of the assurance, the Ministry of Human Resource Development stated in a note furnished on 23 April, 1990 that the fact that this reply had been construed as an

assurance came to be known to the Department only when communication No. FX/HRD(82)USQ6223—LS/88 dated 27.7.88 was received. Immediately thereafter, the matter was taken up with the Secretary, Rashtriya Veda Vidya Pratishthan. He replied that conduct of follow-up workshops had been planned. Considering the nature and language of the original reply given to the Lok Sabha and the above-mentioned response of the Secretary, Rashtriya Veda Vidya Pratishthan, the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs was addressed on 14-10-88 requesting that the item might be deleted from the list of assurances. It may be appreciated that the question of Government taking any action would arise only if any definite recommendations were received from the Committee of Experts after its constitution by the Pratishthan and after the Committee itself had considered the matter. It was keeping this in view that request was made to delete the item from the list of assurances. On 23.1.89, reply was received from the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs that the Committee on Government Assurances was not likely to agree for dropping the assurance and that "maximum extension of time" might be sought. The matter was pursued by the Department and the Assistant Educational Adviser attended a meeting in Parliament House Annexe on 9.8.89 when he was conclusively informed that the dropping of the assurance was not agreed to. In the above context, in order that up-to-date information be obtained before asking for maximum extension of time, D.O. reminders were issued to the Secretary, Rashtriya Veda Vidya Pratishthan in September and October, 1989. (In fact, all along, there had been correspondence with the Pratishthan from the time the reply had been treated as an assurance). Even the reply received from the Secretary of the Pratishthan in November, 1989 indicated that it would take further time for the receipt of recommendations of the Expert Committee. In the meantime, Lok Sabha Elections, 1989, intervened and the Department had to wait until the new Government came to position. According to rules of practice, approval of Minister has to be obtained for seeking extension of time to fulfil assurances. On 14.2.90, intimation was also received that evidence on representatives of the Department of Education on the matter would be taken by the Committee on Government Assurances. Accordingly, Additional Secretary, Deptt. of Education, appeared before the Committee and tendered evidence on 5.3.90. After taking orders of the new Minister in charge of Education, a statement was also submitted to the Lok Sabha Secretariat on 26.2.90. It would thus be seen that all along every effort was made to pursue the matter with the Rashtriya Veda Vidya Pratishthan to seek ways of fulfilling the assurance. Considering all the facts and circumstances of the case, the Lok Sabha Secretariat was requested to move the Committee on Government Assurances to drop the assurance or to grant one year's extension of time in case it was not found feasible to drop the assurance.

1.17 In reply to a question whether any time limit was laid down for the

submission of the Report by the Expert Committee and whether any interim report was received, the Ministry of Human Resource Development in the note dated the 23 April, 1990 stated that no time limit was laid down for the submission of the report by the Expert Committee and that no interim report had been received. However, the points of action that emerged out of the minutes of the Expert Committee were considered by the Rashtriya Veda Vidya Pratishthan and the following steps were taken to implement the recommendations of the Expert Committee:—

Recommendations

1. The National Council of Educational Research and Training may be requested to include some of the Sutras and their applications as enrichment materials, in consultation with a panel of mathematicians constituted for the purpose by the Rashtriya Veda Vidya Pratishthan.
2. The Agencies inclined to conduct training programmes in Vedic Mathematics should be encouraged and supported.
3. The Rashtriya Veda-Vidya Pratishthan should commission the writing of the following.

Follow up action

1. The matter was discussed in a meeting convened by the Deptt. of Education at which representatives of the Pratishthan and NCERT were also present. This was followed by a meeting of an Expert Committee constituted by the Pratishthan on 2nd January, 1990. In pursuance of the recommendation of this Committee, the Member Secretary, Rashtriya Veda Vidya Pratishthan, has had a meeting with the Director, NCERT, and discussed the question of devising enrichment materials on Vedic Mathematics.
2. The Rashtriya Veda Vidya Pratishthan has not yet identified any agency to conduct training programmes in Vedic Mathematics.
- 3 & 4. Smt. Ranjani Chari of the Kendriya Vidyalyaya Sangathan has been sanctioned fellowship to work on Vedic Mathematics in the school context. Dr. Narendra Puri, Reader, Roorkee University is working on a book on Vedic Mathematics for engineers. Shri D. Kulkarni, an expert from Pune is compiling a book on Vedic Mathematics for bankers. Shri Om Vikas, Director, Deptt. of Electronics has been entrusted

- (a) A book giving for each Sutra, its statement, its proof, its motivation, illustrative examples explaining limitations and possibilities for generalisation.
 - (b) A book explaining how students can discover the Sutras by recognising patterns with the help of illustrations.
 - (c) A book explaining Sutras for educating teachers and other users like managers, bankers, engineers etc.
 - (d) A book comparing the Sutras with other methods of calculations and in particular with those of Trachtenburg Speed System of Basic Mathematics.
4. Projects may be sanctioned to competent mathematicians and computer scientists for
- (a) development of ideas in the book 'Vedic Mathematics' by Jagad Guru Shankaracharya.
 - (b) investigating the possibilities of incorporating the relevant ideas in appropriate computer software programmes.
 - (c) expounding and developing Mathematical Foundations behind the Sutras.

1.18 The assurance is yet to be implemented.

1.19 The Committee note that the Workshop on Vedic Mathematics held in March, 1988 recommended the setting up of a multi-disciplinary committee consisting of experts in the field of Mathematics-Vedic, traditional and modern and Computer Science to recommend measures to include Vedic Mathematics in the curriculum at various levels in the educational institutions. The Government assured the committee that it would take action on the final recommendations of the Expert Committee. The Committee regret to note that the Ministry of Human Resource Development had sought dropping of the assurance instead of implementing

the work of preparing a paper on the use of Vedic Mathematics on computers.

it by drawing out a time-bound programme. The Committee do not approve of this attitude on the part of the Ministry. The Committee need hardly emphasise that the commitments made before the House are solemn promises and positive action should be taken by Government to fulfil them particularly in matters of such vital importance. The Committee recommend that the Ministry of Human Resource Development should take effective steps to expedite decision on the implementation of the recommendations of Expert Committee on Vedic Mathematics made so far to fulfil the assurance.

Assurance regarding Teaching of Sanskrit under Central Board of Secondary Education

2.1 On 1 December, 1988, Shri P.M. Sayeed, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 2886 to the Minister of Human Resource Development:—

- (a) whether "Sanskrit" has been clubbed as optional subject alongwith foreign languages like French, German, Russian, Spanish, etc. by the Central Board of Secondary Education;
- (b) if so, the reasons therefor;
- (c) whether only 20 per cent of the Central Board of Secondary Education school students are allowed to take Sanskrit in North India alongwith Hindi 'A' level course;
- (d) whether even this small percentage is denied to the students of Central Board of Secondary Education schools in South Indian States where Hindi course 'B' only is invariably taught; and
- (e) if so, the remedial measures proposed to give Sanskrit its due place in the system of education?

2.2 In reply to the above question, the then Minister of State in the Departments of Education and Culture in the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Shri L.P. Sahi) stated as follows:—

- (a) and (b) In keeping with the three language formula, the Central Board of Secondary Education has prescribed Hindi, English and one of the modern Indian languages for secondary school examination. Sanskrit will be taught alongwith Hindi as part of Hindi 'A' course, also the students may offer one of the seven classical and European languages including Sanskrit as an additional language on optional basis.
- (c) For 1988 examination 144365 candidates, out of total of 193565 who appeared at the All India and Delhi Secondary Examination, 1988 offered Hindi Course 'A' which is approximately 75% of the total number.
- (d) For student opting Hindi 'B' course, there is a provision for taking Sanskrit as an additional subject. The question of requiring Sanskrit to be studied as part of other Indian languages at 'A' level, as is prescribed for Hindi, is under consideration of the Central Board of Secondary Education.
- (e) Does not arise.

2.3 The reply to part (d) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was to be implemented by the Ministry by 28 February, 1989.

2.4 Since the assurance remained unimplemented, the Committee in their sitting held on 9 February, 1990 decided to take evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education).

2.5 On 27 February, 1990, the Ministry of Human Resource Development submitted a background note to the Committee giving the reasons for delay in implementing the assurance and the steps taken for implementation of the assurance. It has been stated in the note that since 1947, the educationists all over the country concerned with qualitative improvement in school education, have been ascribing a great deal of importance to teaching of languages in schools which influences intellectual growth in school students and inculcates in them the sense of national integration. The three language formula in school education system was evolved on the basis of recommendations made by the Secondary Education Commission (1952-53), Central Advisory Board of Education (CABE) during 1956-64, Chief Ministers' Conference (1961), National Integration Conference (1961), Education Commission (1968).

The report of Education Commission (1964-66) formed the basis of the National Policy on Education, 1968 which stipulated in para 4(3) (b) thereof:—

“Three Language Formula”

At the Secondary stage, the State Governments should adopt and vigorously implement the Three Language Formula which includes the study of a modern Indian Language, preferably one of the Southern languages, apart from Hindi and English in the Hindi speaking States and of Hindi alongwith the regional language and English in the non-Hindi speaking States.

The National Policy of Education (NPE)-1986 (Para 8.7) has endorsed the above formulation made in the 1968 policy and called for more energetic and purposeful implementation of the Three Language Formula. Based on the directives in the National Policy of Education—1986 the NCERT brought out a national curricular framework for elementary and secondary education. In this document, the NCERT has envisaged teaching of:—

- (i) One language—the mother tongue / the regional language at primary stage (Classes I - V)
- (ii) 3 languages at the upper primary stage (classes V - VIII) and Secondary stage (Classes IX to X)

The school education is primary looked after by the State Governments

and the State Boards of Secondary Education prescribing curricula, syllabi and textbooks for all subjects including the languages at the school stage. At the national level, however, the curricular framework and textbooks are prepared by the NCERT and the States are encouraged to adopt / adapt such curricular framework / textbooks. The Central Government has all along recommended faithful implementation of the Three Language Formula, representing the consensus in the country.

The following deficiencies were noted in the States in the matter of implementation of the Three Language Formula:—

- (i) All the languages are not being taught compulsorily at the secondary stage.
- (ii) Duration for compulsory study of 3 languages varies.
- (iii) There is a general indifference among students for learning more languages which add to their workload without providing skill or knowledge required in the world of work or for further study.
- (iv) A classical language has been substituted for a modern Indian language in some States.
- (v) No provision exists for teaching of South Indian languages for which the formula indicated a preference in Hindi-speaking States.
- (vi) Competency levels to be achieved by students in respect of each language have not been precisely specified.

The old scheme of studies of the CBSE which the schools affiliated to CBSE had been following prior to September, 1988, contained certain features mentioned below:—

- (i) The candidates for the CBSE—conducted terminal class X examination were not required to study 3 languages upto class X. They were examined for only 2 languages out of which one had to be Hindi or English in Class X Board examination. The third language was required to be studied only upto class VIII.
- (ii) The choice of languages was not confined to Modern Indian Languages since such candidates could select 2 languages from as many as 26 languages which included foreign languages like French, German, Russian, Arabic, Persian and Portuguese.
- (iii) Since Sanskrit was usually chosen as the third language and that too by a small section of students and since either Hindi or English was compulsorily examinable at the Class X Board Examination, Sanskrit was not opted for by the candidates for the Board Examination.
- (iv) Since Sanskrit was not examinable at the class X examination conducted by the CBSE, it was not studied with adequate attention and seriousness.

- (v) The old scheme required that the candidates for class X Examination conducted by the CBSE should have studied 3 languages upto class VIII only. So even the insignificant minority of students opting for Sanskrit as the third language, were studying it upto class VIII. Since their performance upto class VIII level was assessed internally by the respective schools, no uniform standard for competency level could be laid down or maintained by the CBSE.

In order to ensure faithful implementation of the Three Language Formula in Schools, the CAGE appointed a Committee for Language Development and Three Language Formula. The old scheme of studies of CBSE came up for specific consideration in a meeting of this Committee held in December, 1987. Subsequently, the matter was taken up for consultation with the States in the Conference of the State Education Secretaries and Directors of Education held on 17-18 June, 1988.

In pursuance of the recommendations made by the above mentioned Committee and also by this Conference, the CAGE brought out a revised scheme of studies on 16.9.88.

The Sept. '88 Scheme of CBSE

The salient features of this new scheme in teaching of languages were:—

- (i) All candidates were made to appear in 3 language in Class X Examination conducted by CBSE. This was strictly in accordance with the Three Language Formula.
- (ii) Three languages were Hindi, English and one of the Modern Indian Languages.
- (iii) Sanskrit was made part of Hindi 'A' Course.
- (iv) Besides, Sanskrit could be offered on optional basis as an additional subject.

As such, teaching Sanskrit as one of the three languages would have necessarily required the secondary schools students to give up either Hindi or English or the regional language which would have been violative of the Three Language Formula. On the other hand by requiring Sanskrit to be studied with Hindi for 'A' level course and by enabling students to offer Sanskrit as an additional language for the Class X Board Examination (of the CBSE), adequate scope was provided in the new scheme for a meaningful study of Sanskrit.

It is also clarified that 'A' level course in the new scheme was nothing but the course for first language, which required 10 years of compulsory learning from Class I to Class X. Thus, the vast majority of candidates offering Hindi 'A' Course for the Class X CBSE Examination, would have studied Sanskrit much more thoroughly and seriously than before. Under the old Scheme of Studies, only 24,000 candidates offered Sanskrit as a subject in Class X Board Examination; whereas after the introduction of the new Scheme of September, 1988, more than 90,000 candidates due for

appearing in Class X Board Examination of 1989, offered Hindi at 'A' level. Thus, under the Sept. '88 Scheme, Sanskrit would have been studied as part of Hindi 'A' Course by about 4 times of students than before and since Hindi 'A' Course would have been examinable through CBSE Examination of Class X, such larger body of student community would have studied Sanskrit much more seriously.

Supreme Court Orders

However, on filing of a Writ Petition in the Supreme Court by Shri Santosh Kumar and 5 other petitioners, against the U.O.I. and the CBSE challenging the revised scheme of studies introduced by the CBSE on 16.9.88, the Hon'ble Supreme Court passed an interim order on 17.3.89 restraining:—

- (i) the Central Govt. from giving effect to NPE '86 w.e.f. 31.3.89 in so far as it affects the position of Sanskrit.
- (ii) the Central Govt. from giving effect on para 8.7 of NPE '86 (relating to Three Language Formula), and
- (iii) CBSE from implementing its Scheme of Studies of 16.9.88 for Secondary Classes in so far as it related to Sanskrit.

The interim order passed on 17.3.89 by the Hon'ble Supreme Court was an ex-parte stay order. The Central Govt. filed in the Supreme Court, a counter-affidavit and an application for vacation of the stay order.

Meanwhile, the CBSE and the Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan had issued instructions to all CBSE affiliated schools and Kendriya Vidyalayas (where the Sept. '88 Scheme had been introduced) respectively, to restore the old Scheme of Studies.

The Writ Petition came up for hearing in the Supreme Court on 14.12.89 and on that the Hon'ble Court passed another interim order directing "whatever may be the position with regard to the other Indian Languages, the position as regards Sanskrit Language shall continue to remain as it was before the impugned order (i.e. the Supreme Court Order dated 17.3.89) was passed. This order shall continue in force pending disposal of the writ petition."

The CBSE has clarified that Sanskrit will continue to be one of the languages for the purpose of Three Language Formula and not a part of Hindi 'A' Course till the final disposal of the writ petition. In a nutshell, therefore, as things stand today, the old scheme of studies will continue till the Supreme Court passes a final judgement on the writ petition. The entire matter is, therefore, subjudice at present.

However, specific subject matter of the Assurance has been the following:—

"The question of requiring Sanskrit to be studied as a part of Other Indian Languages at 'A' level as is prescribed for Hindi, is under consideration of the CBSE."

The CBSE has now clarified that it had obtained responses from the Principals of 250 Schools and out of them, only 69 were in favour of making Sanskrit a part of non-Hindi regional languages. Keeping in view the stay order granted by the Supreme Court on 17.3.89, the proposal was not pursued by the CBSE any further. As such, it is not possible to consider this proposal unless the Supreme Court delivers a final judgement vacating its *ex parte* stay order passed on 17.3.89 and restoring all the restraints imposed by the same on the respondent No. 1 i.e. the Union of India and respondent No. 2 i.e. the CBSE in the Writ Petition. Therefore, the proposal contained in the subject-matter of this Assurance is not possible to be considered unless the Supreme Court in its final verdict restores the CBSE Scheme of Studies of 16.9.88 fully.

In view of above, the Chairman of the Committee on Government Assurance is requested to treat this Assurance as closed. The delay in making a proper assessment of the actual position about this Assurance was mainly due to the Writ Petition filed in the Supreme Court and time taken in receipt of certified copies of the interim orders passed by the Supreme Court on 17.3.89 and 14.12.89. Lastly, the delay in making the assessment was also due to the fact that the collection of the comments by the CBSE from the School Principals as mentioned in para 20 of this note above took time.

2.6 Explaining the reasons for delay in implementing the assurance, the representative of the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education) during evidence held on 5 March, 1990 stated as follows:—

“The other assurance related to the learning of Sanskrit under the three language formula. In regard to this assurance also, we had serious difficulties. There has been intervention on the part of the Supreme Court. Certain directions were issued in September 1988 by the CBSE to over 2500 schools that had been affiliated to the CBSE and they related to the manner in which Sanskrit should be taught in the school system. That is done in the schools which are affiliated to the CBSE. Then, certain people did not agree with the circular of the CBSE and they moved the Supreme Court. It has issued two interlocutory orders. According to these orders, *the status quo ante* has to be restored. The matter is *sub-judice* because this matter has already come under the consideration of the Supreme Court. Pending disposal of the case, we have to implement the interim order of the Supreme Court, i.e. restoration of *status quo ante*. So we have certain difficulties in the matter of fulfilling this assurance.”

2.7 The Committee enquired whether the Ministry wanted Sanskrit to be taught as before as a separate subject, as there was an all-India

agitation on the issue and people have moved the Supreme Court. In reply, the witness stated:

“I will give the background. We have the three-language formula in the school system. In the Hindi-speaking areas, apart from Hindi and English, one of the other regional languages, preferably one of the South Indian languages was to be taken up. In the non-Hindi speaking areas, apart from the regional language and English, they have to learn another Indian language.”

2.8 The Committee desired to know if there was a single school in the country following this formula. In the reply, the witness stated:

“It is not being done effectively.”

2.9 The Committee were further informed:

“In Punjab, they have prescribed Telugu. In practice, the third, i.e. the South Indian language is not effectively being taught. I am speaking about the three-language formula. In many parts of India, children have opted for a foreign language, e.g. German, or French, or opted for Sanskrit. They are not learning one of the southern languages. It was felt by the policy makers, and recognised that there must be a better enforcement of the three-language formula. In September, 1988, CBSE issued a circular saying that if Sanskrit was to be learnt, it should be learnt as part of Hindi. It was not the intention to belittle the importance of Sanskrit. It was felt that in this manner, both Hindi and Sanskrit would come to be learnt.”

The Committee further pointed out that Government divided the single, full subject of Sanskrit into Hindi and Sanskrit.

2.10 The witness explained in this regard as follows:

“People indeed have a grievance on this basis. The clarification we have been trying to give is that if Sanskrit is taken as part of Hindi, more people will learn that language, viz. Sanskrit.”

2.11 The assurance is yet to be implemented.

2.12 The Committee note that in September, 1988, Central Board of Secondary Education introduced a scheme whereby Sanskrit was to be taught alongwith Hindi as a part of Hindi ‘A’ course to encourage more people to learn Sanskrit alongwith Hindi. The Committee also note that the Supreme Court have stayed the operation of the above-mentioned scheme and the matter is sub-judice at present. The Committee recommend that the Government should make efforts to get the matter decided early by the Supreme Court.

Assurance regarding Free Education to Girls

3.1 On 9 March, 1989, Shri R. M. Bhoje, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 1901 to the Minister of Human Resource Development:—

“(a) Whether in some States education for girls is free upto the University level; and

(b) if so, the names of those States?”

3.2 In reply to the above question, the then Minister of State in the Departments of Education and Culture in the Ministry of Human Resource Development stated as follows:—

“(a) & (b): Education of girls upto Class VIII is already free in the States in Government and local body schools.

At secondary or higher secondary level, all the States except Meghalaya, Punjab and Union Territory of Delhi have made education free for girls.

Information about free education of girls at University level is not available and is being collected from the States.”

3.3 The reply to the above question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be fulfilled by 9 June, 1989 i.e. within three months from the date of the reply.

3.4 As the assurance remained unfulfilled, the Committee decided on 9 February, 1990 to take evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education).

3.5 On 23 February, 1990, in a note furnished to the Committee, the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education) stated:—

“Since an Assurance had been given in the above mentioned reply that the information is being collected from the States, a letter was addressed to all the Education Secretaries in the States and UTs on 20th March, 1989 requesting them to give information regarding free education of girls at degree/postgraduate levels in their State.

Some of the States sent information about girls' education at graduate and postgraduate levels. The States/UTs from which

information was awaited were reminded in December, 1989 and requested to expedite the information.

The information from the majority of the States/UTs was received by February, 1990 except for four States, namely, Nagaland, Madhya Pradesh, J&K and Andhra Pradesh. These States were reminded telegraphically on 9-2-1990 and 22-2-1990 to send the requisite information latest by 28-2-1990.

According to the information which has been received so far, in 15 States/UTs (details at Annexure-II) education is not free for girls at the university level. In 10 States (details at Annexure-III) education for girls is free at the university level; or the proposal to make education free is under consideration of the State Government. In the Union Territories of Dadra & Nagar Haveli and Lakshadweep, there are no colleges."

3.6 The Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education) on 5 March, 1990.

3.7 Explaining the reasons for delay in the implementation of the assurance, the representative of the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education) stated during evidence:—

"There are three assurances on which evidence is being taken by the Committee today. One is relating to Universities and higher education Bureau. So far as that assurance is concerned, we have practically received information from all the States and I may submit that on merits that statement itself may be taken as fulfilling the assurance that has been given."

3.8 The Committee pointed out that in the brief note submitted to the Committee the information has not been given as to whether any Central University is giving free education and desired to start it at home first. The witness stated:—

"The main problem is one of the resources. The perspective of the Government of India is, we have a limited amount of funds. We cannot at the same time make education free, which would only help the well to do people."

3.9 The Committee suggested that the Government could have an economic limit as Tamil Nadu State was giving free education upto an income limit of Rs. 12,000/- per annum. The witnesses explained that the financial commitments became very high.

3.10 The Committee emphasised their point to do something for the sake of girls. The witnesses stated:—

"Elementary education is totally free. According to the Government of India, there will be some distortions in terms of quality but the

subsidy also turns out to be a huge figure. That is why higher education is not yet made free. Almost all the resources that are available are spent on universal education. We have got as many as 10 crores of children.”

3.11 The Ministry, however, implemented the assurance only on 16 August, 1990 by laying the following information on the Table of the House (Statement IX/Item 37):—

“Education for girls at college/University level is free in Bihar, Gujarat, Jammu and Kashmir, Mizoram, Nagaland and Sikkim. In Madhya Pradesh and Tamil Nadu it is partially free. In the U.T. of Andaman and Nicobar Islands concession in fees is provided.”

3.12 The Committee note that the Ministry of Human Resource Development took unduly long time of over one year to collect information about the States providing free education to girls at the University level. The Committee are surprised to note that such a vital information is not readily available with the Union Government entrusted with the task of planning University level studies particularly at a time when Government was planning to celebrate 1990 as the SAARC Year of the Girl Child. The Committee cannot help but conclude that the delay of over one year to collect such an important information to be placed before the Lok Sabha speaks volumes of the lethargic manner in which Government functions. The Committee note that the process of collection of information actually commenced only after giving an assurance to the House, although the Ministry had ample advance notice about the admission of the question. The Committee trust that Government would take Parliamentary work with all the seriousness and furnish to Parliament the information on vital issues expeditiously.

NEW DELHI;

13 November, 1990

22 Kartika, 1912 (Saka)

DR. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA,

Chairman,

Committee on Government Assurances.

ANNEXURE-I

(Vide Para 1.2 of the Report)

Name and Addresses of Participants:

1. Dr. A.K. Patel,
Member of Parliament,
5-B, Parliament House,
New Delhi.
2. Professor H.C. Khare,
9, Jawaharlal Nehru Road,
Allahabad.
3. Shri N. Puri,
41 / 2, Amod Kunj,
University Campus,
Roorkee.
4. Dr. R.P. Aggarwal,
Vice-Chancellor,
Rajasthan University,
Jaipur.
5. Professor Abhaya Kashyap,
Executive Director,
Centre for Emerging Technology,
33, Aurangzeb Road,
New Delhi.
6. Shri Rajendra Sharma,
5-B, Parliament House,
New Delhi.
7. Shri Om Vikas,
Director,
Department of Electronics,
C Wing, IIIrd Floor,
Pushpa Bhawan, Madangir Road,
New Delhi.
8. Shri Ishwar Bhai Patel,
Chairman, Maharishi Academy of Vedic Science,
36, High Land Park Society,
Ahmedabad.
9. Shri H.D. Pandya,
Matrichhaya,
Railway Housing Colony,
Bhavnagar (Gujarat).

10. Dr. S.A. Parmahans,
Department of Mathematics,
(Faculty of Science)
Banaras Hindu University,
Varanasi.
11. Professor Wazir Hasan Abdi,
Hasan Manzil,
89, H.I.G. (E. Sector),
Aliganj Extension,
Lucknow.
12. Professor K.S. Shukla,
Argara Hussainiganj Crossing,
Lucknow.
13. Dr. Ashok Sharma,
Department of Applied Maths-Science,
and Humanities,
Motilal Nehru Engg. College,
Aliahabad.
14. Professor H.C. Bansal,
Department of Maths,
Rajasthan University,
Jaipur.
15. Dr. T.M. Karade,
Professor of Maths,
Eristein Foundation International,
2, Tilak Nagar,
Nagpur.
16. Shri Dilip Kulkarni,
1, Meghadut Sohanagar,
Behind Peshava Park,
Pune-411030.
17. Dr. George Abraham,
1520, 12th Main Road,
Annanagar,
Madras.
18. Mrs. C. Santamma,
Department of Physics,
Andhra University,
Vishakhapatanam, (A.P.)
19. Dr. R.C. Dwivedi,
P-5, University Campus,
University of Rajasthan,
Jaipur.

20. Dr. Abha Bhatnagar,
Computer Incharge,
Demonstration Multipurposes School,
Regional College of Education,
Ajmer (Rajasthan).
21. Dr. Jai Jain,
Reader Pedagogy,
Lal Bahadur Shastri Kendriya
Sanskrit Vidyapeetha,
New Delhi.
22. Dr. Ram Lal Yadav,
Reader Pedagogy,
Lal Bahadur Shastri Kendriya
Sanskrit Vidyapeetha,
New Delhi.
23. Shri Ram Dev Jha,
Lecturer Jyotish,
Lal Bahadur Shastri Kendriya
Sanskrit Vidyapeetha,
New Delhi.
24. Dr. Bhaskar Misra,
Lecturer Pedagogy,
Lal Bahadur Shastri Kendriya
Sanskrit Vidyapeetha,
New Delhi.
25. Dr. Dharmadhikari,
Department of Electronics,
C Wing, IIIrd Floor,
Pushpa Bhawan, Madangir Road,
New Delhi.
26. Professor (Mrs.) Asha Rani Singhal,
Meerut University,
Meerut (U.P)
27. Mrs. Rajni Chari,
c / o Col. R. Rangachari,
Col. G. (S.D),
H.Q. Central Command
P.O. Dilkusha, Lucknow (U.P.)
28. Mrs. K. Vijai Kumari,
T.G.T. Mathematics,
Navodaya Vidyalaya
Meddapuram 533437,
Distt. East Godavari (A.P.)

29. **Shri Teekam Singh,**
T.G.T. Mathematics
Navodaya Vidyalaya,
Jayanpur,
Distt. Azamgarh (U.P.)
30. **Shri G.D. Dhall,**
Reader, Department of Education
Science & Mathematics,
N.C.E.R.T. Sri Aurobindo
New Delhi.
31. **Dr. Indumati,**
Reader,
Department of Mathematics,
Pondicherry University,
Pondicherry-605001.
32. **Dr. P.S. Mishra,**
Reader,
Department of Metallurgy,
Roorkee University,
Roorkee-247667.
33. **Km. Pragati Goyal,**
Senior Research Fellow
Department of Mathematics
Roorkee University,
Roorkee-247667.
34. **Shri Kapoorchand Kulish,**
c / o the "Rajasthan Patrika"
Jawaharlal Nehru Marg,
Jaipur.
35. **Shri S.K. Kapoor,**
Senior Judicial Magistrate,
Rohtak-124001,
Haryana.
36. **Dr. Aruna Nigam**
Reader, Mathematics Department,
Lucknow University,
Lucknow-220067.
37. **Shri Dila Ram,**
Saharanpur (U.P.)
38. **Dr. Madan Mishra,**
Director, Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan,
New Delhi.

39. Prof. R.K. Shukla,
Principal, Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeeth,
Jaipur.
40. Shri T.N. Dhar, Deputy Director,
Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan,
New Delhi.

ANNEXURE-II
(Vide Para 3.5 of the Report)

No Provision of Free Education for Girls at University Level

Name of States

1. Assam
2. Arunachal Pradesh
3. Goa
4. Haryana
5. Karnataka
6. Kerala
7. Manipur
8. Meghalaya
9. Punjab
10. Tripura
11. Uttar Pradesh
12. West Bengal

Name of Union Territory

13. Chandigarh
14. Delhi
15. Pondicherry

ANNEXURE-III
(Vide Para 3.5 of the Report)

States/Union Territories in which Education for Girls is Free at University Level

Name of States	Remarks
1. Gujarat	Education for girls free at university level.
2. Mizoram	Education for girls free at university level.
3. Orissa	Education is free for girls at university level in general education.
4. Rajasthan	Education is free for girls at university level in general education.
5. Sikkim	Education is free for girls at university level.
6. Tamil Nadu	Education is free at the first year undergraduate level for poor and middle class girl students whose family income does not exceed Rs. 12,000/- per annum.
7. Bihar	Provision of free education for girls is under consideration.
8. Himachal Pradesh	Provision of free education for girls is under consideration.
9. Maharashtra	Provision of free education for girls is under consideration.
Union Territory	
10. Andaman & Nicobar Islands	Only concession in fees is provided for girls at college level.

MINUTES
THIRD SITTING

Minutes of the third sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 5 March, 1990, in Committee Room 'C', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

The Committee met on Monday, the 5 March, 1990 from 16.00 hrs to 17.45 hours.

PRESENT

1. Dr. Vijay Kumar Malhotra — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Smt. Subhasini Ali
3. Shri Bhajaman Behera
4. Shri Het Ram
5. Shri Mahabir Prasad
6. Dr. Mahadeepak Singh Shakya
7. Shri Kusuma Krishnamurthy
8. Shri Amar Roy Pradhan
9. Shri Ramji Lal Suman
10. Shri C. Srinivasan

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri C.K. Jain — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri S.C. Gupta — *Director*
3. Shri Jyoti Prasad — *Under Secretary*

MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION)

1. Shri S. Gopalan, *Additional Secretary*
2. Dr. (Mrs.) D.M. De Rebello, *Joint Secretary*
3. Shri S.G. Mankad, *Joint Secretary*

**

**

**

Assurance regarding Seminar on Vedic Mathematics
(USQ No. 6223 dt. 7.4.88)

By way of a general statement on the delay in implementing the

assurance regarding Seminar on Vedic Mathematics, the representative of the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Culture) stated:

“So far as the assurance regarding Vedic Mathematics is concerned, we have again submitted a statement in detail. At an earlier stage, we had submitted to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs and also the Assurance Committee that by the very nature of the assurance, we had rather serious difficulties in implementing it within the time because the question was of the action which the Government had to take to implement the recommendations of an expert Committee that had been constituted in pursuance of a seminar that had been held at Jaipur regarding Vedic Mathematics. This seminar had been held in March, 1988. A Committee was to be constituted, it was to give a series of recommendations and they had to be considered by the Government and appropriate decisions taken. On that basis, we had requested that the matter may not be treated as an assurance, because it was difficult to implement it within any stipulated time. The recommendation was rather general in nature.”

The Committee enquired whether the Expert Committee in Vedic Mathematics was a Government Committee and in reply, the witness stated:

“It has been constituted by Rashtriya Vedic Vidya Prathisthan. It is a society registered under the Societies Registration Act. The Member Secretary of this organisation is Shri Kreet Joshi. It is fully funded by the Government. The Prathisthan has been created on the basis of an Act. The Government of India will contribute a corpus fund of Rs. 10 crores over a period of time and interest earnings out of this corpus can be utilised by this Prathisthan.

In terms of various mathematical formulae we have additions or subtractions or divisions or any kind of mathematical calculations, but it is stood by the experts in vedic mathematics, i.e. the *sutras*.”

The Committee were further informed by the witness:

“Yes, it has been formed by the Government. It has been constituted by the Rashtriya Veda Vidya Prathisthan. The Chairman of that Prathisthan is the Human Resource Minister. Because it is a Registered Society, we do not interfere in its academic activities. The people who are associated in this Committee are Scholars in mathematics. In fact the Jaipur Seminar was attended by 46 persons, most of whom are specialists in mathematics.

* * * *

The fellowships have been offered for the people who are experts in mathematics and who would go into the rationale of the *sutras*. It is because we have to make a beginning. The scientific foundations of the same are not available as of Law.”

The Committee enquired about the outcome of the whole exercise and in the reply the representatives stated:

“According to the report that we have received from the Member Secretary of the Rashtriya Veda Vidya Prathisthan, the Committee has been constituted only recently. The Prathisthan has serious financial problem. We have to put them in the right track. We have done it only recently. It is too early for us to make an assessment of the outcome of the work done on the basis of fellowships.”

The Committee desired to know about the basis for funding to the Prathisthan and whether all conditions required to be fulfilled were fulfilled by the Prathisthan. The witness stated that they had given the amount to the Prathisthan for carrying out various activities and it was a corpus fund so they could not outright utilise that money.

The Committee desired to know whether this workshop was organised by this society. The representative informed that they took the initiative and the Prathisthan were the main organisers.

The Committee enquired whether Government had ever thought about deputing one or two Professors, who could monitor the whole affairs of this Prathisthan and their contribution to the world of Mathematics. In reply, the witness stated:

“The activities of the Prathisthan frequently come up for review in the committee. We will ensure that people do not just end up drawing salaries. We will ask for the results of the research conducted. Reserach has to be conducted. They will ask NCERT for enrichment material, and for advice as to what extent Vedic Mathematics can be included.”

The Committee further enquired that in the name of culture and tradition, much money is spent and Government has been paying for it. In reply, the witness observed:

“I will give you the example of one of the activities. There are various Vedas, including the Sama Veda. It has to be chanted in a particular style; and people who are experts in this, are dying out. In order to ensure that the tradition is preserved for posterity, Rashtriya Veda Vidya Prathisthan is taking certain steps to audio tape the chantings by the scholars. Government is helping in the creation of a corpus. They are having a programme for taperecording the chants. This is only one of the activities.”

The Committee desired to know the results as the Government had spent a lot of time and money. The witness replied that the Committee was set up only recently. Specific activities had to be undertaken by them and sought time as they would meet once in three months.

Assurance regarding teaching of Sanskrit under Central Board of Secondary Education (USQ No. 2886 dated 1.12.1988)

Explaining the reasons for delay in implementing the assurance, the

representative of the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education) stated :—

“The other assurance related to the learning of Sanskrit under the three-language formula. In regard to this assurance also, we had serious difficulties. There has been intervention on the part of the Supreme Court. Certain directions were issued in September 1988 by the CBSE to over 2500 schools that had been affiliated to the CBSE and they related to the manner in which Sanskrit should be taught in the school system. That is done in the schools which are affiliated to the CBSE. Then, certain people did not agree with the circular of the CBSE and they moved the Supreme Court. It has issued two interlocutory orders. According to these orders, the *status quo ante* has to be restored. The matter is sub-judice because this matter has already come under the consideration of the Supreme Court. Pending disposal of the case, we have to implement the interim order of the Supreme Court, i.e. restoration of *status quo ante*. So we have certain difficulties in the matter of fulfilling this assurance.”

The Committee enquired whether the Ministry wanted Sanskrit to be taught as before as a separate subject, as there was an all-India agitation on the issue and people have moved the Supreme Court. In reply, the witness stated:

“I will give the background. We have the three-language formula in the school system. In the Hindi-speaking areas, apart from Hindi and English, one of the other regional languages, preferably one of the South Indian languages was to be taken up. In the non-Hindi speaking areas, apart from the regional language and English, they have to learn another Indian language.”

The Committee desired to know if there was a single school in the country following this formula. In the reply, the witness stated:

“It is not being done effectively.”

The Committee were further informed:

“In Punjab, they have prescribed Telugu. In practice the third, i.e. the South Indian language is not effectively being taught. I am speaking about the three-language formula. In many parts of India, children have opted for a foreign language, e.g. German or French, or opted for Sanskrit. They are not learning one of the southern languages. It was felt by the policy-matters, and recognised that there must be a better enforcement of the three-language formula. In September 1988, CBSE issued a circular saying that if Sanskrit was to be learnt, it should be learnt as part of Hindi. It was not the intention to belittle the importance of Sanskrit. It was felt that in this manner, both Hindi and Sanskrit would come to be learnt.”

The Committee further pointed out that Government divided the single, full subject of Sanskrit into Hindi and Sanskrit.

The witness explained in this regard as follows:

“People indeed have a grievance on this basis. The clarification we have been trying to give is that if Sanskrit is taken as part of Hindi, more people will learn that language, viz. Sanskrit.”

Assurance regarding States imparting free education for girls (USQ No. 1901 dt. 9.3.1989)

Explaining the reasons for delay in the implementation of the assurance, the representative of the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education) stated:

“There are three assurances on which evidence is being taken by the Committee today. One is relating to Universities and higher education Bureau. So far as that assurance is concerned, we have practically received information from all the States and I may submit that on merits that statement itself may be taken as fulfilling the assurance that has been given.”

The Committee pointed out that in the brief note submitted to the Committee the information has not been given as to whether any Central University is giving free education and desired to start it at home first. The witness stated:

“The main problem is one of the resources. The perspective of the Government of India is, we have a limited amount of funds. We cannot at the same time make education free, which would only help the well to do people.”

The Committee suggested that the Government could have an economic limit as Tamil Nadu State is giving free education upto an income limit of Rs. 12,000/- per annum. The witnesses explained that the financial commitments become very high.

The Committee emphasised their point to do something for the sake of girls. The witnesses stated:

“Elementary education is totally free. According to the Government of India, there will be some distortions in terms of quality but the subsidy also turns out to be a huge figure. That is why higher education is not yet made free. Almost all the resources that are available are spent on universal education. We have got as many as 10 crores of children.”

The witnesses then withdrew.

** ** **
** ** **

The Committee then adjourned to meet on Tuesday, 6 March, 1990 at 11.00 hours.

MINUTES
FIFTEENTH SITTING

Minutes of the Fifteenth Sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances Held on 13 November, 1990 in Committee Room '53', Parliament House, New Delhi.

—————

The Committee met on Tuesday, the 13 November, 1990 from 11.00 hrs. to 11.30 hrs.

PRESENT

1. Dr. Vijay Kumar Malhotra — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Het Ram
3. Shri Mahabir Prasad
4. Dr. Mahadeepak Singh Shakya
5. Shri Haribhau Shankar Mahale
6. Shri Kusuma Krishnamurthy
7. Shri Amar Roy Pradhan
8. Shri Sanford Marak
9. Shri Surya Narain Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri R.C. Bhardwaj — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri G.C. Hallan — *Director*
3. Shri A.N. Chopra — *Under Secretary*

2. The Committee decided to undertake on-the-spot study visit to Calcutta, Port Blair, Madras and Bangalore from 2 January, 1991 to 9 January, 1991 in connection with the examination of certain pending/implemented assurances.

3. The Committee took up for consideration in the Draft of Seventh and Eighth Reports of the Committee on Government Assurances and adopted them.

* * * *

The Committee then adjourned.

© 1990 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

PUBLISHED UNDER RULE 382 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE AND
CONDUCT OF BUSINESS IN LOK SABHA (SEVENTH EDITION) AND
PRINTED BY MANAGER, P.L. UNIT GOVT. OF INDIA PRESS,
MINTO ROAD NEW DELHI