

*Monday,
21st March, 1904*

ABSTRACT OF THE PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

Council of the Governor General of India,

LAWS AND REGULATIONS

Vol. XLIII

Jan.-Dec., 1904

ABSTRACT OF THE PROCEEDINGS
OF
THE COUNCIL OF THE GOVERNOR GENERAL OF INDIA:
ASSEMBLED FOR THE PURPOSE OF MAKING
LAWS AND REGULATIONS

1904

VOLUME XLIII



Published by Authority of the Governor General.



CALCUTTA
PRINTED BY THE SUPERINTENDENT OF GOVERNMENT PRINTING, INDIA,
1905

Proceedings of the Council of the Governor General of India, assembled for the purpose of making Laws and Regulations under the provisions of the Indian Councils Acts, 1861 and 1892 (24 & 25 Vict., Cap. 67, and 55 & 56 Vict., Cap. 14).

The Council met at Government House, Calcutta, at 10 A. M. on Monday, the 21st March, 1904.

PRESENT:

His Excellency Baron Curzon, P.C., G.M.S.I., G.M.I.E., Viceroy and Governor General of India, *presiding*.

His Honour Sir A. H. L. Fraser, K.C.S.I., Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal.

His Excellency General Viscount Kitchener of Khartoum, G.C.B., O.M., G.C.M.G., Commander-in-Chief in India.

The Hon'ble Mr. T. Raleigh, C.S.I.

The Hon'ble Sir E. F.G. Law, K.C.M.G., C.S.I.

The Hon'ble Major-General Sir E. R. Elles, K.C.B., K.C.I.E.

The Hon'ble Sir A. T. Arundel, K.C.S.I.

The Hon'ble Sir Denzil Ibbetson, K.C.S.I.

The Hon'ble Rai Sri Ram Bahadur.

The Hon'ble Mr. A. W. Cruickshank, C.S.I.

His Highness Raja Sir Surindar Bikram Prakash Bahadur, K.C.S.I., of Sirmur.

His Highness Agha Sir Sultan Muhammad Shah, Agha Khan, G.C.I.E.

The Hon'ble Mr. Gopal Krishna Gokhale, C.I.E.

The Hon'ble Mr. E. Cable.

The Hon'ble Nawab Saiyid Muhammad Sahib Bahadur.

The Hon'ble Mr. H. Adamson, C.S.I.

The Hon'ble Mr. A. Pedler, C.I.E., F.R.S.

The Hon'ble Mr. T. Morison.

The Hon'ble Dr. Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar.

The Hon'ble Mr. J. B. Bilderbeck.

The Hon'ble Mr. D. M. Hamilton.

The Hon'ble Rai Bahadur B. K. Bose, C.I.E.

The Hon'ble Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya, D.L., F.R.A.S., F.R.S.E.

INDIAN UNIVERSITIES BILL.

The adjourned debate on this Bill was resumed today.

The Hon'ble RAI SRI RAM BAHADUR moved that in clause 19 the words "by special order of the Senate" be omitted. He said:—"The Syndicate

[*Rai Sri Ram Bahadur ; Mr. Raleigh ; Dr. [21ST MARCH, 1904.]
Bhandarkar ; Mr. Gokhale.*]

under this Bill is the body invested with the executive government of the University. The order for allowing any person admission to the higher examination should be passed by that body. Matters will thus be expedited ; otherwise there will be great delay, as the meetings of the Senates are few and far between."

The Hon'ble MR. RALEIGH said:—"The clause in its present form represents the result of long and careful discussion in Select Committee. The words 'by special order of the Senate' form part of what may be called a compromise at which the Committee arrived, and we kept this expression to indicate that, as a general rule, the admission of private students should not be encouraged. The matter should go to the Senate in order to mark that it is a special indulgence. I cannot accept the amendment."

The Hon'ble DR. BHANDARKAR said:—"The effect of the amendment will, if adopted, be to empower the Syndicate to admit anybody to the examinations in accordance with certain regulations and of the last to admit teachers and educational officers as a matter of course. I am for not admitting anybody to the examinations without a certificate of his having regularly gone through the required course of instruction at a College. The object of this Bill is to provide that young men shall go through a regular course of instruction and be under the influence of their teachers for a specific period, which is generally four years, and to put an end to cramming for passing a certain examination. This object will be defeated if we make a rule to admit a man without such a certificate. I was therefore for requiring everybody to produce a certificate. And that is the plan on which we in Bombay have been working except in only two instances within the last 45 years. But the majority of the Select Committee were for leaving the door open, and in deference to those whom I represented they added some qualifying expressions. The amendment under discussion proposes to remove the most important of these and the other to admit a certain set of persons without restraint. I think if a regular course of instruction is necessary for anybody it is necessary above all for those who are to be teachers and educational officers. These can have no idea of what education ought to be unless they have gone through a regular course themselves, and consequently their work as teachers and educational officers must be perfunctory and inefficient."

The motion was put and negatived.

The Hon'ble MR. GOKHALE moved that in clause 21, sub-clause (1) head (b), the words "and the conditions governing their tenure of office" be

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [*Mr. Gokhale ; Mr. Raleigh ; Mr. Pedler.*]

omitted. He said:—" Clause 21 lays down the conditions which a College applying for affiliation has got to fulfil. Among those conditions is a condition about the teaching staff. It is to the effect that the College should satisfy the Syndicate about the qualifications of the teaching staff, and further that the Syndicate should also be satisfied about the conditions governing the tenure of office of these teachers. It is to this latter provision that I take exception. I submit, my Lord, that when the Syndicate is satisfied about the qualifications of the men who are going to work in a College, the terms on which the services of the men have been secured by the College is really no concern of the Syndicate. There are Colleges which would object to disclosing the conditions under which their teachers work to any outside body; my own College, for instance, would object to a demand for information on this point; so would, I think, the Jesuits.

"In the case of the London University I find that the University requires that the qualifications of the teachers should be satisfactory, but there is nothing said about the conditions governing their tenure of office. I therefore propose this amendment."

The Hon'ble MR. RALEIGH said:—" My Lord, it is a matter of common knowledge that in some of the Colleges of our Universities the position of the teachers is not what it ought to be. It is not merely a question of pay but of security of tenure and the place they occupy in relation to the management or administration of the College. It was in order to cover cases of that kind and to give the University the right to concern itself in such matters that these words were inserted. The cases which were quoted by the Hon'ble Member as illustrating what he considers the objectionable nature of the rule, do not appear to me to call for much explanation. In a Jesuit College, for instance, the conditions governing the tenure of office are that the teachers are there in obedience to the command of their superiors. There is nothing in the conditions under which a Jesuit Professor is working, there is nothing in the conditions under which a Professor of the Fergusson College is working, which is not already known to all the world, and I may say that in both cases the conditions are entirely creditable to the persons concerned. Why then there should be any objection taken to the University taking note of these matters I am quite unable to understand."

The Hon'ble MR. PEDLER said:—" I should like to add a few words in support of what has fallen from the Hon'ble Mr. Raleigh. Certainly with regard to the Colleges with which I am acquainted the tenure of office of some of the staff is most unsatisfactory. They are sent away almost at a moment's notice, and I have already given an instance, I think, in the course of the discussions on this Bill where certain Colleges absolutely discharge

[*Mr. Pedler ; Mr. Gokhale ; Mr. Raleigh.*] [21ST MARCH, 1904.]

their staff of Professors at the end of a season, say in April, and re-engage some or all of them again at the end of June, the object of course being to save the salaries for three months. So in the same way I have found that if in certain of the Colleges, not the satisfactory ones of course, any Professor does not give satisfaction, or if he does not entirely obey what the Proprietor of the College may order, he receives notice, and the College may sometimes be without a Professor for months at a time. I should therefore strongly support the Hon'ble Mr. Raleigh's remarks and oppose the amendment mainly on behalf of the good teachers."

The motion was put and negatived.

The Hon'ble MR. GOKHALE moved that in clause 21, sub-clause (1), head (c), between the words "will be made" and the words "in conformity with the regulations" the words "within a reasonable time after affiliation has been granted" be inserted. He said:—"This amendment refers to sub-clause (c), which lays down among other things that the College will have to satisfy the Syndicate that proper provision will be made for the residence in the College or in lodgings approved by the College of students not residing with their parents or guardians. Now, while I entirely agree that a College which fails to make this provision neglects an important duty, I think that it should be allowed a reasonable margin of time after affiliation for making this provision. My Lord, in a country where the people are so poor as they are with us, private enterprise in the field of education is hampered by a number of difficulties. In the case of my own College, with all the sympathy that we received from the Princes and people of our Presidency, it took us ten years of incessant effort after affiliation to bring up our equipment to its present standard. In the case of other Colleges the difficulties might be even greater. I trust, therefore, that my amendment will be accepted, so as to remove all reasonable ground for complaint."

The Hon'ble MR. RALEIGH said:—"My Lord, the sub-clause as it stands uses the expression 'will be made', and that is, I think, sufficient to secure that the reasonable time for which the Hon'ble Member has pleaded will be granted. The words which he proposes to add would not really strengthen the sub-clause in any way, because obviously, when you say a reasonable time, then the authority upon which we are conferring the power, that is, the Syndicate, would have to say what is meant by a reasonable time. I think that practically there is no danger that the Syndicate would use this power in such a way as to impose any unfair demand on the promoters of a new College, and therefore I see no necessity for the amendment."

The motion was put and negatived.

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [*Mr. Gokhale ; Nawab Saiyid Muhammad ; Mr. Raleigh.*]

The Hon'ble MR. GOKHALE moved that in clause 21, sub-clause (1), head (f), between the words "be made" and the words "for the residence of the Head of the College" the words "within a reasonable time after affiliation has been granted" be inserted. He said :—"My reasons for this amendment are the same as for the previous one. I think the provision to be made for the residence of the Principal of the College and some of the Professors might not be practicable at once, and some time might be allowed. However, I do not wish to say anything after what has fallen from the Hon'ble Member and merely make the motion."

The motion was put and negatived.

The Hon'ble NAWAB SAIYID MUHAMMAD moved that in clause 21, sub-clause (1), head (f), for the words "the Head of the College and some members" the words "one member" be substituted, and the words "the College or" be omitted. He said :—"In moving this amendment, I beg to point out that when a College applies for affiliation the demand that provision should be made for the residence of the Head of the College and some members of the teaching staff in or near the place provided for the residence of students seems to me unnecessary and in many instances may be impracticable. When a College is newly established, there will be a great difficulty in finding suitable accommodation for the residence of students, and it will be adding to the difficulty if accommodation is to be provided for the residence of the Head of the College and some members of the teaching staff. It will be easier to arrange for the residence of some one member of the staff.

"Again, there is absolutely no reason why the Head of a College or any member of the teaching staff should invariably be required to reside in or near the College itself. It may with some reason be demanded that some sort of supervision be kept on students in the place provided for their residence. For that purpose, it will be sufficient if any one member of the staff who has to supervise is required to reside in or near the place provided for the residence of students."

The Hon'ble MR. RALEIGH said :—"My Lord, this sub-clause is designed to promote the object so strongly approved by Mr. Justice Ameer Ali and other authorities who know the circumstances of Colleges in this country and to give our Colleges, as far as possible, a residential character. I am quite aware of all the difficulties in the way, financial and other, and therefore we inserted words which are not usually found in the statute law.

[*Mr. Raleigh ; Rai Sri Ram Bahadur.*] [21ST MARCH, 1904.]

These words give a very wide discretion and I think are a sufficient protection to Colleges. I therefore see no necessity for the Hon'ble Member's amendment."

The motion was put and negatived.

The Hon'ble RAI SRI RAM BAHADUR moved that in clause 21, sub-clause (1), head (f), for the word "and" the word "or" be substituted, and for the word "members" the word "member" be substituted. He said:—"This is an amendment slightly different from the one proposed by my Hon'ble friend Nawab Saiyid Muhammad. If special residential quarters for some one member of the teaching staff be provided, that will be quite sufficient, and not for the Head of the College, as well as for the members of the teaching staff."

The Hon'ble Mr. RALEIGH said:—"My reply to the Hon'ble Member is the same as that to the last amendment."

The motion was put and negatived.

The Hon'ble RAI SRI RAM BAHADUR moved that in clause 21, sub-clause (1), head (f), after the word "staff" the words "or some other competent person" be inserted. He said:—"The amendment relates to the clause just now discussed. There are colleges which have superintendents of boarding houses. These officers, though not belonging to the tutorial staff, live in the boarding houses. The amendment proposed by me, if accepted, will provide for such cases."

The Hon'ble Mr. RALEIGH said:—"My Lord, I think the language of this amendment is rather dangerously vague. The object of the sub-clause is to secure that the teaching and governing staff of the College take the responsibility for places in which the students reside, and I think it is very desirable that they should do so. The words 'competent person' on the other hand are extremely general. We have cases of hostels, for instance, where the person employed as a khansama is put in charge of students, and it might be contended that the khansama in his own line of business is a competent person. It is to guard against cases of that kind, and to ensure the competent supervision of the teaching members of the College, that the sub-clause was retained."

The motion was put and negatived.

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [*Mr. Raleigh; Mr. Gokhale.*]

The Hon'ble MR. GOKHALE moved that in clause 21, sub-clause (1), head (g), for the words "its continued maintenance" the words "its maintenance in an efficient condition" be substituted. He said :—"This refers to sub-clause (g), which lays down that the College seeking affiliation shall have to satisfy the Syndicate that the financial resources of the College are such as to make due provision for its continued maintenance. The word that was used in the original Bill was 'permanent'. In the Select Committee it was changed into the word 'continued'. 'Continued maintenance' might, however, be misinterpreted as well as 'permanent maintenance', the expression being supposed to imply that the College should have resources, other than current, of a character to ensure its continued existence. It must be remembered that the provisions of these sub-clauses, though they apply in the first instance to new Colleges seeking affiliation, have been made applicable by a subsequent clause to existing Colleges. Thus, the Syndicate may at any time call upon any affiliated College to satisfy it as to what its resources are, and the Syndicate might say that, though they were sufficient to enable the College to maintain itself in an efficient condition while they lasted, there was no guarantee that they would always last, and therefore there was no guarantee of the continued maintenance of the College. I submit that all that the Syndicate has really to concern itself with is to see that the College is able to maintain itself in an efficient condition, and I therefore move that the words 'its maintenance in an efficient condition' should be substituted for the words 'its continued maintenance'."

The Hon'ble MR. RALEIGH said :—"My Lord, the wording of this sub-clause was settled after a very careful discussion in the Select Committee, and with great deference to my Hon'ble Colleague I must decline now to discuss its merits. I think our methods of business will not be improved if we take up questions of this nature in open Council."

The motion was put and negatived.

The Hon'ble MR. GOKHALE moved that in clause 21, sub-clause (7), the sentence beginning "The application shall further contain" be omitted. He said :—"These words were not in the original Bill; they were added in Select Committee. They are to the following effect :—

'The application shall further contain an assurance that after the College is affiliated any transference of management and all changes in the teaching staff shall be forthwith reported to the Syndicate.'

"Now I have no objection to a College being called upon to report any transference of management; but in regard to changes in the teaching staff, well.

[*Mr. Gokhale; Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya.*] [21ST MARCH, 1904.]

I really think that a provision of that kind might at times be very irritating. If they are permanent changes I do not object to a College being called upon to report, but even temporary changes are included within the scope of this sub-clause, and to that I have a strong objection."

The Hon'ble MR. RALEIGH said:—"I think it very important that changes in the teaching staff of the College should be notified to the University, and I think it desirable that the attention of the College should be called to that duty when the application for affiliation is being considered. But I may explain that these words were inserted in the Bill on the motion of my Hon'ble friend Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya, and I think I may enjoy the luxury of retiring from the field and allowing my two most formidable critics to fight it out between themselves."

The Hon'ble DR. ASUTOSH MUKHOPADHYAYA said:—"My Lord, the clause to which my Hon'ble friend Mr. Gokhale has taken exception was, as has been stated by the Hon'ble Member in charge, inserted in the Bill by the Select Committee at my instance, and I adhere to my view that it is a necessary improvement upon the Bill as originally framed. My conception of affiliation is that it is a continuing and subsisting relation between the University and the College, and every safeguard ought to be provided for the practical achievement of this conception. When a College is affiliated, two elements, which I may describe as the material and the personal element, have to be taken into consideration. So far as the material element is concerned, under which head I include the College building, the laboratory and the residence of the students, it is little liable to sudden change or capricious alteration. But so far as the personal element is concerned, under which head I include the constitution of the committee of management and the tutorial staff, it is liable to sudden changes. To take one example: the authorities may affiliate a College upon the assurance of a committee the members of which are of the highest standing and unimpeachable character; as this committee is not a corporation, there is nothing to prevent its dissolution at any time; it is conceivable that the management may be transferred to irresponsible persons, as indeed happened not many months ago in the case of a Bengal College, which had been affiliated originally at the instance of a wealthy landowner who subsequently transferred the management of the institution to a speculator, under whose excellent guidance the College was ruined. The Syndicate did not discover this fact till it was brought to their notice years after by the exasperated Principal of the College. Similarly, in the case of the tutorial staff, affiliation has often been secured at a time when the College was manned by able Professors who have

[18TH MARCH, 1904.] [*Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya ; Mr. Gokhale.*]

been gradually replaced by inferior men. This, my Lord, in my opinion, is an extremely undesirable and absolutely indefensible state of things. The Syndicate is entitled to say that they must be kept duly apprised of all changes in the committee of management and the tutorial staff. I do not apprehend for a moment that the Syndicate will ordinarily find it necessary to intervene ; if I am not very much mistaken, the effect of the clause will be to prevent unnecessary and undesirable changes, which I regret to say are not always introduced very wisely or in the true interests of the students. I must, therefore, oppose the motion of my Hon'ble friend."

The Hon'ble MR. GOKHALE said :—"In deference to what fell from Your Excellency on Saturday last, I have, I hope, been exercising the right of reply more sparingly today, but I cannot allow the remarks of the Hon'ble Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya to pass without a reply. I may point out that much of what this unlettered sub-clause contains is really provided for in other ways. For instance, one of the conditions laid down in clause 21 is that the College should be under a regularly constituted governing body, and that the Syndicate should be satisfied about the qualifications of the teaching staff and the conditions governing their tenure of office. And the Syndicate is empowered to call for reports from time to time on these points from a College. The Syndicate therefore really possess all the power that is needed. This assurance binds nobody : there is no penalty attaching to its non-fulfilment and it is, moreover, a perfectly unnecessary assurance. I have already stated that in regard to the transference of management I have no objection and my Hon'ble friend need not have elaborated that point at all ; but in regard to changes in the teaching staff—especially temporary changes—I must say that great inconvenience must arise in practice. I think those who have any experience of the working of a College will realize that at once. I therefore think that this sub-clause should be omitted."

The motion was put and negatived.

The Hon'ble MR. GOKHALE moved that in clause 21, sub-clause (2), for the words "record their opinion on the matter" the words "pass such order as they deem proper : Provided that if the order is for granting the application, the previous sanction of the Government shall be necessary before the order becomes effective" be substituted. He said :—"I beg first to point out that amendments 81, 83* and 86† all hang together. They are practically three

* That in clause 21, sub-clause (3) be omitted, the following sub-clauses being renumbered accordingly.

† That in clause 21, sub-clause (4), for the word "Government" the word "Senate" be substituted.

[*Mr. Gokhale ; Mr. Raleigh.*] [18TH MARCH, 1904.]

parts of one and the same amendment, and I had given notice of them all as one amendment. I hope, therefore, that Your Lordship will allow me to speak to these three amendments taken together.

"The three amendments of which I have spoken refer to the power which the Government have expressly taken to themselves under this Bill to make affiliation a direct act of their own. Under the old law the matter is governed by regulations which have received the sanction of Government. These regulations leave affiliation, in all Universities, to be granted by the Syndicate or Senate, with the previous sanction of Government. This is reasonable and this is all that is really necessary. The present Bill, however, goes much beyond that and lays down that the Syndicate and the Senate are merely to report and the Government are to pass final orders on an application for affiliation, and they may override even the unanimous opinion of the Syndicate and the Senate, and either grant or withhold affiliation. My Lord, no case has been made out for thus reducing the Syndicate and the Senate to a position so devoid of dignity or importance, and I therefore move the amendment standing in my name."

The Hon'ble MR. RALEIGH said :—"My Lord, we have now come to a group of amendments which are all governed, according to my view of the case, by the same principle, and the principle is this, that in the affiliation and disaffiliation of Colleges the responsibility rests not on the University alone but on the University acting in co-operation with Government. We consider that a proposal to add a new College to the University, or a proposal to strike a College off the list, is a matter on which the Government ought to be fully informed and a matter in which also Government should take the responsibility of final decision. The only objection which, as far as I can see, has been taken to that in the part of the Bill we are now considering is that the Government after an unfavourable report from the Syndicate and Senate may insist on affiliating the College. I would ask the Council to consider whether that is at all probable. Hitherto the Government has been criticised for attempting to apply a high standard, some say an impossibly high standard, to the Colleges. Is it then at all likely that if the Syndicate and the Senate are of opinion that there is no sufficient guarantee for securing efficient teaching or permanent maintenance, or adequate supervision of students, the Government will still insist on affiliation? That seems to me so improbable as to be almost out of the question, and therefore I would maintain the Bill in its present form."

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [*Mr. Morison ; Mr. Gokhale.*]

The Hon'ble Mr. MORISON said :—"I think this the most important and the most valuable provision in the Bill. Our Senates and Syndicates are largely composed of Fellows who belong to or represent the Colleges which are popularly supposed to be in rival competition with each other. The public does not believe that these Fellows are free from bias if they recommend disaffiliation or refuse affiliation, and the Senates and Syndicates are apt to decide weakly and timidly when they recall that they will be charged with jealousy or partiality for taking a certain course. A short while ago the Syndicate of Allahabad University made difficulties about the affiliation of the Central College at Benares, and this action was very generally attributed to the jealousy or malice of certain members of the Syndicate. The action of Government is less liable to misrepresentation. The Government may, perhaps, be accused of wanting to arrest the spread of education, but as between rival institutions the impartiality of the Government is generally trusted I think. It is, again, important to the University that affiliation and disaffiliation should be the acts of an external authority."

The Hon'ble Mr. GOKHALE said :—"I will say just one word in reply to the Hon'ble Mr. Raleigh. If it is inconceivable that the Government will exercise this power as against the unanimous wishes of the Syndicate and Senate, then there is no reason whatsoever why the Government should take this power. I think the new Senate and Syndicate are entitled to at least as much confidence and as much consideration at the hands of Government as the old bodies, and the provisions as they stand in the Bill are quite derogatory to them.

"As regards what the Hon'ble Mr. Morison said, well, my idea of a Senate is different from his. If affiliation and disaffiliation are to be direct acts of an outside authority exercised independently of the wishes of the Senate and the Syndicate, I do not think there is much dignity or independence left to such a University."

[*Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya.*] [21ST MARCH, 1904.]

The Council divided :—

Ayes 4.

The Hon'ble Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya.

The Hon'ble Rai Bahadur Bipin Krishna Bose.

The Hon'ble Mr. Gopal Krishna Gokhale.

The Hon'ble Rai Sri Ram Bahadur.

Noes 18.

The Hon'ble Mr. D. M. Hamilton.

The Hon'ble Mr. J. B. Bilderbeck.

The Hon'ble Dr. Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar.

The Hon'ble Mr. T. Morison.

The Hon'ble Mr. A. Pedler.

The Hon'ble Mr. H. Adamson.

The Hon'ble Nawab Saiyid Muhammad.

The Hon'ble Mr. E. Cable.

His Highness the Agha Khan.

His Highness the Raja of Sirmur.

The Hon'ble Mr. A. W. Cruickshank.

The Hon'ble Sir Denzil Ibbetson.

The Hon'ble Sir A. T. Arundel.

The Hon'ble Major-General Sir E. R. Elles.

The Hon'ble Sir E. F. G. Law.

The Hon'ble Mr. T. Raleigh.

His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal.

So the motion was negatived.

The Hon'ble DR. ASUTOSH MUKHOPADHYAYA moved that to clause 21 the following new sub-clause (6) be added, namely :—

"(6) An enquiry under this section shall not be made by any person who is directly or indirectly interested in any affiliated College in the neighbourhood of the College proposed to be affiliated."

He said :—"One of the most important provisions of the Bill regarding the relations between the University and the affiliated Colleges is the right of inquiry and inspection conferred upon the Syndicate. It is unquestionable that the University should exercise an effective power of control over affiliated Colleges and should exercise some degree of supervision over them; this can only be done properly by a periodical and systematic inspection of every College, no matter

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [*Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya; Mr. Raleigh; Mr. Bilderbeck.*]

under whose management it may be. It is obvious that such inspection is essential at the time of the affiliation of the College, during its continuance and also at the time of disaffiliation, should such a contingency unfortunately arise. But it is equally clear that such enquiry, if it is to inspire confidence, and such inspection, if it is to be productive of good results, must be cautiously and judiciously made by an absolutely impartial and the most qualified person available. In order to enable the University to discharge this new function of enquiry and inspection properly, it is essential that as soon as funds permit the University should make provision for the appointment of a special and eminently qualified officer. But inasmuch as this may not be found practicable immediately and as enquiry may have to be conducted and inspection may have to be made by what is described in the Bill as any competent person, I venture to suggest that provisions may be inserted in the Bill directing that no such enquiry and inspection shall be made by a person directly or indirectly interested in any affiliated College in the neighbourhood of the College which has to be inspected or in respect of which an enquiry has to be made."

The Hon'ble MR. RALEIGH said:—"It seems to me that if we accept this amendment it will carry us very far. As my Hon'ble Colleague Mr. Morison pointed out a short time ago, all University authorities are constituted of persons the greater number of whom are interested, or at least the Hon'ble Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya would hold them to be interested, in Colleges. If therefore we assume that a legal provision is necessary in order to prevent the Syndicate from doing what would be unwise and unfair, then it seems to me that we ought to have introduced rather elaborate safeguards into every part of the University constitution. I admit that certain apprehensions have been excited by the proposal to inspect Colleges. There are, for example, in a certain town in Bengal two Colleges that carry on a rather lively feud with one another, and people who do not like this Bill think it reasonable to assume that the Principals of those two Colleges will be appointed to inspect one another and the results will be unsatisfactory. But there is really no reason, assuming that we have a moderately competent Syndicate, to fear that anything so unwise will be done. I therefore do not think the amendment necessary."

The Hon'ble MR. BILDERBECK said:—"I wish to remark, my Lord, that I object to the introduction of any provision of this nature which postulates a possibility of a lack of commonsense or of a sense of common justice in a body like the Syndicate. It seems to me too that the provision would exclude the employment of one or two men who must be described as interested in the

[*Mr. Bilderbeck ; Rai Sri Ram Bahadur ; Mr. [21ST MARCH, 1904.] Gokhale.*]

institutions of the Presidency and who might be the persons best qualified to decide on the questions that might be raised. I refer of course to the Inspector of the Division or the Director of Public Instruction himself."

The Hon'ble RAI SIR RAM BAHADUR said :—"I beg to support the amendment. I know of an instance in our own Province in which, had it not been for the interference of Government, a College though most efficient in every respect would not have been affiliated to the University because of the rivalry of another College in that particular locality, as my Hon'ble friend Mr. Morison will bear me out. I therefore say that this is a good safeguard and should be provided in the Bill."

The motion was put and negatived.

The Hon'ble MR. GOKHALE moved that in clause 23, sub-clause (2), for the word "shall" the word "may" be substituted, and after the words "in this behalf" the following be added, namely :—"whenever the Syndicate has reasons to think that the efficiency of the College has fallen below a reasonable standard." He said :—"My Lord, this amendment refers to the clause which provides for the inspection of Colleges by the Syndicate. The clause as it is worded here reads thus :—

'(2) The Syndicate shall cause every such College to be inspected from time to time by one or more competent persons authorized by the Syndicate in this behalf.'

"Now, my Lord, in theory I have no objection to the inspection of Colleges. It also looks very nice on paper. As a matter of fact, however, in practice there will be very great difficulties in carrying these provisions out. My Lord, we have not got the men in this country to go and inspect the quality of teaching imparted in the different Colleges. It may be argued that the inspection was not intended to have reference especially to the quality of the teaching; but the recent Resolution of the Government of India on the subject of education makes special mention of the quality of teaching as one of the points on which inspection is to take place: and if that be so, my Lord, I submit that one of two things will happen: either men who are not qualified to go and inspect Colleges—to inspect the quality of teaching imparted in Colleges—will go and do this work, or else this provision will remain a dead letter. In either case it is undesirable that the provision should find a place in this Bill. In Colleges the men who teach are supposed to be specialists. How can one man, even if he were a most distinguished one, pronounce on the quality of the teaching of a number of

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [*Mr. Gokhale ; Mr. Raleigh.*]

specialists? If you want to send a separate expert for testing the College teaching in regard to separate subjects, you will have to send as many experts as there are subjects. This inspection, again, is bound to be a source of much difficulty and irritation in practice. There are some men in some Colleges who are on a much higher level than corresponding men in other Colleges, and if any of the latter are selected to inspect the work of any of the former, the inspection is likely to be resented.

“My Hon’ble friend Mr. Morison speaking to a previous amendment of mine said that the impartiality of members of the Syndicate has very often been questioned, and therefore it is not desirable that questions affecting the starting of rival Colleges should be left to the Syndicate. Well, that same argument applies to this case. If members of the Syndicate undertake the inspection duty, it will in practice mean the inspection of one College by a Professor in another. If you had University Professors then it would be a different thing. Then those Professors could have gone about and done the work of inspection. In their absence you will have to draw the inspecting officers from among the men belonging to the Colleges, and this, as I have pointed out, is likely to prove very unsatisfactory. I think there is only one case in which inspection should be provided for, and that is where the Syndicate has reasons to think, from the periodical reports received or from the results of examinations, that the College has allowed its efficiency to sink below a reasonable standard. In that case there would be no indignity in a member of any College going to inspect such a College.”

The Hon’ble MR. RALEIGH said:—“My Lord, my Hon’ble friend Mr. Gokhale wishes to make inspection an occasional duty of the Syndicate, a duty which is not to be performed except where it has reason to apprehend that there is something wrong or seriously defective. The Government of India, on the other hand, are of opinion that there ought to be a regular inspection of Colleges. It will be remembered that in the Despatch of 1854 inspection of Colleges was contemplated, and what it was intended at that time to introduce was inspection by Government. We now propose that inspection should be conducted by University agency. We are quite aware that our proposal raises the question whether it will be possible for members of the Syndicate to undertake this duty with good effect, the question whether the University will be able to provide itself with some regular machinery for inspecting all its Colleges—these are questions which I prefer that each University should work out for itself, but I think that the duty of regularly inspecting its Colleges should be imposed upon each of them.

[Mr. Raleigh ; Mr. Pedler.] [21ST MARCH, 1904.]

I have indicated the real difficulties in the case: the difficulties which the Hon'ble Mr. Gokhale has started, if he will pardon me for saying so, appear to me to be somewhat fanciful. He seems to imagine that inspection of Colleges can only be undertaken by some impartial authority who is able to set right each Professor in his own special subject, and his vivid imagination conjures up a person of this kind—a person of overbearing manners and no commonsense, who comes into a College, takes delight in finding fault and sets himself to contradict eminent Professors in their own special subjects. He then asks us to say who there is in India who will undertake to come and inspect Mr. Selby's work in philosophy, or Mr. Bain's work in political economy, or Mr. Paranjpye's work in mathematics.

"Now let us bring the matter to a practical test. The Hon'ble Mr. Gokhale and I have been colleagues now for some time, and he knows very well that I am not qualified to put myself in comparison with any of the three distinguished teachers whom I have named; but if the Bombay Syndicate were to employ me to inspect the Poona Colleges, I should accept that mission without serious misgivings. I should endeavour by enquiry on the spot to ascertain the quantity and the quality of the work done, and I should write a report trying to bring out the good points of the Poona Colleges, which are many, for admiration and imitation elsewhere, and if there were any points in which one might in a friendly way suggest an improvement in the working of those Colleges, those also might be mentioned.

"Now inspection of this kind would introduce a new element into Indian University life. Your Excellency once used the phrase 'watertight compartments' in describing how people of different provinces and different communities in India work out their own problems without ever meeting to compare the advantages of different systems. That observation applies with great force to our College life. Nothing has struck me more in going about the country than to find men who have given many years of devoted labour to their own Colleges, who seem to know nothing about other good Colleges which may be quite close to them. Now if a University makes a business of introducing inspection, in the sense which I have tried to give to that term, the result will be that the experience of each College will be brought into the common stock and turned to account for the benefit of every other College of the same University."

The Hon'ble MR. PEDLER said:—"I wish to strongly oppose the amendment proposed by the Hon'ble Mr. Gokhale. It appears to me that if any University affiliates a College, that gives a certain right to the University

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [Mr. Pedler ; Mr. Gokhale.]

to see that the work which is being carried on is up to the required standard, and there is only one way of ascertaining this, and that is by being in actual touch with such College. The experience that I have had in Bengal has shown me the absolute necessity, not only of inspection now and again, but of frequent and periodical expert inspection. Unless Colleges know what is expected of them they really do not work up to the standard required. When going round with the Universities Commission I think that the one fact brought out most prominently was the desirability of this form of inspection. Perhaps I have said one or two rather strong things in reference to Bengal in the course of the debate, and I should now wish to add that in whatever Province the Universities Commission made their tours the same facts were revealed. In every Province bad Colleges were found to exist which should never have been affiliated and which urgently required to be brought up to a higher standard to make them in any way comparable with the other Colleges which had been affiliated to the University. I may mention the case of one College, not in Bengal—a second grade College—where, on visiting it, it was found to consist of one room, very dark, very dirty, divided into two sections by a canvas partition which was torn in various places. The whole furniture consisted of two or three benches in very bad repair. There were two students on the roll of this College. Now, if there had been anything like a periodical inspection, such a College as this would either have ceased to exist or been made to rise to a proper standard. I therefore think it is absolutely essential that there should be a periodical inspection of these Colleges."

The Hon'ble MR. GOKHALE said:—"I beg leave to say just one word in reply to what the Hon'ble Mr. Raleigh has said. He practically leaves the difficulty of the question untouched. He says that this question, how the inspection should be exercised, should be left to the different Universities to decide. That does not carry us very far. Of course, he offers himself to go and inspect Colleges, if appointed to do so; but I do not think there are many men of his type available: so even that is not a practical suggestion.

"As regards what the Hon'ble Mr. Pedler says, it must be remembered that under this Bill the Syndicate will be empowered to call for periodical reports from Colleges on such points as it deems proper, and I myself am willing that where a College has sunk below a certain standard, inspection should be enforced; but in all other cases the inspection will be only nominal or else it will be needlessly irritating."

The motion was put and negatived.

[Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya] [21ST MARCH, 1904.]

The Hon'ble DR. ASUTOSH MUKHOPADHYAYA moved that to clause 23 the following new sub-clause be added, namely :—

"(4) An inspection under this section shall not be made by any person who is directly or indirectly interested in any affiliated College in the neighbourhood of the College to be inspected."

The motion was put and negatived.

The Hon'ble DR. ASUTOSH MUKHOPADHYAYA moved that in clause 24, sub-clause (2), for the words "Before taking the said motion into consideration, the Syndicate shall" the words "If upon such motion, the Syndicate is of opinion that there are *prima facie* grounds for enquiry, the Syndicate shall, before taking further action in the matter," be substituted. He said :—"My Lord, the provisions of the Bill which define the procedure to be followed, when a College has to be disaffiliated, appear to me, if I may say so without discourtesy, to be of a somewhat impractical character, though I must confess that in the Bill as amended some improvements have been made. But even now the Bill provides that if a member of the Syndicate gives notice of a motion to disaffiliate a College, accompanied by a statement of his reasons, the matter must go up to the Government notwithstanding that it may turn out that the charges are groundless and that the individual member concerned may have been sadly mistaken or grievously misled. Once the initiative has been taken, once the ball has been set in motion, there is no agency that can stop it. I cannot conceive that there is any necessity for a provision like this. I therefore venture to suggest that, before any action is taken by the Syndicate upon any motion for disaffiliation, the Syndicate should be satisfied that there are *prima facie* grounds for enquiry; unless the Syndicate is so satisfied, I do not see the necessity for any public enquiry. After all we are concerned with and recognise the Senate and the Syndicate and not individual members of either body. A public enquiry into the conduct of a College is a matter of the utmost gravity and may seriously affect its position and reputation, and I have no hesitation in saying that such an enquiry ought not to be instituted at the instance of any individual member of the Syndicate whatever his position may be; such an enquiry ought to be held only if the Syndicate is satisfied that a *prima facie* case has been made out. I hope, my Lord, I shall not be told that if my suggestion is accepted the Syndicate may decline to hold an enquiry where an enquiry ought to be held. If your re-constituted Syndicate deserves this want of confidence, the most perfect piece of legislation which this or any other Council may manufacture will be of no avail in effecting the educational reforms which every right-minded man desires."

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [Mr. Raleigh; Mr. Gokhale.]

The Hon'ble MR. RALEIGH said :—" My Lord, I must refer to what I said in starting on this group of amendmients in regard to the duty imposed upon the Government and the University in this matter. It appears to me that the motion to disaffiliate a College is a very serious one. It raises a question on which not only the University but also the Government should be fully informed, and if in a body like the Syndicate one member is prepared to take upon himself the extremely unpleasant task of proposing the disaffiliation of a College, the case seems to be one that must be settled by authority, and on which the procedure indicated in the Bill must be followed."

The motion was put and negatived.

The Hon'ble MR. GOKHALE moved that in clause 24, sub-clause (3), after the words " shall make a report to the Senate " the words " if, in their opinion, the rights conferred on the College by the affiliation should be withdrawn " be added. He said :—" When a proposal to disaffiliate a College comes before the Syndicate, the Syndicate may come to the conclusion that disaffiliation was not at all necessary. If the Syndicate takes this view, then the Senate should not be troubled in the matter, and the question should not go up to Government at all. The argument just now urged by the Hon'ble Mr. Raleigh appears to me to be somewhat extraordinary. He would set one member of the Syndicate above all the other members. If one member proposes disaffiliation and the others are all against it, Mr. Raleigh would wish that the Government should express an opinion. Now, my Lord, look at the number of safeguards that already exist. First of all, eighty per cent. of the Senate are to be nominated by Government, and these are to elect the Syndicate, and in this Syndicate half the member of seats are by statute reserved for Professors. If in these circumstances the Syndicate is not to be allowed to decide whether a motion for disaffiliation should or should not go to the Senate and the Government, I submit that the Syndicate has no real authority conferred on it."

The Hon'ble Mr. RALEIGH said :—" My Lord, my reply to this is the same as to the last amendment. I think that, if the proposal to disaffiliate is made, it is a case for inquiry not only by the University but also by the Government, and that the best way of securing the consideration of the serious questions raised is to follow the procedure laid down in the Bill."

The motion was put and negatived.

The Hon'ble MR. GOKHALE moved that in clause 24, sub-clause (4), for the words " record their opinion on the matter " the words " pass such order as they deem proper : Provided that, if the order is for disaffiliation, the previous sanction of the Government shall be required before it become

[*Mr. Gokhale; Mr. Raleigh; Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya; Rai Sri Ram Bahadur.*] [21ST MARCH, 1904.]

effective" be substituted. He said:—"My amendment is practically the same in substance as the existing regulations of the different Universities on the subject of disaffiliation. My Lord, I submit that where the Syndicate or the Senate, or the Senate acting on a recommendation of the Syndicate, comes to the conclusion that there is no need for disaffiliation, the matter should not go to Government. If disaffiliation is resolved upon, of course the previous sanction of the Government should be necessary, and that is the present practice. No case has been made out for a larger measure of Government interference and control than this. On the other hand, the new constitution of both the Senate and the Syndicate is a powerful argument against the course proposed."

The Hon'ble MR. RALEIGH said:—"I cannot accept this amendment. I think my reasons have already been stated by implication."

The motion was put and negatived.

The Hon'ble DR. ASUTOSH MUKHOPADHYAYA moved that to clause 24 the following new sub-clause (7) be added, namely:—

"(7) An inspection or enquiry under this section shall not be made by any person who is directly or indirectly interested in any affiliated College in the neighbourhood of the College proposed to be disaffiliated."

The motion was put and negatived.

The Hon'ble RAI SRI RAM BAHADUR moved that in clause 26, sub-clause (1), head (a), after the word "Government" the words "which shall come into force after such sanction" be added. He said:—"What I propose is that when the rules have been framed by the Senate and Government sanction has been obtained, the rules should come into force without any interference by the Government."

The Hon'ble MR. RALEIGH said:—"My Lord, I think the proposal to omit sub-clause (b) raises an important question of principle. I oppose this amendment, but perhaps the argument had better be stated on the next motion."

The motion was put and negatived.

The Hon'ble MR. GOKHALE moved that in clause 26, sub-clause (1), head (b) be omitted. He said:—"This clause reads as follows:—

'26. (1) Within one year after the commencement of this Act or within such further period as the Government may fix in this behalf,—

(a) the Senate as constituted under this Act shall cause a revised body of regulations to be prepared and submitted for the sanction of the Government;

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [*Mr. Gokhale ; Mr. Raleigh*]

- (b) if any additions to, or alterations in, the draft submitted appear to the Government to be necessary, the Government, after consulting the Senate, may sanction the proposed body of regulations, with such additions and alterations as appear to the Government to be necessary.'

"The clause refers to the new body of regulations that have to be framed by the Senate. I admit that the provision is only of a temporary character, and the power that the Government would exercise under this clause would be confined to the first body of regulations and would not apply to any subsequent regulations that may be framed afterwards; but all important regulations will be included in the first body, and therefore there is not much comfort in the fact that subsequent regulations will be free from such interference on the part of Government. My Lord, I submit that a University ought to be left in a matter of this kind to determine what regulations it requires, and the Government should be content to have the power of sanctioning or vetoing them. This is not a matter like affiliation and disaffiliation where it may be urged that, owing to the rivalries and jealousies of different Colleges, it is necessary for the Government to keep in their own hands the power of both initiation and control. The members of the new Senates will—at least ninety per cent. of them—be appointed because of their fitness to be members of an academic body. Surely these men ought to be trusted to frame proper regulations. We have been told again and again that the Universities at present do not attach sufficient value to the opinion of experts. Well, the Government in their turn do not err on the side of trusting the experts too much either. After all, how little is the risk in leaving this matter to the Senate! The men are nominated by Government, and it is in the last degree unlikely that they would in any way set themselves in opposition to the wishes of Government in any important matter. Moreover, who is better qualified to advise the Government in these matters than a Senate composed of men appointed to be Fellows because of their being educational experts? I think therefore that head (b) of sub-clause (1) of clause 26 should be omitted."

The Hon'ble MR. RALEIGH said:—"My Lord, this particular sub-clause has been a good deal commented upon, and is relied upon as evidence that the Government are taking to themselves too much power to control the Universities. I will state as clearly as I can the reasons for which I think it should be regarded as a necessary part of the Bill. The Government has accepted in general terms and with some important modifications the policy which was outlined in the Report of the Universities Commission. If that policy is to be carried out, it will be necessary in the case of each University that the regulations should be revised, and that there should be, as the Bill proposes, a new body

of regulations. Now there were two courses open to the Government. They might have followed the course which has on various occasions been taken by University reformers in England. When Lord Salisbury, for instance, undertook to introduce certain changes into the courses of study and the administration of the University of Oxford, how did he proceed? He induced Parliament to pass an Act under which a Statutory Commission was appointed to make regulations for the Universities. There were seven members of the Commission and, when they proceeded to make new statutes for the University, two members of the University were appointed to sit with them. In the same way when they came to make new statutes for a College two members of that College were added to the seven Commissioners, and this body, appointed by Parliament, after sitting for a considerable time produced the statutes under which the daily work of the University is now carried on. Well, we could not well follow a procedure of that kind in India simply because it would have been difficult to find men who were at once competent to do the work and able to devote the necessary time to its completion. We therefore proposed, and the proposal is altogether in favour of the University, that the University itself should in the first instance make its own regulations. That, I submit, so far from showing any want of confidence in the Universities, shows that we are prepared to give them the largest possible measure of power in framing the rules under which they are to work.

"Now everything, from the Government point of view, depends upon the new constitution of the University being started with regulations which are complete and which in important points of principle are satisfactory. Instead of appointing an outside authority to go round and make regulations for each University, with or against its will, we proposed that the Universities themselves should make regulations and that we should merely retain the power to make additions or alterations in the body of the regulations when it is presented. This general description of our policy must be taken subject to the assurance which, speaking in the name of Government, I gave on the introduction of this Bill, namely, that Government had no idea of using this temporary power merely for the sake of introducing uniformity, and that we disclaimed altogether the idea that there could be any good in reducing the five Universities in India to a rigid uniformity, or in prescribing, for example, the same courses of study in each. These are matters in which we are perfectly content that each University should frame its own policy. But in case—and it is a perfectly conceivable case—any influence should prevail which would prevent a University

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [*Mr. Raleigh ; Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya.*]

from making a regulation at all, or induce it to make an unsuitable regulation, then we ask for the power to make the addition or the alteration required, and I submit that we are not asking for more than is necessary. For these reasons I would keep the sub-clause."

The Hon'ble DR. ASUTOSH MUKHOPADHYAYA said:—"I desire to support this motion which is identical with the next one standing against my name. I entirely dissent from the view that the Government should take power to add to or alter the regulations. Under the Act of Incorporation as also under this Bill, regulations framed by the Senate do not acquire any binding character till they have received the approval of the Government. The power of veto which the Government thus enjoys is, I venture to think, quite effective for all practical purposes. If the re-constituted Senate was intended to be a miscellaneous body of amateurs, I could appreciate the propriety of such a provision in the law. But it seems to me to be quite inconsistent with the avowed character of the University as a body of experts, that an elaborate set of regulations framed by them should be liable to be modified by the Government, and I am unable to see where Government will get expert advice outside the Senate to help it in the performance of this delicate and difficult task. If the Government has got such expert advisers, surely they ought to be on the Senate, so that they may take part in the deliberations of the University when the regulations are framed. My Lord, I deem it my duty to say that this provision of the law is indefensible and I am fortified in my view by a significant sentence in the Report of the Select Committee where they recommend the adoption of this clause on the understanding that the power conferred will not be used to introduce changes in the courses of study and other matters in which the University may be trusted to frame its own rules with the sanction of Government. To me, at any rate, it is a novel procedure to take power under an Act of the legislature in the widest possible terms and then to couple it with an assurance in the Report of the Select Committee that the power conferred is intended to be exercised only in certain undefined cases. My Lord, this cannot be right. A provision like this, which it is conceded is of a needlessly wide and sweeping character, naturally raises in the minds of people an apprehension as to what may or may not result from an interference on the part of the Government. I willingly concede that it is not merely inevitable but necessary and desirable that the Government should exercise some degree of control over the University; yet it does not follow by any means that the Government should reserve to itself such possible power of interference as may reduce the University to a department of the State. Let the University be re-constituted

[*Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya ; Dr. Bhandarkar ; [21ST MARCH, 1904.]*
Mr. Morison ; Mr. Pedler.]

with the utmost care and caution. But if the Universities are to take root and grow on Indian soil, the re-constituted Senates must be trusted and allowed to enjoy some degree of independence. I am afraid, my Lord, there are people still haunted by the phantom of inept Senates which will disappear under the operation of this Bill—and they are applying to the new Senate restrictions which might be perfectly justifiable in their application to existing Senates."

The Hon'ble DR. BHANDARKAR said :—" I beg to support this amendment. If Government really want something to be put in the regulations, they can easily get it done by making suggestions. Even our present Senates have never thrown away any suggestions from Government. Our Bombay University adopted at the suggestion of Government the school final examination. In the same manner Government suggested that Patography might be added to the course of one of our degrees. All the Universities accepted it, and ours laid down a more elaborate course than the others and it still stands in the Calendar. I do not remember a single occasion on which a suggestion of Government was thrown out by the present Senate."

The Hon'ble MR. MORISON said :—" I wish to say that when I was serving on the Committee I supported this provision only on the distinct understanding which was then given that this power would not be used to override the Universities, but it was solely intended to secure that a complete body of regulations shall be submitted for sanction ; I understood that this clause was only to be used in case the Universities attempt to escape from the provisions of section 25, by delaying indefinitely the drafting of regulations with regard to such clauses as they do not like. As it appears that the Government are not now prepared to give any such assurance I will support the amendment."

The Hon'ble MR. PEDLER said :—" I have not much to say with reference to the present amendment ; but I wish to oppose it for one or two practical reasons. When a body of regulations is made it is almost sure that there will be a few omissions or a few things which will require revision. All that this sub-section (b) says is that the Government after consulting the Senate may sanction the proposed body of regulations, etc. ; so that while the Government would be adding to or amending the regulations, the Senates would have the opportunity of expressing their views, and I think it may be taken as an axiom that any such representations would be carefully listened to and given full weight."

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [*Nawab Saiyid Muhammad ; Rai Sri Ram Bahadur ; Sir Denzil Ibbetson.*]

The Hon'ble NAWAB SAIYID MUHAMMAD said :—" My Lord, clause 26, sub-clause (1), head (b), seems to me unnecessary and, in some measure, unconstitutional. Past experience does not justify any departure from the practice now followed of allowing the governing body of a University to frame its own regulations subject to the sanction of the Government. The regulations do not come into operation until sanctioned by the Government, and that is, I think, a sufficient safeguard against any undesirable or improper regulation being framed. The reservation on the part of the Government of power to make additions or alterations in the regulations implies a want of confidence in the Senate for which there is no foundation. Government cannot possibly have better advice on University affairs than that emanating from the Senate constituted under the provisions of this Bill which are calculated to include in that body the men best fitted for the work. I, therefore, beg to support the amendment."

The Hon'ble RAI SRI RAM BAHADUR said :—" I beg to support the amendment. Experience of the past has shown that the Senates of Universities have never framed any regulations which were against the wishes of Government. The Senates and Syndicates which will now come into existence will consist mostly of educational experts, and the Director of Public Instruction, head of the Educational Department, in each Province will be one of the permanent members of both. I do not see any necessity for any power of interference to be exercised by Government. The presence of the experts and officers of the Educational Department both on the Senate and the Syndicate will be sufficient to ensure the rules being framed properly. The Government should not appropriate the direct power to make alterations and additions when the rules come up before it for sanction."

The Hon'ble SIR DENZIL IBBETSON said :—" My Lord, I should like to say a word on two points. In the first place, the Hon'ble Mr. Morison has told us that in Select Committee he supported this provision of the law on the understanding that an assurance had been given that it should not be used to override the University. Well that, of course, represents with absolute accuracy the impression produced on the Hon'ble Member's mind ; but I can assure him that such an assurance was not given, either by the Hon'ble Mr. Raleigh or by myself ; and not only was it not given, but when it was suggested that such an assurance should be given, I at once pointed out that it would be quite impossible that such an assurance could be given ; because, although, as the Hon'ble Mr. Raleigh has already twice told the Council and as the Select Committee contemplate in their Report, this power is not intended to be used to override

the Senate on minor matters, or to attain uniformity on such matters, yet it is distinctly contemplated that in matters of important principle, as my Hon'ble Colleague explained just now, the power should be used if necessary, and that was most certainly pointed out distinctly by myself. The second point on which I should like to say a word is that referred to in the Hon'ble Dr. Mukhopadhyaya's argument that the power of veto which the Government possesses is sufficient, without any power to make additions to or alterations in the regulations. That power of veto is insufficient for this reason. Imagine that the Senate of any particular University sent up regulations in which one of these points of vital principle was concerned, on which Government felt so strongly that the line adopted in the regulations was wrong, that they were compelled to overrule the Senate and to decline to sanction the regulation on that point. If the Government power stopped there, the Senate would have only to sit still and do nothing, and the result would be that there would be no regulation at all upon that point. One of the most important points in the scheme of reorganisation is that the new Senate should start fair, with a complete and satisfactory body of regulations. And in order to secure this body of regulations, upon which so much depends, it is absolutely essential that Government should have the power, not only to disallow provisions upon points of vital importance, but also to fill the blanks which that disallowance may have caused."

The Council divided :—

Ayes 8.

The Hon'ble Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya.
The Hon'ble Rai Bahadur Bipin Krishna Bose.
The Hon'ble Dr. Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar.
The Hon'ble Mr. T. Morison.
The Hon'ble Nawab Saiyid Muhammad.
The Hon'ble Mr. Gopal Krishna Gokhale.
His Highness the Agha Khan.
The Hon'ble Rai Sri Ram Bahadur.

Noes 14.

The Hon'ble Mr. D. M. Hamilton.
The Hon'ble Mr. J. B. Bilderbeck.
The Hon'ble Mr. A. Pedler.
The Hon'ble Mr. H. Adamson.
The Hon'ble Mr. E. Cable.
His Highness the Raja of Sirmur.
The Hon'ble Mr. A. W. Cruickshank.
The Hon'ble Sir Denzil Ibbetson.
The Hon'ble Sir A. T. Arundel.
The Hon'ble Major-General Sir E. R. Elles.
The Hon'ble Sir E. FG. Law.
The Hon'ble Mr. T. Raleigh.
His Excellency the Commande-in-Chief.
His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal.

To the motion was negatived.

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya ; Mr. Raleigh ;
Mr. Gokhale.]

The Hon'ble DR. ASUTOSH MUKHOPADHYAYA moved that the following new clause be inserted after clause 28 and the present clause 29 be re-numbered 30:—

"29. In section 7, Act II of 1857, Act XXII of 1857, and Act XXVII of 1857, the following words shall be inserted before the word 'cancelled':—

'with the consent of not less than two-thirds of the members of the Senate, present at a meeting specially convened for the purpose.'"

He said:—"The Acts of Incorporation of the Universities of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras provide that the Chancellor may, at any moment, cancel the appointment of any Fellow. The Acts of Incorporation of the Universities of the Punjab and Allahabad provide that such cancellation may be made upon the recommendation of not less than two-thirds of the members of the Senate present at a meeting specially convened for the purpose. I venture to suggest that the Acts of Incorporation of the three older Universities may be brought into harmony with those of the two younger Universities, as I am unable to discover any good reason for a difference upon this particular matter. I may be permitted to state, as an additional reason, that as Fellowships will, in future, be tenable only for five years, no Ordinary Fellow ought to be liable to removal during this term, except for some very good reason and upon the recommendation of the Senate."

The Hon'ble MR. RALEIGH said:—"My Lord, there may in certain cases be an advantage in taking the opinion of the Senate when a Fellowship is cancelled; in other cases it may be better to have no public discussion. The question is of no great practical importance. I can only find one case in which the power to cancel has been exercised. On the whole, I think the amendment is hardly necessary."

The motion was put and negatived.

The Hon'ble MR. GOKHALE moved that in the first schedule, the words "The Lord Bishop of Calcutta", "The Bishop of Bombay", "The Bishop of Madras", "The Bishop of Lahore", and "The Bishop of Lucknow" be omitted. He said:—"My Lord, taking the case of Bombay, I find that there are five *ex officio* Fellows included in the schedule, and they are the two Ordinary Members of the Governor's Council, the Chief Justice, the Director of Public Instruction and the Lord Bishop of Bombay. Of these, the Ordinary Members of the Governor's Council are there, because they with the Governor make up the Local Government, and as he is *ex officio* Chancellor they are *ex officio* Fellows, and I have no objection to that. Similarly, the Chief Justice, as

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [Mr. Gokhale; Mr. Raleigh; Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya.]

the highest Judicial authority in the Province, may be regarded as the head of the Faculty of Law, though he may not be the nominal head. Also as the Director of Public Instruction is the highest educational officer of Government, one can understand why he is an *ex officio* Fellow. But the inclusion of the Lord Bishop's name in the list I do not understand. He is no doubt the head of the English Church, but that Church has nothing to do with our Universities. Had a new Faculty—the Faculty of Theology—been added to the existing Faculties, as was proposed by some, the Lord Bishop might have been regarded as the head of that Faculty. But in its absence and with the avowed policy of Government of religious neutrality in educational matters, I do not see why the Lord Bishop should be an *ex officio* Fellow. I therefore move the amendment standing in my name."

The Hon'ble MR. RALEIGH said:—"My Lord, in proposing to retain the five Bishops as *ex officio* Fellows of the Universities we follow what has been the usage of the Universities, and we can give a good academic reason for doing so. The Anglican Bishop of an Indian diocese is almost always a distinguished Graduate of Oxford or Cambridge. Now it has often been pointed out that the Indian Universities conform to the Oxford and Cambridge type to this extent, that they are Universities in which the ordinary Arts teaching is in the hands of Colleges. Therefore, I think that the presence of gentlemen who are distinguished members of English Colleges is likely to be helpful to our Universities, and I cannot see that it would do any possible harm. I therefore should prefer to retain the words which the Hon'ble Member wishes to take out."

The motion was put and negatived.

The Hon'ble MR. RALEIGH moved that the Bill to amend the law relating to the Universities of British India, as amended, be passed.

The Hon'ble DR. ASUTOSH MUKHOPADHYAYA said:—"My Lord, the motion now before the Council is in one sense of a formal character, but as it calls upon us to assent to a legislative measure which has hardly been equalled in importance by any other subject which in recent years has engaged the attention of this Council, affecting, as it does, the educational prospects of the people of this vast Empire, I cannot persuade myself to record a silent vote. It is impossible on the present occasion to trace the origin and growth of the University system in British India, but I may point out that when in the famous Despatch of 1854 Sir Charles Wood laid the foundation of the existing system of public education in India, a memorable advance was made over

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [*Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya.*]

anything that had preceded before. The Court of Directors, with genuine statesmanlike foresight, recognised that England's prime function in India was to superintend the tranquil elevation of the whole moral and intellectual standards and directed the establishment of a graduated series of schools and Colleges crowned in each Presidency by a University. The Acts of the Legislature creating the Universities were passed in the year of the great Mutiny and will ever remain as striking monuments of the coolness, the persistent energy and the generous impulses of the British race. But it would be idle to deny that time—that great relentless critic—has discovered defects in the constitution and the working of the Universities. I desire to dissociate myself completely from those who maintain that our Universities are ideal institutions and do not stand in need of any reform. My Lord, for some weeks past I have been assiduously studying the proceedings and the Reports of of the Oxford University Commission of 1850 and the Cambridge University Commission of the same year. The evidence and the reports furnish extremely instructive reading and prove conclusively how these ancient seats of learning and the Colleges composing the Universities had, towards the middle of the last century, completely got out of order and that drastic reforms had to be introduced in the best interests of the discipline and the studies of the Universities. I have referred to this matter to shew that there is no reason why Indian Universities should be left alone if they are capable of improvement. But I cannot agree with those unfriendly critics who maintain that the Universities have failed in the objects which they had in view, namely, in the words of the great Despatch of 1854, 'the diffusion of the improvements, science, philosophy and literature of Europe, in short of European knowledge,' and I cannot but point out that, in some quarters at least, the Universities are disliked and cried down, because there is really a dislike of the culture which educated Indians have attained. But if the Universities are not at the present day all that they might and ought to be, the question remains, are the provisions of the present Bill calculated to meet the requirements of the situation? In order to answer this question it is necessary to review for a moment the provisions of the Bill, which, broadly speaking, fall into three divisions; one dealing with the relation between the University and the affiliated Colleges, the next dealing with the constitution of the University, and the third dealing with the functions of the University. As to the first of these problems, if the Universities are to be anything better than mere examining machines, the Universities must exercise an effective power of control over affiliated Colleges and should exercise some degree of supervision over them. I concede that it is not desirable that there should be any undue interference with the internal management of the Colleges or any interference with the

[*Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya.*] [21ST MARCH, 1904.]

administration of their finances so long as proper efficiency is maintained; but it does not follow by any means that it is desirable for the Universities to have no control over affiliated Colleges. I welcome the provisions of the Bill defining the requirements of an affiliated College, and I have no doubt that if these provisions are reasonably, judiciously and sympathetically enforced, they will tend to elevate the standard and character of our Colleges and thus necessarily to improve the character of the education imparted to our young men. I will not examine in detail these provisions, but I wish to lay particular stress upon those which require that every College must have a regularly constituted governing body, that the teaching staff are duly qualified and that suitable provision is made by the College authorities for the residence of such of the students as do not reside with their parents or guardians. But I attach even greater importance to the clause which points out the desirability of the Head of the College and some members of the teaching staff residing near the place provided for the residence of the students. My Lord, when this last provision is fully carried out, as I hope it may be carried out in the course of years to come, I trust excellent results will follow and a healthier relation will be established between the pupil and the teacher. The system now prevalent, under which there is a feeling of distance between the Professor and his pupil, is good for neither party, and I can conceive nothing more injurious to the interests of education than this feeling of estrangement between the pupil, who probably lives in the native part of the town, and his Professor who takes pride in not knowing the names of half the pupils he teaches and is comfortably lodged in Chowringhee. If our Colleges are ever to be organised as corporate bodies, this is the first step which has to be taken, and the Bill rightly insists upon it. There is one other point to which I should like to make pointed reference; the Bill provides that where affiliation is sought in any branch of experimental science, arrangements will have to be made in conformity with the regulations for imparting instruction in that branch of science in a properly equipped laboratory or a museum. I trust, My Lord, that this provision, when carried out in practice, will remove what has been a standing scandal, not merely in some private Colleges, but also in some Colleges owned and managed by the Government.

"My Lord, I stated just now that the provisions of the Bill which define the requirements of the affiliated Colleges and which entitle the University authorities, by enquiry and inspection, to ascertain whether these requirements are complied with, must be reasonably, cautiously and sympathetically enforced. My Lord, this is a qualification of the utmost importance, and I desire to lay special stress upon it. The provisions of the Bill are necessarily vague and a great deal will depend upon the mode in which they are enforced. And this brings me

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [*Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya.*]

to the second division of the Bill which deals with the constitution of the University and which thus acquires a character of paramount importance. If the administration of the University happens to be placed in the hands of people who have no real sympathy with the cause of high education—who cannot or will not understand the difficulties of struggling Colleges and their students and who are anxious to play the role of reformers—the provisions of the Bill to which I have just referred at length may in their hands prove a dangerous weapon, and the cause of high education will be in such a contingency undoubtedly imperilled and probably ruined. My Lord, I wish I could conscientiously say that the constitutional provisions of the Bill are satisfactory and are furnished with the necessary safeguards. Every effort that we have made for securing a statutory recognition of the non-official, and of the Indian element on the Senate has been strenuously opposed on behalf of the Government and has consequently failed. I am not one of those who contend that high education must be left entirely to the control of the people. On the other hand, I willingly concede that high education is one of the paramount duties of the State, and that it must be nurtured and developed under the fostering care of a beneficent Government. But I deny most emphatically that it is necessary or desirable to have any provisions in the law which may possibly convert the Universities into mere departments of the State; it is quite possible to stunt the growth of a beautiful tree by constant pruning and too affectionate care. I acknowledge with feelings of the sincerest gratitude that the Bill recognises, though to a limited extent, the principle of election, and I hope that at no distant date Government may find it possible to accord it a wider recognition, by throwing open to election a larger number of Fellowships and conferring the franchise upon Professors in our affiliated Colleges. But, my Lord, what has caused me the utmost disappointment is the refusal of the Government to define the character of the Senate and to prescribe any statutory rules for the guidance of successive Chancellors; when I add to this the provisions of the Bill, which make Fellowships terminable after five years, which secure for teachers a position of advantage on the Syndicate by means of artificial rules, which make affiliation and disaffiliation direct acts of the Government, and which make it possible, in theory at any rate, for the Government to impose any regulations even on the re-constituted Universities—when I take these together I feel bound to express my deepest regret that what might otherwise have been a beneficent measure should be disfigured by blemishes of a startling character.

“ My Lord, as to one of these particular points of difference I was told that the five years rule was in perfect harmony with the principle which obtains

[*Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya.*] [21ST MARCH, 1904.]

in this country in regard to some of the highest appointments under the State. I was assured, my Lord, that the five years rule works admirably where it prevails. But those who gave me the assurance must have forgotten for the moment a celebrated minute by the late Marquis of Salisbury, dated the 26th of April, 1875, in which the five years rule is condemned in unqualified terms, and it is pointed out that the actions of the Indian Government formed a long series of inconsistencies, that it had been found impossible to give permanent force to a new policy and all this was attributed to the fact that 'the Indian Government is'—my Lord, I will quote the language of the great statesman—'the Indian Government is by the law of its existence a Government of incessant changes, it is the despotism of a line of Kings whose reigns are limited by climatic causes to five years.' My Lord, I have quoted the language of one of the greatest British statesmen of the nineteenth century, and I hope I may be pardoned if I tenaciously adhere to error in such company.

"My Lord, while upon this question of the constitutional provisions of the Bill, may I be permitted to refer for a moment to a matter of great importance upon which particular stress has been laid by some of my Hon'ble Colleagues, but most pointedly of all by my Hon'ble friend Mr. Alexander Pedler. My Lord, it has been broadly stated by the Hon'ble Member in charge that the constitutional provisions of the Bill have been so framed as to render it possible for the Government to restore, what has been felicitously called, balance of power and interest from time to time. It has further been pointed out that if University education of the Western type is to prosper in this country, the European element must be strongly represented on our Senates. I am not aware that anybody has ever suggested any doubt as to the necessity of an adequate representation of the best qualified exponents of Western culture in our academic deliberations. But the Hon'ble Mr. Pedler complained with some bitterness that whereas in 1880 the European element had a substantial majority on the Senate of the Calcutta University, in 1902 the position had been reversed and the Indian element enjoyed a substantial majority; and he did not hesitate to attribute this result to an inherent defect in the constitutional provisions of our Act of Incorporation. My Lord, my Hon'ble Colleague supported his position by an imposing array of figures which I cannot but consider as somewhat unfortunate, as curiously enough they forcibly illustrate the saying that statistics are good servants, but they are not good masters. My Lord, my Hon'ble friend must have forgotten—that is the only assumption which I can make—that between the years to which he referred—1880 and 1902—a great change had come over the Department over which he so worthily presides. Whereas in 1880 there were plenty of qualified Europeans employed as Professors in the various Government Colleges in Bengal who

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya.]

formed useful members of our Senate, in 1902 the number of European Professors had been considerably diminished. My Lord, it was with reference to this very particular matter that I asked a question in the local Legislative Council on the 14th August last, in answer to which I was told that the policy of placing certain of the Government Colleges entirely under Indian Professors had emanated from a recommendation of the Public Service Commission in 1886-87, that pursuant to this policy the Colleges at Hooghly, Krishnagar, Rajshahi, Cuttack and Chittagong and the Calcutta Sanskrit College were manned almost entirely by Indian Professors. I was further assured that according to present arrangements the College at Dacca, of the new buildings of which Your Excellency laid the foundations the other day, was also to be entirely manned by Indian Professors. It was further added that out of twenty-two Professors attached to the Presidency College, which is supposed to be the model College in Bengal, capable of teaching up to the highest European standards, fifteen were Indians and seven Europeans, of whom four were absent on deputation, making the actual number of Indian Professors nineteen and the actual number of European Professors three. In answer, my Lord, to another inconvenient question, which I asked in the same Council on the 8th August last, I was informed that out of nine Government Colleges in Bengal, in as many as eight Colleges not one single European was employed by the Government to teach the English language and literature in the F. A., B. A., and M. A. classes, and that in the remaining College there was one solitary European Professor to teach English to my countrymen,—and, my Lord, would Your Excellency be surprised to hear that the Presidency College was included in the list of the eight Colleges. My Lord, I claim to have proved to the hilt that, under the auspices of the Government of Bengal, Western education is imparted to my countrymen in Government Colleges mainly through Indian agency, and that for the last eighteen years the English agency employed in the Educational Service has been steadily and systematically reduced. My Lord, I am not patriotic enough to be able to appreciate the wisdom of this policy, and I will add this much, that here is the true explanation why the European element has been steadily reduced on the Senate. If there was a large number of distinguished Europeans employed in the Education Department, as used to be the case a quarter of a century ago, they would undoubtedly have been placed on the Senate by the Government which had at its disposal an unlimited number of Fellowships. My Lord, I trust I shall be forgiven if I say that to employ Indians as the main agency for imparting Western education to Indians, and then to complain that these Indians have a dominant influence in the administration of their University, is neither logic nor good sense.

[*Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya.*] [21ST MARCH, 1904.]

"My Lord, it may be asked why absolute reliance should not be placed upon the capacity of the Government to administer the Universities in a perfectly satisfactory manner. Before I answer this question may I be permitted to point out that education can never be forced upon a people, and that if you wish to educate a race you must carry the nation with you. So far at any rate as high education in India is concerned, the policy of the State in recent years has not been quite of the character one would wish. The policy of the Government has been that for all kinds of advanced education, private effort should be increasingly and mainly relied on. I am not one of those who watch with indifference the small progress made in primary education; but while I willingly recognise that it is the duty of the State to permeate and elevate the vast amorphous unlettered substratum of the population, I am wholly unable to understand why the Government should abdicate its power and neglect its duties in respect of higher and collegiate education. If, however, we examine the history of high education for the last quarter of a century, we shall feel convinced that the condition of things is far from satisfactory. My Lord, the truth of the matter is that we have reached the ebb tide of high education, not because the Senates are inefficient but because the Government has starved its Colleges and has persistently weakened its Education Department. I cheerfully acknowledge that recently our Education Department has been strengthened by the accession of one or two really good men, to whose advice and co-operation we look forward with great expectations. But this Bill will be of little practical use unless the Government reverses its policy, substantially raises the efficiency of its Colleges, and materially strengthens its Education Department by the employment to a much larger extent of really first class men, first class not from the local or the Indian, but from the European, the Western, point of view. I sincerely hope this fundamental question may, under Your Excellency's enlightened guidance, receive the consideration of the present sympathetic Ruler of my province—the first Rector of my University; and I earnestly desire that His Honour's administration may mark an important era in the true progress of high education in Bengal. My Lord, there was a time, not very many years ago, when the Government maintained well-equipped Colleges under the management of Professors who would be an honour to any University. I am not asking Your Excellency to give us illustrious educators of the type of Arnold and Jowett, Kelvin and Ramsay; such personalities are rare even in England and cannot be imported or transplanted. If, however, Government will give us Professors of the type of Professor Cowell, Professor Tawney, Professor Gough, Professor Clarke, and Sir John Eliot—I name only a few of those who are no

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [*Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya.*]

longer amongst us—we should have nothing to complain; each of them was a tower of strength to my University and commanded universal respect and admiration. But, my Lord, we have fallen upon evil times, when safe mediocrity is the order of the day. We are quite familiar with gentlemen who obtain second class or even third class honours at Oxford or at some other English University and are fortunate enough to secure appointments as Professors in Government Colleges in this country. If upon their arrival they pose as eminent educational experts and shew no unmistakeable contempt for their Indian fellow-subjects, who, with all their shortcomings, may have devoted years of patient toil to the examination and solution of difficult educational problems, are the latter to be blamed if they show their impatience of these self-constituted educational experts. My Lord, the real danger in connection with this Bill is that, in spite of the best intentions and purest motive of the Government, the actual administration of its provisions may fall into the hands of fifth rate and unsympathetic teachers, of whom recent events have shown there are not a few in this country, who are uncharitable enough to imagine that the interest in the University which the best amongst the Indians feel is an interest otherwise than educational. My Lord, I yield to none in my appreciation of the words of the poet—

‘ And not by eastern windows only
When daylight comes, comes in the light
In front the Sun climbs slow, how slowly,
But westward look, the land is bright.’

“ But what I demur to is that every obscure young man who manages to get a degree at Oxford and secures an employment in the Education Service here, should be regarded as an Apostle of western learning.

“ My Lord, an examination of the proceedings of my University for many years past will prove conclusively that schemes of reform of the most vital character which originated with Indian members were strenuously opposed and defeated at the instance of officials and of teachers who thought they might be affected by the measures. My Lord, I have no desire to revive controversies which have been now forgotten, but I shall never forget how in 1891, when the first Indian Vice-Chancellor of my University made a strenuous effort to enforce the cause of discipline, the attempt was thwarted by the combined effort of some of the highest European officials whose action was supported even by the Government of India. I will never forget how during the administration of the same Indian Vice-Chancellor, at the instance of a member of the much-

[*Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya.*] [21ST MARCH, 1904.]

abused and much-dreaded profession to which I have the honour to belong, a regulation was passed which would have limited the number of boys in schools and made efficient teaching possible ; my Lord, this very regulation, before it could be carried into effect, was repealed during the administration of one of his successors—an eminent European educationist—by the combined effort of teachers and College proprietors whose profits would have been seriously affected by the operation of the rule. My Lord, I will never forget that it was by the persistent efforts of European Doctors and official members of the Senate that the preliminary qualification for the highly prized degree of Doctor in Medicine was lowered in spite of the protest of the Indian and the non-official members. My Lord, I will never forget that it was an eminent European educationist—I am sorry to say a Director of Public Instruction—who made a desperate effort to abolish the study of classical languages in my University, and the situation was saved only by the persistent effort of the Indian members and by the casting vote of an eminent lawyer who now occupies a seat on the Judicial Committee of His Majesty's Privy Council. Lastly, my Lord, though I shall gratefully remember that the best among the European teachers have materially helped to elevate the standard of University education, I can never afford to forget that, on more than one memorable occasion, necessary reforms in this direction have been retarded by the persistent opposition of inferior teachers who are unable or unwilling to keep pace with the progress of the times, and feel it a pang to part company with the favourite outworn text-books of their youth. If non-academic Indians go wrong, one may excuse them ; but what are we to say when European Professors who claim to be bearers of the sacred light from the Western Isle, from the banks of the Isis and the Cam, are also found to go astray ?

“ My Lord, I have only one word to add as to the third division of the Bill which deals with the extended scope of the Universities. I hope I may be permitted to point out that a reconstitution of the entire Education Department, at least in the higher branches of the service, is rendered imperatively necessary if practical effect is to be given to the provisions of the Bill which enlarge the scope of the Universities and make it their duty to promote advanced study and research. This is undoubtedly the portion of the Bill which has been welcomed by every friend of education, but it must remain a dead letter unless funds and men are forthcoming. I had ventured to make what still seems to me to be an extremely moderate and reasonable suggestion for raising funds by means of contributions from members of the Senate, which has shared the common fate of all our amendments. My Lord, is it too much to expect that the Government will,

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [*Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya.*]

in the beginning at least, generously and liberally come forward and help the Universities in this matter? We require teachers whose duty it will be not to impart elementary instruction for the purposes of the University examinations—which, after all, is only a secondary part in the work of a true University—but whose function it will be to extend the bounds of knowledge and to guide their students in their attempt to search out the secrets of nature. Of such investigators who are capable of doing original work themselves, and who are willing to encourage others in the path of original investigation, we have had, unfortunately, very few in the past. I trust, my Lord, when the Universities are reconstituted, they may, by the generous help of the Government, be provided with such teachers and investigators. It certainly seems to me anomalous that it should be possible to secure for the Meteorological Department of the Government of India an eminent mathematician who has distinguished himself by his brilliant researches in the domain of physics, while the Universities and the Colleges are left to be manned, with a few solitary exceptions, by comparatively inferior men.

“My Lord, I trust I may be pardoned if I derive my conception of a University from the characteristics as they have been recently described by one of the foremost mathematicians of the age:—‘To my mind, a University is a corporation of teachers and students banded together for the pursuit of learning and the increase of knowledge, duly housed and fitly endowed, to meet the demands raised in the achievements of its purposes. In the prosecution of its academic aims, the University should be free from all external censorship of doctrine; it should also be free from all external control over the range, or the modes, or the subjects of teaching. Above all, thought should be free from fetters of official type: whether political from the State, or ecclesiastical from the churches, or civil from the community, or pedantic from the corporate repressive action of the University itself. In its establishment, the amplest powers that wisdom can suggest should be conferred upon it. In working out its intellectual salvation, the exercise of those powers should be vested in select bodies of fit persons, sufficiently small in number to be efficient, yet large enough in number to prevent degeneration into an intellectual clique, changing sufficiently from time to time to prevent the dominance of merely personal policies, and representative enough to be in touch alike with the experience of the past and with aspirations for the future, so far as these have taken shape or acquired definition.’ My Lord, with this conception of an ideal University before my mind I find it impossible to accord to all the provisions of the Bill my unhesitating and unqualified approval. My Lord, I yield to none in my desire to see a Statute for the reform of the Indian Universities as free from objection as possible, and I

[*Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya ; Rai Bahadur* [21ST MARCH, 1904.]
Bipin Krishna Bose ; Mr. Bilderbeck.]

have striven to attain that object according to the best of my lights ; but, to my infinite regret, my endeavours have not been wholly successful. My Lord, we are about to make a great experiment, and let me hope that my fears and misgivings will prove unfounded. If the provisions of the Bill help in any measure to secure the realisation of Universities of the type so eloquently described by Professor Forsyth, the promoters of the measure will rightly have earned the lasting gratitude of the future generations of Indian students ; if, on the other hand, these provisions in any way injure and retard, as they well may, the cause of high education, the obloquy and reproach of the measure must necessarily attach to the same individuals."

The Hon'ble RAI BAHADUR BIPIN KRISHNA BOSE said :—" My Lord, if I intervene in this debate, it is merely with a view to explain in the fewest words possible the vote I am going to give. The object of the Bill may be said to be (1) to introduce such reforms in our Universities as would render them more efficient agencies for the promotion of collegiate education, and (2) to secure to the Government adequate control over higher education in this country. I believe that the attainment of these objects would not have been rendered less effective if concessions had been made in the direction indicated in some of the amendments moved during the course of this debate, notably as regards the representation of the popular element in the Senate and the term of office of the members of the Senate. Nevertheless, there is much in the Bill with which I am in sympathy, and such being the case, I do not think I shall be acting rightly if I vote against the motion before the Council. I shall therefore support it."

The Hon'ble MR. BILDERBECK said :—" My Lord, I believe that this Bill possesses immense potentialities for good, and that when the bitterness and angry feelings that have been stirred up by its introduction have subsided, it will be acknowledged by the Indian community to have been introduced in their own interests. I base my belief on my knowledge of the opinions held by some of the brightest and most thoughtful among the younger generation of students in Madras, and I must add that if these opinions diffuse themselves generally among their contemporaries, we have some augury of the ultimate success of the measure, for it is axiomatic that the provisions of the Bill can have their complete fruition only if the educated classes unite with the Administration in sympathetic and loyal efforts to raise the standards of higher education.

[21ST MARCH, 1904.]

[Mr. Bilderbeck.]

"I propose to deal very briefly with four of the most important reforms embodied in the Bill.

"One of its most important potentialities resides in the sections which invest the Universities with power to provide for the appointment of University Professors, and the erection and equipment of laboratories, etc. My Lord, I crave your kind permission to speak with some freedom on this aspect of the Bill. My service as an educational officer will in all human probability ere long terminate, and I therefore wish to take advantage of an opportunity which may never recur to make an earnest appeal to Government to step forward boldly and help the Universities or some of them with such a degree of liberality that a start may soon be made in the real work of University teaching. If only effect can be given to these provisions of the Bill, influences will soon be operative which will react beneficially on the ideals and educational methods of our University system. It is true that the 'organisation of brain power'—as an eminent man of Science has recently described it—is costly in the extreme—costly, that is to say, if we look at only one side of the account, but far from costly if we look at the enormous gains accruing to the country in the evolution of spiritual forces, in the intensification of intellectual activities and in the growth of material prosperity. These are mere platitudes to those acquainted with the facts, but the truths involved have not been fully realized by the public. It is self-evident that as no aid of any value can be expected for decades to come from benefactors amongst the Indian community, the State, and the State alone, can provide what is necessary: Three lakhs a year to one University would not be excessive, but if this be beyond the means of Government, perhaps some compromise could be effected if Government could see its way to handing over to the University the buildings and the salaries attached to the establishment of one of its own Colleges, and to economising its grants elsewhere, for concentration of effort, of material, and of means is essential to the solution of the problem.

"Perhaps the most important provision of the Bill as containing the *fons et origo* from which issue the powers of guidance and control required to give effect to the potentialities in the other parts of the Bill, is to be found in the sections dealing with the reconstructed machinery of administration. The measure was absolutely necessary, although it may be true that the older Senates in some cases have acquitted themselves well and have little or nothing to be ashamed of. I think it is a fair description of the facts to say that the supersession of the older Senates, while it involves a condemnation of the machinery, does not necessarily carry with it a condemnation of the work executed by the machinery,

[21ST MARCH, 1904.]

[Mr. Bilderbeck.]

though this is perhaps a somewhat academic distinction which carries with it little of the virtue of consolation. Universities, like individuals, must rise on stepping stones of their dead selves to higher things, and in the light of that fuller knowledge that comes to those who observe and reason from the results of experience, it has been for some time clear that, so far as human foresight can judge, University work will be more vigorously and efficiently administered by a small and compact body of carefully selected men. My Lord, I am of opinion that the Senates of the future will become a power in the land and make their influence felt not only in the University, but in the general administration of the country.

"I would, at this point, take the opportunity of expressing my gratitude to Government for the concession made to members of the teaching profession in section 6 of the Bill. If a University does not mean a collection of teachers who know their business, I do not know what the terms signifies, and the statutory recognition of the necessity for the representation of teachers on the Senates of the future is in my opinion one of the most valuable provisions in the Bill. My Lord, a further remark on this subject. Having for some years been President of the Teachers Guild in Madras, I think I can take upon myself the responsibility of saying that the concession will be hailed with pleasure by teachers of all grades, as being, I believe, the first statutory recognition in British India of the existence and of the essential importance of the profession.

"The third important provision of the Bill deals with the conditions of affiliation, more especially those which in some degree place affiliated Colleges under the control of the University. If I were asked to state to what cause more than another I would ascribe the failures and defects of our University system, I would say it was the absence of an effective general and systematic control over the machinery of collegiate education, in which term I include equipment, staff and methods of teaching. I shall endeavour to explain my meaning.

"When we remember that our imported University system has not yet grown into the life of the people and called into existence a cultivated public opinion; when we remember that the so-called University is a name without a habitation for a *genius loci*, and that, therefore, it cannot provide those localised standards which we expect to find in centres of intellectual activity, we must admit that University life in this country is without its natural nourishment and the progress of learning is deprived of some of the most powerful stimuli to sustained effort on the higher planes of work. When, too, we remember that our University is really a collection of institutions dropped about in different parts of the country, hardly capable of influencing one another except for evil by the process

[21ST MARCH, 1904.]

[*Mr. Bilderbeck.*]

of under-selling, and connected with the University by an affiliation which in most cases means nothing more than the permission to prepare and send up candidates for its examinations, can it be a matter for wonder that, except in the case of a few institutions which have the good fortune to be administered by men with high standards of duty and the necessary firmness and energy to act up to these standards, the only test of intellectual attainments and educational competency comes to be, for the student, ability to pass examinations and, for the teacher, ability to get his students through these examinations? Conditions of this kind have evoked false ideals and false methods of teaching and have encouraged the establishment of an excessive number of ill-equipped Colleges.

"In the conditions of the country there have been only two agencies which could successfully have combated these evils—one the University itself, the other the Government through its Department of Education. These agencies, either separately or in combination, could and should have brought the necessary pressure to bear on the improvement of the efficiency of the affiliated Colleges; but owing, perhaps, to the existence of a divided responsibility, unfortunately neither agency has exercised an adequately effective control. The Bill now remedies this evil by giving large powers of direct control over affiliated institutions to the Universities, while Government is relieved of a considerable portion of its duties in the supervision of Colleges, those in receipt of grants being excepted. However, as no Government can repudiate the greatest responsibility that falls to its lot—the necessity of fostering the interests of a national education in the highest as well as in the lowest branches—the Government of India for this general reason, as well as for other special reasons, necessarily reserves to itself some powers of interference and control in the affairs of the University. In the recognition of these principles of administration we must find the explanation and justification of the much abused and much opposed provisions in the Bill which leave to Government a final decision in all questions of affiliation and disaffiliation.

"The fourth and the last provision to which I wish to refer relates to the conduct of students and the maintenance of discipline. It is important that Universities should recognize that it is incumbent upon them to concern themselves with the manners, the behaviour and moral tone of their undergraduates, and the Bill provides that this duty shall not be overlooked. In performing this duty patience and care will be necessary, in view of the fact that the University must work through the affiliated Colleges and of the necessity of taking into account the special difficulties that the disciplinarian in India has to

[*Mr. Bilderbeck ; Dr. Bhandarkar.*] [21ST MARCH, 1904.]

contend with in the active or passive resistance of parents and of his Indian assistants who, owing to a kindness of nature, are not always able to see that blessings often disguise themselves in the form of severity.

"I am glad to see that in the provisions of this Bill Government has not allowed itself to press unduly the necessity for hostels. It must be remembered that in India the hostel system is on its trial, and that in some parts of the country it may have to go through a period of storm and stress before its final adaptation to Indian conditions. In the Madras Presidency there are still many unsolved problems of hostel administration—not the least important being the somewhat sordid question of making them pay their way. I think, my Lord, it would be well if those that are concerned in the administration of the new Act were to remember that it took nearly 150 years of University life in Cambridge before the residential system, which is such a characteristic feature in the University system of that and its sister University, was generally and definitively adopted.

"My Lord, holding as I do the views that I have expressed as to the importance of the provisions of the Bill, I cannot understand the language of those who describe the measure before the Council as a retrograde step and one that can do nothing for the Universities of India. May I be permitted to congratulate Your Lordship's Government on the near prospect of a successful termination of its labours in connection with this Bill."

The Hon'ble DR. BHANDARKAR said :—"My Lord, when the Bill before us was published, I hailed it as a measure calculated to remove the many evils that had crept gradually into the system of the Bombay University and to place higher education on a sound basis. Knowing the whole previous history of that University and being its oldest Graduate and closely connected with it, I regretted these evils more than perhaps anybody else. But since that time I have seen that those of my countrymen who take the lead in the discussion of public affairs or make their voices heard have condemned it; and even without waiting to hear what I have to say, they have both here and on the Bombay side begun, I am told, to chastise me severely for my not having followed my two Hon'ble Hindu colleagues and written a minute of dissent on the Report of the Select Committee. This staggers me, I confess, my Lord, and I find myself now in the predicament of the poor Brahman in an old Sanskrit story. Intending to perform a sacrifice he went to a rich man in an adjoining town and got from him a holy sacrificial animal. A goat is such an animal, while a dog is a very unclean animal, which no holy man should

[21ST MARCH, 1904.]

[*Dr. Bhandarkar.*]

even touch. The Brahman placed the goat on his shoulders and set out for his village. Three men saw him taking away the fat animal and resolved to have recourse to a device to make him give it up in order that they might themselves make a feast of it. They, therefore, put on different dresses and took their stand at different points on the route followed by the Brahman. The first going up to the Brahman said, 'O Brahman, why dost thou carry this unclean beast, this dog, on thy shoulders?' 'Nonsense!' says the Brahman, 'art thou blind, dost thou not see that this is a holy sacrificial animal and not an unclean dog?' 'Holy Brahman, do not be angry, go thy way,' says the other. After he had gone some distance the second man accosted the Brahman and said, 'O Brahman, even if thou lovest this dog, it is not proper that thou shouldst carry it on thy shoulders.' 'Art thou blind, dost thou not see that it is a holy sacrificial animal and not an unclean dog?' says the Brahman. 'Holy man, be not angry, do what pleases thee,' says the other. When he had gone further the third met him and said, 'It is certainly an unbecoming deed for a Brahman to carry a dog on his shoulders: therefore throw it down before anybody sees thee.' The poor Brahman was confused and thinking that it was a veritable dog that he carried, when so many had said it was, threw down the goat in haste and ran away to his village. Shall I similarly throw away this University Bill, because so many have said it is a bad measure? But I must not be a simpleton like the Brahman and believe that 'three' means 'all' or act against my clearest convictions even though they may be opposed to what *all* people say. My speaking and criticizing countrymen are not *all* my countrymen; and I have met a good many persons here who disapprove of the constitution of the present Senate and are in sympathy with the projected reform, and there are many in Western India who are dissatisfied with the existing state of things, though they occupy an humble position and have not spoken. And why should the views of my countrymen, most of them non-educationists, be alone consulted and not those of European educationists on our side of the country, who are more likely to be in the right? They certainly are not opposed or even believed to be opposed to the diffusion of higher education, and between them and ourselves there is not an unfriendly feeling. I am much grieved to find, however, that the adherence of these gentlemen, among whom we have such a man of dignified feeling as the Principal of the Deccan College, to the main provisions of the Bill has been most unjustifiably ascribed to the prospect of power which it holds out to them. They might, if they cared, easily retort by saying that the non-educationists are moving heaven and earth to get this Bill thrown out because it threatens to deprive them of the power and patronage they have been enjoying so long. And

my clearest convictions as regards the constituents of sound education were formed early in life. In 1855, when the new Department of Public Instruction was organized in virtue of the despatch of 1854, the Government of Bombay directed that the Elphinstone College, which had been in existence for about eighteen years before, should be examined by outside examiners instead of by Professors as had been usually the case, in order to ascertain from independent evidence its efficiency as an institution for higher education. Mr. E. I. Howard, one of the Examiners, subjected me, who was then a student of the College, along with my fellow-students to a severe test. Instead of raising an outcry against the unfairness of the test, I took it as indicating Mr. Howard's opinion as to what an educated man should know and what his capacities should be. This together with the manner in which he proceeded to re-organize that College as Director of Public Instruction, to which office he was appointed by Lord Elphinstone a short time after, instilled into my mind those ideas about education which I retain to this day. These ideas I endeavoured to carry out as Head Master of High Schools, Sanskrit Professor in the Elphinstone and Deccan Colleges, a University Syndic for eight years, and Chairman of the Syndicate for two years. If, therefore, I should now, for fear of displeasing those of my countrymen who speak and criticize and whom they represent, set my back against my whole previous career, I should stand self-condemned. I must, therefore, speak out boldly and fearlessly.

"And, first, I must not entirely pass over in silence the attitude of suspicion in which the speakers against the Bill have placed themselves. The Government, it is suspected, aim a blow at higher education; the educated native, it is said, is a menace to Government, and its policy is to put him down by all means. And what are the grounds? The only ones I had heard stated are that no native was invited for the Simla Conference and one was put on the University Commission at the last moment. These facts do not, I think, in any way justify the inference. The educationists on our side that were invited were Mr. Justice Candy, Mr. Giles, and Mr. Selby. Their presence at the Conference ought to have assured us that no harm was intended. And certain recent acts of the Viceroy, the Government of India, and the Local Governments ought to inspire confidence in us. The Imperial Library, which at present is the British Museum in miniature, but is destined at some future time under the fostering care of Government to be not an unworthy rival of that noble Institution, bears testimony to the anxiety of its founder to promote higher education. Everybody is allowed free access to it, and a man who really wishes to advance his

[21ST MARCH, 1904.]

[*Dr. Bhandarkar.*]

knowledge of a subject and make it his own, so as to constitute himself an authority on it, has the means of doing so placed at his hands. Measures have been taken to preserve carefully the ancient monuments of the country by legislation as well as administrative acts so as to render them available for close study to natives as well as foreigners. In the Victoria Memorial Hall all the historical relics of India from the most remote times to the present are to be brought together and will serve the same purpose. The Government of India have recently contributed six lakhs in Bombay and ten lakhs here for the purpose of primary education, and have promised five lakhs a year for five years to the Universities. The Local Governments both here and in Bombay have been making liberal grants for the promotion of College education. If, in spite of all this, we go on suspecting the motives of Government in introducing this Bill, we shall be doing no good to ourselves or to anybody else.

"Again, I must deprecate the turn that has been given to this question in some quarters as if it involved a conflict of interest between Natives and Europeans. The Universities exist practically for the Natives of India; so that the interests involved are those of Indians only. The only question is who will best promote those interests; and these must be allowed preponderance in the Universities, be they Europeans or Indians. But I think we must not forget that the object of the Universities is to give education in European literature and science, to instil European ideas in our minds, and acquaint us with European methods of inquiry. This can best be done by Europeans—I mean of course by competent Europeans—who, in addition to the education which their home and their society gives them, have gone through a course of regular mental and moral culture in the atmosphere of their Universities and have realized the true academic spirit. I do not think we have yet learned all that we have to learn from Europeans and arrived at that condition in which we may give them only a subordinate position in our Universities and Colleges, much less dispense with them altogether. On the other hand, it is very much to be desired that Europeans should always realize the dignity of their position as the apostles of a higher and progressive civilization, who have come out to rouse the mind and conscience of India. What Lord Reay said in his address to our University in 1889, should always be borne in mind. 'I am not aware,' said he, 'that for a British subject there is a more honourable profession than that of holding an appointment in the Department of Higher Education in India.' I have no doubt he who realizes all this will entertain nothing but the most friendly feelings for those among whom he has been sent out to work; and I am glad to say that on our side

of the country the relations between the European educationists and ourselves are friendly. In the observations I am going to make I will speak of men with the true educational instinct, as I may call it, and men without it, and not of Natives and Europeans, especially as neither of those two classes is composed exclusively of Natives or of Europeans.

“Now the ideas about education which I have said I endeavoured to carry out during my educational career are chiefly these. A student should be taught not to be satisfied until he has clear ideas of what he reads or what is brought to his notice, to reason cogently, whenever more views than one of the nature of a thing present themselves to him, to critically examine them and determine which is correct, and to observe facts closely before forming any theory which will connect them together. This is what may be called mental culture or the training of the mind. And this requires that the standard of instruction and examination should be pretty high. This training of the mind ‘must’, in the words of the new Chancellor of our University, ‘go hand in hand with discipline and the moulding of the individual character’. In order that these ends may be steadily kept in view, the Senates of our Universities should be composed of Fellows who are University or College teachers and who should have a preponderating voice in the management, persons of distinguished attainments qualified to take part in University business, representatives of the learned professions or professional gentlemen of high standing, European and Native, who have had a University education, and members of the Indian Civil Service educated in the Universities of the United Kingdom and possessing high academic qualifications. This list differs but slightly from that given in the Report of the Universities Commission. Nominations and even elections to University Fellowships have hitherto been made with a view to confer an honour on the particular individuals; and hence our Senates are, as they are, not in a condition to appreciate those two ends of education duly and keep them always in view. It is for this reason that I advocate the change of constitution contemplated by the Bill before us. And that the Senate of the Bombay University has not kept those ends in view will appear plainly to one who examines its history during the last eighteen years. Before that period the composition of our Senate was similar to what it is now; but shape was given to our University in the beginning by men like Sir Joseph Arnould, Mr. E. I. Howard, and Sir Alexander Grant. In an address to the Chancellor, Sir Bartle Frere, Sir Alexander, who was our Vice-Chancellor, spoke in 1867 of the ‘policy of strict and severe examinations’ followed by our Senate in those days and of its being ‘of more importance to create a high standard of scholarship in this country, than to multiply ever so much the num-

[21ST MARCH, 1904.]

[*Dr. Bhandarkar.*]

ber of persons possessing nominal distinctions at the hands of a University.' Sir Alexander's was a towering personality and nobody dared to measure strength with him. Consequently mere honorary Fellows who did not understand or take interest in University matters did not attend the meetings of the Senate or were not appointed members of the Syndicate, and the field was left open to Sir Alexander to carry out his own ideas. And the principles and practices that then came to be recognized, were handed down without much change till about the year 1883. In the latter years of Sir Raymond West's Vice-Chancellorship, the honorary members, as I have called them as distinguished from those qualified to take part in University business, began to realize their strength and the meetings of the Senate to be largely attended; and in course of time the debates lost their academic and dignified character and the Senate became a popular assembly. What the tendencies of the Senate in its new character are it has shown during these eighteen years, by certain acts which have been alluded to during the controversy that has been going on. Dr. Dimmock, the Principal of the Grant Medical College, mentioned one of these. The Professors of that College have from time to time for the last eighteen years been bringing up the question of raising the standard of qualification for entrance into that College from the Matriculation to the Intermediate or at least the Previous Examination and substituting the M.B. Degree for the L.M. or L.M. and S. The sister Universities of Calcutta and Madras have long since made the change, but our Senate consistently threw out the proposals of the Grant Medical College Professors on all occasions. But repentance generally comes over one on death-bed; and our Senate has recently accepted the proposals. Again, certain courses of study are laid down for the different degrees and the candidates have to go through these within a specific period. The period is an essential constituent of the test to be applied. A young man cannot be said to possess much capacity, if he is able to get up one subject only in that period, and takes up another at any future time he likes, and similarly a third after he has passed in the second. And the evil is heightened when, after passing in the first subject, he is at liberty to leave College, take up some employment, and during his leisure hours study the subjects in which he has not passed. Besides, the several subjects of the course form a whole, and his passing in that whole at one and the same time, whatever the period he takes to get it up, is itself an evidence of his powers, which is lost when the course is broken up into parts. This examination in compartments, as it has been called, has been condemned by the Universities Commission including the Hon'ble Mr. Justice Gurudas Banerji, and it is condemned by almost all the educationists on the Bombay side. And yet in

spite of their protests our Senate passed a resolution dividing the course for the third or last examination for the B. A. Degree into three parts. The Government in the time of Lord Sandhurst, having with much trouble ascertained the views of the College teachers, vetoed the resolution, and when asked for the reasons at a meeting of the Bombay Legislative Council, Lord Sandhurst declared it had been done in the interests of higher education. What a falling off have we here from the standard laid down by Sir A. Grant and what a change in the relative positions of the University and the Government ! Sir A. Grant used the words I have quoted in his address to Sir Bartle Frere, thinking that Government were not disposed to approve of the strict and severe examinations of the University, and Lord Sandhurst overruled the University, because it had lowered the character of its examinations—that is, rendered them less strict and severe. The form in which the proposal was originally sent up to the Syndicate was that a candidate who had failed should be examined the next time he appeared only in those subjects in which he had failed, and if he passed in some of these at the time and failed in others to examine him the third time in these last only until in the course of time he had passed in all. Thus the University had to open an account with every candidate, debit to him the examinations in all the subjects and place to his credit each as he passed it until the whole account was cleared. Similarly, the view that anybody should be admitted to the examinations, whether he was educated at a College or not, was held by some of the leaders of the Senate. The reforms that the Hon'ble Mr. Gokhale spoke of the other day were effected fourteen years ago when the present standing majority had not become compact or was not organized. As to the other requisite of a good education, the temper of our Senate will be understood from an occurrence that took place about ten years ago. A complaint of serious breach of school discipline caused by a defect in the form of the certificate to be produced by candidates for matriculation was made by most of the schoolmasters in the Presidency. The representatives in the Syndicate of the standing majority in the Senate stoutly refused to alter the form, but the point was carried against them ; and when the proposed alteration was brought up before the Senate, it was passed only because the schoolmasters who were Fellows came up for the meeting from different parts of the Presidency. The question of going back to the old form was again raised about three years ago, but through the influence of some educationists on the Syndicate it was dropped. It will thus be seen that the tendency of our Senate is not to raise the standard even when an imperative necessity has been shown for it, to lower the character of the tests and pay little attention to breach of discipline. And, constituted as it is, nothing better can be expected of it. The change, therefore, con-

[21ST MARCH, 1904.]

[*Dr. Bhandarkar.*]

templated by the Bill cannot but be salutary in the interests of higher education and will not effect any violent change, but will only bring our University back to the standard of Sir Alexander Grant, and legalize that form of the Senate which it practically had about twenty years ago, when only the Educational Fellows and such as understood education and took real interest in it, attended the meetings, and the rest held aloof contenting themselves with the mere honour.

" But a further change that the Bill contemplates is to reduce the tenure of Fellowships to five years. A life tenure will have the effect of reducing the proceedings of the University to a dead routine. There is no opening for the infusion of new ideas and new modes of working; and it has a distinct tendency to impair the sense of responsibility. With a limited number of Fellows a life tenure will make our Senates in some respects worse than they are at present, since now the addition of new members every year introduces fresh blood into the organization. With the limited tenure the advantage arising from fresh annual additions which we have at present will be retained, while the Senates will be prevented from becoming too large by the compulsory retirement of old Fellows equal in number to those added. I am, therefore, entirely in favour of the change. A ten years' tenure was suggested by some; but I think its effects would be nearly the same as those of a life tenure. I was, however, in favour of the proposal to extend the tenure to seven years, and I think still it might have been adopted though I attach no great importance to it.

" But it is stated that such a short tenure will make Fellows subservient to Government, since their re-appointment depends on their pleasure; and it is even hinted that it was resorted to as a device to enable the Government to control the deliberations of the Senate. In this respect I perfectly agree with my honoured friend, Principal Selby of the Deccan College, who writes, 'I cannot think that Government intend to watch the deliberations of the Senate or that they have a policy of their own with regard to the matters which come before the Senate and that they intend to punish by deprivation those who oppose them.' If we look to the previous history of the manner in which Government on our side have been acting towards oppositionists, we shall find that in the Legislative Councils, before elected members were admitted, they often re-nominated a person who criticized and opposed their measures. Neither did the Government or their officers ever endeavour to influence in any way the deliberations of our Senate. And the concession that Government have made that not less than two-fifths of the Fellows nominated by the Chancellor shall be educationists and the restriction they have thus placed on his power show to my mind

that what is aimed at by these provisions in the Bill is to secure an efficient Senate and nothing dark is contemplated. The other points in the Bill, on the strength of which the charge of officializing the Senate has been brought forward, are, first, the occurrence in section 3 of the words 'subject to the approval of Government', secondly, the affiliation of Colleges directly by an order of Government based on the recommendation of the Senate, instead of by a resolution of the Senate approved by Government, and, thirdly, the power reserved to Government to make additions and alterations in the regulations to be made by the new Senates. The first has now been given up by the Select Committee; the second power the Government already possess by the Act of Incorporation and it has always been exercised at Calcutta, though the Bombay Government did not know of their possessing it till 1897; and the third is now by a resolution of the Select Committee to be exercised only after consulting the Senate. And it ought not to be forgotten that this power is to be exercised only once, *i.e.*, in the beginning, and not afterwards. I think this last power might be given up by Government. If they consider an addition or alteration desirable in the first body of the regulations, they might make suggestions to the Senate, which suggestions would certainly be attended to. I do not remember a suggestion of Government having been thrown out by our present Senate. Now, if the second power, which Government have all along possessed, has not officialized the Universities hitherto, there is no reason to believe that it will officialise them in the future. My Lord, the independence of Universities is a matter on which some of our most eminent Vice-Chancellors laid very great stress. Sir Alexander, in the address to Sir Bartle Frere already quoted from, contended in 1867 for the independence of the University as against Government interference; but Sir Raymond West in 1888, while admitting the necessity of that independence, drew particular attention, in a passage quoted by the *Times of India*, to what he calls 'another kind of independence.' 'Now in these days,' says he, 'the Universities in Europe and also in India may have a still more arduous task to perform, when democracy is advancing with such giant strides, and when the multitude almost thinks it has a sort of divine right to go wrong.' 'The Universities must be made and kept independent on that side as well as the side which they present to the Government.' The difference in the attitudes of these two Vice-Chancellors shows the difference in the condition of things in 1867 and 1888, and Sir Raymond West must evidently have in his mind the tendencies which, as I have said, began to operate about the year 1883 and which have now worked themselves out completely.

"The third point very strenuously objected to in the Bill before us is

[21ST MARCH, 1904.]

[*Dr. Bhandarkar.*]

that concerning the stringent rules about affiliation. If discipline and the moulding of character are a requisite of sound education, more important even than intellectual education, efforts must be made to secure them. The students should always live under the eye of their teachers, and in order that the students may feel their influence and the teachers stand before them always as models, it is necessary that they should meet in other places than the lecture-room and should freely mix with each other. At the same time, as between students themselves, friendship, mutual regard and appreciation, sociableness, good manners, and such other virtues are promoted by their living together. All this is not possible unless residential quarters and houses for teachers are provided within the College premises. And it would promote a healthy moral and intellectual tone if the whole establishment were located in a place remote from town influences. We should carry out the idea of what I might call the forest Universities of the old Hindu Rishis. We find frequent mention in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas of teaching establishments in forests presided over by a person who was called Kulapati. A Kulapati is traditionally explained as a holy Brahman who fed and educated ten thousand persons. Whether he was able actually to feed and educate so many is of course open to question; but the fact of there being such establishments in places remote from towns may be relied on. And the Hindu idea of the student becoming a member of the family of the teacher has come down to our own times. A Hindu's traditional reverence for his Guru or teacher is in all likelihood based on that fact. But with our new system of education both the living together and the reverence have disappeared. And the Hindu ideas have also been European ideas. The older European Universities are located remote from busy towns, and students and teachers live together and dine together. And these ideas have not been unfamiliar to us in Western India. Our old educationists, Mr. Howard and Sir Alexander Grant, chose sites away from the towns of Bombay and Poona for the Elphinstone and Deccan Colleges, and made provision for residential quarters for the students and a house for the Principal or a Professor. And from time to time the accommodation has been added to and even now new buildings are being erected. But a great deal more in other respects remains to be done to bring about a close intercourse between the students and their teachers. The Principal and Professors should, for instance, give conversational parties and invite their pupils to them, the expenses being paid from the College funds. The aided Colleges too have, so far as possible, carried out these ideas; so that the opposition to these provisions of the Bill is not strong on the Bombay side. But in Bengal it is loud and determined. Educationists in Bengal do not seem to have in past times fully realized the importance of students and teachers living

close to each other and to have familiarized the people with those ideas. Consequently mere rooms for classes are considered a sufficient accommodation for a College. Some good men are afraid that, if these provisions of the Bill are strictly insisted on, the number of Colleges will decrease and the moral and social regeneration of India which depends upon the wide spread of education will be arrested. But discipline and the moulding of character form, as I have frequently observed, a most essential constituent of a good education ; and I feel convinced that where these have not been attended to, the education imparted will, instead of helping, retard India's regeneration. For do we not often observe sophistry and perverse reasoning resorted to frequently to defend old customs and principles of action and find holy orthodoxy openly and rank heterodoxy in secret ? No, no ! A large number of such men must contribute to render Indian society hollow with no faith in any definite principles. And the Bill does not propose to make the new conditions applicable to Colleges already affiliated, though the inspection clauses will compel the managers to attend to some of them at some future time. Besides, even in the case of new Colleges seeking affiliation, the fulfilment of the conditions in the beginning is not insisted on ; what is required is to satisfy the Syndicate that they *will* be conformed to. Again, accommodation for students and teachers need not, according to the Bill as amended by the Select Committee, be provided in the College, but may be secured in or near lodgings approved by the College ; and students residing with their parents are not to be compelled to live in the College or lodgings. It will thus be seen that all that is sought is that the students should be under some discipline, and all unnecessary difficulties in the way of the managers of old or new Colleges have been carefully avoided. To require therefore that these provisions as to residence and inspection should be given up is to assert that discipline and moulding of character are of no importance in education. And should any difficulties in complying with the conditions to be imposed, be really experienced, our patriotism ought rather to take the course of assisting the institutions by collecting the required amount of money than of insisting that those conditions should be dropped. If our Vice-Chancellor Sir Raymond West had not been exacting in his demands, when the managers of the Fergusson College at Poona applied for affiliation, efforts would not have been made to collect funds and 'the College,' as Principal Selby says, 'would never have become what it has become.' I have, therefore, no fear that the provisions of the Bill will retard the diffusion of education ; they will simply have the effect, if at all, of making us exert ourselves to raise funds for private institutions, as was done in the case of our Fergusson College.

[21ST MARCH, 1904.]

[Dr. Bhandarkar.]

"The object of the Bill is to raise the standard of higher education by requiring a systematic course of education and so far as possible to prevent cram, which an exclusive attention to examination fosters. That in a large number of cases our educational system gives little training to the mind and simply encourages cram cannot be doubted. One finds it by the manner in which our Graduates often speak and write. In the department of Sanskrit Scholarship and Indian Antiquities, the critical methods of study are understood and appreciated by very few. A great many endeavour to follow them, but not understanding the spirit fail in some points most egregiously. A more definite test is afforded by the number of men that write prize-essays and fail to obtain the prizes. There are seven prizes in connection with our University which are awarded to the writer of the best essay on any given subject. The Syndicate has been offering some of these for the last 38 years, others for 28, 27, etc., and the total number of years or the total number of prizes hitherto offered in connection with these seven endowments is 182. Of these, 52 were not competed for at all; for 130, essays were received, but 57 prizes only were given and 73 not given, as the essays did not deserve them. Supposing that about a hundred essays were sent in for the 73 prizes, and not taking the unsuccessful candidates for the prizes that were awarded, it follows that the number of unsuccessful writers is to the number of successful writers as 100 to 57, *i.e.*, about 63 per cent. of the writers are unsuccessful. But if we regard 73 essays alone to have been sent for the 73 prizes, 56 per cent. at least are unsuccessful. Thus the percentage of Graduates who, though they have the energy and the will to write, are not able to study a subject for themselves and do independent work deserving of any consideration varies from 56 to 63 or more per cent.; that is, the education of so many is defective. While, if we take the number of prizes not competed for at all, the number of effective men is greatly reduced.

"But some gentlemen understand the object of the Bill to be to provide that the highest possible education should be given to the Natives of India and learning should be encouraged, and it is contended as against its provisions that lower education is also wanted. As I understand the Bill, it does nothing of the sort. It does not propose the abolition of Anglo-Vernacular or High Schools. These are wanted and men whose education stops there have also a useful function to discharge. But what the Bill aims at is that the higher or College education that is given should be of a nature to train the mind of the student and mould his character. Is it contended that this is not wanted and that we want Graduates without mental and moral training, men who believe that they know English Literature, History, Political Economy,

Philosophy, etc., simply because they have passed an examination in them, but really possess no clear conception about anything and are unable to reason consistently and to turn their knowledge to a good account and who have not in them the making of good citizens? If so, I must beg leave to differ entirely from those gentlemen. I contend that the higher education that is given to a man should be real and not a sham and that a sham is harmful to society and can in no way do good to it. A man's education may be of a lower degree but certainly not a sham.

"Now the question is, will the Bill before us remove the existing evils and render our higher education a reality? It lays down the plan of work, and that, I feel convinced, is well-devised and calculated to secure the end in view. But whether it will give us men with their minds well trained and characters properly moulded will depend entirely or in a large measure on the sort of persons who are entrusted with the execution of the plan. The laying down of a plan is all that the Government of India can do in its legislative branch, but it is the function of the administrative branch to see that the agents employed to carry it out are efficient. We must have Fellows with strong academic instincts, and teachers who can and will do their duties zealously and effectively. The aim of these latter must be to train the intellect and the heart of their pupils. Their ability, culture, and character must be such as to inspire true respect and reverence for them in the minds of the students. In the time of Lord Dufferin the Government of India issued a Resolution directing greater efforts being made towards moral training in schools and Colleges; and our Vice-Chancellor Sir Raymond West in speaking of it in the course of his Convocation address insisted on noble examples being placed before the students in the shape of their teachers and said, 'I have little faith in any other method, and for those who desire a continued progress, and elevation and refinement of character, as well as the development and expansion of the intellectual faculties, I say, "Get good and capable and high-minded teachers."' We must of course procure our teachers principally from England, and if we would have such results as this Bill aims at, 'England must,' in the words of Lord Reay, 'give to India a due proportion of its *best* men.' 'Unless,' he goes on, 'Indian Universities receive the best representatives of English learning, they must fail, and failure in this instance entails positive and not merely negative results.' This, in my humble opinion, is perfectly true. But do we always get the best representatives of English learning and good, capable and high-minded teachers? It would be ingratitude to deny that we have had five or six such men during the last forty-five years; but we have had a much larger number of quite another stamp. For our purposes mere Oxford pass-men will not do; we have tried

[21ST MARCH, 1904.]

[*Dr. Bhandarkar.*]

them and found them quite unsatisfactory. Young honours-men coming out soon after their examination, with their tastes unformed, acquire habits here which can certainly not be called academic. In my opinion a man, who has been brought out as Professor of a certain subject, should devote himself entirely to it, and should not fritter away his time and energies. He should endeavour to know all that can be known in that subject and should constitute himself an authority on it. But this is not done except in a few instances, and the bait is often held before them of Educational Inspectorships and other better-paid appointments. There is only one man within my recollection who has resisted the bait and stuck on to his work of teaching and study. Professors of Sanskrit on our side are expected to do some original work, and that is because these appointments were formerly held by Germans, and a German is never a Professor unless he is a student at the same time. But I do not see why Professors of English Literature, History, Philosophy, Mathematics and Science should not similarly be expected to do some original work; but that is not done. I think, if we would have, in the words of Lord Reay, 'the best representatives of English learning,' men of the stamp of resident Fellows of the Colleges at Oxford and Cambridge, who after their examination have passed several years in the atmosphere of their University, should be secured for the Indian Educational Service. Indian Colleges should also have a fair complement of the best Native Professors available. In Bengal we have a good many Indians educated in English and Scotch Universities and who have taken high degrees. These should be first availed of. Then our own distinguished Graduates should be admitted; but the implied condition in the case of all these as well as of European Professors should be that they should be students as well as teachers. Not only should Government procure such men for their Colleges, but make it a condition of their grants-in-aid that private Colleges should employ persons of the same stamp; and it will be the duty of the Syndicate to see that unaided Colleges should also have such Professors. Now, all these men will give an academic tone to our Universities and will naturally be as Fellows the leaders or directors of the Senate; in fact, according to my view, it is such men that constitute a University.

"And if we have a large body of such men, we shall be able to remove another great evil. The University requires good examiners as much as good teachers. The examiners in the last resort really determine what a student shall read and how he shall read it. The student cares little for those points in his Professor's lectures on which the person usually appointed examiner is not likely to ask any question. And it depends on the examiner to find out whether the candidate's mind is really trained in the proper way; and his question

[*Dr. Bhandarkar ; Mr. Morison.*] [21ST MARCH, 1904.]

paper should be so framed as to bring out this. If we have such examinations, they will exercise a wholesome influence on the teaching and the learning. To be able to do his duty properly, an examiner should be a specialist. Appointments, therefore, to examinerships must be carefully made; but in a good many cases the importance of the function is not appreciated and the necessary care is not bestowed on the matter. Persons with no pretensions to a special knowledge of a subject are appointed examiners in that subject even at our highest examination in Arts, the M. A. There is no doubt a difficulty in getting good men, and now and then in the present state of things irregularities on the part of Professors who are appointed examiners are complained of. But this difficulty and these irregularities and evils of a like nature will, I think, disappear if such a Professorate as I have described, *i.e.*, a Professorate composed of 'good and high-minded men,' who are students all their life, is secured and a healthy academic atmosphere created about our Universities. And with such a Professorate and academic atmosphere and such a law for the regulation of the constitution and functions of the Senate and Syndicate as is laid down by this Bill, I anticipate nothing but a bright future for the education of India and for India itself."

The Hon'ble MR. MORISON said :—"My Lord, the Government Resolution upon education, which appeared last Saturday, must profoundly affect the view which we take of this Bill, for now we have an assurance that this measure is not the end but the beginning of educational reform. If indeed this Bill had been the final measure of reform in which the educational movement of the last three or four years was to culminate, I should have confessed to a great sense of disappointment. I am, certainly, in favour of placing a maximum limit upon the number of Fellows and of transferring to the Statute Book certain regulations which have hitherto only been found in the Calendar; but these are not changes which, however desirable, could very materially improve the character of University education, and, if reform were to end here, I could only look upon the Bill as a piece of minor legislation about which it would be difficult to entertain any very strong feelings.

"The Government Resolution of last Saturday has dispelled any such fears, and I am now hopeful that the introduction of this Bill marks the beginning of a new era for education in India and that it is the preliminary to changes which will deal directly with education itself and not merely with its administrative machinery. The discussion upon the amendments has dealt with all the main provisions of this Bill, but I should like to make a few remarks on certain aspects of the policy which is now being inaugurated, upon which the Resolu-

[21 ST MARCH, 1904.]

[*Mr. Morison.*]

tion is silent or with regard to which I differ from the Government. The Bill before us is, in the main, an enabling Bill, a measure to give power to the Universities to improve themselves; reform has not been imposed upon them from without, but an opportunity has been offered them of developing themselves from within; hence the years immediately following the passage of this Bill are of the utmost importance, as upon the public opinion then formed will depend the policy which the Universities will adopt. I feel very strongly that all men engaged in the work of education ought to exert themselves strenuously during this critical period to secure the general adoption of sounder views upon education and a truer conception of the value of learning. That is a task which can best be performed by persons who are not in Government employment, but I should like to secure the co-operation of the members of the Indian Educational Service, and in order to make this co-operation possible I ask the Government to give their educational officers absolute freedom to speak and vote in the Senate according to their own convictions and release them from the obligation expressed or understood of voting on all occasions with the Government. As long as the suspicion exists that the members of the Educational Service are merely the mouthpieces on the Senate of the official policy, so long will they be powerless to influence public opinion. Furthermore, the departmental expedient of controlling the opinions of its own officers results, in practice, in depriving the deliberations of the Senate of any real value; the Senate becomes a chamber for registering the opinions of the Director of Public Instruction, mechanically worked through by the departmental vote; the eminent scholars and experienced educationalists in Government service are precluded from contributing anything of value to the debate; the Senate arrives at a foregone conclusion in order to take from the Director of Public Instruction the odium of an unwise or unpopular measure.

"The second point on which I would ask the Government to amplify the policy indicated in their Resolution is directly connected with that section of the Bill which deals with affiliation and disaffiliation. As soon as this provision becomes law I submit that the Government will have undertaken a new responsibility with regard to aided and independent Colleges, and I venture to ask them to adopt a policy with regard to these institutions which seems to me to be a logical corollary from this section. As affiliation and disaffiliation are in future to be acts of Government, it follows that every institution which continues to be affiliated has the approbation of Government. I admit that as long as affiliation and disaffiliation were the acts of the University it was open to an officer to doubt whether a local institution was approved of by Government or not; but

that doubt is now resolved; if the Government has not disaffiliated a College, the Government presumably approves of it and desires that it should be as efficient as possible. Now what all Colleges, Government, aided or unaided, want is more money; the heads and managers everywhere recognise their deficiencies in the matter of buildings, staff, library and laboratory equipment, but are helpless to remedy them for want of money. I therefore ask the Government expressly to permit their officers to give local bodies their countenance and assistance in raising funds for education; I wish that Government would go even further and inform local officers that they are *expected* to render such help to Schools and Colleges in their neighbourhood. It is right that Colleges which are founded for the good of particular communities or a particular area should be compelled to depend mainly upon their own exertions for finding the necessary funds, and I think that institutions which are thus founded and controlled by the people themselves have a particular virtue in infusing public spirit in their students; but none of these movements is yet strong, and Government should aid the weak beginnings of self-help by judicious encouragement. Outside the Presidency-towns, the Collector is still a great social power, and when I see the waste of money by which local *raises* attempt to toady themselves into his favour, I cannot help being indignant at the officer who refrains from diverting this expenditure into fruitful channels; for the money that is squandered year by year in every division upon dinners, garden-parties and *tamashas* to the Commissioner and Collectors would be enough to revolutionise the finances of most private Colleges. I should like to see the Commissioner co-operating openly and actively with the local governing body in bringing the Colleges in his division up to a higher pitch of efficiency. We all know that the best way to collect money for any public object is to get the Commissioner or Collector to take the chair at a meeting, and public opinion would very strongly support any Government servant who used his official position to collect subscriptions for education. As the logical development of the policy indicated by this Bill, I ask the Government, in the first place, to rescind all existing circulars which forbid Government officers to take part in any public meeting in aid of a private College, and in the second place to recognise publicly that the founder or benefactor of any affiliated College has rendered a public service which the State will not be slow to honour. If the Government would give effect to this policy, the aided and unaided Colleges would not long remain inefficient, and now that affiliation and disaffiliation are the direct acts of Government I can see no reason for maintaining the old attitude of official indifference.

"I have got one more suggestion to offer regarding the policy to be pursued under this Act. If the Government is not prepared to assist private Colleges by

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [*Mr. Morison ; Mr. Pedler.*]

official countenance, then I beg to protest against any attempt at improving University education by the barren process of disaffiliating the inferior Colleges. Even granting that the minor Colleges are very imperfect, I strongly deprecate anything like a general suppression of them. It is a curious mistake to hold, as some people do, that the existence of bad Colleges vitiates our whole University system; for as a matter of fact these Colleges hurt none but their own pupils; no other College is prevented from doing good work by the fact that they are unsatisfactory; the real need of our Indian Universities is not fewer bad Colleges, but more good ones, or, to put the matter more accurately, it is the badness of our good Colleges and not the badness of the bad ones which is the capital defect of our educational system; and consequently by far the most important problem for us to solve is how to find money for more teachers and libraries and better laboratory equipment in our big Colleges. But if in pursuance of a mistaken policy a large number of the smaller institutions are disaffiliated, the immediate and inevitable result will be to impair the efficiency of the good Colleges. Every one of our big Colleges has already more pupils than its staff is able to cope with, and every one of them would be thrown into a state of disorganisation if large drafts of students from disaffiliated Colleges were added to the present number.

"But although I may not see eye to eye with the Government as to the future developments of their educational policy, I cordially support that policy in so far as it is defined in this Bill; and, as the Head of a private College, which has owed much to the sympathy and co-operation of Government servants, I wish to express my regret at the acrimonious recrimination of Government which all over the country has been imported into the discussion of University questions. The abuse of Government is part, sometimes indeed the whole, of the equipment of Congress politicians; but the large and earnest body of Indians who believe that education is the supreme need of their countrymen, and who are labouring with unselfish devotion to diffuse its benefits, will deplore the thoughtless language which is tending to alienate the sympathies of the official class from education."

The Hon'ble MR. PEDLER said:—"My Lord, as the Bill which is about to be put to the Council will form a new starting point in the history of Indian University education, it is impossible for me to give a silent vote in its favour. In view of the strenuous opposition to many of its clauses and in view of the fact that one of the members of the Select Committee on this Bill considered it necessary to put forward a dissent in which the whole policy of the proposed changes has been called in question, and in which he stated that he considers 'the whole

measure a most retrograde piece of legislation bound to prove detrimental to the highest interests of the country,' it appears desirable to state one or two facts and points of view which may have been lost sight of. In the discussion of this Bill in the various newspapers also, the exact conditions of the existing University education in India appear to have been quite misunderstood and wrongly described, and a great many of the statements made have been utterly at variance with what in my opinion are the existing conditions of Indian higher education, and specially that of Bengal.

"I should wish therefore to be permitted to put forward certain considerations which to my mind make it imperative that this Bill should be passed, with the object of raising the tone and standard of University education throughout India, and I shall naturally refer rather pointedly to the Calcutta University, with the working of which I have been very familiar for the last thirty years.

"The motto adopted by the Calcutta University, which was the first of the Indian Universities, was, 'the advancement of learning,' and, if acted up to, no better motto could possibly be selected for any University.

"How has the Calcutta University contributed to the advancement of learning in the last fifty years? Have the Graduates who have passed through the various Indian Universities, advanced learning in any way? Speaking as a general truth, and without taking a few exceptional cases into consideration, have Indian University students developed any original thinking power, have they shown any aptitude for original research either on the literary or scientific side of learning?

"There are half a dozen or a dozen honourable exceptions among Indian Graduates, some of whom are sitting at this Council today, but the great bulk of Indian Graduates show *no* originality. As Director of Public Instruction in Bengal, I am a Trustee of the 'Elliott Fund for fostering Original Research.' In many years the annual prize cannot be awarded as not a single research worthy of the name is sent in to the Trustees. The Government of Bengal also gives certain Research Scholarships yearly, and, as Director, all applications for them pass through my hands. The selection of really qualified candidates for such scholarships is most difficult, and only a still smaller number of Graduates justify their selections, and among such students, several have asked to be allowed to take up University Examinerships necessitating their throwing up research, simply because these Examinerships pay well, and rather better than the Research Scholarships they are holding.

[21ST MARCH, 1904.]

[*Mr. Pedler.*]

"Looking at what has been done by the Graduates of the Calcutta University, and the general character of the men turned out in the last half century, it would perhaps have been better if the motto of the University had been changed from 'the advancement of learning' into 'the repetition of known facts.'

"There are many aspects from which high education can be considered, and one of the least satisfactory from an educationist's point of view is, what may be called, the 'commercial aspect.' I am sorry to think this is the point of view which must be strongly held by certain members of this Council, for some speeches in the Council when the Bill was referred to the Select Committee and again more recently can only have been prompted by their valuing high education solely by its ability to secure remunerative employment for those who possess degrees. They seem to be more than content with the existing state of affairs, and think that all is well if the holder of a depreciated degree is able to get remunerative employment, and that all will be ill if a certain number of more or less uneducated persons are not allowed the distinction (!) of calling themselves Graduates of an Indian University. Their speeches clearly showed they are content with a low standard for degrees. I am sorry to say also that the commercial aspect of education is the one generally in favour in Bengal.

"How is knowledge to advance in India unless a really high standard is set by each University? Instead of gradually but steadily elevating standards of high education in Bengal, the tendency, I am sorry to say, has been the reverse. The examinations in the Calcutta University have in many cases been not on knowledge of, or on a mastery of, subjects, but on a knowledge of particular text-books, and in many cases examiners are forbidden to go outside the four corners of the text-books. Let me read a few extracts from the rules for examination in the Calcutta University issued to all examiners for their guidance :

'Gentlemen setting papers are requested to guide themselves by the text-book or portion of the text-book prescribed by the Syndicate as covering the syllabus.' 'When two or more alternative text-books or groups of text-books are prescribed in any subject, the examination questions shall be so framed as to be capable of being answered out of any one of the prescribed text-books or groups of text-books.'

"Here is another gem in the Calcutta University rules—

'In the mathematical papers for the Entrance Examination not less than 60 per cent. of the marks in Geometry and not more than 30 per cent. of the marks in Arithmetic and Algebra shall be assigned to book work.'

"The passing marks in this paper are fixed at 25 per cent., so that any student can secure far more than pass marks simply by book work.

"Again, in the F. A. Examination, the rule runs—

'In the mathematical papers, at least three-fifths (or 60 per cent.) of the marks shall be awarded to book work.'

"Again, the pass marks in mathematics are 25 per cent., so by simply knowing his book work a student can secure more than twice the number of marks required for a pass. It is, however, useless to multiply instances, and only one further case need be taken from the B. A. rules, which runs—

'The questions in Descriptive Astronomy shall be confined to book work.'

"I think I am right in saying therefore, the Calcutta University Examinations are largely on books and on book work.

"Is it any wonder, in the face of instructions like these, that if a professor in a Bengal College lectures on any special point not within the four corners of the text-book, the students either say to the lecturer 'this is not required for our examination' or pay no attention to the lecturer? What is the value of a good professor or lecturer in the face of such regulations? A good gramophone would be nearly as useful as a professor in certain cases. Can it be said that these rules are not a direct invitation to the students to 'cram' their books, and can it be wondered at that the Universities Commission found that in addition to low standards of examination the prevalent evil in Indian education was 'cram'?

The Hon'ble Dr. Mukhopadhyaya apparently attributes this unsatisfactory state of things in Indian University education partly to certain changes of the policy of Government in replacing a certain number of European Professors by Indian Professors, and he has made a rather strong and personal attack on the scholarship and attainments of the members of the Bengal Educational Department. In my opinion these charges do not explain the lowering in the standard of Indian education, but the causes are to be sought in such regulations as those to which I have referred.

"I do not propose, however, to take up these attacks at present, as they can scarcely be adequately dealt with in such a place as this. I should, however, wish to point out that it is very easy to compare the past with the present and not to the advantage of the present, and it is difficult to weigh one set of men against another; but the members of the Bengal Educational Department are,

[21ST MARCH, 1904.]

[*Mr. Pedler.*]

I assert, all men who are filled with the highest sense of duty and who do their work with the highest aims and with the greatest ability and zeal. I will also add that in my opinion many of the members of the Department of which I have the honour to be head are men who in their turn will earn equally honourable if not more distinguished names than those of the gentlemen quoted by Dr. Mukhopadhyaya with so much praise.

"I am afraid it must be admitted that a very low standard of examination, and therefore of work, is now required by the Calcutta University and I believe by Indian Universities generally. Indeed, it is not, I think, going too far to say that in Bengal such standards have had to be set because of the numerous low grade institutions, that is, both Colleges and schools, which have been from time to time affiliated to the Calcutta University.

"In such cases as this, however, it is difficult to distinguish between cause and effect, or to say whether the low standards of examination have produced bad schools and Colleges, or whether the existence of the latter has dragged down the standards of examination. The history of such things has, however, been exemplified in the records of the Calcutta University, and it is really a case of action and reaction. Thus large numbers of failures due to Colleges and schools sending up improperly prepared candidates, result in the appointment of Committees of Enquiry,—the standards are by them declared to be too high and are lowered. Schools and Colleges then work to a still lower level than before, the process is repeated, and the final result can be well imagined.

"This lowering of the standards of teaching has gone on to such an extent that the conclusion which was forced on the Indian Universities Commission was that, unless something was done to improve the condition of such educational institutions, high education in certain parts of India would shortly cease to exist.

"The Commission visited certain Colleges, I will not say in what locality, which were teaching up to the highest degree of M. A., and which were supposed to be teaching practical Science, where the scientific apparatus was certainly not worth ten rupees. In other similar Colleges, a display of new scientific apparatus was made, but it had clearly never been used to perform a single experiment. The apparatus was for the purposes of inspection only. I can unhesitatingly say as an expert in certain branches of Science, that in a very large proportion of the schools and Colleges in India, the so-called teaching of Science is a complete failure; and I am afraid the same conclusion would be

applicable to the teaching of many other subjects. I have inspected many Colleges and many schools in many parts of India, and the percentage of really satisfactory institutions is, I regret to say, lamentably small.

"Again, I would ask, can there be anything more disheartening than for those who are connected with admittedly good Colleges and schools, and for those who are earnestly striving after high educational ideals, to find that really good and sound work is at a discount, as for example, in the Calcutta University? It is most disheartening also that Colleges and schools in which only instruction, and not real education, is given, are placed on a par with good institutions and, so far as the University numerical results show, are believed to be equally successful.

"The Bill this Council is now asked to pass is clearly framed with a view to put the government of the Universities on a more satisfactory footing. Speaking for the Calcutta University in particular, it is desired to make the Senate a working body, instead of an unwieldy collection of individuals, a very large proportion of whom have had no expert knowledge of education or of educational methods or even of educational needs. Another point which has been strongly emphasized on the discussions on this Bill is, that the Senate is to represent all classes of those interested in education, and not to be mainly representative of one small section of educated Indian opinion, as is the case at present in Calcutta. Also the Syndicate, which is to be the governing and executive working body of the University, and which will have large powers and functions, is to be largely composed of educational experts, who as such will be familiar with the practical working out of educational problems. The Bill indeed provides for a majority of educational experts being on the Syndicate or the governing body of the Universities. Can it be said that the majority of members of those Syndicates have in the past history of certain Universities been educational experts? Such experts have usually been in a hopeless minority, and the same has been the case in the Senates of some of the older Universities. To have secured this change in the method of government of the Universities as is proposed in this Bill will in itself be more than sufficient reward for all the time and trouble which have been spent on the question of Indian University reform.

"The Bill will, however, not only secure this great object of expert supervision over the working of higher education, but it will secure far more than this. Universities will be given facilities for teaching various branches of learning themselves, and for the creation of central institutions for teaching the higher branches of learning in a way which the majority of small Colleges can never hope to attain.

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [Mr. Pedler.]

"The Universities will now have in the rules laid down for the affiliation of new Colleges, and the inspection of existing Colleges, a means not only of keeping up the standard of education to a level to be determined on, but as time goes on to secure that, as educational methods advance, the standards of Indian education can be made to rise at the same time.

"Judging by the remarks which have fallen from Indian gentlemen, and from the remarks in the Press, it would appear that the majority of these think education is a fixed and constant thing, whereas on the contrary, if there is one branch of work in which rapid progress is being made, it is in the science of education.

"Indian University education cannot afford to stand still: it must advance. Even if our standards had remained stationary, this in itself is relative decay when compared to the rapid advances made in other countries. What is really wanted is a constant and steady advance according to the most modern methods of work and of thought. What is wanted therefore among our Fellows is a constant addition of young men educated up to the highest modern ideals, who may advise and guide our Senates in all modern developments. The former system of life Fellowships did not provide for this and the arrangement for the five years tenure in this Bill will give ample opportunity for bringing in such men; for new Fellows must come in if the Indian Universities are to live and to progress. Very much has been made in the discussions on the Bill of the value of such experience in educational matters as could be gained as a life Fellow of the Indian Universities. Experience is good, but only up to a certain extent, and there is always the reverse side. Experience without advance or progress is never likely to add to our stock of knowledge or to bring about success. Experience entirely confined to working an out-of-date machine is not a good preparation to control a more perfect modern machine.

"In my opinion, therefore, one of the most valuable provisions of the whole Bill is that of terminable Fellowships, by which a constant succession of young and able men will be able to be brought in as Fellows of the Universities.

"There are, however, other features of the Bill, such as the provisions for residence of students, power to add experts in Boards of Studies and the Faculties inspective of Colleges, and many other matters; but I should weary the Council if I were to refer to them in detail.

"My view of the situation, expressed in a few words, is this: Government is making a whole-hearted attempt to provide the necessary University machinery

[*Mr. Pedler ; Mr. Adamson.*] [21ST MARCH, 1904.]

for putting this section of Indian education on a higher and nobler basis than hitherto. It is giving to teachers a more potent voice in education. It is trying to arrange matters so that in future teaching may not be subordinate to examination, but rather that examination should be subordinate to teaching. It is providing machinery by which collegiate and other institutions can gradually be brought up to a proper standard, and that they may be steadily and gradually elevated in the future.

"It is further to be remarked that if once a proper standard of Indian University education is set up, and if arrangements are made for its future continued improvement, this in itself will at once elevate all other branches of educational work in India to a corresponding extent.

"At present the low standard for the pass B. A. degree which admittedly exists necessitates an equally low standard for the Intermediate or F. A. Examination, and a correspondingly or even still lower standard for the schools which work up to the Matriculation Examination of the University. If, therefore, we arrange to elevate the B. A. degree to one representing a proper and really satisfactory standard, it will follow that in the course of a few years all the lower standards of education, even down to the lowest classes of our schools, must simultaneously rise.

"Hence I look upon it that this Bill will be of immense benefit, not only to Indian University education, but also to the whole range of Indian education, and will convert what is at present rather of the nature of a failure, from its exceedingly low standards, into a reality. Under the Bill the education which will be given will, I hope, be real, and not merely of the nature of instruction, as is so largely the case at present.

"Such being my view of the case, I confidently trust that the Council will pass the Bill, and thus give to India a renewed lease of intellectual life and vigour."

The Hon'ble MR. ADAMSON said:—"This Bill has been framed by educational experts, it has been supported by educational experts, and it has been opposed at somewhat tedious length by educational experts. My only excuse for speaking is that I am not an educational expert. My views merely represent the opinion of the man on the street, who does not know very much about the science of education, who does not care very much how Syndicates and Senates are composed, but who looks broadly at the main question, and asks whether under the present system of University management, or under the system proposed in this Bill, the affiliated College, which is the machine of University

[21ST MARCH, 1904.]

[*Mr. Adamson.*]

teaching, is more likely to satisfy the condition of a good machine that has to manipulate valuable raw produce, that condition being that it shall turn out finished material with a minimum amount of waste. The finished material is the B.A., and the waste is the failed candidate. The Hon'ble Member who introduced the Bill referred to both of these products. I think that he was a little too hard on the B.A. I am not inclined to disparage the Indian B.A., because he is sometimes discontented, and because he sometimes has an exaggerated estimate of his own capacities. The same type is to be found not in India alone, but in England, and in fact everywhere where there is a University. But I will say this for him, that if his degree is the hall mark of a sound education, a little rubbing against the world soon tones down his discontent and conceit, and he eventually emerges a useful member of society as the result of the education that he has received. If, on the other hand, his degree is not the hall mark of a sound education, it is not so much the blame of the College at which he has been trained, as of the University examiners who have passed a spurious article. But when I turn to the great army of failed candidates, who are so conspicuous in Indian Universities as compared with Universities in other lands, I stand on entirely different ground. I think that they import a very real and a very serious danger to the community. In this opinion I am at issue with the opponents of this Bill. For when I turn to former proceedings in this Council, I find that the Hon'ble Mr. Gokhale, who is the chief opponent of the Bill, regards this blot on the Indian University system with the utmost complacency. He asked what harm the great multitude of failed candidates, who beset the avenues of subordinate employment, could possibly bring to the community, and he compared them to labourers who are out of work, because the supply is in excess of the demand. I am unable to share the complacency of the Hon'ble Member. What shall be said about the parents of this vast host, who have expended their means in educating their sons, and at the end find that the education to provide which they have pinched and saved and probably incurred heavy debt, is a mere froth, and that it has not fitted their sons for any situation that requires an educated man to fill it. And what shall be said about the young men themselves, who no doubt, boy like, have had an implicit belief in the efficiency of their College, and find after long years of wasted effort, that might have been better employed in cultivating fields, or in learning a trade, that their College is a fraud, that it has not fitted them for the only employment to which they aspire, and that the best years of their life have been wasted. Surely this is an evil to parents and to

sons that is fraught with the gravest and most serious dangers to the country. Does the Hon'ble Member think that there is any real comparison between these failed candidates and labourers who are out of employment? In the one case the labourers are competent to do the work, but they are impeded by a temporary derangement of demand and supply; in the other the failed candidates are for ever unable to obtain the only work which they desire, because their education has not fitted them for it. I can assure the Hon'ble Member that at least in the part of India with which I am best acquainted, it is not the demand for educated men that is inadequate, but it is the supply of the genuine article that is deficient.

"To me, the very fact that there is in India a disproportionate and overwhelming number of failed candidates, is convincing proof that many of the affiliated Colleges which profess to provide a University training, are imperfectly performing their functions. The machine is defective, because it produces an excessive amount of waste. Having in mind the views of the opposers of this Bill I have no hope that the Universities, constituted as they are at present, will ever take the drastic steps that are necessary to remove what all thinking men must regard as a serious evil. It is for this reason that I welcome the most prominent feature in this Bill, *viz.*, increased Government control. Government at all events is determined that affiliated Colleges shall teach up to a standard that represents a sound University training. I hope, and no doubt we all hope, that the time will yet come when the Indian Universities will be able to stand on their own legs without external assistance, but I believe, for the reasons I have stated, that at present and for years to come it is absolutely necessary that Government should assume quite as complete a control of the Universities as is given by the provisions of this Bill. The function of a University is to provide, not a smattering of learning for the many, but a sound and finished education for the limited number of students who are qualified to enter its gates, and who honestly desire to acquire it. A less adequate course of instruction is the function of a school of lower grade than a University. But the motto of a properly constituted University should be—

'A little learning is a dangerous thing

Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian spring."

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [*Nawab Saiyid Muhammad.*]

The Hon'ble NAWAB SAIYID MUHAMMAD said :—" My Lord, with Your Excellency's permission I beg to say a few words before the passing of this Bill. Though it has been considerably modified in the Select Committee and some of its objectionable features have been removed, still there is the fear that higher education may not increase as rapidly as it did in the past by the operation of the various provisions of this Bill, those especially which relate to the affiliation and disaffiliation of Colleges. If the defect in the existing system is removed by enacting that the Universities shall be deemed to have been incorporated for the purpose (among others) of making provision for the instruction of students, with power to appoint University Professors and Lecturers, to hold and manage educational endowments, to erect, equip and maintain University libraries, laboratories and museums and to make regulations to carry out the above objects and to do all acts which tend to the promotion of study and research, and if the existing regulations as to the affiliation and disaffiliation of Colleges and the constitution of the Senate and Syndicate were left uninterfered with, the whole country with one voice would have thanked Your Excellency most heartily for the endeavours to improve the educational system of this country. What the country wants is teaching Universities in addition to the existing Colleges, financed liberally by the State which will give facilities, to the promotion of study and research, for those who are intellectually fit for such purposes, and which will give those that can afford it and have the capacity for it an education that develops their best faculties and starts them on the track of thoughts which will most stimulate the higher activities of their minds in after life.

" The numerous stringent provisions of the Bill relating to the affiliation of Colleges will have the effect of preventing the establishment of new Colleges by private enterprise. For we cannot ignore the fact that the country is a poor one and the percentage of the educated population very low.

" My Lord, we are all aware that the Bill before us is based on the Report of the Indian Universities Commission. But the Government recognised the weight of Dr. Gurudas Banerji's authority, and at the back of the opinion recorded in his minute of dissent there is a great mass of public opinion, and it is doubtful whether it is wise to disregard it in framing a measure of this kind. In doing away with the existing governing bodies of the Indian Universities and in reconstituting the Senates, this Bill has accepted the recommendation of the Commission without taking into account the opinions of Dr. Banerji and the Senates of the different Universities themselves. No satisfactory reason has been given for fixing the maximum number of the Senates

[*Nawab Saiyid Muhammad.*] [21ST MARCH, 1904.]

of the three older Universities at 100 and of the two younger Universities at 75, respectively. The analogy of the London or any other European University does not apply, because the respective attainments and eminence of the governing bodies of those institutions bear no comparison with those of an Indian University, while the apprehension appears to be well founded that the new Senates in India will not be sufficiently representative. The maximum numbers proposed by the Bill will be inadequate, to judge by experience, for the representation of all classes of interests.

"It has been contended that in some instances even Indian non-official witnesses or high Indian authorities have declared the Senates too unwieldy. If they did so, it was in the expectation that it was proposed to convert the Indian Universities into teaching Universities forthwith; but unfortunately this is not likely to happen. The fact has been evidently overlooked that the Senates retained their so-called unwieldy dimensions by the liberal nominations that were made annually, and to make these bodies less unwieldy it was only necessary to suspend fresh nominations for a few years at the end of which the Senates would be found to have been reduced to a more manageable size. And if the Government thought it best to fix a statutory limit, 150 would approximate more closely to an adequate number consistent with sufficient representation of all the religious communities, than the number which has been fixed by the Bill.

"In the case of one University, at any rate, as pointed out by my Hon'ble friends Rai Sri Ram Bahadur and Mr. Gokhale, the proposed reconstitution has not the support of local opinion, official or non-official; nor has the present constitution been given a fair trial. I am referring to the Allahabad University. When public opinion, the University authorities as well as the Local Government are alike opposed to the reconstitution of that University, the only ground on which this legislation can be applied to that University is, as one may fancy, due to an apprehension that ultimately the present constitution may fail, as it is said to have failed elsewhere. This will practically be a reform in anticipation of an evil the existence of which has not been proved. The Select Committee are to be congratulated upon having fixed on a uniform electorate for the election of a small proportion of Ordinary Fellows, though I see no reason why this right should have been withheld from the Allahabad and the Punjab Universities. Holders of the degree of Doctor or Master in any Faculty and all Graduates of ten years' standing will be placed on the register and entitled to the right of vote. This provision is in accordance with the recommendation of the Universities Commission and will meet with general approval.

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [*Nawab Saiyid Muhammad; Mr. Cable; Mr. Gokhale.*]

"In the treatment of regulations framed by the University the provisions of the Bill are open to grave objection. The presumption is that the new Senates will be better than the existing ones, but in point of fact the new Senates will not have even that measure of independence and responsibility which is enjoyed by the existing bodies. Either the capacity of the new governing bodies is doubted, or the Government desires to appropriate the functions of the University and to make it a Department of Government. To one of these two conclusions we are irresistibly driven, and the Bill now before us, instead of expanding the cause of higher education and making it more self-reliant and self-governing, seeks to deprive it of what little promise it had of growth in those directions. I have no hesitation in saying that this Bill is not suited to the conditions and requirements of the country at large, and in my humble opinion the existing system should be given a further trial."

The Hon'ble MR. CABLE said :—"My Lord, like my Hon'ble Colleague Mr. Adamson, I am not an expert, and it had not been my intention to speak upon the subject of the Bill now about to be passed into law—for I have of course recognized that it was entirely an affair for experts; and if I do venture now to make a few observations, they will only deal with the question of what I may call the resulting product of the Bill—of course I refer to the Graduates. We must all agree in hoping that under the new Act the Graduates will emerge from the Universities better equipped in every way for the battle of life, but they will have at least this in common with the present discontented B. A's. *vis.*, they will require employment. It is a fact, I believe, that the Government avenues of employment are choked and the ranks of the various professions are equally overcrowded. Why then should not these men turn to commercial and industrial pursuits? It is a fact that business enterprise is hampered in this country simply because suitable men in sufficient numbers are unobtainable. Given a body of able, highly educated, reliable and active young Indians available for the sphere of commercial management, and I have no doubt that they would obtain lucrative appointments. It is a mistake to suppose that for the higher grades at all events of commercial and industrial work, only a commercial education as it is called is necessary. Business is fast becoming a science, and will require the very highest training and attainments in the future if success is to be assured, and I know of no other career in India more honourable for its sons to pursue than the development of the resources of their own country."

The Hon'ble MR. GOKHALE said :—"My Lord, the struggle is over. The opponents of the Bill have lost all along the line; and it only remains for them

now to count up their losses—for gains they have had none. Let those who will, say what they will; this Bill amounts to an emphatic condemnation, as unmerited as it was unnecessary, of the educated classes of this country. It amounts to a formal declaration on the part of the Government of India, made with the concurrence of the Legislative Council, that the system of University education, which has been in vogue in this country for the last fifty years, has been a failure, and that the men educated under that system have proved themselves unworthy of being associated, in any appreciable degree, with the administration of their own Universities. My Lord, I feel that my educated countrymen have a right to complain that this condemnation has been passed on them without giving them a fair hearing. I do not, of course, refer to the hearing which has been given to the opponents of this measure in this Council—for I gladly acknowledge the unfailing courtesy and patience with which the Hon'ble Member in charge has conducted the Bill through the Council—but I refer to the fact that the Government of India decided to make these drastic changes on the one-sided representations of men who considered that because they were engaged in the actual work of teaching therefore they were entitled to a virtual monopoly of power in the Universities. Five years ago, when Your Lordship first announced that the Government of India intended taking up the question of University reform, the announcement was hailed with satisfaction and even with enthusiasm all over the country. Last year, speaking on the occasion of the Budget debate, Your Lordship wondered how it was that the appetite of the educated classes for University reform, at one time so keen, had suddenly died down. My Lord, the explanation of the phenomenon lies on the surface. Five years ago, when this question was first taken up, Your Lordship defined your attitude towards University reform in a speech made as Chancellor of the Calcutta University at the Convocation of 1899. In that speech, after pointing out the difference between a teaching University and an examining University, Your Lordship proceeded to observe as follows:—

‘Nevertheless, inevitable and obvious as these differences are, there may yet be in an examining University—there is in such institutions in some parts of my own country and still more abroad—an inherent influence inseparable from the curriculum through which the student has had to pass before he can take his degree, which is not without its effect upon character and morals, which inspires in him something more than a hungry appetite for a diploma, and which turns him out something better than a sort of phonographic automaton into which have been spoken the ideas and thoughts of other men. I ask myself, may such things be said with any truth of the examining Universities of India? I know at first sight that it may appear that I shall be met with an overwhelming

[21ST MARCH, 1904.]

[Mr. Gokhale.]

chorus of denial. I shall be told, for I read it in many newspapers and in the speeches of public men, that our system of higher education in India is a failure, that it has sacrificed the formation of character upon the altar of cram, and that Indian Universities turn out only a discontented horde of office-seekers, whom we have educated for places which are not in existence for them to fill. Gentlemen, may I venture to suggest to you that one defect of the Anglo-Saxon character is that it is apt to be a little loud both in self-praise and in self-condemnation? When we are contemplating our virtues we sometimes annoy other people by the almost pharisaical complacency of our transports; but, equally, I think, when we are diagnosing our faults, are we apt almost to revel in the superior quality of our transgressions. There is, in fact, a certain cant of self-depreciation as well as of self-laudation. I say to myself, therefore, in the first place, is it possible, is it likely, that we have been for years teaching hundreds and thousands of young men, even if the immediate object be the passing of an examination or the winning of a degree, a literature which contains invaluable lessons for character and for life, and science which is founded upon the reverent contemplation of nature and her truths, without leaving a permanent impress upon the moral as well as the intellectual being of many who have passed through this course? I then proceed to ask the able officials by whom I am surrounded, and whose assistance makes the labour of the Viceroy of India relaxation rather than toil, whether they have observed any reflection of this beneficent influence in the quality and character of the young men who entered the ranks of what is now known as the provincial service; and when I hear from them almost without dissent that there has been a marked upward trend in the honesty, the integrity, and the capacity of native officials in those departments of Government, then I decline altogether to dissociate cause from effect. I say that knowledge has not been altogether shamed by her children, grave as the defects of our system may be, and room though there may be for reform. I refuse to join in a wholesale condemnation which is as extravagant as it is unjust.

"My Lord, the generous warmth of this most sympathetic utterance at once kindled throughout the country a great hope, and for a time it was thought that we were on the eve of a mighty reform which would change the whole face of things in regard to higher education in India. A liberal provision of funds for the encouragement of original research and of higher teaching, the institution of an adequate number of substantial scholarships to enable our most gifted young men to devote themselves to advanced studies, an improvement in the status and mode of recruitment of the Educational Service so as to attract to it the best men available, both European and Indian, the simplification of the preliminary tests, with a single stiff examination at the end of the course for ordinary students, so as to discourage cramming as far as possible—these and other measures of reform appeared to be almost within sight. It was, however, not long before the new-born hope that had thus gladdened our hearts was chilled to death, and we found that, instead of the measures we were looking for, we were to have only a perpetuation of the narrow, bigoted and inexpansive

rule of experts. My Lord, it has been too freely assumed in the course of the discussions over this Bill that all experts as a body are necessarily in favour of particular changes, and that laymen, on the other hand, as a class are opposed to them. When the new régime is inaugurated, it will soon be discovered that it is a great mistake to think so. It is a matter of general experience that the greatest opposition to change has generally come from some of the experts themselves—the older men among the experts, who rarely regard with a friendly eye any proposal to make a departure from the order of things to which they have been long accustomed. The younger experts, on the other hand, always imagine that unless changes of a radical character are introduced so as to reproduce, in however faint a manner, the condition of things with which they were familiar at their own University, the education that is given is not worth imparting. And as the older experts have naturally more influence, their opposition generally prevails, and in course of time the appetite of the younger men for reform gradually disappears. However, my Lord, I am sure the Council is quite weary now of listening to any more arguments about the rule of experts or any other features of the Bill, important or unimportant. Moreover, I have already twice spoken on the general character of the Bill. And I will therefore now proceed to one or two points only, that arise out of this discussion, before I bring my remarks to a close. My Lord, it is to my mind a painful and significant circumstance that the present condemnation of the educated classes has been passed at the instance of men engaged in the work of education. I am astonished that these men do not realize that a part at least of this condemnation is bound to recoil on their own heads. The Hon'ble Mr. Pedler has told the Council of dishonest clerks, unscrupulous managers of Colleges, and convict Graduates. I do hope, for the Hon'ble Member's own sake as much as for the credit of the educated classes, that there has been another and a brighter side to his experience. Else, my Lord, what a sad sense of failure he must carry with him into his retirement! Happily all educationists have not been so unfortunate in their experience nor, if I may say so, so one-sided in their judgments. There have been men among them who have regarded the affection and reverence of their pupils as their most valued possession, who have looked upon the educated classes with a feeling of pride, and who have always stood up for them whenever anyone has ventured to assail them. One such Professor, within my experience, was Dr. Wordsworth, grandson of the great poet—a man honoured and beloved as few Englishmen have been on our side. Another such man is Mr. Selby, whose approaching retirement will inflict a most severe loss on the Education Department of our Presidency. My Lord, I am aware that it is invidious to mention names; but these two men have exercised such

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [Mr. Gokhale; Rai Sri Ram Bahadur.]

abiding influence over successive generations of students during their time that I feel no hesitation in offering a special tribute of recognition and gratitude to them. Their hold over the minds of their pupils has been due, not only to their intellectual attainments, but also to their deep sympathy with them as a class which they had helped specially to create. I believe that such men have never had occasion to complain that their views on any subject did not receive at the hands of educated Indians the consideration that was due to them. It is through such men that some of England's best work in India is done; it is these men who present to the Indian mind the best side of English character and English culture. It is such men that are principally wanted for the work of higher education in India in the present state of things, and the best interests of both the rulers and the ruled may safely be entrusted to their keeping. I think, my Lord, there is practically no limit to the influence which a truly great Professor, who adds to his intellectual attainments sympathy and love for his pupils, may exercise over the minds of Indian students, whose natural attitude towards a teacher, inherited through a long course of centuries, is one of profound reverence. The recent Resolution of the Government of India on the subject of education strikes the right note when it says, 'where the problems to be solved are so complex, and the interests at stake so momentous, India is entitled to ask for the highest intellect and culture that either English or Indian seats of learning can furnish for her needs.' If the principle enunciated in this sentence is faithfully acted upon, it will go a long way to counteract the evil which is apprehended from the passage of this Bill. How far, however, this will be done, remains to be seen. Meanwhile, the old order will change, yielding place to new. My Lord, one cannot contemplate without deep emotion the disappearance of this old order; for with all its faults, it had obtained a strong hold on our attachment and our reverence, and round it had sprung up some of our most cherished aspirations. For the present, however, the hands of the clock have been put back; and though this by itself cannot stop the progress of the clock while the spring continues wound and the pendulum swings, there can be no doubt that the work done today in this Council Chamber will be regarded with sorrow all over the country for a long time to come."

The Hon'ble RAI SRI RAM BAHADUR said :—" My Lord, this Bill is a piece of legislation the effect of which will not be of a transient character, but the future generations of this country will be affected by its provisions. Therefore instead of saying the bare word 'no' with regard to the motion before the Council, I would like to make a few remarks with Your Excellency's permission.

"My Lord, the one consideration which ought to outweigh all others in taking in hand any legislation is that its provisions should be framed to supply the needs, and be suitable to the conditions, of the people for whom it is intended. But I regret to say that in the present Bill this principle has been departed from not to an inconsiderable degree.

"My Lord, the five Indian Universities were created at different times for the peoples of the various provinces whose conditions and requirements are so dissimilar. Their sphere of influence has been in quarters far removed from each other, and their growth and development have proceeded on different lines. They all have now been dealt with in one Act and cast in almost one uniform mould.

"My Lord, such a process may advance the cause of centralization, but it cannot adequately meet the varying needs of the people of the several provinces. The Bill, even with the amendments made by the Select Committee, has not been materially improved on points of vital importance; it remains virtually the same as at the time of its introduction. One of the most essential changes which the Bill will bring about will be the making a clear sweep of the existing Senates, and replacing them by Senates of a disproportionately small number of members and with representative element unduly diminished. The reconstitution of the Senates and Syndicates on the lines laid down in the Bill will result in placing the entire control of the Universities in the hands of educational men, among whom for a long time to come there will be a predominance of the European element, which together with the official element will have the upper hand. The analogy of the constitution of the governing bodies of the European and American Universities cannot hold good in the case of those of India. In the European countries and in America, the teachers and the taught belong to the same nationality, the interests of both are identical; public opinion plays a very important part in moulding the conduct of the members of the governing bodies, and any abuse of power can at once be remedied. But circumstances in India are quite different, and any scheme which though thought of with the best of motives, but which actually will result in diminishing the number of non-official Indians on the governing bodies of the Universities and reducing their influence, would be highly detrimental to the real advancement of high education among the Indian youths. My Lord, it is an adequate representation of the Indian element alone which will place the governing body in touch with the people and make that body thoroughly acquainted with the requirements and educational needs of the Indian students. The Senates will be deprived of many of the executive functions which they discharge at present

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [Rai Sri Ram Bahadur]

and which under this Bill will now be performed by the Syndicate. Even in such important matters as the affiliation or disaffiliation of Colleges, the Senates will now play a secondary part, *vis.*, that of making reports and recommendations, the Syndicates taking the initiative and the Government passing the final orders. The Syndicates of the future will in relation to their Senates occupy the position which, under the present Calcutta Municipality Act, the General Committee of the Corporation has in relation to the Corporation, the real power vesting in the smaller body, and the larger body being relegated to the position of a mere consultative assembly. The general result of the working of this Bill will be to deprive the Universities of even the moderate share of independence enjoyed by them at present, and to completely officialise and convert them into Departments of State.

"Next come the provisions of the Bill which exact a very high standard of efficiency, at the very start, from an institution applying for affiliation to the University. My Lord, I do not advance the proposition that institutions should be affiliated indiscriminately, without some fair standard of efficiency being exacted from them. But I take objection to those provisions of the Bill which require a high degree of efficiency from newly started institutions and which lay down the severe conditions such institutions must fulfil before they can get themselves affiliated. The exacting of such high degree of efficiency beforehand will not only check, but make almost impossible, the coming into existence of indigenous institutions. My Lord, the policy of the Government should be to encourage the starting and develop the growth of such institutions and not to check their coming into existence by exacting from them a degree of efficiency which in the Government institutions, long established, has been attained very slowly and gradually.

"My Lord, the moral taught by the adage 'Rome was not built in a day' holds good in the larger things as well as in the smaller ones. The provisions of the Bill will require a College, from its very start, to be completely equipped and fully supplied with all requisites like the Grecian goddess of old who came into existence with the full panoply. My Lord, the history of even the best Government or of aided Colleges of the present day teaches us a different lesson. For the sake of illustration I shall refer to two principal institutions of my Provinces, *vis.*, the Canning College of Lucknow and the Muir Central College of Allahabad, they being the typical instances of the two classes, *vis.*, aided and Government Colleges. Canning College, which imparts instruction in Arts, Sciences, Law and the Oriental languages, was started in a rented house with a small staff of teachers without any boarding house

or laboratory. Gradually it has acquired all the requisites and appliances necessary for a first class College. The Muir Central College, a Government institution which occupies the first place in the United Provinces, cannot boast of better antecedents, and all that we see of it now has been the result of a very slow and gradual growth, extending over a period of nearly 32 years. Government took thirteen years to construct a local habitation for that institution. The College boarding house is still in an unsatisfactory condition.

"My Lord, the now famous despatch of 1854 did, for the first time, lay down the policy which the British Government was to follow towards the people of this country with regard to education in all its branches. The adoption of measures for imparting of high education in suitable institutions and the establishment of Universities for testing the knowledge of, and conferring degrees upon, the Indian youths were along with others enjoined as incumbent duties of the Indian Government. Nearly half a century has passed since, and it is to the vigorous pursuance of the liberal policy laid down in that despatch, assisted by private help, that the people of India are indebted to the spread of high education among them now.

"But, my Lord, I consider it my duty to say that the amount which the Government has contributed towards the cost of the Universities and the maintenance of, and aid to, the institutions for imparting collegiate education, has been totally disproportionate to the real wants and requirements. As noticed by the Indian Universities Commission, the resources of the Indian Universities and Colleges are very small, when compared with the vast endowments of England and America, and the large sums placed by the Government of other countries at the disposal of their Universities. Except the Punjab University, which gets Rs2,000 a year, the other Indian Universities receive no grant whatever from Government. Coming now to the sums which the Government spends on its own collegiate institutions of all classes (general and professional, teaching law, medicine, engineering and agriculture) the amount for the year 1902-03, as given in the Appropriation Report of the Finance Department, came to Rs19,90,000. The sum given in the shape of aid to aided institutions came to Rs2,39,663. (For the later figures I am indebted to the Hon'ble the Finance Minister.) The aggregate sum therefore spent under all three heads, *vis.*, (1) Universities, (2) collegiate institutions maintained by Government, and (3) grants given to aided institutions, comes to Rs22,61,663, which in sterling money comes to £150,777 only. My Lord, the number of collegiate institutions of all classes and imparting instruction of all kinds according to the Universities Commission's Report in India, is 191. The number of students in those institutions is 23,000.

[21ST MARCH, 1904.]

[*Rai Sri Ram Bahadur.*]

"My Lord, it cannot be said that the sum spent by Government on high education in India does bear any adequate proportion to the vastness of population, numerical strength of the institutions, and the sum spent by other Governments on the high education of their respective countries. By way of illustration I shall give the figures of grants received by some of the Universities of other countries from their respective Governments. The University of Moscow receives an annual grant of £53,000, that of Vienna £83,000. The Japanese Government gives to the Universities of Tokyo and Kioto, a grant in the currency of that country which comes to nearly R19,00,000 a year. The parliamentary grants to the four Scotch Universities, Edinburgh, St. Andrews, Aberdeen and Glasgow for the year 1901 amounted in round numbers to £72,000. We are thankful to Your Excellency's Government for the promised grant of five lakhs of rupees for a period of five years in aid of Universities and Colleges which may establish a special claim to assistance in carrying out the reform which Government have in view. Your Lordship has fully recognized the principle that 'education is not only one of the foremost duties of Government, but it is perhaps the highest of all,' and as one of the main objects of Government in passing this Bill is to bring high education under their control to a larger degree, it is hoped that expenditure from the Public Exchequer under this head will be more liberal and sufficient to meet all the requirements.

"But my Lord, neither the passing of legislative enactments nor the reconstitution of the Senates or Syndicates, nor any strictness observed in the affiliation of Colleges, will go much to improve the tone of the education imparted to the Indian youth, so as to bring it to the ideal standard, unless appointments in the tuitional staff of the Colleges and especially of Government are given to the best University men. In making such appointments more and better care ought to be exercised and liberal salaries ought to be paid to them than at present.

"My Lord, before I conclude, I would like to say a few words with regard to the criticism often levelled against the products of the Indian Universities. The so-called discontented B.A. is often held up as the typical product, and he is considered, in certain quarters, as a disturbing element in the existing order of things. In the first place, I beg to say that the charge is totally groundless. The Graduate of the Indian University knows far better than the ignorant peasant the advantages which the British rule has conferred on the Indian people, and is therefore a better and more loyal citizen than the unknowing rustic. Secondly, is India alone the country where we meet with the discontented B.A.? Are the centres of education in other civilized countries, which are held up to us as models for imitation, totally free from his presence?

[*Rai Sri Ram Bahadur; Sir Edward Law; the* [21ST MARCH, 1904.]
Lieutenant-Governor.]

"The system of education which is in vogue in India is mainly responsible for so many of the Indian youths being compelled to resort to University examinations. The possession of a University certificate is considered not only a passport for entrance into the Government service, but even for employment in private offices and commercial firms. Persons who intend to adopt the profession of medicine or engineering must pass some University examination before their admission into the institutions imparting instruction in those branches; graduation in arts is necessary before a man can appear for the B. L. examination which alone can qualify him to practise in the High Courts. Whilst in the Inns of Court no such high test is exacted. The number of University examinees will go on increasing until a differentiation in the system of education from the very beginning is adopted, so that those who have a bent for literary pursuits may adopt one course, and those who want to enter into commercial and other lines may adopt a different one."

The Hon'ble SIR EDWARD LAW said:—"My Lord, the Hon'ble Member has just mentioned some figures of expenditure. I am not able to check exactly what he said, but I can give some figures which will show that the expenditure is increasing and is, I fancy, a very much larger figure than he imagines. In our accounts for 1902-03 under the head 'Education' (and this does not by any means include the total amount spent on Education since there are contributions from Municipalities and other special funds devoted to the purpose), the direct Imperial contribution was £1,297,664; and in the revised estimate for 1903-04 we get up to a figure of £1,378,200, whilst in our Budget Estimate we anticipate a very considerable further increase."

His Honour THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR said:—"My Lord, I should like to make a few remarks on this Bill before the motion is put. I do not consider it necessary to enter into any discussion of the educational policy which has been pursued in Bengal, or to follow either my Hon'ble friend Dr. Asutosh Mukhopadhyaya or my Hon'ble friend Mr. Pedler in this matter. The only thing in this connection that I should like to say is this, that while such a discussion may be more or less irrelevant to the question which is immediately before us, there are times and occasions when it should be distinctly relevant; and I shall be very glad to receive in the local Council any 'inconvenient questions' (I use the Hon'ble Member's own words) which Dr. Mukhopadhyaya may have to put on the subject. I can only express the hope that when I go on, as perhaps it may be necessary to do, to improve education on the lines which he has suggested, and when the natural criticism finds its place in the

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [*The Lieutenant-Governor.*]

Native Press, that I am giving 'fat appointments' to Europeans, I shall find the same vigorous support on the part of the learned Doctor as he has given to the proposals in this Council.

"There is another remark which I should like to make of a general character, and it is this, that I do feel that it is misleading (and I think perhaps that I am a little sensitive on that point) I do think that it is misleading for one Hon'ble Member to say that an amendment shared 'the common fate of other amendments' and for another Hon'ble Member to say that the result of this discussion is that those who are opposed to some of the principles of this Bill 'have had no gains, and have lost all along the line.' I think it is misleading, because it conveys an absolutely erroneous impression of the nature of the discussion that has been taking place. It seems to me that we must bear in mind that it is necessary that we should not convey in this respect an unfair and prejudiced impression to the public. What has been taking place for the last three days has been a discussion on a Bill which has been thoroughly threshed out in Committee. Even so, several amendments have been accepted; but the point to which I wish to draw attention is this, that even if no amendments had been accepted, that would not mean that due attention had not been given to the views of those who moved those amendments, but that, having been thoroughly considered in Committee, these amendments had been rejected.

"And now, my Lord, I should like to say a few words in regard to the Bill itself. First of all, in regard to the need for reform. I have the very strongest feeling that there has been a great need for reform, and I do not believe that there is any man, European or Indian, who is thoroughly interested in education, who does not share that view. I am very far from any sweeping condemnation of higher education as we have had experience of it during the thirty years that I have spent in this country. I came fresh from a University and believing very much in University education, and I have taken great interest in higher education and University education ever since I came to the country. I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that higher education has made great progress in the country since I came to India thirty years ago. I know, and am perfectly persuaded, that there has been great improvement in the learned professions, and in the class of men whom we are now able to enlist in the Provincial Service, and in the other services of Government which enlist Indians; and I attribute this to the progress of higher education, in large measure indeed almost entirely to the progress of higher education; and much of the credit of these improvements must go of course to the Universities. But I am bound to say that, while these are my views, and while I have the greatest sympathy in the work that has been and is being

carried on by the Universities, yet at the same time my experience shows me that the result of the University examinations is in many respects good, but is altogether uncertain; that we have men who come up from some Colleges whose capacity and character shows that they have received instruction under such conditions as make it likely that that instruction will be sound instruction, and that the development of their character, their moral and intellectual capacity, has been the object of the College. But there are men who come up showing very different character and qualifications; and I think that the idea that the University should be an examining body, and that it should not take care to supervise and control the agencies which carry on education so as to see that the instruction imparted will be sound, and that the education will have regard to morality as well as intellect, must lead to failure and in many cases to what is absolute scandal. Now, of course, I thoroughly share the views that have been expressed by the Hon'ble Mr. Morison, that in dealing with defective Colleges we must proceed slowly; but I altogether differ from the view that such Colleges hurt none but their own own students. I think they have a tendency to deteriorate the whole course of education, and they altogether deprive University degrees of their value. Furthermore, even if they only hurt their own students, why should the University give its imprimatur to an education which we believe to be hurtful? It is impossible to meet this state of things by legislation alone, but what this Bill aims at is to meet three existing defects, and if these are effectively remedied, the Universities will be left to carry on a course of work which will be free from the defects, which at all events may be free from the defects, which have characterised the Universities in the past.

"The first of these provisions of the Bill is in regard to teaching. Now here all that the Bill does is to lay down the principle that the Universities should be, or may be, teaching institutions. Surely it is impossible to go further than this. Apart from suggestions regarding private liberality, we have had three proposals made to us whereby to promote this object of the Bill, and I should think that two of them at least may be deservedly set aside. The one is the proposal to exact a certain contribution from Fellows from year to year for the discharge of their onerous duties. The other is the Hon'ble Mr. Morison's proposal that dinners and garden parties to Commissioners and Collectors should be given up. Now I suppose the first proposal would give straight away about Rs.5,000 a year. The other proposal, as far as my experience goes, would not have given to any College in the Central Provinces five rupees or even five annas a year. As to these dinners or garden parties to Collectors or Commissioners, I am not certain that I should not welcome them from a social point of view.

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [*The Lieutenant Governor.*]

I have no experience of any abuse in this direction. What the experience of others is I do not know, but no dinner party was ever got up for me by any Native gentleman in my Province, nor even a garden party, until I became the Head of the Government.

"The third proposal is that the Government should give some money for the advancement of University education. This is clearly a matter which cannot be dealt with in the Bill; but the fact that this point about the Universities being teaching institutions is contained in the Bill, practically pledges the Government to help forward the matter.

"The second provision of the Bill is to give a working constitution to the Universities, and powers to supervise and control the agencies engaged in imparting higher education. Now, in regard to this working constitution, I should like to say that I do not regard the constitution as laid down in this Bill as ideal and final. I am pleased to find in the Minute of Dissent recorded by Mr. Gokhale that he admits that the 'statutory provision for the election of two Fellows every year by Graduates in the older Universities is an improvement on the existing practice which derives its authority from a mere executive order of Government.' There is undoubtedly an advance in the Bill as compared with any previous legislation on the subject. But I admit at once that it does not go so far as I should be very glad some day to see legislation go in this direction. It is not ideal legislation, but, as the Hon'ble Member in charge of the Bill has said, it is what has been adopted for the present; it is as far as the Government sees it safe to go now, and the Government is bound to judge, it seems to me, not by what we hope may result from the provisions of this Bill, but by what now exists. Legislation must be in accordance with existing circumstances, not in accordance with hopes of the future. We heard a very solemn warning addressed to Your Excellency and Your Excellency's Government by the Hon'ble Dr. Mukhopadhyaya, with all the vehemence and solemnity which might have characterised a Hebrew prophet, when he told you that if you refused to carry out a greater popularising of this Bill now, there would arise another Viceroy and another Government that would do it, and to whom all the credit would redound. I do not know whether, if the policy of this Bill were developed, it would be in accordance with human nature that all the credit would be given to those who developed the policy; but I am perfectly certain of this, that when that policy is developed, and when it becomes reasonable and right to extend the principles now laid down in the Bill in regard to representation, I am perfectly certain that those who will hail with most satisfaction that development of policy will be Your Excellency and the Members of Your Excellency's Government.

[*The Lieutenant-Governor.*] [21ST MARCH, 1904.]

"There is only one other point to which I desire to draw attention and it is this: the powers which are given to supervise and control the agencies now engaged in higher education. Far and away the most important of these are the powers connected with affiliation and disaffiliation; but in connection with these there is also the power connected with inspection. In affiliation and disaffiliation, the Universities act in concert with the Local Government; in regard to inspection we have the University acting alone. Now, it seems to me that this power of inspection is precisely what you want between affiliation and disaffiliation. You want the Universities to be kept in constant touch with what is going on in the Colleges to which they have been affiliated. You want to have a living touch between the University and the College throughout the whole of its existence in affiliation. You want affiliation to be a continuing relation. You want the University to be kept aware of what is going on in the College, always to know how the College acts up to the conditions of its affiliation, and you also want to be able to carry the news of any particular advancement in education of any particular College into other Colleges.

"Now, it seems to me, my Lord, that this work of affiliation and disaffiliation must rest for the present at least where it has been placed. I must say that I am rather surprised to find that men of great logical acumen are perfectly prepared to accept the view that, when the Syndicate and the Senate are prepared to act, then they must go to Government; but when they decline to act, then Government cannot interfere; that is to say, that when the Syndicate and the Senate act, their action is to be subject to control because it may be wrong; but when they decline to act their inaction is to be final, because inaction must apparently always be right. It was not exactly so put, but it was put almost in the same words, when it was said that a small matter like refusing to affiliate might surely be left to the Syndicate and the Senate. A small matter! It is a very great matter indeed, and a matter in which experience shows that the Syndicate and Senate are as likely to go wrong as when they take action, and I say that legislation must deal with the facts as they exist. I say that experience does not show the propriety, the wisdom, or the expediency of leaving inaction in regard to disaffiliation as a thing to be settled by the University alone.

"Now, my Lord, I hope that I have not detained the Council too long with these remarks. I desire to conclude by joining in the congratulation that has been offered to Your Excellency's Government at this last stage of the proceedings, and especially to the Hon'ble Member in charge of the Bill. I feel very strongly that it must be a source of great satisfaction and gratification to him that this Bill will find its place in the Statute Book before he leaves the

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [*The Lieutenant-Governor ; Mr. Raleigh.*]

country. And because he is a very old friend, and indeed I may say a school fellow, of my own, I take the opportunity of congratulating him very heartily in this public manner.

"I would also express this hope that, when this Bill has been passed, it will form a basis of action in the future, and that we shall all pull together in doing all we can to advance the cause of higher education which lies as nearly to the heart of the Government as it does to the heart of any of those who have been, but will (I trust) no longer be, the opponents of this Bill."

The Hon'ble MR. RALEIGH said :—"It may seem strange that at this important moment in the history of the Bill the Member in charge should have little or nothing to say, but the duty committed to me was the controversial defence of the Bill and all the speeches of today show much to my satisfaction that we are passing out of the stage of controversy. When I compare the continuous fusillade of Friday and Saturday to the mildly reflective character of most of the speeches to which we have just been listening, I feel that all our minds are really made up and that even those who have opposed this Bill will accept it when passed in a reasonable spirit. In fact, I confidently expect to find among them our most valuable advisers and helpers in the future.

"My Hon'ble friend Dr. Mukhopadhyaya is, as I understand, not an enemy but a critic of this Bill, and no man has a better right to criticise it, because it is in large part his own work. Dr. Mukhopadhyaya has expressed a natural regret that he did not get even more of his own way in the Select Committee. I will ask him to believe that on some points I should have been glad to give him a little more of his own way, but for this one practical consideration that I had to trim the ship and carry her into harbour. So far as the Hon'ble Dr. Mukhopadhyaya's speech introduced new matter into the debate, it was matter that concerned the Government of Bengal: the Hon'ble Mr. Pedler and His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor have shown that Bengal is well able to defend herself. The first speech which I think distinctly committed the Hon'ble Member who delivered it to rejection of the Bill was that of the Hon'ble Nawab Saiyid Muhammad, and the conclusion of the whole matter after he had given us his arguments against this Bill was that the present system of University education should have a further trial. I have some difficulty in realising exactly what that advice would commit us to. Ten or twenty years of inaction: then another Universities Commission: another report: another agitation: and another Bill, bringing us perhaps in twenty years time to the point where we are today. I think myself that for many reasons the present is the suitable moment for action, and that we shall do wrong if we allow it to slip.

"The Hon'ble Mr. Gokhale maintains his opposition to the Bill, but as the grounds which he gave are grounds which I have already had to deal with in the course of the debate, he will perhaps excuse me if I do not attempt at present any further reply. There were, however, one or two points in his speech which showed that he still misunderstands the Government on certain very important points. He spoke, for instance, of the condemnation—he implied that it was an unqualified and unfairly severe condemnation—which we passed on the existing system of University education. Now, from the very start of his discussion there has been nothing that I have had more at heart than to avoid the language of condemnation or disparagement as applied to any individual, College of University in India, and Hon'ble Members of Council are aware that as often as I have had to speak of a particular University, as, for instance, when it was proposed to take one University after another out of the Bill, I have always begun by acknowledging the excellent work done by these Universities in the past. I would ask the Hon'ble Mr. Gokhale to admit that the acknowledgment was perfectly sincere. The Hon'ble Mr. Gokhale goes on to suggest that we have passed this unfair condemnation on the evidence of the people to whom he refers, with an air of resentment which I cannot quite understand, as experts. He seems to think that certain persons usurping the name of educationalists have got hold of the Government and have persuaded them to attack the Universities. The evidence taken by the Universities Commission is not in the hands of the public, and therefore I have often much to my regret been obliged to refrain from quoting it; but I would ask the Hon'ble Mr. Gokhale to take from me this general assurance that the strongest evidence as to the necessity for reform in the Universities was not the evidence of College teachers, but the evidence of Judges, Pleaders, Doctors and professional men, who had received their own education in Indian Colleges, who were attached by local sentiment to their own Colleges and Universities, and who yet felt that these Universities and Colleges had failed to a certain extent to answer the purposes of their foundation, and agreed that the moment had come to deal with them.

"There was one other phrase of the Hon'ble Mr. Gokhale's which I wish to notice because I think it embodies another erroneous view of the whole situation as it is today. He spoke of the disappearance of the old order and seemed to imagine that the old Universities were going out of sight, and that some brand new invention of the present Administration was going to take their place. I demur to that altogether. I have quoted again and again, in support of the proposals which I have asked this Council to accept, the evidence of men in the very forefront of University work, and therefore I have

[21ST MARCH, 1904.] [*Mr. Raleigh; the President.*]

the right to say that, although in some points we are introducing a new order, we carry forward into that new order the very best of the old.

"The Hon'ble Rai Sri Ram Bahadur is full of misgivings about this because he thinks we are destroying the representative character of the Senate and putting the authorities of the University out of touch with the people. I have had occasion to say before in the course of these debates that the word 'representative' is one which in connection with Universities requires to be used with some care. We do not profess that we are creating a Senate which will represent every class of the community, or which will represent classes according to their numerical proportion or the interests which they have at stake in University education. We desire to make the Senate representative of the best academic opinion of the provinces for which it acts, and in selecting a Senate on that principle we intend to use all possible care to do justice to communities, to classes of people and to races; and I contend that if this Bill at all answers the purpose of those by whom it has been framed, then the Senate of the future will be more and not less representative than it has been in the past.

"My Lord, these are all the points which I think the Member in charge of the Bill is called upon to answer before we proceed to vote. Many suggestions have been thrown out in regard to the general educational policy of the Government; but it does not fall within my province to deal with the general question. I am content to say that the whole of this discussion confirms me in the belief that this Bill was originally framed on sound and useful lines, that it has been greatly improved by the attention given to it by the Select Committee, and that the Council may now pass it into law with a confident hope that we are placing a powerful instrument for good in the hands of the friends of higher education in this country."

His Excellency THE PRESIDENT said:—"We have now reached the final stage of a controversy that has been going on for nearly five years; and we are about to pass into law a Bill which is intended to have, and which I believe will have, a profound effect upon the future of the Indian people. It might be thought that there is no matter upon which public opinion ought to be more unanimous than reform in education. The subject is so tremendous, so vital, I may almost say so sacred; and yet experience shows that there is no subject in all countries upon which thoughtful and patriotic men are more sharply divided, and that education shares with theology the distinction of provoking

passions and recrimination almost beyond any other human concern. Such has, to some extent, been our fate in India in respect of this Bill. A great many hard and some bitter things have been said of the Government in the discussion of the last few years. I wish at this final stage to pass the sponge over these. No reform in India can be achieved without a prolonged and often painful struggle, and no reformer, as I know, can quit the field without his scars. On the present occasion my desire is rather to present to the public, and even to those Hon'ble Members who have conducted the fight against us with so much assiduity, and I would add, with reference more particularly to this concluding debate, with so much equanimity and self-control, a view of our action which even, if it does not mitigate their suspicion, will perhaps lead them to recognise that the Government have been proceeding throughout upon principles as clear, as definite, and as honest as any which it is possible for men to entertain. I will not go back into the old story of the state into which University education had fallen in India. When I first came out here, I was implored to take it up by many of those who have since fought the hardest against the changes for which they then appealed. Nothing would have been easier than to let it alone. Matters would merely have gone drifting along. The rush of immature striplings to our Indian Universities, not to learn but to earn, would have continued till it became an avalanche ultimately bringing the entire educational fabric down to the ground. Colleges might have been left to multiply without regard to any criterion either of necessity or merit; the examination curse would have tightened its grip upon the life of the rising generation; standards would have sunk lower and lower. The output would have steadily swollen in volume, at the cost of all that education ought to mean: and one day India would have awakened to the fact that she had for years been bartering her intellectual heritage for the proverbial mess of pottage, and no more. My Hon'ble Colleague, Mr. Raleigh, and I set ourselves to defeat this destiny. I venture to say that no one of the many distinguished Englishmen who have come out to serve in India have been imbued with a greater enthusiasm for education or a finer grasp of the academic ideal than he. His perfect knowledge and admirable temper have been freely illustrated in the debate that is now drawing to a close, and when the day comes, as it will come, when the country will rejoice that a Government of India was found with the courage to take up this problem, it will also congratulate itself that the main burden was committed to such capable hands.

“What is the principal charge that has been reiterated at all stages of this debate, inspiring the majority of amendments, and pointing every peroration? Is it not that this Bill is merely intended to rivet the control of Government upon

[21ST MARCH, 1904.]

[*The President.*]

the Indian Universities, and that our reforms, however well meaning, are misguided and will not succeed, because they place in the hands of Government what ought to be entrusted to others? This is the first point that I should like to discuss.

"In so far as the charge is to the effect that Government has taken the power of the last word in the entire programme of reconstruction, it is true, and this is, in my opinion, the best guarantee that the programme will not be inoperative. I constantly regret that Government is compelled to be so dominant a factor in the settlement of Indian problems. I feel of the Government in India, what Wordsworth said of the material world, namely, that it is too much with us. But so it is, and so for long it will remain. Where so many divergent interests and classes exist, there are required the combined control and stimulus of some powerful and impartial central force, and there is no force in India that answers to that description, at any rate at the present stage of Indian evolution, except the Government. The consequence is that, though this is a country where everybody claims the liberty to denounce the Government for what it does, everybody also appeals to the Government who wants anything to be done. I often see it supposed that because we have to do so much, we therefore think that we are right in all that we do. No one connected with the Government would, I am sure, make so absurd a claim. Governments are very apt to err, and we assuredly claim no immunity from the general law. But the fact remains that if progress is desired in any branch of the national development, the Government is compelled to associate itself with the task, and to exert itself strongly in the desired direction. If the Government had not taken up this particular problem of higher education, I ask therefore who would have done it, and if we had not made ourselves responsible for seeing it through, who will give me any guarantees that it would not have proved abortive? Even the Hon'ble Mr. Gokhale, who is the strongest opponent of Government interference, said in his note of dissent that if University chairs, laboratories, and museums had to be provided, the money would have to be found by Government. Exactly, but why? There is plenty of wealth among his own countrymen if they are willing to devote it to these objects: as I am myself hopeful that they will one day do. Dr. Mukhopadhyaya said that they would not come forward because of this Bill. Is he quite sure that they came forward before? Anyhow I should be slow to believe that they will be actuated by such petty motives. Again in his speech in December last the Hon'ble Mr. Gokhale gave us his own idea of University reform, which was that the Government should reform its own Colleges. Once more, it was the

Government, not private enterprise, or public opinion that was to move. It is futile, therefore, to attack Government for exercising a final control in these matters, when you know perfectly well that there is no one else to do it, and when in the same breath you appeal to Government to do what you are unable or unwilling to do yourselves.

"In the concrete cases contained in this Bill, it does not, in my opinion, involve any unreasonable distrust of the new Senates or Syndicates that the Government should claim the last voice in affiliation or disaffiliation, or in the formation of the important body of rules. I daresay Government will not require to interfere at all. Anyone who imagines that we are likely to embark upon a policy of actively quarrelling with the Senates and humiliating them, must think either that we are very curious parents or that we have a great deal of spare time on our hands. It is quite likely that the Senates and Syndicates will be perfectly competent to stand by themselves, and will make no mistakes. I firmly hope that this will be the case. But if it is not, and, until they are created, the matter must necessarily be in doubt—the Government must in common prudence retain the power which it has done. I rather wish that those Hon'ble Members who are so satisfied with the constitution of 1857, that they deprecate any departure from it, would look back to the first list of Fellows of the Calcutta University, and to the part that was claimed by Government in the control of the University, at that time. Out of the first Senate of 30, all but 5 were Europeans, and out of the 5 Indians 4 were officials. It seems to me that we have marched a long way forward since those days, and not in the direction of Government control, but away from it.

"There are two other criticisms which I have heard in these debates to which I take leave to demur. The first is Mr. Gokhale's assumption, repeated more than once, that it is the desire and intention of Government to place the Indian element in so hopeless a minority on the future Senates as to dissociate them for all practical purposes from the government of the University. Why should he assume this to be the case? What does he know of the way in which the various Chancellors will exercise their prerogative? What do any of us know until we see? I once before upbraided Mr. Gokhale with the suspicion with which he regards our proposals, and he was rather pained at my reproach. But I could not point to a more striking instance of gratuitous suspicion than this. Let me remind him further that it is not while Europeans but while his own countrymen have enjoyed the practical monopoly of a power upon the Senates that matters, at least in the University which I know best, have reached a stage which calls so urgently for reform. Up to a quarter of a century

[21ST MARCH, 1904.]

[*The President.*]

ago the Europeans were in an immense majority upon the Calcutta Senate. But during the last fifteen years the balance has veered in the opposite direction, and the majority has been overwhelmingly native. Is the Hon'ble Member so satisfied with the state of affairs that has accompanied this change—I will not go so far as to say that it has been wholly the consequence of it—as to claim that the Indian element should be placed in a position of permanent predominance in the future? His second argument, which I think rather an ungenerous one, is that the control of the Universities ought not to be placed in the hands of those whose interest in this country is only a temporary one. Only temporary—yes, but there is many an Englishman who gives thirty-five years of the best of his life to this country, and who is willing to work himself even unto death for the sake of duty to an alien people. Are the Indians quite confident that there would be many of them willing in the converse case to do the same? I venture to think that, if there were set down in two tables the services that have been rendered to India by her temporary and her permanent friends, the former would not come so badly out of the comparison.

“Now let me suppose for a moment that Government had the design that has been attributed to us by our critics, *vis.*, to officialise the Universities, and to render them merely a department of the State. There are a few questions that I should like to put in that case. If this was our intention, I have been wondering why we did not make a much better business of it while we were about it? Why should we have given away 20 per cent. of the new Senates to election? Why should we have gone out of our way to create for them a far wider and more popular electorate than now exists in any Indian University—an electorate which is a concession to an almost unanimous public demand, but which I should not be surprised if public opinion itself will one day find cause to regret. Why did we not insist upon bringing the Director of Public Instruction everywhere to the front? Why did we agree on Friday last that the Chancellor's choice of Fellows should be fettered by restrictions as to two-fifths being drawn from the teaching profession? Why have we left so much to the Senates in respect of the regulations instead of doing it at once ourselves? And why, above all, did we not tighten our clutch upon each University by passing a special Act for it, in which we could have brought it finally and effectively under our thumb? The argument to which I listened in this debate about the separate Acts for the separate Universities seemed to me a most surprising one. It must surely be quite clear that a series of individual Acts must have been much more stringent than a general one, inasmuch as we only apply in the

latter what is common to all, and leave to each University to frame its own regulations in accordance with its own needs, and subject only to Government sanction. Our object, indeed, may be defined in Lord Macaulay's well-known dictum about the Indian Codes: 'Uniformity when we can have it; diversity when we must have it; but in all cases certainty.' And yet the same Hon'ble Members who complain of Government interference in general are those who complain of us for not having exerted it in each of these particular cases. As a matter of fact the charge that Government secretly desires to officialise the Universities breaks down the moment that it is closely examined; for it is inconceivable, if that were our real object, that we should have done it in so clumsy and imperfect a fashion. My own view, therefore, of Government interference is that we have taken the powers, if we did not already possess them—and it has frequently been pointed out that they are already implied, if not actually given, in the original Acts of Incorporation—that are absolutely necessary to ensure that the new reforms shall be given a fair trial, and that they shall not be broken down by any hostile or unfriendly influences. As soon, however, as the new Senates have started on their way, and the new regulations been approved, my belief is that Government will be able very soon to relax its control. The reason is two-fold. If you will look at the Bill, you will see that a very large measure of independence is left to the Senates, and that the real power for the future will be vested in them. Secondly, the last thing that the Government can want is to go on dry-nursing the Senates for ever. The stronger and more influential they become—provided they do not fall a prey to sectarian animosities or to sectional intrigues—the better will Government be pleased. The ideal that we look forward to is that of self-governing institutions watched parentally by the Government in the background. If the institutions play their part, the control will be nominal. If they do not, it will be there as a check.

"I dealt at an earlier stage of the debate with our insistence upon a five years' term of Fellowship, and need not repeat the arguments which I there employed. But here, again, I think that there is a certain inconsistency in the position of our critics. For if they are right in arguing that Government desires only to put its own puppets upon the Senates, and is certain to resent independence of any description, surely it would be better, from our point of view, to have a ten years' puppet or a lifelong puppet than a five years' puppet. But the point is not really worth pursuing. The whole tenor of this discussion, and the successive changes that have been introduced into the original Bill, must surely, by this time, have convinced our critics that what we want

[21ST MARCH, 1904.]

[*The President.*]

to get is not a servile Senate, but an expert Senate, not one of place-hunters, but of educationalists. The argument has been constantly employed that future Chancellors or Vice-Chancellors here or elsewhere may not happen to take the same interest in education that Mr. Raleigh and I are generously credited with doing. If that be the case, so much the more likely are they to leave the educationalists alone, and to let the new Senates stand or fall on their own account.

“Then we come to the point about affiliation and disaffiliation. Here, again, the same distrust has been expressed, and a picture is drawn of Government intervening in order to exact impossible tests from struggling or impoverished institutions. I am tempted to make two remarks about this. Firstly, the Hon’ble Members, to whom I am referring, in their anxiety to depict the dangers ahead, have been relatively silent as to the shortcomings and blunders behind. I make one exception. In one of his speeches this morning, the Hon’ble Dr. Mukhopadhyaya let in a few rays of cold light upon some of the strange proceedings of the Bengal Colleges in recent years. Now, why has greater stringency in respect of affiliation and disaffiliation been called for? Because, at any rate in some parts of the country, there has been the most culpable laxity in both respects in the past. Many wholly unworthy institutions have been allowed the privilege of affiliation, and have retained it for years. Except in extreme cases it would have been useless to go to the Senates for drastic remedies; for the Senates, under the influences to which I have referred, would have refused to move. It requires but the slightest acquaintance with the facts to know that in many affiliated institutions the professors and teachers have been underpaid, the appliances inadequate, the buildings insanitary and unsuitable, the teaching superficial, and the College banking account very likely insolvent. And this brings me to my second point. Our Bill contains provisions expressly designed to check this state of things in the future. The conditions that are henceforward to be required for affiliation are contained in clause 21 of the Bill. They are couched in the most reasonable terms, and have been invested with an elasticity that might even be thought likely to render them ineffective. Let us suppose that some visitor from a foreign clime were to come to India and to be shown this clause. I venture to say that his first remark would be one of astonishment that these provisions had not been insisted upon for years; and if he were then told that upon being introduced in this Bill, they had excited no small amount of suspicion and alarm among a certain section of the population, he would reply that the sooner such people were guided into a proper frame of mind the better. It is at the bad and unworthy institutions that this clause is aimed: not at the young and

struggling venture. Advanced standards are no more likely to be exacted from the latter, than we demand the muscles or the character of a man from a boy. It is not the weak but earnest aspirant that will suffer. But the hoary offender—well, I rather differ from the Hon'ble Mr. Morison, for I hope that we shall bring him down. I certainly do not contemplate any campaign of what he described as general suppression. But there is something I think even worse than that, and it is a policy of impotent condonation, excused by the mistaken plea that the transgressor only injures himself.

“As regards the general character of our Bill I think that its moderation might not unreasonably be deduced from the fact that such entirely opposite and contradictory verdicts have been passed upon it by its critics. While some of the Native Members here have been denouncing it as a retrograde and pernicious measure, I have seen it described elsewhere as a barren and petty effort, more fit for ridicule than for indignation. Both of these estimates cannot be true, and both are obviously coloured by party predilections. Those who characterise it as retrograde merely mean that the progress which it must lead to is not precisely in the direction which they would like. Those who denounce its ineptitude have failed, I think, to recognize that the Bill does not itself sum up the history or the capacities of reform; but that these are not obscurely concealed in the consequences that will immediately flow from it. The Universities Commission dealt with many subjects, besides constitutional reconstruction. If you refer to their Report, you will find entire sections—amounting to nearly two-thirds of the whole—devoted to the subject of teaching, to courses of study, and to the nature and conduct of examinations. All of these matters we have excluded from this Bill. But they have not, therefore, been ignored or lost sight of, and clause 25 of the Bill, which provides for the regulations to be drawn up within a year of the passing of the Act, is, in my view, almost its most momentous section. This is a point of which I think that public opinion has scarcely grasped the full meaning. The truth is that this Bill only raises the walls of the new house; it does not furnish its chambers. Or let me put it in another way. We provide the machinery for reform; but we leave the Universities to carry it out. We give them new governing bodies as competent for the purpose as we think that we can make them in India,—anyhow incomparably more competent than any that have hitherto existed,—we invest these reconstituted bodies with adequate powers, and we bid them discharge the task. Here, again, may I not ask, if Government had been so avaricious of control, would it not have been simple for us to have grasped all this in the Bill, and to have laid down the law once

.

[21ST MARCH, 1904.]

[*The President.*]

for all as to Faculties, and Boards of Studies, and examinations, and curricula, and fees? And yet, to the confounding of our critics, not only have all these immensely important subjects been left to the Universities under the Bill, but they have actually been left to be dealt with in a different way in each University according to its own circumstances and needs. This seems to me to deal the final death-blow to the theory of Government autocracy, which, having played to the full the part that was expected of it in these debates, may now, I hope, be allowed to expire.

"On the whole, however, I think that the most remarkable feature of the debate has been the striking contrast that it has presented in its concluding stages to the declamation of less responsible criticism outside. I did indeed make a special effort by the composition of this Council to provide for the consideration of the Bill by the most competent body, European and Native, that I could procure. A more representative assembly for the special purposes of an individual Bill has, I believe, never taken its seat at this table. And what has the discussion by these experts shown? Indian opinion has not been ranged exclusively on one side, and European on the other. This Bill has received its strongest support from some of the Indian gentlemen who are here. We have still in our recollection the bold and emphatic testimony that was borne by that veteran educationalist, Dr. Bhandarkar. Mr. Bose gave the weight of his thoughtful support to the Bill. Some of those Hon'ble Members who have been our most constant critics have not concealed their frank sympathy with many of the objects and provisions of our Bill. The Hon'ble Dr. Mukhopadhyaya's final speech was, in my view, a conclusive admission of its necessity. The Hon'ble Mr. Gokhale's concluding remarks were in the nature of an exception, and I think that everyone of us must have been startled at the sharp contrast between the tone of those remarks and all the speeches that had preceded. After doing his best at an earlier stage of the Bill, and with success, to place experts in a majority on the Senates of the future, he indulged in a denunciation of experts which seemed to me not quite gracious or apposite. Alone of all of us he also has made the discovery that this Bill involves a condemnation of the educated classes in India without a fair hearing. Without a fair hearing! They have been talking for five years, and we have been listening for five years. We have given to their representations a hearing unprecedented in length and in consideration. As for the condemnation of the educated classes, it is sufficient for me to confront the Hon'ble Member with the opinion of the Hon'ble Dr. Bhandarkar, at whose feet Mr. Gokhale told us that he himself once sat, and of the Hon'ble Mr. Bose.

They welcome this Bill, not as a condemnation of the educated classes of their countrymen, but as a decree of emancipation which will free the energies and activities of those classes from the clogs and fetters that have done so much to drag them down.

"Finally, we have had the unanimous and enthusiastic witness of the European educationalists on the Council, who see in the passing of this measure a great and important step forward in the progress of the education to which they have devoted their lives. I think, therefore, that this has been a most instructive debate; and I shall leave this Council room today with the gratified consciousness that we are placing upon the Statute-book an enactment that is welcomed and valued by the leading authorities to whom it has been in our power to refer.

"I will not further detain the Council. I am not so sanguine as to think that, because we pass this Bill, a new heaven and a new earth will straight away dawn upon higher education in India. We shall still be confronted with conditions inseparable from Indian character, Indian economics, and Indian life. Other reformers will be called for after us, and will perhaps do better work than we. But our effort will mark a definite stage in the educational advancement of the country: it will check tendencies that were leading to demoralisation, if not to ruin; and it will provide opportunities which it will rest with others, Indian as well as European, to turn to good use when we have disappeared and are forgotten."

The motion was put and agreed to.

The Council adjourned to Wednesday, the 23rd March, 1904.

CALCUTTA;
The 21 March, 1904. }

J. M. MACPHERSON,
Secretary to the Government of India,
Legislative Department.