

REPORT

OF THE

COMMITTEE

APPOINTED BY THE SENATE

ON THE

13th MARCH, 1922



CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY PRESS

1922

CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|---------------------------------------|------|
| Constitution | 1 |
| Procedure | 7 |
| College of Science and Technology ... | 8 |
| Post-Graduate Teaching in Arts ... | 18 |
| “Thoughtless Expansion ” | 23 |
| University Law College | 30 |
| Charge of Delay | 36 |
| Array of Numerical Figures | 36 |
| Conclusion | 38 |

LETTERS

| | |
|--|----|
| Letter to the Government of Bengal, dated 5th February, 1921 | 14 |
| Reply from the Government of Bengal, dated 15th November, 1921 | 17 |
| Letter to the Government of India, dated 30th December, 1912 | 39 |
| Letter to the Government of India, dated 4th October, 1913 | 42 |

TABULAR STATEMENTS

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| University College of Science | 13 |
| Post-Graduate in Arts | 19 |
| Post-Graduate in Science | 19 |
| Post-Graduate Teaching in Arts ... | 22 |
| Government Grants | 27 |
| University Law College | 33 |
| Ditto | 34 |
| Ditto | 35 |

REPORT

We, the members of the Committee appointed by the Senate on the 13th March, 1922, to draw up a statement on the points arising in connection with the speech delivered by the Minister for Education, Bengal, in the Bengal Legislative Council on the 1st March, 1922, have the honour to submit our report.

Amongst the various points which require to be considered in connection with the speech the foremost place must be assigned to the question of the position of the University in relation to the Government, and we will accordingly examine it in the first place.

CONSTITUTION

The University of Calcutta is a Corporation created by Statute, and its privileges and obligations must be determined by reference to the statutory provisions which will be found set out in Act II of 1857 (the Act of Incorporation) and Act VIII of 1904 (the Indian Universities Act). These enactments have been amended from time to time and, in their amended form, are printed in the volume of Regulations published by the University.

The constitution of the Body Corporate of the University is defined in Section 1 of the Act of Incorporation and Section 4 of the Indian Universities Act. The Body Corporate consists of

- (a) the Chancellor,
- (b) the Vice-Chancellor,
- (c) the Ex-officio Fellows,
- (d) the Ordinary Fellows,
 - (i) elected by Registered Graduates,
 - (ii) elected by the Faculties, and
 - (iii) nominated by the Chancellor.

These persons constitute the Senate of the University.

Section 8 of the Act of Incorporation which authorises the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor and Fellows to superintend the affairs of the University is in the following terms :

"The Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor and Fellows, for the time being, shall have the entire management of and superintendence over the affairs, concerns

and property of the said University; and, in all cases unprovided for by this Act, it shall be lawful for the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor and Fellows to act in such manner as shall appear to them best calculated to promote the purposes intended by the said University."

Section 4 of the Act of Incorporation provides that the Governor of Bengal, for the time being, shall be the Chancellor of the University. The Governor General of India was the Chancellor of the University till the amendment of the Act of Incorporation in 1921.

The Vice-Chancellor is, under Section 5 of the Act of Incorporation, nominated by the Local Government of Bengal. The Vice-Chancellor was nominated by the Governor General of India in Council before the amendment of the Act of Incorporation in 1921.

The number of Ex-officio Fellows cannot exceed ten, as laid down in the proviso to Section 5 (2) of the Indian Universities Act. The list of Ex-officio Fellows may be modified by the Government by notification in the Gazette. The expression "the Government" now means the Local Government; (Section 2 (2) (b) of the Indian Universities Act). Before the amendment of 1921, the expression meant, in the case of the University of Calcutta, the Governor General in Council.

The list of Ex-officio Fellows at present is as follows :

His Excellency the Governor of Assam.

The Chief Justice of the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal.

The Lord Bishop of Calcutta and Metropolitan of India.

The Member of the Council of the Governor General in charge of the Department of Education.

The Minister for Local Self-Government, Bengal.

The Minister for Education, Bengal.

The Minister for Agriculture and Industries, Bengal.

The Minister for Education, Assam.

The Director of Public Instruction, Bengal.

The Director of Public Instruction, Assam.

This list, it will be noticed, includes the Member of the Council of the Governor General in charge of the Department of Education, the Minister for Education in Bengal and the Minister for Education in Assam. Consequently, the Minister for Education in Bengal is one of the ten Ex-officio Fellows in the same way as the Member of the Council of the Governor General in charge of the Department of Education and the Minister for Education in Assam.

The position thus is that the entire management of and superintendence over the affairs, concerns and property of the University is vested in the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor and Fellows, and, it is lawful for

them, in all cases unprovided for by Statute, to act in such manner as shall appear to them best calculated to promote the purposes intended by the University. No Fellow, Ex-officio or Ordinary, has any special power or privilege.

The Chancellor has the power to nominate Ordinary Fellows, subject to the restrictions and qualifications mentioned in Sections 6, 9 and 10 of the Indian Universities Act; he may, under Section 11, declare vacant the office of an Ordinary Fellow who has not attended a meeting of the Senate during the period of one year. The Chancellor may also nominate any person possessing the prescribed qualification to be an Honorary Fellow for life under Section 13 (2). His assent is, under Section 17, necessary when an Honorary Degree is proposed to be conferred by the Senate. Confirmation by him is also necessary when it is proposed under Section 18 to cancel a Degree or Diploma.

The consent of the Vice-Chancellor is necessary under Section 17 when an Honorary Degree is proposed to be conferred.

Under Section 15, the Executive Government of the University is vested in the Syndicate; the Vice-Chancellor is Ex-officio the Chairman of the Syndicate. The Vice-Chancellor has emergency powers under Section 6 of Chapter IV of the Regulations.

We now pass on to the points of contact between the Government and the University, so far as they are mentioned in the Act of Incorporation and the Indian Universities Act.

Under the second paragraph of Section 8 of the Act of Incorporation, as it originally stood, the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor and Fellows were authorised to make and alter from time to time bye-laws and regulations touching all matters whatever regarding the University. These bye-laws and regulations, however, could be operative only after they had received the approval of the Governor General of India in Council. This provision has been replaced by Section 25 of the Indian Universities Act, which empowers the Senate to make regulations from time to time with the sanction of the Government. As already pointed out, till the amendment of 1921, the expression "the Government" meant the Governor General in Council, and it now means the Local Government.

Another matter which brings the University into touch with the Government is the affiliation and disaffiliation of Colleges. The provisions on this subject are embodied in Section 21, 22 and 24 of the Indian Universities Act. The final order on all applications for affiliation and disaffiliation, after they have been considered by the Syndicate and the Senate, can be passed only by the Government to whom all the papers are required to be submitted by the Registrar.

Under Section 7 of the Act of Incorporation, the Government may cancel the appointment of any person as Fellow.

It is plain that, except upon questions of change of Regulations, and the affiliation and disaffiliation of Colleges, and a further matter presently to be mentioned, the Senate, composed of the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor and Fellows, is constituted a self-contained Corporation and is vested with the entire management of and superintendence over the affairs, concerns and property of the University, and no interference on the part of the Government, much less of any member thereof, is permissible. In this connection, it may be pointed out that the Senate is under no legal obligation to furnish reports, returns or other information. Reference may be made to Section 23 of the Indian Universities Act which makes it obligatory upon every affiliated College to furnish such reports, returns and other information as the Syndicate may require to enable it to judge of the efficiency of the College. No power, however, is reserved to the Government to call for reports, returns and other information from the Senate. The reason for this will be obvious to all persons familiar with University administration. There are many matters connected therewith, specially with the conduct of examinations, which no University should be called upon to disclose. We do not suggest, however, that because the University is not under a legal obligation to furnish reports, returns and other information, it should necessarily decline to do so. Much may be and is gained by publicity in suitable cases, but what should be distinctly understood is that such information cannot be demanded as a matter of right.

The point which has been reserved above for consideration, arises on Section 15 of the Act of Incorporation. The section, as enacted in 1857, was in the following terms :

“The said Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor and Fellows shall have power to charge such reasonable fees for the degrees to be conferred by them and upon admission into the said University and for continuance therein, as they, with the approbation of the Governor General of India in Council, shall, from time to time, see fit to impose. Such fees shall be carried to one General Fee Fund for the payment of expenses of the said University, under the direction and regulations of the Governor General of India in Council, to whom the accounts of income and expenditure of the said University shall, once in every year, be submitted for such examination and audit as the said Governor General of India in Council may direct.”

The section was amended in 1921, when the expression “Governor General of India in Council” was replaced by the expression “Local Government

of Bengal." Before we consider the extent of the power conferred on the Government by this section, it may be stated that it does not authorise what may be called "inspection." Reference may again be made to Section 23 (2) of the Indian Universities Act which authorises the Syndicate to inspect every affiliated College from time to time. No such power is reserved to the Government in respect of the University either under the Act of Incorporation or the Indian Universities Act. This has been expressly recognised by the Government of India, as will appear from the following question and answer in the Legislative Assembly :

"QUESTION 263. *Mr. J. Chaudhury*: (e) Is the Government of India aware that the University of Calcutta is at present on the verge of bankruptcy, and do Government propose to appoint a Committee to look into its financial position and come to its rescue, pending its reconstitution on a sound educational and financial basis?"

ANSWER. *Mr. H. Sharp*: (e). Government have been informed that the financial position of the University of Calcutta is precarious. They have no intention of appointing a Committee such as that contemplated by the Honourable Member, nor does the existing law provide for the appointment of such a Committee." (*Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly, dated the 22nd February, 1921.*)

Let us now turn to the language of Section 15, which, as we have stated, has been in operation since 1857. The fees mentioned in the first sentence of the section have to be carried into one General Fee Fund for the payment of expenses of the University under the direction and regulations of the Government. Apart from the question of the meaning of the expression "direction and regulations," it is obvious that such direction and regulations can apply only to the classes of fees specified in the first sentence, namely, (1) fees for degrees conferred by the Senate, (2) fees for admission into the University, (3) fees for continuance in the University. Under (1) comes the fee of Rs. 5 charged by the University when a degree is conferred *in absentia*; under (2) comes what is known as the Registration fee of Rs. 2; under (3) comes the fee payable by Registered Graduates. The Government is not authorised to issue "direction and regulations" in respect of other classes of fees which the University may charge or other kinds of income which the University may possess. Further, if "direction and regulations" are issued by the Government, they cannot conflict with the regulations otherwise made and already sanctioned by the Government, becoming thereby binding upon all members of the University. Section 15 again contemplates that the accounts of income and expenditure of the University shall, once in every year, be submitted for such examination and audit as the Government may direct.

Such examination and audit, however, are contemplated to take place only once in every year, and, as a matter of fact, the examination and audit have been held annually ever since the establishment of the University. There is thus no foundation for the claim which has sometimes been put forward, that the University is subject to general financial control by the Government or is liable to have its academic activities regulated by pressure of such control.

We have hitherto confined our attention to the provisions of the Act of Incorporation and the Indian Universities Act. There are, however, provisions in the Regulations which also bring the University into contact with the Government. Section 8 of Chapter VIII of the Regulations makes the appointment of the Inspector of Colleges subject to the approval of the Government. Section 1 of Chapter IX enables the Senate to found a Professorship, which is to be maintained out of the funds of the University, only with the previous consent of the Government. Section 10 of Chapter IX, again, provides that no University Professor shall be appointed without the sanction of the Government. Section 8 of Chapter X provides that no University Reader shall be appointed without the sanction of the Government. Sections 12 and 13 of Chapter XI as originally framed provided that no University Lecturer or Junior University Lecturer should be appointed without the sanction of the Governor General in Council; these sections have now been replaced by Section 32 of Chapter XI in its new form, which provides as follows:

“No person whose salary is, or is to be, paid from funds supplied by the Government, shall be appointed or re-appointed University Lecturer, without the previous sanction of the Government. The names of all other persons appointed or re-appointed Lecturers, shall be notified to the Local Government within one week from the date of the decision of the Senate. If, within six weeks from the receipt of such notification, the Government intimate to the University that a specified appointment is objectionable on other than academic grounds, such decision shall take effect and the appointment shall stand cancelled.”

It will be recalled that these Regulations, as promulgated in 1906, were made by the Government of India in the exercise of its extraordinary power under Section 26 (2) of the Indian Universities Act. A question has been raised—but never decided—whether such provisions in the Regulations as vest in the Government a power of control in excess of what is conferred by the Act of Incorporation or by the Indian Universities Act, are not really *ultra vires*. Section 8 of the Act of Incorporation, set out above, authorises the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor and Fellows to act in such manner as shall appear to them best calculated to promote the purposes intended by the University, in all cases unprovided for by the Act. It has been urged that the insertion of restrictive

provisions in the Regulations constitutes an encroachment upon the statutory powers vested in the Senate by Section 8. We need not on the present occasion express a final opinion on this controversy. We do not feel called upon to do so, but we must add that interference with the administration of the University in a manner not authorised by law should not be tolerated by the Senate. As the law now stands, we certainly cannot recommend to the Senate the acceptance of any position contrary to this view.

It is worthy of note that wherever the University is brought into contact with the Government, the expression formerly used was "Governor General in Council" and now used is "Government" or "Local Government." Neither the Member of the Executive Council of the Governor General in charge of Education nor the Minister in charge of Education in Bengal is mentioned or can be recognised as such. The intention apparently has been that the Chancellor, who is the Head of the University, should, in his capacity as the Head of the Government, have a direct voice in the final decision of such University matters as are required by Statute to be taken up to the Government. Expressions recently used by some persons show that the true position of the Governor (Chancellor) in this respect is apt to be overlooked or ignored; and they appear to us to be based upon an assumption not founded on the statute as it stands, which in our view is quite unambiguous and clear.

PROCEDURE

The next important point which deserves consideration is one of the procedure to be adopted when the Government deals with a University matter which is within its jurisdiction. It is obviously undesirable that a person in the position of a responsible Minister should give public expression to opinions upon University questions which the University authorities themselves had not been previously given an opportunity to examine and consider. The contrary procedure is bound to lead to unhappy results. A Minister cannot always be expected to possess an intimate first-hand acquaintance with the various aspects of the manifold and complex problems which must arise in a great and progressive University. If the Minister were to form his opinion on such materials as might be available to him, he might sometimes come to erroneous conclusions; and the public expression of opinions so formed might lead to complications which all persons interested in the welfare of the University should be anxious to avoid. That this apprehension is not altogether unfounded, may be illustrated from some of the observations contained in the Minister's speech.

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

We shall now take up the remarks made by the Minister with reference to the expenditure incurred by the University on the College of Science and Technology. These are mainly based on figures for the five years from 1916-17 to 1920-21, and we find the hope expressed that the University "would revise their way of dealing with the science side." In order to obtain the true perspective of the situation, it is necessary, however, to take into account the expenditure incurred by the University in respect of the College of Science since its commencement.

On the 16th March, 1912, Lord Hardinge in his Convocation Address announced that the Government of India had decided to make an annual grant of Rs. 65,000 for the appointment of University Professors and Lecturers in special subjects and for the encouragement in other ways of higher studies and research. On the 29th March, 1912, the Government of India addressed a letter to the Government of Bengal, intimating, for the information of the University, that a recurring grant of Rs. 65,000 had been made and that the object of the grant was to enable the University to make a definite step forward towards the realisation of the idea of a Teaching University for higher work as also to improve the inspection of Colleges. The Syndicate intimated to the Government of Bengal that they were unanimously opposed to the appointment of an additional Inspector of Colleges, and they urged, instead, the creation of a Professorship of Chemistry in addition to the two other chairs of Mathematics and Philosophy which had been previously suggested. The Government of Bengal, on the 31st July, 1912, strongly supported this proposal and expressed their concurrence with the opinion of the Syndicate that no provision need be made for the appointment of an additional Inspector of Colleges. On the 15th June, 1912, Mr. Taraknath Palit executed his first Trust Deed in favour of the University, transferring money and land worth about eight lakhs of rupees for the establishment of two Professorships, one of Chemistry and the other of Physics, "as a first step towards the foundation of a University College of Science and Technology." The Syndicate accordingly modified their proposal that Rs. 12,000 out of the Imperial Grant should be applied for the foundation of a Chair of Chemistry and recommended that the sum should be devoted to the maintenance of the Laboratory of the proposed University College of Science. On the 18th September, 1912, the Government of India sanctioned this proposal. On the 8th October, 1912, Mr. Palit made a further gift of seven lakhs of rupees. On the 30th December, 1912, the Syndicate addressed a letter to the Government of India for liberal financial

assistance for the development of University work in general and of the University College of Science in particular. The second paragraph of this letter, which is printed in full in Appendix I, was as follows:

“The Government of India are no doubt aware that in the course of the last six months, Mr. T. Palit, Bar-at-Law, has made over to the University a princely gift of money and property of the aggregate value of nearly fifteen lakhs of rupees for the purpose of founding a College of Science and for the general improvement of scientific and technical education. Under the terms of the deeds of gift, the University is bound to maintain, from the income of the endowment, a Chair of Physics and a Chair of Chemistry and to institute a scholarship to be awarded to a distinguished graduate for the study of Science in a foreign country; the University is also bound to establish a laboratory for advanced teaching and research and to contribute towards this object at least two and a half lakhs of rupees out of its own funds. But this sum is quite inadequate for the establishment of a laboratory of the kind contemplated. The Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate are anxious that the fullest advantage should be taken of this unique opportunity to establish a residential College of Science in Calcutta, and it appears to them that if the necessary funds are available, the object can be speedily accomplished without any difficulty. The properties vested in the University by Mr. Palit include, among others, two fine plots of land, one of 12 bighas and the other of 25 bighas in area. On the bigger plot, there are two splendid three-storied houses, recently built, which are admirably suited to accommodate 200 students. If, therefore, adequate funds were forthcoming to erect and equip the requisite laboratories and Professors' quarters on this plot, a Residential College could be set up in working order in the course of a year. The estimated cost of the project amounts to fifteen lakhs of rupees, and the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate do not hesitate to ask the Government of India for a grant to the University of this sum. The gift of Mr. Palit is absolutely unique in the history of University education in this country, and they feel sure that the Government of India will be glad to supplement it by at least an equal amount to enable the University to carry out the scheme in its entirety, specially in view of the fact that the University has already agreed to contribute two and a half lakhs out of its own very limited savings. I am desirous to add that a sympathetic and generous attitude on the part of the Government of India towards the object which Mr. Palit had at heart, cannot fail greatly to influence public sentiment and may not improbably induce other wealthy gentlemen to found similar endowments for the encouragement of higher teaching.”

On the 14th January, 1913, the following reply was received :

"The Government of India are not yet aware what grants, if any, they will be able to assign for education during the ensuing financial year. But I am to say that the requests of the Calcutta University will receive consideration in conjunction with the claims of other Universities and other branches of education."

On the 8th August, 1913, Dr. Rashbehary Ghose offered to place at the disposal of the University a sum of ten lakhs of rupees in furtherance of the University College of Science and for the promotion of scientific and technical education by the establishment of four Professorships of Applied Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry and Botany with special reference to Agriculture. The Syndicate, encouraged by this munificent gift, again addressed a letter to the Government of India on the 4th October, 1913, and pressed for a substantial grant in aid of the University College of Science. The second paragraph of this letter, which is printed in full in Appendix II, was as follows :

"In our letter, dated the 30th December, 1912, the first place was assigned to the scheme for the establishment of a University College of Science for the promotion of higher teaching in different branches of Physical and Natural Science. The Syndicate pointed out that in furtherance of the object, Sir Taraknath Palit had made a gift of money and land to the extent of 15 lakhs of rupees and that the University had undertaken to supplement this unique gift by a contribution of two and a half lakhs from its limited Reserve Fund. The Syndicate entertained the hope that, under these circumstances, the Government of India might suitably supplement and thereby accord recognition to this princely gift, but they were disappointed to find that money was not available for this purpose. Since then, Dr. Rashbehary Ghose has made a gift of 10 lakhs of rupees for the foundation of Professorships and Studentships in connection with the proposed University College of Science. The Syndicate venture to urge upon the Government of India that a claim has now been fully established for a generous contribution from the State in furtherance of the University College of Science. They further desire me to point out that the foundation of a University College of Science for Post-Graduate Studies and Research is one of the foremost needs of the University. There is only one College, namely, the Presidency College, which is affiliated in Physics and Chemistry up to the standard of the M.A. and M.Sc. Examinations, but it must be noted that the Presidency College, inspite of its new laboratories, has very limited accommodation for Post-Graduate students and is not able to take in more than 10 students in Chemistry and 18 students in Physics every year. Apart, therefore, from the obvious

importance of increased facilities for the scientific training of qualified students in this country, it is plain that there does not exist in this University adequate provision for the training of the numerous lecturers and demonstrators required for the efficient management of the Colleges affiliated in scientific subjects. In our letter of the 30th December, 1912, it was stated that the estimated cost of the project for the establishment of a University College of Science was 15 lakhs of rupees; the Syndicate have carefully reconsidered the matter and have come to the conclusion that a smaller sum would not be sufficient to secure that efficiency for the institution, which must for obvious reasons, be its principal characteristic. The laboratory building, of which the plans are ready, will cost at least five lakhs of rupees: the hostel which is proposed to be attached to it, will cost not less than two lakhs of rupees; the equipment will, on the most moderate estimate, cost five lakhs of rupees; a suitable scientific library cannot be created for less than two lakhs of rupees, if complete sets of important periodicals and publications of learned societies have to be brought together, while at least one lakh will be required for additional land. It is not suggested that the whole of this money, if available, may be utilised in the course of twelve months, but it is eminently desirable that an idea should be formed of the minimum requirements of the entire scheme which it may take two or possibly three years to complete."

On the 27th November, 1913, the Government of India replied that the Imperial funds available for education that year had already been allotted. On the 4th December, 1913, the University pointed out that the Syndicate had no intention to ask for a grant out of the funds available during the then current financial year; but that their object was to place before the Government, as early as October, a statement of their pressing needs so as to enable the Government to take it into consideration when framing its budget estimates for the following year. On the 23rd December, 1913, the Government of India replied that when funds were available, the request of the University for further grants for higher teaching would be considered in conjunction with other demands.

Although financial assistance from the Government of India was thus not forthcoming, the University authorities did not feel quite discouraged, in as much as hopes had been held out that their request "for further grants for higher teaching would be considered." The scheme for the foundation of a University College of Science could not be abandoned, as the acceptance of the generous gifts of Sir Taraknath Palit and Sir Rashbehary Ghose had placed the University under an obligation to provide for laboratory, workshop and other equipments. The foundation-stone of the building

designed for the University College of Science was accordingly laid on the 27th March, 1914, and the University proceeded to meet the cost of erection from the Reserve Fund, formed out of the surplus of examination fees realised from candidates of all grades in different stations of life from every corner of the Province. Unforeseen difficulties, however, arose. The outbreak of the Great War led to a sudden and phenomenal depreciation of the Government securities in which the Reserve Fund had been invested. Accordingly, on the 1st December, 1914, the Syndicate applied to the Government for a temporary loan against these securities, as their sale at the prices then current would entail heavy loss upon the University. On the 16th March, 1915, the application was refused; the result was that the securities were sold in the open market at a loss of nearly forty thousand rupees. We cannot overlook that in their letter, for the first time, the Government stated that they felt themselves unable to consider this or any other request regarding these matters, unless they received a clear statement of the general policy of the University in this respect and of the proposed College of Science in particular. It is unnecessary to set out here the correspondence which thereupon ensued between the University and the Government of India; the relevant documents have already been printed and will be found in the Appendix to the Minutes of the Senate dated the 3rd January, 1920. It is sufficient for our present purpose to state that the ultimate result of a protracted correspondence was that on the 9th August, 1917, the Government of India sent the following intimation to the University:

“In reply I am to say that the Government of India propose to defer consideration of the question of granting financial assistance in this connection to the University, pending receipt of the recommendations of the proposed Calcutta University Commission.”

Notwithstanding this regrettable attitude of the Government of India, the University steadily proceeded with the work of the College of Science and Technology. The adoption of this course is fully justified by an event which followed. On the 22nd December, 1919, Sir Rashbehary Ghose offered to place at the disposal of the University three and a half per cent. Government securities of the nominal value of Rs. 11,43,000, which would produce an annual income of Rs. 40,005, to be applied exclusively for purposes of technological instruction and research, by the establishment of two new University Professorships of Applied Chemistry and Applied Physics and four research studentships.

The amount which has been spent on the University College of Science during the last ten years may now be set out in the form of a tabular statement under the principal heads of expenditure:

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF SCIENCE.

| Year | Palit Professors, Asst. Professors and Assistants. | Ghose Professors, Demonstrators and Draughtsmen. | Palit Research Scholars. | Ghose Research Scholars. | Professors, Lecturers, Laboratory Assistants and Menials. | Books and furniture. | Physics Department. | Chemistry Department. | Applied Mathematics Department. | Botany Department. | Zoology Department. | Experimental Psychology Department. | Bio-Chemistry Department. | Workshop. | Gas and Electricity. | Buildings. | TOTAL. |
|-----------------------|--|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|----------------------|------------|-----------|
| | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. |
| 1912-13 | ... | ... | ... | ... | 1,977 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 1,977 |
| 1913-14 | ... | 2,829 | ... | ... | 3,600 | 567 | ... | 11,130 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 29,135 | 47,261 |
| 1914-15 | ... | 22,080 | ... | 1,575 | 3,600 | ... | ... | 1,575 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 3,32,621 | 2,61,451 |
| 1915-16 | ... | 25,200 | 5,625 | 3,675 | 1,986 | ... | ... | 23,030 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 34,201 | 93,617 |
| 1916-17 | 13,573 | 25,200 | 11,750 | 6,600 | 9,844 | 6,995 | 23,375 | 11,261 | 10 | ... | ... | 3,041 | 2,988 | ... | 968 | 33,966 | 1,49,571 |
| 1917-18 | 28,106 | 25,200 | 4,525 | 5,475 | 39,590 | 2,293 | 51,375 | 47,016 | 10 | 23,374 | 6,000 | 3,693 | 1,366 | 13,852 | 1,813 | 52,518 | 3,05,657 |
| 1918-19 | 29,917 | 24,074 | 4,791 | 5,591 | 81,866 | 6,303 | 12,863 | 23,420 | 156 | 30,500 | 12,132 | 1,463 | 11 | 665 | 2,275 | 11,263 | 2,49,290 |
| 1919-20 | 32,940 | 24,000 | 5,725 | 4,836 | 71,012 | 12,235 | 16,910 | 14,688 | 62 | 9,018 | 16,153 | 2,161 | 2,532 | 121 | 2,389 | 2,836 | 2,19,618 |
| 1920-21 | 34,047 | 41,658 | 5,425 | 4,875 | 1,00,460 | 8,472 | 17,207 | 26,171 | 1,384 | 14,678 | 6,845 | 4,284 | 1,245 | 5,045 | 3,527 | 4,400 | 2,80,623 |
| 1921-22 (9 months) | 28,482 | 34,303 | 2,600 | 6,220 | 73,166 | 4,533 | 5,677 | 13,112 | 82 | 20,204 | 1,197 | 10,527 | 29 | 1,438 | 2,530 | 704 | 2,04,894 |
| TOTAL | 1,67,065 | 2,24,544 | 40,341 | 38,847 | 3,87,101 | 43,398 | 1,29,407 | 1,71,403 | 1,704 | 97,774 | 42,327 | 25,115 | 8,171 | 20,621 | 13,507 | 4,01,734 | 18,13,959 |

The above statement shows that the total expenditure on the University College of Science and Technology up to 31st March, 1922, has been Rs. 18,13,959. This sum has been contributed as follows :

| | Rs. |
|---|--------------|
| 1. Contribution from the annual Government of India Grant of Rs. 65,000 ... | ... 1,20,000 |
| 2. Contribution from Sir Taraknath Palit Fund ... | ... 1,87,306 |
| 3. Contribution from Sir Rashbehary Ghose Fund ... | ... 3,51,744 |
| 4. Tuition fees from students : | ... 65,000 |
| 5. Contribution from the Fee Fund of the University ... | ... 9,89,909 |

TOTAL Rs. ... 18,13,959

What we desire to emphasise is that while the University has contributed from its Fee Fund nearly ten lacs of rupees to supplement the tuition fees and the income of the Palit and Ghose funds, only one lac and twenty thousand rupees have been contributed by the Government of India in ten years from the public funds. There is no room for controversy as to the fact that the financial embarrassment of the University is attributable very largely to the expenditure on the College of Science. The position would have been entirely different if the Government of India had, even in some measure, fulfilled its obligation to the cause of development of higher studies by rendering liberal financial assistance to the University in recognition of the unparalleled gifts of Sir Taraknath Palit and Sir Rashbehary Ghose. To select the figures for recent years and to confine our attention to them alone, cannot but create a misleading impression as to the part which has been played by the University and the Government respectively in the matter of the establishment of a University College of Science and Technology for advanced instruction and research.

At this point it is our duty to draw attention to events which happened during the last year. On the 5th February, 1921, the Registrar, under the instruction of the then Vice-Chancellor (approved by the Syndicate on the 11th February, 1921) addressed the following letter to the Government of Bengal, asking for financial assistance towards the development of higher teaching in the University, specially technological and agricultural instruction :

"I am directed by the Vice-Chancellor and Syndicate to request you to place before the Hon'ble the Minister in charge of Education this application for financial assistance for the development of teaching work in accordance with the recommendations of the Calcutta University Commission.

Paragraph 54 of Chapter LI of the Report of the Commission (Vol. V, pp. 282-83) is in these terms :

"The post-graduate scheme described in Chapter XV is carried on at a cost of more than 5 lakhs of rupees, of which Rs. 1,25,000 is derived from lecture fees. The Government of

India has contributed towards the cost, first, by founding three chairs and two readerships at an annual cost of Rs. 40,000; and secondly, by a grant of Rs. 15,000 for the post-graduate classes in general. The balance, more than half of the total, is taken from the general funds of the University, which are, in fact, derived almost wholly from the profits on examinations. Fees at the Matriculation, Intermediate and B. A. Examinations have been increased in order to meet these charges. The 138 full-time University Lecturers who provide the bulk of the instruction are paid salaries, varying in amount, which average Rs. 225 per mensem or £180 per annum. The funds do not permit these salaries to be increased, nor is any superannuation scheme provided; it is, consequently, difficult to retain the services of some of the abler teachers. It would demand an additional expenditure of about 1½ lakhs to increase the average salary to Rs. 300, which is not excessive for this grade of work, seeing that we have suggested Rs. 200 as the average for those of the College Teachers who are not Heads of Departments."

The recommendation of the Commission has received additional strength from recent events. It has been brought to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor that appointments in the Dacca University have been offered to members of the Calcutta University staff on much higher salaries than the Calcutta University has found it hitherto possible to pay them. To take one illustration, a member of the Post-Graduate staff in Philosophy, who is in receipt of a salary of Rs. 300, has been offered an appointment in the Dacca University on a minimum salary of Rs. 500 with periodical increments. The Vice-Chancellor and Syndicate are not able to appreciate the justification for placing public funds at the disposal of the Dacca University authorities, with the inevitable result that they are enabled to take away members of the Post-Graduate staff by offer of higher salaries. If public funds are available for development of higher teaching in Bengal, the Calcutta University is manifestly entitled to a fair share thereof. I am, accordingly, directed to request that a grant of one and a quarter lakhs be made for salaries of the Post-Graduate staff during the session 1921-22, as recommended by the Commission.

I am, further, directed to request that a capital grant of Rupees Ten Lakhs may be made for extension of Technological studies, as recommended by the Commission in Paragraph 75 of Chapter LI of their Report. The Government of Bengal are, no doubt, aware of the organisation which exists in the University College of Science and Technology for teaching in Science, Pure and Applied. The College of Science owes its existence in the main to the munificence of the late Sir Taraknath Palit and the Hon'ble Sir Rashbehary Ghose. The gift made by the former (money and land) is worth 15 lakhs of rupees; the endowment created by the latter exceeds 20 lakhs of rupees. The income of the two endowments has to be applied principally in the maintenance of eight Chairs and sixteen Research Students. The Chairs are now held by scholars of the highest academic distinction:

| | |
|--|---|
| Palit Professor of Chemistry. | Sir P. C. Ray, Kt., Ph.D., D.Sc., C.I.E., F.C.S. |
| Palit Professor of Physics. | Mr. C. V. Raman, MA.. |
| Ghose Professor of Applied Mathematics. | Dr. S. K. Banerjee, D.Sc. |
| Ghose Professor of Chemistry | Dr. P. C. Mitter, M.A., Ph.D. (Berlin). |
| Ghose Professor of Physics | Dr. D. M. Bose, M.A., B.Sc. Ph.D. (Berlin). |
| Ghose Professor of Agricultural Botany. | Dr. S. P. Agharkar, M.A., Ph.D. (Berlin). |
| Ghose Professor of Applied Physics. | Dr. P. N. Ghosh, M.A., Ph.D. |
| Ghose Professor of Applied Chemistry. | Dr. H. K. Sen, M.A., D.Sc. (London). |

The balance of the income of these endowments, which is left after payment of the salaries of these Professors and of scholarships to the research students, is quite inadequate for equipment of the respective Laboratories. The University has, consequently, found it necessary to devote a large portion of its current income from year to year to the construction of the Laboratory buildings, and the equipment of the Laboratories. Some idea of the sums which have been spent by the University will be gained from the following statement :

| | Rs. |
|---|-----------------|
| Cost of erection of Palit Laboratory Building at 92, Upper Circular Road ... | 3,89,427 |
| Equipment for the Laboratory (Physical, Chemical and Biological) ... | 3,34,382 |
| TOTAL | 7,23,809 |

Besides this, the University maintains two Chairs, one for Botany and the other, for Zoology. The former is held by Dr. P. Brühl, D.Sc., who is on the grade of Rs. 800-50-1,000, and the latter, by Mr. S. Maulik, M.A. (Cantab), who is on the grade of Rs. 600-50-800. To carry on the work in each Department, the University has found it necessary to employ a number of Assistant Professors, Lecturers and Demonstrators, whose aggregate salary amounts to Rs. 3,525 per month. Notwithstanding all these arrangements, the University has found it impossible to undertake instruction in Technology and Applied Science on anything approaching an adequate scale. This is a matter for deep regret, specially in view of the fact that the last gift of the Hon'ble Sir Rashbehary Ghose was made expressly for development of technological teaching, and the Chair of Botany first created by him was expressly intended for improvement of agricultural instruction. The authorities of the Science College have had ready for some time past a carefully prepared programme of work for the development of technological instruction, and its outline may be set forth here for information of Government :

| | Rs. |
|--|------------------|
| (A) Applied Chemistry ... | 4,65,000 |
| (B) Applied Physics ... | 2,10,000 |
| (C) Applied Botany (including Agriculture) | 2,00,000 |
| (D) Library of the Science College ... | 1,25,000 |
| TOTAL | 10,00,000 |

In Chemistry (A), the most essential need is an adequate workshop : this, it is estimated, will cost Rs. 2,25,000, namely, Rs. 75,000 for building and Rs. 1,50,000 for appliances. It is proposed to undertake instruction in Chemistry of Leather and Chemistry of Dyes. Besides this, it is proposed to have arrangements for practical instruction in the manufacture of some of the following :

Sulphuric Acid, Glass, Paper and Pulp, Lime, Mortar and Cement, Sugar, Soap, Candle and Glycerine, Paints and Pigments, Oils. Apart from these, factory appliances, like disintegrators, centrifugals, filter-presses, hydraulic presses, vacuum pans, etc., would be indispensable. These would require a grant of 2 lakhs of rupees to enable the College authorities to make a good beginning. Finally, at least Rs. 40,000 would be needed for even a small laboratory for technical analysis. This brings up the figure for the Department of Chemistry to Rs. 4,65,000.

In the Department of Applied Physics (B), it is intended to undertake work in Applied Electricity, in the testing and standardisation of instruments, in Applied Optics (including Illumination Engineering), in Pyrometry and in Applied Thermo-Dynamics (including a study of the efficiency of

different types of Heat Engines). An estimate of Rs. 2,10,000 is manifestly a very modest demand for so important a work.

In the Department of Botany (C), it is intended to undertake instruction in Agriculture. The most urgent need is an experimental farm, which need not be situated in the immediate neighbourhood of Calcutta. A site in some place easily accessible by rail will meet the needs of our students. The acquisition of land and the construction and equipment of a farm will cost at least a lakh of rupees. Another one lakh will enable the University Professors to complete the arrangements which have already been begun in Palit House at 35, Balligunj Circular Road.

The remaining item (D) is the Library of the University College of Science. For purposes of instruction on the most modern lines in such subjects as Chemistry, Physics and Botany, it is absolutely essential to acquire the chief journals and standard works of reference. A sum of Rupees One Lakh and Twenty-five Thousand will enable the University to procure not all, but many, of the most pressing requisites.

It is obvious that a recurring grant would be needed for the purpose of carrying out efficiently the work of technological and agricultural instruction from year to year. The Vice-Chancellor and Syndicate do not, however, press for a recurring grant during the ensuing session, and they will be content to utilise the capital grant, which may be placed at their disposal, with the assistance of their present staff.

The Vice-Chancellor and Syndicate, accordingly, request that provision may be made for a capital grant of Rupees Ten Lakhs for the development of technological studies in connection with the University College of Science, in addition to the grant of Rupees One Lakh and Twenty-five Thousand for the salary of Post-Graduate Teachers."

To this letter the Government of Bengal replied on the 15th November, 1921, in the following terms :

"I am directed to refer to your letter, No. G-345, dated the 5th February, 1921, in which you ask for a grant of Rs. 1,25,000 for improvement of the Post-Graduate Department of the Calcutta University and a capital grant of Rs. 10,00,000 for extension of technological studies. Both these proposals are based on the recommendations of the Calcutta University Commission's Report.

The present financial condition of the Government of Bengal is well-known to the Calcutta University. The University is, no doubt, aware that representations were made by this Government to the Government of India about the need of improving the finances of the Province. It was not possible to reply to your letter until the Government of India had considered these representations, and the relief since granted by the Government of India is so inadequate that unless fresh sources of revenue are made available, very drastic retrenchments will have to be undertaken in all Departments. The University will, therefore, realise that there is no immediate prospect of carrying into effect the recommendations of the Sadler Commission. The Government of Bengal, however, propose shortly to address the Government of India, protesting against the inadequacy of financial relief, as, among other consequences, inevitably leading to the postponement of University reforms on the lines of the Sadler Commission's report. The Government of Bengal in the Ministry of Education regret to say that, as in their present financial position, reforms on the lines of the Sadler Commission's Report cannot possibly be contemplated, they are unable to grant either of the requests contained in the letter under reply. Government further desire to take this opportunity of suggesting that in the present critical financial position both of the University and of the Government, the University may find it desirable not to try to expand its activities till fresh sources of revenue are made available to it.

I am to add that, although the Calcutta University has made no representation to Government about the necessity of relief for its immediate needs, the attention of Government has been drawn to its critical and embarrassing financial position from the published proceedings and reports. Under certain conditions and subject to certain contingencies the Government of Bengal are willing to help the Calcutta University to extricate itself from its more immediate financial embarrassments and any representation for assistance on a modest scale which the Calcutta University desires to place before the Government will be sympathetically considered.

Finally, I am to say that, although for the reason stated above, no formal reply could be earlier given to the letter under reply, the provisional views of Government were verbally communicated to responsible authorities of the University."

This letter, though disappointing in the immediate result, need not be regarded as discouraging in tone. It may be pointed out, however, that there was no ground for the apprehension that the University might try to expand its activities before fresh sources of revenue had become available. The University had asked for assistance only to carry out in a suitable manner the great work of advanced instruction and research in Science and Technology, which it had been privileged to initiate by reason of the munificence of Sir Taraknath Palit and Sir Rashbehary Ghose, long before the appointment of the University Commission and the formulation of their scheme of University reconstruction. But it is gratifying to record that while the Government of India had failed to assist the University in a befitting manner and the Government of Bengal regretted its inability to promote the work of the University in these directions, yet another splendid donation was received by the University. The gift made by the late Kumar Guruprasad Singh of Khaira amounted to five and a half lacs of rupees and the University was able last year to devote three of the five chairs, maintained out of that endowment, to Physics, Chemistry and Agriculture—each of these a subject within the scope of the activities of the College of Science and Technology.

The substance of the matter is that while the University has persistently striven, during the last ten years, often under extremely adverse circumstances, to maintain a College of Science and Technology, the Government of India and the Government of Bengal have not yet helped the institution in a manner worthy of its great founders. In such circumstances, criticism not accompanied by practical manifestation of good-will and sympathy, is not likely to facilitate the performance of a difficult task.

POST-GRADUATE TEACHING IN ARTS

We next pass on to a criticism which has been directed against the apparently larger expenditure on Post-Graduate Teaching in Arts in comparison with that incurred on the Science side. In our opinion,

this is based upon a superficial comparison of the sums spent on each side without making any reference to the number of students and the variety of subjects included within the scope of each department. The following tables set out the number of students in each side in the Fifth and Sixth Year Classes during the years 1920-21 and 1921-22.

POST-GRADUATE

ARTS.

| | 1920-21. | | | 1921-22. | | |
|-----------------------------|----------|----------|-------|----------|----------|-------|
| | 5th-year | 6th-year | Total | 5th-year | 6th-year | Total |
| English ... | 313 | 228 | 541 | 240 | 158 | 398 |
| Sanskrit ... | 25 | 22 | 47 | 12 | 16 | 28 |
| Pali ... | 6 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| Arabic ... | 5 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 9 |
| Persian ... | 5 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| Comparative Philology ... | 4 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Indian Vernaculars ... | 32 | 20 | 52 | 16 | 16 | 32 |
| Philosophy ... | 85 | 62 | 147 | 53 | 43 | 96 |
| Experimental Psychology ... | 11 | 4 | 15 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| History ... | 109 | 54 | 163 | 57 | 59 | 116 |
| Anthropology ... | 20 | ... | 20 | 19 | 9 | 28 |
| Economics ... | 104 | 68 | 172 | 51 | 63 | 114 |
| Pure Mathematics ... | 71 | 37 | 108 | 49 | 35 | 84 |
| Ancient Indian History ... | 26 | 21 | 47 | 18 | 17 | 35 |
| Commerce ... | ... | ... | ... | 110 | ... | 110 |
| | 815 | 528 | 1343 | 641 | 430 | 1071 |

POST-GRADUATE

SCIENCE.

| | 1920-21. | | | 1921-22. | | |
|-------------------------|----------|----------|-------|----------|----------|-------|
| | 5th-year | 6th-year | Total | 5th-year | 6th-year | Total |
| Applied Mathematics ... | 27 | 22 | 49 | 17 | 14 | 31 |
| Physics ... | 33 | 26 | 59 | 30 | 18 | 48 |
| Chemistry ... | 27 | 26 | 53 | 28 | 20 | 48 |
| Botany ... | 4 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| Physiology ... | 6 | 6 | 12 | 7 | 6 | 13 |
| Geology ... | 6 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 12 |
| Zoology ... | 9 | 1 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 7 |
| Applied Chemistry ... | 12 | 2 | 14 | 16 | 10 | 26 |
| | 124 | 87 | 211 | 115 | 80 | 195 |

It will be observed that whereas in 1920-21, there were 1,343 students in the department of Arts, there were only 211 students in the department of Science; in 1921-22 the respective figures were 1,071 and 195. Again, while the department of Arts included as many as fifteen distinct subjects, many of them consisting of several sections and sub-sections, there were only eight subjects in the department of Science. It is further worthy of note that three of the subjects in the department of Arts, namely, Experimental Psychology, Anthropology and Pure Mathematics lie on the border-land of Arts and Science, if, indeed they are not really included in the domain of Science. Apart from this, the fact cannot be ignored that the department of Arts in an Indian University must be of an even more comprehensive character than in a western University, in as much as many of the subjects must be studied and investigated with reference to eastern as well as western conditions. For instance, subjects like History, Philosophy and Economics have to be approached by the Indian student from a standpoint not quite identical with what appeals to a western student. Even if this factor be not taken into account, it will be found that in many western Universities not specially devoted to Science, the scope of activities in the department of Letters is more comprehensive and involves the expenditure of a larger sum of money than the Science side.

Finally, the implications of the suggestion that the expenditure on the science side from the University Funds should be increased, are perhaps not always fully realised. Thus, if it were proposed to increase the number of students now annually admitted into the University College of Science, a substantial amount of capital expenditure would be inevitable, as additional buildings and laboratory appliances would at once be needed. The University cannot be expected to contribute continuously, from its precarious fee income, large sums thus required for capital expenditure. It is also well-known that in a scientific subject which is always accompanied by laboratory work, each student costs an appreciable sum in the way of recurring expenditure. It has been calculated, for instance, that in the department of Chemistry, the monthly expenditure on each student is nearly three times the tuition fee paid by him. Far different is the position in the department of Arts, where it is immaterial whether, for instance, forty or sixty students attend a class in Philosophy. It is desirable to add here that, apart from all these considerations, there is a fundamental difficulty in the way of a substantial increase in the number of Post-Graduate students in the department of Science. Experience has shown that the accommodation available for B.Sc. students in our affiliated Colleges is strictly limited, and the training which is received by many of them is not sufficiently

thorough so as to enable them to profit by a course of post-graduate study. This points to the conclusion that the affiliated Colleges themselves require to be strengthened, so that there may be a larger supply of better qualified graduates for admission into the University classes. This clearly raises a problem which the University cannot be expected to solve by means of its unaided efforts. When the true facts are correctly appreciated, it will, we think, be found that there is no ground for the imputation that the University has unduly favoured the department of Arts to the detriment of the department of Science. It should also be borne in mind that while the department of Science has attracted notable endowments, there is nothing substantial which can be deemed worthy of mention in the department of Arts. Moreover, the grant from the public funds is equally inadequate in the case of both the departments. Consequently, the Arts side must rely for its maintenance, in a much larger measure than the Science side on the general fund of the University—unless, indeed, it is intended that the department of Arts should be starved out of existence.

Before we pass on to the next point, we may set out, in the form of a tabular statement, the amount spent during the last ten years in the Department of Arts under the principal heads of expenditure :

POST-GRADUATE TEACHING IN ARTS.

| YEAR. | Minto Professor of Economics. | Hardinge Professor of Higher Mathematics. | George V Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy. | Carmichael Professor of Ancient Indian History and Culture. | University Professors and Lecturers. | Administration. | Library. | Furniture. | Stationery and Contingencies. | Scholarship. | Electric Expenses. | Provident Fund. |
|---------|-------------------------------|---|--|---|--------------------------------------|-----------------|----------|------------|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. |
| 1911-12 | 9,000 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 1912-13 | 5,250 | ... | ... | 2,032 | 46,141 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 1913-14 | 5,935 | 9,950 | 5,000 | 12,000 | 66,289 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 1914-15 | 15,428 | 15,000 | 12,000 | 4,645 | 1,23,521 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 2,804 | ... |
| 1915-16 | 14,573 | 15,000 | 12,000 | ... | 1,32,580 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 2,607 | ... |
| 1916-17 | 15,000 | 6,250 | 12,000 | ... | 1,34,994 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 2,982 | ... |
| 1917-18 | 15,000 | 7,185 | 12,000 | 10,967 | 2,15,968 | 8,003 | 5,517 | 1,508 | 722 | ... | 3,306 | ... |
| 1918-19 | 9,032 | 16,200 | 12,000 | 12,000 | 3,24,472 | 19,730 | 18,724 | 2,211 | 1,499 | 925 | 3,209 | ... |
| 1919-20 | 4,839 | 16,200 | 14,750 | 12,000 | 3,28,645 | 28,286 | 20,759 | 1,170 | 2,180 | 4,163 | 6,024 | 3,621 |
| 1920-21 | 12,000 | 16,200 | 10,935 | 16,145 | 3,88,215 | 25,453 | 18,303 | 1,957 | 2,637 | 7,520 | 3,449 | 12,082 |
| TOTAL | 1,08,057 | 1,01,985 | 90,685 | 69,789 | 17,60,823 | 81,472 | 63,303 | 6,846 | 7,038 | 12,608 | 24,381 | 15,703 |

GRAND TOTAL—23,40,690.

| | Rs. |
|---|-----------|
| This sum was met from : | |
| (1) Government grant for three Professorships | 2,98,727 |
| (2) Government grant for University Lecturers | 1,35,000 |
| (3) Tuition fees from students | 6,58,106 |
| (4) University funds | 12,48,857 |
| TOTAL | 23,40,690 |

The figures in this table, when contrasted with those contained in the table set out above regarding the University College of Science, bring into relief two vital points. In the first place, the contribution from the University Funds for Post-Graduate teaching in Arts has not been unduly excessive in comparison with the contribution to the College of Science. In the second place, while in the case of the Department of Arts, the University has not contributed even double the amount of tuition fees, in the case of the Department of Science, the University has contributed more than fifteen times the amount of tuition fees.

"THOUGHTLESS EXPANSION"

We next proceed to deal with the grave charge that the expansion of higher teaching in the University furnishes evidence of "criminal thoughtlessness." It is not essential for our present purpose to trace the development of Post-Graduate Teaching in the University, under the Regulations framed in 1906, and before the introduction of the system now in operation. In 1916, the Government of India appointed a Committee to advise them on the best method of consolidation of Post-Graduate studies. The Committee consisted of Mr. Hornell, Dr. Hayden, Mr. Anderson, Dr. Seal, Dr. Howells, Dr. P. C. Ray, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Wordsworth and Sir Asutosh Mookerjee as Chairman. On the 12th December, 1916, the Committee presented a unanimous report, which outlined a comprehensive scheme of reconstruction. The Government of India expressed their approval of the Report with the concurrence of Lord Carmichael, who was, at the time, Rector of the University. The Government of India then forwarded the Report to the Senate for consideration, with the intimation that, if the scheme framed by the Committee should find favour with the Senate, the Government would be prepared to accord their sanction to it. After a prolonged debate, the Senate adopted the principle formulated in the Report and framed Regulations with a view to carry it into immediate execution. Lord Ronaldshay, who had meanwhile, succeeded Lord Carmichael as Rector, after independent examination of the scheme became, as he himself stated in his Convocation Address in 1920, its "convinced supporter" and "gave to it all the support which was within his power." On the 26th

June, 1917, the Government of India accorded their sanction to the Regulations for Post-Graduate Teaching in various branches of Arts and Science. Since then, the Regulations have been amplified with the sanction of the Government concerned, and new subjects have been taken up for study and research, such as Indian Vernaculars, Anthropology, Ancient Indian History and Commerce. The scheme now in operation is thus the result of deliberate thought and anxious discussion on the part of all the authorities concerned.* The financial aspect of the matter was manifestly kept well in mind by the framers of the Regulations when they inserted the following provision in section 45 of Chapter XI of the Regulations:

“From the date of commencement of the Regulations contained in this chapter, a fund shall be constituted for the promotion of Post-Graduate studies, to be called “The Post-Graduate Teaching Fund.” To such fund there shall be annually credited

- (a) grants from Government and benefactions made specifically for this purpose by donors;
- (b) fees paid by students in the Post-Graduate classes;
- (c) one-third of the fees realised from candidates for the Matriculation, I.A., I.Sc., B.A., and B.Sc. Examinations; and
- (d) such other sums as the Senate may, from time to time, direct.”

At the time when the Regulations were framed, the fees payable by candidates for the Matriculation, I.A., I.Sc., and B.A. examinations were raised from Rs. 12, Rs. 25, Rs. 25, Rs. 35 to Rs. 15, Rs. 30, Rs. 30, Rs. 40, respectively, with the proviso that one-third of the fees realised, including the fees for the B.Sc. examination (which remained unaltered), must be credited to the Post-Graduate Teaching Fund. It was fully anticipated that this contribution by itself would not be sufficient to enable the University to discharge the obligation imposed upon it, and that reliance would have to be placed upon grants from the Government, upon private benefactions, and upon such other sums as the Senate might from time to time find it practicable to vote from its

* It is important to recall in this connection that such of the University Chairs as are maintained out of University funds and not out of endowments have all been established, as required by Sec. 1 of Chap. IV of the Regulations, with the previous consent of the Government of India. The Carmichael Professorship of Ancient Indian History and Culture was established in this manner in 1912, the Professorship of Comparative Philology in 1913; the two Professorships in English Language and Literature in 1913, the Professorship of Botany in 1917, the Professorship of Zoology in 1917, and the Professorship of International Law, Public and Private, in 1919.

general income. Economy and efficiency cannot be measured by a mathematical standard; but, subject to the obvious reservation that an educational institution maintained for the Advancement of Learning cannot be run on commercial lines, the system has been carried out with such economy as is consistent with efficiency. We are aware that the suggestion has been repeated from time to time that the salaries paid to Post-Graduate teachers were unusually liberal and that they were overpaid and underworked. This criticism is sufficiently answered by the significant fact that lecturers in the Post-Graduate Department, have been eagerly sought after by promoters of new Universities and Heads of Government Departments who have offered them more liberal salaries and more attractive terms than this University has ever been in a position to hold out.* On the other hand, a new line of criticism has recently found some favour, namely, that the University need not undertake instruction in subjects which do not attract a large number of students. This objection, if allowed to prevail, would sweep away most of the subjects which should be included in the Post-Graduate scheme of an Indian University, if it is to justify its existence as an oriental seat of learning. It will further be found that not a few lecturers have to work in more than one department and some of them moreover are in charge of large under-graduate classes in subjects, not taken up in most of the affiliated Colleges in the city.†

* In this category may be included, amongst others, Dr. Brajendranath Seal (Mysore), Dr. Ganesh Prasad (Benares), Dr. Rameshchandra Majumdar (Dacca), Mr. Krishna Binod Saha (Dacca), Mr. Haridas Bhattacharyya (Dacca), Mr. Nalinimohan Bose (Dacca), Mr. Satyendranath Bose (Dacca), Mr. Sabidullah (Dacca), Dr. Jnanendrachandra Ghose (Dacca), Mr. Surendranath Majumdar (Patna), Dr. Radhakamal Mookerjee (Lucknow), Mr. Bhujangabhushan Mookerjee (Lucknow), Mr. Praphullachandra Bose (Indore), Mr. K. G. Naik (Baroda), Mr. A. K. Chanda (I.E.S.), Mr. B. N. Seal (I.E.S.), Mr. Durgagati Chatteraj (P. E. S.), Mr. Abinashchandra Saha (P. E. S.), Mr. Anantprasad Banerjee (P. E. S.), Mr. Dhireschandra Acharyya (P. E. S.), Mr. Panchanandas Mookerjee (P. E. S.), Mr. Ramaprasad Chanda (Archæological Dept.), Mr. S. N. Bal (Botanical Dept.) Mr. Srinivasa Rao (Zoological Dept.), Dr. Sudhansukumar Banerjee (Meteorological Dept.), Mr. Chinmayanandan (Meteorological Dept), Dr. Rasiklal Datta (Industries Dept.).

† As an illustration we may mention that a criticism has on this ground been directed against the Department of Pali amongst others. It has been urged that to maintain a staff of 8 teachers for 8 Post-graduate students is an indefensible waste of money. This overlooks, however, the undeniable fact that the number of teachers requisite for specialisation and for advanced instruction and research, depends very largely upon the extent and scope of the subject concerned. Moreover, these Post-graduate teachers in Pali have to take part along with two junior lecturers, in the work of 7 junior classes in Pali, for Matriculation, First Year, Second Year, Third Year Pass, Third Year Honours, Fourth Year Pass and Fourth Year Honours students. The students in these classes number 400 men on an average. The members of the staff in Pali have also to deal with Pali as basic language in the Department of Indian Vernaculars and with the History and Philosophy of

On the other hand, the fact cannot be ignored that the University Commission recommended (Report, Vol. 5, p. 282) that, apart from all questions of reconstruction of the University, a grant of Rs. 1,25,000 a year should be made by the Government with a view to increase the salaries of the members of the Post-Graduate staff which, on an average, amounted to Rs. 225 a month and should not, according to the Commission be, on an average, less than Rs. 300 a month. It will also be recalled that in anticipation of probable financial stringency as the result of the Great War, the Senate sought the sanction of the Government to a proposal for increase in the examination fees. The Government declined to accord the necessary sanction, except to a limited extent. Meanwhile, the expenditure in the general department of the University has appreciably increased as the result of post-war conditions. At the same time, the steady rise in the income of the University has been arrested by the successive creation of the Patna University, the Rangoon University, the Dacca University and the Dacca Intermediate Board. The embarrassment of the situation has moreover been accentuated by an unforeseen reduction in the number of candidates at various examinations, which has been attributed to political excitement spreading throughout the country. If all these circumstances are borne in mind, the University cannot be rightly charged with "thoughtlessness" in matters financial. Neither can it be blamed for duplicating the work of instruction available in other academic centres. The truth is that this University has been the first in the field in the matter of Post-Graduate teaching, and while the grants it has received from the State have not been increased for many years past, notwithstanding the expansion of its activities, other institutions have been created within its jurisdiction and are being maintained by liberal grants from the State, thus duplicating the work which had already been undertaken and performed by this University.

Here we may conveniently set out the grants annually received by this University from the Government.*

Buddhism in the Department of Ancient Indian History. The Departments are, indeed, so correlated and interdependent that the abolition of one may involve the abolition of the others. Observations of a similar character apply to other departments, such as Arabic and Persian, and Anthropology. Though the number of Post-Graduate students in Arabic and Persian is small, there are under-graduate classes, which contain on an average 170 students. In Anthropology the number of Post Graduate students is steadily increasing; there are besides under-graduate classes which contain about 140 students.

* Besides the grants enumerated, there is a sum of Rs. 13,128 placed by the Local Government in the hands of the University for part payment of rent of

- (1) Minto Professorship (Economics)—Rs. 10,000 since 1909-10, raised to Rs. 13,000 since 1913-14.
- (2) Hardinge Professorship (Mathematics)—Rs. 12,000 since 1912-13.
- (3) George V Professorship (Philosophy)—Rs. 12,000 since 1912-13.
- (4) Laboratory (Science)—Rs. 12,000 since 1912-13.
- (5) Readers—Rs. 4,000 since 1912-13.
- (6) University Post-Graduate Lecturers—Rs. 15,000 since 1912-13.
- (7) Law College—Rs. 20,000 since 1909-10.
- (8) Law College—Rs. 10,000 since 1912-13.
- (9) Inspection, General Administration—Rs. 25,000 since 1905-6.*
- (10) Travelling expenses of Fellows—Rs. 5,000 since 1905-6.

If these sums were considered essential for the needs of the University so many years ago, it is undeniable that grants on a much more liberal scale from the public funds would, *prima facie*, be necessary now to meet its steadily growing demands. What requires revision is not the ideal of those, who have developed and carried on the work of Post-Graduate teaching in the University, often amidst unpropitious circumstances, but the stand-point of those who are entrusted with the duty of promoting higher education by the assignment of grants from public revenues.

While on this subject, we may draw attention to the remarkable fact that although the grant for Post-Graduate teaching has remained unaltered during the last ten years, the introduction of the present system has actually resulted in pecuniary benefit to the Government of Bengal. The system, as is well known, is based upon the principle of co-operation between the Colleges and the University. Many of the Professors in the Presidency College have accordingly been appointed University Lecturers. The University offers them an honorarium of Rs. 1,200 a year each. The Government of Bengal receives the amount from the University and does not pay it to the Professors concerned. On the other hand, the authorities of the Presidency College have to pay over to the University the tuition fee recoverable from such

houses occupied by students of affiliated colleges. This can in no sense be treated as a grant to the University. Under the Regulations, the duty is cast upon the Colleges to provide for suitable residences for such of their students as do not reside with legal or approved guardians. This grant was instituted with a view to diminish the burden which might otherwise have been thrown by the Colleges upon their students.

* The cost of inspection of Colleges exceeds Rs. 18,000 a year, leaving less than Rs. 7,000 a year available for the general administration of the University.

Post-Graduate students as attach themselves to that College. The difference between the sum appropriated by the Government of Bengal and the sum paid by the Presidency College to the University shows a substantial balance in favour of the Government, as will appear from the following statement :

| | Rs. |
|-------------------|--------|
| 1917-18 | 3,464 |
| 1918-19 | 14,255 |
| 1919-20 | 15,976 |

Total Rs. 33,695

It thus appears that the University has not only failed to induce the Government to increase its contribution towards Post-Graduate teaching, but has actually enriched the Government through its Post-Graduate department. It is also worthy of note that while control is claimed over the University as if it were a department of the Government, the University is treated as an outside body when revenue has to be levied. Thus, a sum of Rs. 4,880-9 has been recovered from the University during the period between 1st July, 1920 and 31st March, 1922 as customs duty on laboratory instruments brought out for the University College of Science, whereas no such duty is exacted from what are known as "Government Colleges." The instances of civic thoughtfulness mentioned above may, perhaps, indicate the nature of the treatment hitherto accorded to the University by the Government.

We feel bound to make some other observations before we leave this topic. As prescribed by the Regulations an elaborate procedure has to be followed whenever an appointment is made in the Post-Graduate department. The matter has to be placed successively before the Board of Higher Studies concerned, the Executive Committee, the Council, the Syndicate and the Senate. Each nomination is liable to be challenged at every stage of this process, and the appointment, when made by the Senate, is required to be notified to the Government for the possible exercise of a power of veto on grounds other than academic. Criticisms of a general character to the effect that appointments thus made have been often injudicious should not carry weight with men of judgment and experience. Indeed, a careful study of the list of Post-Graduate teachers would make it manifest that appointments have been made with care and caution. During the last two or three years, there have been many instances where vacancies on the staff, due to death, resignation or like causes, have not either been filled up at all in view of financial stringency, or have been filled up by the appointment of younger

men on smaller salaries.* But it must be kept in view that every vacancy in the staff cannot be left open, even if a moderate standard of efficiency is to be maintained, specially where the interests of students, who are already undergoing training in a subject, must be safeguarded. It should not also be overlooked that the conditions of service in an educational organisation of this character, which includes many a scholar of high academic attainments, cannot be modified all on a sudden. This remark is of special force when we bear in mind that many members of the staff hold appointments for a specified term; but for such moderate security of tenure, it would have been impracticable to retain the services of competent men on the University staff. On the other hand, if it be maintained that Post-Graduate teaching should not have been undertaken by the University unless and until permanent guarantees of adequate grants could be obtained from the Government, experience renders the conclusion highly probable that there would never have been established a Teaching University in Calcutta. Further, the fact remains that the Government of India, though reluctant to give increased financial assistance to this University for the development of higher teaching, have found it within their means to provide large sums of money for the establishment of a University at Dacca, and, in spite of their own increasing financial embarrassments, a University at Delhi. The fundamental importance of the idea of a Teaching University, which has been first put forward and carried out in Calcutta, is now appreciated all through India, and Governments, imperial and local, have shewn their readiness to promote the development of Teaching Universities—with the exception of Bengal, so far as Calcutta alone is concerned. Notwithstanding repeated assurances by the Government of India that the applications of this University for financial assistance towards the development of higher studies would be considered, the question, as we have seen, has been put off from time to time on a variety of grounds, till ultimately that Government severed all connection with this University. We cannot pass over in silence the fact

* In this category are included the vacancies, amongst others, in connection with Prof. Robert Knox, Mr. A. K. Chanda, Mr. Jyotishandra Ghosh and Miss Regina Guha of the Department of English; Mr. Surendranath Majumdar, Mr. Radhagobinda Basak and Mr. Niranjana Prasad Chakrabarti of the Departments of Sanskrit and Pali; Geshe Lobzan Targay and Lama Dawasamdub Kazi of the Department of Tibetan; Mr. Mohitkumar Ghosh, Mr. Durgagati Chatteraj, Mr. Krishnabinod Saha, Mr. Praphullachandra Bose and Dr. Radhakamal Mookerjee of the Department of Economics; Dr. Rameshchandra Majumdar, Mr. Ramaprasad Chanda and Mr. J. Masuda of the Department of History; Mr. P. K. Chakrabarti, Mr. B. N. Seal, Mr. H. D. Bhattacharyya and Dr. R. D. Khan of the Department of Philosophy; and Mr. Sahidullah of the Department of Indian Vernaculars.

that the Government of India incurred heavy expenditure by the appointment of a Commission in the expectation that a scheme of reconstruction might be framed for the University of Calcutta. Lord Chelmsford in his Convocation address delivered on the 16th December, 1918, held out hopes that if the "Commission were unanimous in their main recommendations, he would lose no time in giving effect to them." To be brief, these hopes have not been fulfilled. Meanwhile, the Government of Bengal have pleaded their inability to render financial assistance on account of their own financial embarrassment.

It will be interesting to note here that the Government of India, while appointing the Post-Graduate Committee in 1916, stated that the Committee should frame its recommendations merely with a view to the best expenditure of existing funds and should understand that further grants for post-graduate education could not be expected in the near future. This plainly could not be taken to have abrogated the position indicated in the letters from the Government of India dated the 14th January, 1913, and the 23rd December, 1913, in reply to the applications of the University for financial assistance in recognition of the great endowments created by Sir Taraknath Palit and Sir Rashbehary Ghose. We must further remember that even after the report of the Post-Graduate Committee had been accepted by the Government of India, they stated explicitly in their letter of the 9th August, 1917 that the question of granting financial assistance to the University for the purposes of higher teaching was—not finally decided against the University—but only deferred "pending receipt of the recommendations of the *proposed* University Commission." We fail to understand how in these circumstances the conduct of the members of this University may be deemed justly open to the charge of "criminal thoughtlessness."

UNIVERSITY LAW COLLEGE

Reference is made in the speech of the Minister to the grant of Rs. 30,000 to the University Law College, and it is stated that the College is not only a self-supporting institution but is a paying concern. This, according to him, renders it necessary, when the proper time comes, for him to consider the propriety of diverting the grant from the Law College to the Science College. We cannot but express our deep regret that a step of this nature should have been suggested by a responsible Minister without previous reference to the authorities of the institution concerned. The University Law College is an affiliated College of the University, created with the approval of the Government of India, who sanctioned, as we have seen above, an annual grant of Rs. 20,000

since 1909 and an additional grant of Rs. 10,000 since 1912. As required by the Indian Universities Act, the management of the College is vested, subject to the ultimate control of the Senate, in a Governing Body, constituted as follows :

The Vice-Chancellor—President, *Ex-Officio*.

Three Judges of the High Court (nominated by the Chief Justice of Bengal in consultation with the Vice-Chancellor).

The Advocate-General of Bengal, *Ex-Officio*.

The Senior Government Pleader of the High Court, *Ex-Officio*.

Three members nominated by the Faculty of Law, one of whom at least, is a member of the Bar and one, a Vakil of the High Court.

One Representative of the Incorporated Law Society.

The Legal Remembrancer to the Government of Bengal, *Ex-Officio*.

The Director of Public Instruction, Bengal *Ex-Officio*.

The Principal of the College, *Ex-Officio*.

The Vice-Principal of the College, *Ex-Officio*.

Two Lecturers of the College elected by the staff.

It is not necessary for our present purpose to recapitulate the circumstances which led to the foundation of the College and which are narrated in Chapter XXII of the Report of the University Commission. But it is perfectly plain that a scheme of this character, which is intended to deprive the College of the entire grant it has been enjoying for many years past, should not be planned without previous reference to the Governing Body, responsible for the management of the Institution. Figures taken at random from Budget estimates or reports of auditors are not always sufficient to enable one to obtain an insight into the working of an institution or to form a just estimate of its needs. We do not wish to prejudge the attitude which may be taken up by the Governing Body when the Minister proceeds to carry into execution his intention to deprive the College of its grant; but we may mention facts which show that the situation is not precisely as described in the speech. In 1919, the Senate, with the assent of the Government of India, created a Professorship of International Law, Public and Private, and appointed to the Chair Prof. Arthur Brown whose salary to the extent of Rs. 1,000 a month was to be paid out of the Law College Funds. At the request of the Government of India, the services of Prof. Arthur Brown have been placed at their disposal temporarily; when Prof. Brown reverts, the University will have to fulfil its obligations. There are other commitments also, which are fully known to persons intimately acquainted with the management of the Institution. To take one illustration, the College

has a whole-time Principal whose appointment is permanent; his leave, furlough and retiring allowances are not quite negligible quantities. To take another illustration; the College is located in the Darbhanga Buildings, which, with the lapse of time, is now in need of thorough repairs; the question may be asked, is not the College justly liable to contribute a reasonable share of the maintenance charges and of the rates and taxes? These and other matters will obviously require very careful examination by the Governing Body before the grant is reduced or suspended. Finally, a step of this description can never be justly taken without sufficient previous notice, so that there may be no sudden dislocation of existing arrangements. We may, at this stage, give a financial statement of the College since its foundation, which indicates at a glance that the income already shows signs of steady decline; in such circumstances, an assumption as to the continuance of a margin of safety may prove delusive before long.

UNIVERSITY LAW COLLEGE.

| Year. | Fees. | Government Grant. | Miscellaneous Receipts. | Salary. | Books. | Book-binding. | Furniture. | Scholarship. | Stationery and Contingencies. | Mess Establishment. | Electric Expenses. | Refund. | Repayment of Advance from Fee Fund. | Contribution to University Corps. | Miscellaneous Expenses. | Printing Syllabuses. | Foundation Day Expenses. | Athletic Expenses. |
|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------------------------|-----------|----------|---------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. |
| 1908-09 | 750 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 1909-10 | 32,217 | 23,500 | ... | 47,972 | 21,736 | 2,607 | 9,034 | 750 | 647 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 1910-11 | 36,487 | 28,500 | 10,400 | 58,064 | 7,298 | 126 | 1,193 | 2,310 | 415 | 809 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 1911-12 | 48,197 | 33,500 | ... | 61,947 | 16,420 | 578 | 3,527 | 3,214 | 506 | 1,010 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 1912-13 | 75,486 | 33,500 | ... | 92,717 | 32,291 | ... | ... | 3,470 | 472 | 1,611 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 1913-14 | 1,25,418 | 33,500 | ... | 1,23,864 | 21,362 | ... | 3,690 | 3,476 | 25 | 2,020 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 1914-15 | 1,49,220 | 30,000 | 101 | 1,48,420 | 4,154 | 940 | 125 | 3,014 | 312 | 1,674 | 2,804 | 31 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 1915-16 | 1,60,292 | 30,000 | ... | 1,48,975 | 1,486 | 642 | 72 | 2,382 | 403 | 1,730 | 2,607 | 24 | 10,000 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 1916-17 | 1,65,411 | 30,000 | ... | 1,58,489 | 19,984 | 428 | 764 | 1,646 | 319 | 2,594 | 4,094 | 8 | 20,000 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 1917-18 | 1,98,378 | 30,000 | ... | 1,63,648 | 13,673 | 373 | 678 | 1,932 | 343 | 3,838 | 3,306 | ... | 25,586 | 250 | 29 | ... | ... | ... |
| 1918-19 | 2,00,855 | 30,000 | ... | 1,84,927 | 3,150 | 505 | 940 | 1,940 | 1,399 | 3,985 | 3,196 | 198 | ... | 250 | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 1919-20 | 1,75,737 | 30,000 | 307 | 1,83,897 | 10,233 | 754 | 1,194 | 2,010 | 334 | 3,885 | 6,024 | 71 | ... | ... | ... | 936 | 905 | 905 |
| 1920-21 | 1,69,565 | 30,000 | 42 | 1,83,943 | 11,947 | 693 | 1,194 | 2,082 | 1,291 | 3,660 | 3,450 | 37 | ... | ... | ... | 1,403 | 825 | 950 |
| 1921-22 (9 months) | 1,41,404 | 30,000 | ... | 1,14,397 | 3,483 | 259 | 41 | 1,526 | 261 | 2,920 | ... | 119 | ... | ... | ... | 236 | 270 | 1,350 |
| TOTAL ... | 16,79,417 | 3,92,500 | 10,850 | 16,71,250 | 1,67,317 | 7,905 | 22,452 | 20,752 | 6,817 | 29,636 | 25,481 | 488 | 55,586 | 500 | 29 | 2,575 | 1,095 | 3,205 |

The information contained in the above table may be so re-arranged as to show at a glance, year by year, the receipt and the expenditure, indicating that there is now no longer an excess of the income over the expenditure as was the case some years previously. This is traceable to the fall in the number of students as will appear from the following tables.

NUMBER OF STUDENTS FROM 1909-10 TO 1921-22

| Session. | Number in the beginning of the session. | Number at the end of the session. |
|----------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 1909-10 | 536 | 520 |
| 1910-11 | 657 | 630 |
| 1911-12 | 652 | 632 |
| 1912-13 | 1,262 | 1,190 |
| 1913-14 | 1,715 | 1,533 |
| 1914-15 | 1,950 | 1,867 |
| 1915-16 | 2,163 | 2,000 |
| 1916-17 | 2,403 | 2,161 |
| 1917-18 | 2,226 | 2,140 |
| 1918-19 | 2,369 | 2,124 |
| 1919-20 | 2,080 | 1,868 |
| 1920-21 | 2,191 | 1,570 |
| 1921-22 | 1,987 | 1,655 |

UNIVERSITY LAW COLLEGE

| | 1908-09 | | 1909-10 | | 1910-11 | | 1911-12 | | 1912-13 | | 1913-14 | | 1914-15 | | 1915-16 | | 1916-17 | | 1917-18 | | 1918-19 | | 1919-20 | | 1920-21 | |
|----------------------------|------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | Receipts. | Expenditure. | Receipts. | Expenditure. | Receipts. | Expenditure. | Receipts. | Expenditure. | Receipts. | Expenditure. | Receipts. | Expenditure. | Receipts. | Expenditure. | Receipts. | Expenditure. | Receipts. | Expenditure. | Receipts. | Expenditure. | Receipts. | Expenditure. | Receipts. | Expenditure. | Receipts. | Expenditure. |
| Government Grant ... | 750 | ... | 32,217 | ... | 36,487 | ... | 48,107 | ... | 75,488 | ... | 1,25,418 | ... | 1,49,220 | ... | 1,60,202 | ... | 1,65,411 | ... | 1,98,378 | ... | 2,00,855 | ... | 1,75,737 | ... | 1,69,565 | ... |
| Miscellaneous receipts ... | ... | ... | 23,500 | ... | 28,500 | ... | 33,500 | ... | 33,500 | ... | 33,500 | ... | 30,000 | ... | 30,000 | ... | 30,000 | ... | 30,000 | ... | 30,000 | ... | 30,000 | ... | 30,000 | ... |
| Library ... | ... | ... | ... | 47,972 | ... | 58,054 | ... | 61,947 | ... | 92,717 | ... | 1,23,864 | ... | 1,48,420 | ... | 1,48,075 | ... | 1,58,489 | ... | 1,63,048 | ... | 1,84,927 | ... | 1,83,897 | ... | 1,83,943 |
| Printing ... | ... | ... | ... | 21,730 | ... | 7,298 | ... | 16,420 | ... | 32,291 | ... | 21,382 | ... | 4,154 | ... | 1,486 | ... | 10,954 | ... | 13,673 | ... | 3,150 | ... | 10,233 | ... | 11,947 |
| Binding ... | ... | ... | ... | 2,607 | ... | 128 | ... | 578 | ... | ... | ... | ... | 940 | ... | 642 | ... | 428 | ... | 373 | ... | 505 | ... | 754 | ... | 693 | |
| Stationery ... | ... | ... | ... | 9,034 | ... | 1,193 | ... | 3,527 | ... | ... | ... | 3,690 | ... | 125 | ... | 72 | ... | 764 | ... | 678 | ... | 940 | ... | 1,194 | ... | 1,194 |
| Scholarship ... | ... | ... | ... | 750 | ... | 2,310 | ... | 3,214 | ... | 3,470 | ... | 3,476 | ... | 3,014 | ... | 2,382 | ... | 1,646 | ... | 1,932 | ... | 1,940 | ... | 2,010 | ... | 2,082 |
| Library and Contin. ... | ... | ... | ... | 647 | ... | 415 | ... | 508 | ... | 472 | ... | 25 | ... | 312 | ... | 493 | ... | 319 | ... | 343 | ... | 1,399 | ... | 334 | ... | 1,291 |
| Establishment ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 809 | ... | 1,010 | ... | 1,511 | ... | 2,020 | ... | 1,674 | ... | 1,730 | ... | 2,594 | ... | 3,838 | ... | 3,985 | ... | 3,885 | ... | 3,660 |
| Library Expenses ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 2,804 | ... | 2,607 | ... | 4,094 | ... | 3,306 | ... | 3,196 | ... | 6,024 | ... | 3,450 | |
| Printing ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 31 | ... | 24 | ... | 8 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Payment of Advance ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 10,000 | ... | 20,000 | ... | 25,586 | ... | 108 | ... | 71 | ... | 37 | |
| Contribution to Uni- ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 250 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | |
| Miscellaneous Expenses ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 29 | ... | 250 | ... | ... | ... | |
| Printing Syllabus ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 936 | ... | 1,403 |
| Foundation Day Ex- ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 905 | ... | 825 |
| Stationery Expenses ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 905 | ... | 950 |
| TOTAL ... | 750 | ... | 55,717 | 82,746 | 75,387 | 70,305 | 81,697 | 87,202 | 1,08,866 | 1,30,461 | 1,58,918 | 1,54,437 | 1,79,321 | 1,61,474 | 1,90,292 | 1,68,411 | 1,95,411 | 2,08,326 | 2,28,378 | 2,13,656 | 2,30,855 | 2,00,490 | 2,06,044 | 2,11,148 | 1,99,607 | 2,11,475 |

CHARGE OF DELAY

The Minister in his speech states, almost in a tone of complaint, that the University had not supplied the information asked for with regard to the resolution for the appointment of a Committee adopted by a majority of the Members of the Legislative Council on or about the 30th August, 1921. That there is no ground for the complaint against the University is clear from the following statement of facts :

| | | |
|---------------------|-----|--|
| 30th August, 1921 | ... | Mr. Sarkar's motion carried in Council. |
| 5th December, 1921 | ... | Letter No. 2504-Edn., dated the 2nd December, 1921, from the Deputy Secretary to the Government of Bengal, forwarding copy of the resolution and inviting observations of the University. |
| 9th December, 1921 | ... | Ditto—placed before the Syndicate. Order—Ask Government to send 21 copies of Debates. |
| 12th December, 1921 | ... | Letter (Mis. 4606) to Government forwarding resolution of the Syndicate, dated the 9th December, 1921. |
| 17th January, 1922 | ... | Reminder to above (Mis. No. 5130). |
| 30th January, 1922 | ... | Ditto—(D. O. G. 81). |
| 23rd February, 1922 | ... | Letter No. 379-Edn., dated the 22nd February, 1922, from the Deputy Secretary to Government forwarding 15 copies of the Debates. |
| 24th February, 1922 | ... | Ditto—placed before the Syndicate. Order—Circulate copies of the Debates to members of the Syndicate and bring up after a fortnight. |
| 2nd March, 1922 | ... | Letter No. Mis. 6090 to the Deputy Secretary to Government communicating orders of the Syndicate, dated the 24th February, 1922, and informing that it will necessarily take some time to communicate decision of the Syndicate. |
| 10th March, 1922 | ... | Matter considered by the Syndicate. Government to be informed that financial information would be supplied. Matter referred to the Senate. |
| 25th March, 1922 | ... | Committee appointed by the Senate. |

ARRAY OF NUMERICAL FIGURES

The report of the speech delivered by the Minister bristles with numerical figures, which purport to have been selected at his choice from records

available to him. Some of these figures cannot, in the absence of specific references, be verified, while others do not justify the inferences drawn from them. Thus, it is maintained that in 1916-17 the University spent nothing on the Science side. The tabular statement given on page 13 shows, on the other hand, that in 1916-17 the expenditure on the University College of Science was Rs. 1,49,571. Comparison is also instituted between expenditure on the Arts side and the Science side respectively in different years, and it is sought to be made out that the expenditure by the University on the Arts side out of what is called "its own funds" is disproportionately excessive; but the very important fact is overlooked that a large portion of the sum so spent on the Arts side came from the tuition fees paid by the students themselves. Reference is again made to the opening balances of the Fee Fund from year to year, and it is attempted to prove that in the year ending in June, 1920, the University spent Rs. 1,88,743 of the previous year's balance, plus Rs. 29,171 totalling Rs. 2,37,000 "over and above the huge fee receipts of Rupees eleven lakhs or so." This statement is calculated to produce an erroneous impression, because it is based on the inaccurate assumption that the so-called opening balance was a real surplus. The financial year of the University ends on a date arbitrarily fixed, namely, on the 30th June, after the fees for some of the principal examinations have been received and before the whole of the expenditure has been actually met. The time when the expenditure is met depends largely on the date of publication of the results. It is, therefore, not safe to draw inferences on the assumption that the opening balance shewn in the budget estimates for a particular year is a real surplus. It is not desirable that the action of the University should be criticised in this manner before an audience not in a position to controvert the assertions and without opportunity being given to the University to examine in detail the alleged objections. Intelligent criticism is impossible without much fuller knowledge of the details of University administration than the Minister can be expected to acquire on a study of budget estimates with or without the aid of experts. We cannot leave this topic without reference to the strange theory which has been put forward, that the amount of three crores of rupees spent annually on education in this province, including fees and contributions from the people and local bodies, "goes to help the Calcutta University, though indirectly, in the discharge of its functions." We can only venture to express the hope that when the nature of the activities of the University in the sphere of advanced study and research is fully appreciated, this theory will not be invoked to justify the refusal of financial assistance commensurate with the needs of the University.

CONCLUSION

Our conclusion is that the facts and arguments set out above amply establish that there was no justification for the attack on the University, while many of the comments were clearly without jurisdiction. Thus the University is advised "to give up its present policy of needlessly irritating the Council on matters financial," "from higher and patriotic self-interest at all events" and it is assumed that if the Vice-Chancellor "makes up his mind, things will be easy in the Calcutta University." We are of opinion that the University has furnished no occasion for the alleged irritation, and we may add without impropriety that the decision of matters in difference, if any, between the University and the Government does not rest with the Vice-Chancellor individually, as is supposed, but with the Senate as the Body Corporate. Apart from this instance, there are other matters in the speech, which make it impossible for us to close without reference to its tone and language, which we regret to state, cannot but be deemed unfortunate. It is perhaps not always realised that members of an academic body, who have devoted long years to the service of the University and are intimately acquainted with the various phases of its development as also with the details of its administration, are not likely to be impressed by advice, given with an appearance of authority, though not well-founded on reason,—however exalted the position of the critic. There is plainly no occasion to "forgive and forget," nor is there any need to place this University "once more on the same high pedestal which it had occupied in the past," when one bears in mind that it has been readily acknowledged by critics, competent and impartial, that this University still occupies the foremost place amongst the Universities of India as a Teaching and Research Institution. We do not hesitate to maintain that this is not a case of "doles" to be given by way of accidental charity or compassion. Persons responsible for the development of the University have for years past strenuously worked in its best interests, often amidst the most discouraging circumstances, without that measure of aid from the Government which was legitimately its due. It is now the turn of the custodians of the public funds to recognise their duty and to fulfil their obligation in a befitting manner, for the spread of true University education amongst the people of this province.

ASUTOSH MOOKERJEE
 NIL RATAN SIRCAR
 HERAMBA CHANDRA MAITRA
 A. CHAUDHURI
 P. C. RAY
 GEORGE HOWELLS
 BIDHAN CHANDRA RAY

SENATE HOUSE: }
The 29th April, 1922. }

APPENDIX I.

A letter from the Registrar, Calcutta University, to the Joint Secretary to the Government of India, Education Department, through His Excellency the Rector, dated the 30th December, 1912.

"I am directed by the Hon'ble the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate to address the Government of India upon the question of a special grant for higher teaching in the University of Calcutta. The Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate are deeply grateful to the Government of India for the liberal financial assistance they have already rendered to the University, but they believe that the recent developments in University work not only justify, but make it incumbent upon, them to put forward a claim for a further substantial grant for the next financial year.

The Government of India are no doubt aware that in the course of the six months, Mr. T. Palit, Bar-at-Law, has made to the University a princely gift of money and property of the aggregate value of nearly 15 lakhs of rupees for the purpose of founding a College of Science and for the general improvement of scientific and technical education. Under the terms of the deeds of gift, the University is bound to maintain from the income of the endowment, a Chair of Physics and a Chair of Chemistry and to institute a scholarship to be awarded to a distinguished graduate for the study of Science in a foreign country; the University is also bound to establish a laboratory for advanced teaching and research and to contribute towards this object at least two and a half lakhs of rupees out of its own funds. But this sum is quite inadequate for the establishment of a laboratory of the kind contemplated. The Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate are anxious that the fullest advantage should be taken of this unique opportunity to establish a Residential College of Science in Calcutta, and it appears to them that if the necessary funds are available, the object can be speedily accomplished without any difficulty. The properties vested in the University by Mr. Palit include, among others, two fine plots of land, one of 12 bighas and the other of 25 bighas in area. On the bigger plot there are two splendid three-storied houses, recently built, which are admirably suited to accommodate 200 students. If therefore, adequate funds were forthcoming to erect and equip the requisite laboratories and Professors' quarters on this plot, a Residential College could be set up in working order in the course of a year. The estimated cost of the project amounts to 15 lakhs of Rupees, and the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate do not hesitate to ask the Government of India for a grant to the University of this sum. The gift of Mr. Palit is absolutely unique in the history of University education in this country, and they feel sure that the Government of India will be glad to supplement it by an at least equal amount to enable the University to carry out the scheme in its entirety, especially, in view of the fact that the University has already agreed to contribute 2½ lakhs out of its own very limited savings. I am desired to add that a sympathetic and generous attitude on the part of the Government of India towards the object which Mr. Palit had at heart, cannot fail greatly to influence public sentiment and may not improbably induce other wealthy gentlemen to found similar endowments for the encouragement of higher teaching.

The second subject to which the vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate desire me to draw the attention of the Government of India is the acquisition of the Fish Market situated to the south of the Senate House and east of the new University buildings. This site is urgently needed for further extension

of University buildings. There can also be no doubt that from a sanitary point of view the market ought not to be tolerated in its present place immediately to the north of the Medical College Hospital and to the east of the hostels of medical students and University Law students. The purpose for which the property is required by the University may be briefly indicated. The University has now definitely undertaken post-graduate teaching, and there can be little doubt that advanced teaching for M.A., M.Sc., Ph.D. and D.Sc. degrees—for which the time is fully ripe—must be concentrated in Calcutta, so far, at any rate, as Western Bengal is concerned. The standard prescribed by the Regulations for the degrees of Master and Doctor is so high that adequate instruction in this respect cannot be expected to be imparted by private Colleges, possibly not even by isolated Government Colleges, which have to bear the burden of undergraduate teaching. Besides, the difficulty of securing the services of competent teachers for advanced instruction has been found to be so great that M.A. and M.Sc. instruction in several centres is beyond the range of practical politics. Even in Calcutta, the Presidency College with an exceptionally strong teaching staff and up-to-date equipments, is able to provide for the post-graduate teaching of no more than a very limited number of students in selected groups out of six subjects for the M.A. and M.Sc. Examinations. Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that the arrangements made by the University for post-graduate study have met with striking success. At the present moment, there are over 500 students attending systematic courses of lectures on various M.A. subjects under University Lecturers appointed and paid by the University; and there is reason to believe that their number will substantially increase next session. If this large body of post-graduate students is to be properly educated and kept under discipline, the question of lecture rooms, seminars and hostel accommodation at once urges itself upon our attention. If the site now occupied by the market were acquired for the University and a substantial grant made for the further extension of the University buildings, the need for which is already keenly felt, the question of teaching and residence of post-graduate students would in a great measure be solved. It has been estimated that the acquisition of the market would cost 8 lakhs of rupees and another 7 lakhs would be required for the proposed buildings. I am directed to point out that proposals for the acquisition of the market have from time to time been discussed for several years past; meanwhile the value of the property has rapidly increased, and further delay would mean further rise in value and payment of a heavier sum as compensation to the owner. Immediate acquisition would, therefore, prove to be ultimately economical, since the fish market must be acquired sooner or later for educational purposes, situated as it is in the heart of a locality studded on all sides with handsome educational buildings.

The third point to which I am directed to invite your attention, is the completion of the University Law College Hostel buildings towards the erection of which the Government of India have generously made a grant of 3 lakhs of rupees (the land having been acquired by the University for a lakh and a half out of its own funds). The Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate would ask for a grant of one lakh for furniture, fittings and appliances for the 175 students who will be in residence from June next, as well as for the extra cost of construction of the building. The actual cost of the building has exceeded the estimate, as the apparently solid ground turned out to be in part a filled-up tank, and the foundations had to be laid very much deeper and wider than the Engineers and the Government Architect had anticipated.

The fourth point to which the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate desire me to draw the attention of the Government is the University Library. The one lakh contributed by the Government of India for the current year has been of great assistance to the

University; but at least another lakh would be needed to bring the Library up to the requirements of Post-Graduate students and University Professors and Lecturers. The libraries in Calcutta are singularly lacking in modern books, periodicals and transactions of learned societies absolutely essential for advanced study and research work. The want in this respect could be met to a considerable extent if another lakh was granted next financial year.

The last subject to which the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate desire me to draw your attention is the foundation of at least three more Professorships. Provision has either been made for or is about to be made for seven Chairs in the University as follows :

- (1) Professorship of Law founded by Prasannakumar Tagore.
- (2) Professorship of Economics founded by the Government of India at the time of the Jubilee celebrations.
- (3) and (4) Professorships of Higher Mathematics and of Mental and Moral Philosophy founded by the Government of India on the occasion of the Imperial visit.
- (5) Professorship of Ancient Indian History and Civilisation founded by the University on the occasion of the Imperial visit.
- (6) and (7) Professorships of Chemistry and Physics founded by Mr. Palit.

The three Chairs for which the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate now apply, should in their opinion, be devoted to Applied Mathematics, Modern History and Comparative Philology. The Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate feel that there is pressing need for higher teaching in these branches of knowledge and that if adequate provision is made, there will be no lack of students to avail themselves of the benefits of such teaching. Each of the Chairs would require a recurring grant of Rs. 12,000 to Rs. 15,000 a year.

To summarise: The Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate apply for financial aid to the following extent:

| <i>Non-recurring Grant.</i> | | Rs. |
|--|--|----------|
| (1) For the Residential College of Science supplementing the gift of Mr. Palit ... | | 15 lakhs |
| (2) (a) For the acquisition of the Fish Market | | 8 „ |
| (b) For the erection of a hostel for Post-Graduate Students and for additional lecture rooms and seminars for advanced work and research ... | | 7 „ |
| (3) For the completion and equipment of the University Law College Hostel Building ... | | 1 lakh |
| (4) For the University Library ... | | 1 „ |
| TOTAL | | 32 lakhs |

| <i>Recurring Grant.</i> | | Rs. |
|--|--|--------|
| (1) Professorship of Applied Mathematics ... | | 15,000 |
| (2) Professorship of Modern History ... | | 15,000 |
| (3) Professorship of Comparative Philology ... | | 15,000 |
| TOTAL | | 45,000 |

In conclusion, the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate desire me to urge that this University is entitled to special consideration by reason of the determined and sustained effort it has hitherto successfully made to carry out loyally the reforms contemplated by the Indian Universities Act of 1904. Comparisons are obviously undesirable; but it cannot be disputed that this

University has achieved a high measure of success in its endeavour to undertake and promote higher teaching, and the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate venture to express the hope that the Government of India will not be reluctant to place adequate funds at their disposal to continue and put on a wide and sound basis the work already begun. The Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate finally desire me to assure the Government of India that should the funds be available, they would be able to bring the scheme into full realisation in less than two years. Should the whole of the non-recurring grant of 32 lakhs for which application is now made be not available during the next financial year, the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate will be ready to initiate the scheme if one half is granted during the year 1913-14 and the other half during the year 1914-15."

APPENDIX II.

A letter from the Registrar, Calcutta University, to the Joint Secretary to the Government of India, Education Department, through His Excellency the Rector, dated the 4th October, 1913.

"I am directed by the Syndicate to refer to correspondence resting with your letter No. 75 C.D., dated the 14th January, 1913, in reply to our letter No. 3624, dated the 30th December, 1912, and to address the Government of India upon the question of a further grant for higher teaching in this University. The Syndicate have been informed that during the current year the Government of India have been pleased to make a grant of 8 lakhs of rupees for the acquisition of what is known as the Fish Market Site. The Syndicate are deeply grateful to the Government of India for liberal financial assistance they have hitherto rendered to the University and are encouraged thereby to apply for a further substantial grant to enable them to carry out fully the recent development in University work.

In our letter, dated the 30th December, 1912, the first place was assigned to the scheme for the establishment of a University College of Science for the promotion of higher teaching in different branches of Physical and Natural Science. The Syndicate pointed out that in furtherance of this object Sir Taraknath Palit had made a gift of money and land to the extent of 15 lakhs of rupees and that the University had undertaken to supplement this unique gift by a contribution of two and a half lakhs from its limited Reserve Fund. The Syndicate entertained the hope that under these circumstances the Government of India might suitably supplement and thereby accord recognition to this princely gift, but they were disappointed to find that money was not available for this purpose. Since then Dr. Rashbehary Ghose has made a gift of 10 lakhs of rupees for the foundation of Professorships and Studentships in connection with the proposed University College of Science. The Syndicate venture to urge upon the Government of India that a claim has now been fully established for a generous contribution from the State in furtherance of the University College of Science. They further desire me to point out that the foundation of a University College of Science for Post-Graduate Studies and Research is one of the foremost needs of the University. There is only one College, namely, the Presidency College, which is affiliated in Physics and Chemistry up to the standard of the M.A. and M.Sc. Examinations, but it must be noted that the Presidency College, in spite of its new Laboratories, has very limited accommodation for Post-Graduate students and is not able to take in more than 10 students in Chemistry and 18 students in Physics every year. Apart, therefore, from the obvious importance of increased facilities for the scientific training of qualified students in

this country, it is plain that there does not exist in this University adequate provision for the training of the numerous lecturers and demonstrators required for the efficient management of the Colleges affiliated in scientific subjects. In our letter of the 30th December, 1912, it was stated that the estimated cost of the project for the establishment of a University College of Science was 15 lakhs of rupees; the Syndicate have carefully reconsidered the matter and have come to the conclusion that a smaller sum would not be sufficient to secure that efficiency for the institution, which must, for obvious reasons, be its principal characteristic. The laboratory building, of which the plans are ready, will cost at least 5 lakhs of rupees; the hostel which is proposed to be attached to it, will cost not less than 2 lakhs of rupees; the equipment will, on the most moderate estimate, cost 5 lakhs of rupees; a suitable scientific library cannot be created for less than 2 lakhs of rupees, if complete sets of important periodicals and publications of learned societies have to be brought together, while at least 1 lakh will be required for additional land. It is not suggested that the whole of this money, if available, may be utilised in the course of twelve months, but it is eminently desirable that an idea should be formed of the minimum requirements of the entire scheme which it may take two or possibly three years to complete.

The second point to which I am directed to invite the attention of the Government of India is the development of Post-Graduate teaching apart from Science, in this University. A statement on this subject was made before the Senate by the Hon'ble the Vice-Chancellor on the 27th September last and a copy thereof is annexed to this letter. The most urgent need of the University in this respect is the further extension of the University Buildings. For this purpose, the Fish Market Site may be suitably utilised. The Syndicate have taken up the matter in earnest and plans have already been prepared for extension of the University Buildings which, when completed, will give ample accommodation for the classes held by the University Professors and Lecturers and will enable the University to assign to individual Professors, rooms suitably fitted up for study and research. There will also be space for further and much needed extension of the University Library and finally, arrangements will be made for the residence of 200 Post-Graduate students on the premises. The cost of the building is estimated at 10 lakhs of rupees. The Syndicate would further suggest that land should be acquired in the neighbourhood of the Senate House for play-ground for University students as well as the students of the University Law College specially those resident in the Hardinge Hostel; and there is no reason why such play-ground should not also be used by the members of the Calcutta University Institute. For this purpose a sum of 4 lakhs may be required, and it may be mentioned that suitable land may, without difficulty, be acquired towards the East of the College Square. The Syndicate would also ask that a sum of 2 lakhs may be granted for further additions to the University Library, to which access is now sought by a large number of Post-Graduate students.

The last point to which I am directed to invite the attention of the Government of India is the question of a substantial increase of the recurring grant to the University; the Syndicate gratefully acknowledge, that the present grant is handsome, but they desire me to represent that it has proved inadequate for the rapidly growing needs of higher teaching and research in the University. The annual recurring grant at present stands as follows:—

| | Ra. |
|------------------------------------|--------|
| Inspection of Colleges ... | 25,000 |
| Travelling Expenses of Fellows ... | 5,000 |
| University Law College ... | 20,000 |
| | 10,000 |

| | Rs. |
|---|--------|
| Hardinge Professor of Mathematics ... | 12,000 |
| King George V Professor of Philosophy ... | 12,000 |
| Sir Taraknath Palit Laboratory ... | 12,000 |
| University Readers ... | 4,000 |
| Post-Graduate Teaching ... | 15,000 |

The *additional* annual grant which the Syndicate consider essential is as follows :

| | Rs. |
|---|--------|
| Post-Graduate Teaching ... | 50,000 |
| Sir Taraknath Palit Laboratory ... | 36,000 |
| University Readers ... | 20,000 |
| University Librarian ... | 6,000 |
| Secretary to the Governing Body for Post-Graduate Teaching. | 6,000 |
| Professor of Modern History ... | 12,000 |
| Professor of Mahomedan (Mediæval) Indian History. | 12,000 |
| Professor of Astronomy ... | 12,000 |
| Professor of Botany ... | 12,000 |
| Professor of Zoology ... | 12,000 |
| Professor of Jurisprudence ... | 12,000 |

With regard to each of these claims, brief explanations may be submitted. The number of Post-Graduate students has increased to such an extent that our Lecturers must be increased in number, and if their services are to be continuously retained, (which indeed is a condition absolutely essential for the successful working of our scheme of higher teaching), they must be better paid and better prospects should be held out to them. It is obvious that the recurring expenditure for the Laboratory in connection with the University College of Science which will be used exclusively for Post-Graduate studies and research, will, even at the most moderate estimate, considerably exceed Rs. 1,000 a month (the amount of the present grant) and an additional sum of Rs. 3,000 a month, cannot be deemed by any means too liberal, when it is remembered that there will be at least six University Professors at work with research students under them. For University Readers, the University requires considerably more than the sum at present allotted (Rs. 4,000 a year). Experience has shown that scholars and investigators of the first rank cannot be induced to come out and stay for even a limited period to deliver a special course of lectures, for any sum less than £300 to £400, and, in one case, the University had to pay as much as £600 besides travelling expenses. The additional sum of Rs. 20,000 now asked for will enable the University to secure the services of 3 or 4 distinguished Readers every year as also to arrange for the publication of their lectures. The University also requires the services of a competent whole-time Librarian to look after and catalogue our increasing collection of books. We also require the services of a competent Professor to look after the arrangements for the Post-Graduate Teaching of more than a thousand students. Finally, the University requires 6 additional Chairs, one for each of the following subjects in which there is considerable demand for higher teaching: Modern History, Indian History (Mahomedan Period), Jurisprudence, Astronomy, Botany and Zoology. The Syndicate ask me to submit that this portion of their proposals has strong claims to sympathetic consideration by the Government of India. They desire me to point out that of the 14 Chairs in the University, 3 have been founded by the Government of India, 4 are maintained by the University, while 7 have been established by private munificence, as will appear from the following list :

Government of India.

1. Minto Professor of Economics.
2. Hardinge Professor of Mathematics.
3. King George V Professor of Philosophy.

University Funds.

1. Carmichael Professor of Ancient Indian History and Culture.
2. Professor of Comparative Philology.
3. Professor of English.
4. A Second Professor of English.

Prasannakumar Tagore.

1. Professor of Law.

Sir Tarakanath Patil.

1. Professor of Physics.
2. Professor of Chemistry.

Dr. Rashbehary Ghose.

1. Professor of Applied Mathematics.
2. Professor of Physics.
3. Professor of Chemistry.
4. Professor of Botany.

In conclusion, the Syndicate desire me to emphasise what was stated in the concluding paragraph of our letter, dated the 30th December, 1912, namely, that this University is entitled to special consideration by reason of the determined and sustained efforts successfully made to carry out loyally the reforms contemplated by the Indian Universities Act of 1904 and they venture to repeat the hope previously expressed that the Government of India will not be reluctant to place adequate funds at their disposal to enable them to develop the important work already begun and to place it on a permanent basis."