

**REPORT**  
**OF THE**  
**COMMITTEE**  
**APPOINTED BY THE SENATE**  
**ON THE**  
**25th MARCH 1922**



**CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY PRESS**

**1922**

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
Constitution ... ..	1
Proceedings of the Council ... ..	8
College of Science and Technology ... ..	8
Post-Graduate Teaching in Arts ... ..	20
Misuse of Evidence ... ..	33
Attack on University Officers and Teachers ... ..	36
Imputation of Petulance ... ..	37
Choice Sentiments ... ..	39
Conclusion ... ..	40

## LETTERS

Letter from the Government of India, dated 14th January, 1913 ... ..	11
Letter from the Government of India, dated 9th August, 1917 ... ..	13
Letter to the Government of Bengal, dated 5th February, 1921 ... ..	16
Reply from the Government of Bengal, dated 15th November, 1921 ... ..	19
Letter to the Government of India, dated 30th December, 1912 ... ..	42
Letter to the Government of India, dated 4th October, 1913 ... ..	45
Correspondence with the Government of Bengal, from 22nd December, 1921 to 11th March, 1922 ... ..	49

## TABULAR STATEMENTS

	PAGE
University College of Science ...	... 14
Subjects of Instruction in the Universities of Bristol, Birmingham, Leeds and Manchester ...	... 25
Government Grants ...	... 26
Post-Graduate in Arts ...	... 30
Post-Graduate in Science ...	... 30
Post-Graduate Teaching in Arts ...	... 32

## REPORT

We, the members of the Committee, appointed by the Senate on the 25th March, 1922, to consider a letter from the Government of Bengal on the subject of a resolution moved in the Bengal Legislative Council on the 29th August, 1921, have the honour to submit our report.

The resolution was in the following terms :

“This Council recommends to the Government that, with a view to determine what financial assistance, if any, should be given to the Calcutta University, a committee, consisting of two financial experts, and two members of the Senate, to be nominated by the Government, and three non-official members of this Council not holding any office in the University, to be elected by the Council, be appointed at an early date to enquire into and report on the general working of the University, in particular its financial administration, and recommend such urgent measures or reforms as may be necessary.”

This resolution was adopted by a majority of 55 against 41, and it contemplates the appointment of a Committee to enquire into and report on the general working of the University, in particular its financial administration. Consequently, amongst the various points which require to be considered in connection with the resolution and the speeches made on the subject, the foremost place must be assigned to the question of the position of the University in relation to the Government and the Council, 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 Sections 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 contemplated. 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, and it is manifest that the resolution under consideration really calls upon the Government to act in contravention of the constitution. This view is in complete agreement with that maintained 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 must not 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. In this connection, reference may be made to the definition of the term "Local Government" contained in Sec. 134 (4) of the Government of India Act, which provides that "Local Government" means, in the case of a Governor's Province, the Governor in Council or the Governor acting with Ministers (as the case may require). 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 opinion, is quite unambiguous and clear.

In the view we take of the unconstitutional character of the proposal embodied in the resolution,

it is needless for us to dwell on its other implications. But it is a matter for legitimate comment that gentlemen, who are members of a Legislative Council under a representative form of Government, should, while claiming to elect their own representatives on the proposed Committee, deny a similar privilege to the Senate on whose work they desire to sit in judgment.

#### PROCEEDINGS OF THE COUNCIL

We shall now pass on to the Proceedings of the Council in respect of the resolution. We gather from the letter of the Government of Bengal, dated the 22nd December, 1921, which is set out below, that the observations of the University are invited in respect of these proceedings:

"I am directed to forward for the information of the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate a copy of the Resolution moved by Babu Rishindranath Sarkar regarding the appointment of a Committee *to enquire into the finances* of the Calcutta University, at the meeting of the Bengal Legislative Council held on the 29th August, 1921, together with the proceedings of the Council, pages 138-175 of the Council Proceedings, Volume V (copy enclosed). The *matter* is now under the consideration of Government and the observations of the University are invited on it." It may be remarked in passing that this letter describes the resolution as "regarding the appointment of a Committee to enquire into the finances" of the University, though the resolution itself has a far more comprehensive scope, as it contemplates the appointment of a Committee "*to enquire into and report on the general working of the University, in particular its financial administration.*" The letter further states that the *matter* is now under consideration of the Government, and the observations of the University are invited on it. This, as we read it, includes both the resolution and the proceedings, which are forwarded with the letter.

We cannot but observe at the outset that the proceedings which embody the speeches made by various members of the Council stand on an entirely different footing from the resolution itself. We deeply regret to have to state that the tone and language of some of the speeches made on the occasion are of a deplorable character, and it is impossible for an academic body to follow the example which has thus been set. But what is of vital importance is that many of the speeches betray a surprising ignorance of University affairs, though correct information could, if desired, have been easily gathered from the published proceedings of the University. We shall now refer to some striking instances of misapprehension of the facts.

#### COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

One of the charges brought forward is that "the University has done very little improvement for

the department of Science," and as an instance it is asserted that "the University has gradually reduced the contribution to the Science College from the Fee Fund, till, in 1920-21, it has stopped contributing anything, contrary to the terms of the trust created by Sir Taraknath Palit." This statement is contrary to the facts ; it is, indeed, so misleading that it is necessary to review in brief outline the history of the foundation and development of the University College of Science and Technology, and the part played therein by the University, the Government of India, and the Government of Bengal, respectively. We desire to emphasise that a true perspective of the situation cannot be obtained without taking into account the expenditure which has been incurred by the University in respect of the Science College 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 20th 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, inasmuch 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 imposed upon the University an obligation to provide for laboratories, workshops 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 was 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 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.	
	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	...	...	3,000	507	...	11,130	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	29,135	47,261
1914-15	...	22,080	...	1,575	3,000	...	...	1,575	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2,32,021	2,01,451
1915-16	...	25,200	5,525	3,675	1,986	...	...	23,030	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	34,201	93,617
1916-17	13,573	25,200	11,750	6,000	9,844	6,995	23,375	11,261	10	...	...	3,041	2,988	...	968	33,006	1,49,571
1917-18	23,106	25,200	4,525	5,475	39,590	2,293	51,375	47,016	10	23,374	6,000	3,639	1,366	13,852	1,818	52,518	3,05,657
1918-19	29,917	24,074	4,791	5,501	81,866	8,303	12,863	23,420	156	30,500	12,132	1,403	11	665	2,275	11,263	2,49,290
1919-20	32,940	24,000	5,725	4,836	71,012	12,235	18,910	14,088	62	9,018	16,153	2,161	2,532	121	2,389	2,836	2,19,618
1920-21	34,947	41,658	5,425	4,875	1,00,460	8,472	17,207	26,171	1,364	14,678	6,845	4,284	1,245	5,045	3,527	4,400	2,80,623
1921-22	37,521	44,663	3,950	7,682	86,083	4,597	6,267	21,926	96	21,149	1,312	10,560	52	1,438	3,971	1,403	2,53,090
TOTAL	1,77,404	2,34,904	41,691	40,309	4,00,018	43,462	1,29,997	1,80,217	1,718	98,719	42,442	25,168	8,194	20,621	14,948	4,02,343	18,62,155

The above statement shows that the total expenditure on the University College of Science and Technology up to 30th June, 1922, has been Rs. 18,62,155. This sum has been contributed as follows :

1. Contribution from the annual Government of India Grant of Rs. 65,000 ...	Rs.	1,20,000
2. Contribution from Sir Taraknath Palit Fund ...		2,98,095
3. Contribution from Sir Rashbehary Ghose Fund ...		3,78,166
4. Tuition fees from students ...		66,685
5.* Contribution from the Fee Fund of the University ...		9,99,209

TOTAL Rs. ... 18,62,155

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 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. It may be maintained without fear of contradiction that now, under the auspices of the University, higher instruction in scientific subjects is imparted and research work of recognised value is carried out on a more adequate scale than had been found practicable when the matter was exclusively in the hands of the Local Government with all its resources. One learned Member of the Council, with an impressive air of erudition, did, indeed, quote a number of subjects, which, in his opinion, should have been undertaken by the University, such as "Mining, Agriculture, Industry, Commerce, Entomology, Nautical Science, Forestry, Metallurgy, Science of Leather Industries or of Textile Industries." We are unable to surmise

---

\* Out of this sum Rs. 34,738-2-8 was contributed from the Fee Fund during 1920-21 for purposes of the Laboratory (in addition to the sum contributed for the salary of University teachers in the Department of Science). The allegation made to the contrary by one of the speakers is untrue.

whether this list is based on the enumeration of subjects which the University Commission considered it advantageous or desirable for an Indian University to undertake, as funds should become available. (Vol. V, p. 286.)\* The member of the Legislative Council did not, however, indicate who should provide the necessary funds, and was perhaps not aware that in two at least of these subjects—Agriculture and Commerce—the University had staff ready for work, and that in one of them—Commerce—work had already been commenced by the University, notwithstanding financial stringency.

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

---

\* The speaker apparently did not appreciate the importance of creation and maintenance of University Chairs even in the studies of his choice, for he proceeded to remark, "what useful purpose will be served by the creation of these Chairs, one fails to understand ; creation of Chairs for higher studies dissociated from preliminary and secondary courses is worse than placing a marble dome on a mud-built wall." The speaker could not have been aware that experience has already shown that new departments of study are most effectively organised under the guidance of University Professors ; this applies as much to development of studies of University grade as to the training of teachers as a necessary preliminary to the introduction of the subjects in secondary and primary stages. That the importance of the improvement of secondary courses is fully realised by the University is clear from the action already taken by the Senate for reconstruction of the Matriculation Examination. The destruction of "a marble dome," where it exists, may amuse the iconoclast ; but what should appeal most to "people's representatives" is to maintain the marble dome and to provide money for the substitution of stone for "mud" walls as early as practicable.

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 L1 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, M.A.
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
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7,23,809</b>

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
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10,00,000</b>

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, and 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 could only express regret for 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

Before we deal with the charges brought against the work of the Post-Graduate Department in Arts, it is necessary to state in a brief compass the origin and present position of that department; but 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

---

\* 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. IX 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.



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 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.\* A new line of criticism has

---

\* 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. Sahidullah (Dacca), Dr. Jnanendrachandra Ghose (Dacca), Mr. Surendranath Majumdar (Patna), Dr. Radhakamal Mookerjee (Lucknow), Mr. Bhujangabhushan Mookerjee (Lucknow), Mr. Praphullaachandra Bose (Indore), Mr. K. G. Naik (Baroda), Mr. A. K. Chanda (I. E. S.), Mr. B. N. Seal (I. E. S.), Mr. Durgagati Chattoraj (P. E. S.), Mr. Abinaschandra Saha (P. E. S.), Mr. Anantaprasad Banerjee (P. E. S.), Mr. Dhireschandra Acharyya (P. E. S.), Mr. Panchanandas Mookerjee (P. E. S.), Mr. Ramaprasad Chanda

however 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 are peculiarly well-suited for study and research in an Indian University, and are thus calculated 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.\* 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. Indeed, one of the members of the Council conceded that the University professors were ill-paid and their tenure of office transitory, though he did not proceed to advocate liberal assistance from the State to remedy this state of things. 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

---

(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 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 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 200 on an average. The members of the staff in Pali have also to deal with Pali as one of the basic languages in the Department of Indian Vernaculars and with the History and Philosophy of 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.

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. The present situation is thus attributable, not to extravagance in providing for improved and increased facilities for advanced instruction of our students, but to accidental circumstances which were beyond control and could not have been anticipated.

Another charge which has been brought against the University is that of duplicating the work of instruction available in other academic centres. An imputation more unfounded than this cannot well be imagined. The truth is that this University has been the first in the field in the matter of Post-Graduate teaching and research, and while the grants it has received from the State have not been increased for many years past, notwithstanding the steady and rapid 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.

We cannot, in this connection, overlook the criticism that the University has undertaken instruction in subjects which are practically useless at the present moment. It is a novel theory that a University should concern itself solely, or even chiefly, with subjects, "which add to the material resources of the country"; that such a view can be seriously suggested by men who claim to have received a liberal education, makes it essential that we should not lose sight of the value and importance of cultural education. As has been observed by a writer of eminence, though Science may open up prospects and careers, it does not increase the nation's spiritual stature, and nationality must look to its schools, to its arts (in the largest sense of the word), to its language or languages, to its literature which conveys the finest thought and deepest feeling of its past. The ideal here set forth has nothing narrow and exclusive about it. We cannot but feel that the speaker, who selected the departments of History and Tibetan for disapproval, was not happy in his choice. There is no subject which demands more careful and comprehensive study than History, ancient and modern, western and eastern, by Indian students, not only for success in academic career but also as a preparation for public life. As regards

Tibetan, the speaker could not have been aware that ours is the only Indian University, which makes provision for its study, and that an exploration of the materials already collected is calculated to throw light upon the darkest corners of Indian History during the early centuries of the Christian era. Criticism of this type does not gain strength, even when coupled with an assertion emanating from the "representatives of the people," that the Post-Graduate Department is "out of all proportion to the demand for higher studies at the present moment." The plans for University development, whether judged by work already accomplished or activities yet to be undertaken, have been neither casual nor accidental, but are based on a definite conception of the true function of the University in the life of the Nation. We require more education and better education, and we have no doubt the demand for the highest type of education will increase as the requisite facilities become more and more available.\*

---

\* It is interesting to compare the scope of activities of some of the modern Universities in England with the sphere of work undertaken by this University.

According to the Universities Year Book, 1922, the University of Bristol, incorporated in 1909, has teaching provision in the following subjects:

(1) Agriculture. (2) Anatomy. (3) Arabic, Aramaic, etc. (4) Art. (5) Bio-Chemistry. (6) Botany. (7) Chemistry, Agricultural, Applied, Hygienic, and Physical. (8) Classics. (9) Dentistry. (10) Economics. (11) Education. (12) Engineering. (13) English. (14) French. (15) Geography. (16) Geology. (17) German. (18) Hebrew. (19) History. (20) Italian. (21) Law. (22) Local Government. (23) Mathematics, Applied and Pure. (24) Medicine. (25) Military subjects. (26) Mining. (27) Palaeontology. (28) Philosophy. (29) Physics. (30) Physiology. (31) Public Health. (32) Technology. (33) Theological subjects. (34) Zoology.

The University of Birmingham, incorporated in 1900, provides facilities for study in the following subjects:

(1) Accounting. (2) Agriculture. (3) Human Anatomy and Anthropology. (4) Botany. (5) Brewing. (6) Chemistry. (7) Classics. (8) Commerce. (9) Dentistry. (10) Economics. (11) Education. (12) Engineering. (13) English. (14) French. (15) Geology and Mineralogy. (16) German. (17) History. (18) Italian. (19) Law. (20) Mathematics. (21) Medicine. (22) Metallurgy. (23) Mining. (a) Mining, Petroleum Tech. (b) Mining, Coal and Surveying. (c) Mining, Metal. (d) Mine Rescue Work. (24) Music. (25) Philosophy. (26) Physics. (27) Physiology. (28) Russian. (29) Spanish. (30) Zoology.

The University of Leeds, incorporated in 1904, teaches

(1) Agriculture. (2) Anatomy. (3) Bio-Chemistry. (4) Botany. (5) Chemistry. (6) Classics. (7) Dentistry. (8) Economics. (9) Education. (10) Engineering. (11) English Lan. and Lit. (12) French. (13) Geography. (14) Geology. (15) German Lan. and Lit. (16) Hebrew. (17) Histology. (18) History. (19) Law. (20) Mathematics. (21) Medicine. (22) Metallurgy. (23) Mining. (24) Philosophy. (25) Physics. (26) Physiology. (27) Russian Lan. and Lit. (28) Russian History and Music.

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

- (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

(29) Spanish Lan. and Lit. (30) Technology. (31) Veterinary Hygiene. (32) Zoology. (33) Forestry.

Under Technology we find

(1) Coal, Gas, and Fuel industries. (2) Colour Chemistry and Dyeing. (3) Leather Industries. (4) Textile Industries.

The University of Manchester, founded in 1880, provides instruction in the following subjects:

(1) Accounting. (2) Agriculture. (3) Anatomy. (4) Arabic. (5) Archaeology. (6) Architecture. (7) Banking. (8) Botany. (9) Chemistry. (10) Chinese. (11) Classics. (12) Commerce. (13) Crystallography. (14) Dentistry. (15) Economics. (16) Education. (17) Egyptology. (18) Engineering. (19) Electro-Technics. (20) English Language and Literature. (21) French Language and Literature. (22) Geography. (23) Geology. (24) German and German Philology. (25) Hebrew. (26) Histology. (27) History. (28) Italian Studies. (29) Law. (30) Mathematics. (31) Medicine. (32) Metallurgy and Metallography. (33) Mining. (34) Music. (35) Palaeography. (36) Philology. (37) Philosophy. (38) Physics. (39) Physiology. (40) Political Philosophy. (41) Psychology. (42) Public Health. (43) Railways. (44) Russian. (45) Semitic Languages and Literature. (46) Spanish. (47) Technology. (48) Theology. (49) Veterinary Science. (50) Zoology.

\* 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 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.

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 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 :

1917-18	...	...	Rs. 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. 5,362-11 has been recovered from the University during the period between 1st July, 1920, and 30th June, 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 modest 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

---

\* 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. Niranjanprasad 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. Sabidullah of the Department of Indian Vernaculars.

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 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, *for the information of the Committee*, that it 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 may close this section of our report with a comparison of the expenditure on Post-Graduate Teaching in Arts and Science respectively. The following tables set out the number of students on each side in the Fifth and Sixth Year Classes during the years 1920-21 and 1921-22 :

## 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 ...	5	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

## 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	18	10	28
	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, inasmuch 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 exists 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 :

YEAR.	Minto Professor of Economics.	Hardinge Professor of Higher Mathematics.	George V Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy.	Car michael Professor of Ancient Indian History and Culture.	University Professors and Lecturers.	Administration.	Library.	Furniture.	Stationery and Conduits.	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	5,835	9,950	5,000	12,000	66,280	..	..	..	..	..	2,804	..
1914-15	15,428	15,000	12,000	4,645	1,23,121	..	..	..	..	..	2,607	..
1915-16	14,578	15,000	12,000	..	1,32,580	..	..	..	..	..	2,982	..
1916-17	15,000	6,250	12,000	..	1,34,164	..	..	..	..	..	3,309	..
1917-18	15,000	7,185	12,000	10,667	2,15,986	8,003	5,517	1,508	722	..	3,209	..
1918-19	9,032	16,200	12,000	12,000	3,24,472	19,730	18,724	2,211	1,496	925	6,024	3,021
1919-20	4,839	16,200	14,750	12,000	3,25,645	28,286	20,759	1,170	2,180	4,163	6,024	12,082
1920-21	12,000	16,200	10,835	16,145	3,88,215	25,453	18,303	1,657	2,637	7,520	3,448	10,410
1921-22	11,000	14,850	12,504	16,500	3,67,330	28,745	6,915	692	4,691	7,715	3,276	26,119
Total	1,17,057	1,16,835	1,03,189	86,280	21,28,153	1,10,217	70,218	7,538	11,720	20,323	27,657	26,119

GRAND TOTAL—28,25,824.

This sum was met from :	Rs.
(1) Government grant for three Professorships	3,37,081
(2) Government grant for University Lecturers	1,50,000
(3) Tuition fees from students	7,97,522
(4) University funds	15,40,721

TOTAL Rs. 28,25,324

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 about fifteen times the amount of tuition-fees.

#### MISUSE OF EVIDENCE

We have up to this stage dealt with the more important criticisms contained in the speeches made by the Members of the Council. It is neither necessary nor practicable to take notice of every allegation made against the University, specially when, as we shall presently see, some of the Members themselves admitted that they had no personal knowledge of University affairs. But we must draw attention to the attempt at what may not be unfairly described as an improper use of evidence. One of the speakers invoked the authority of two members of the Calcutta University Commission in support of his condemnation of the Post-Graduate system. He did not, however, inform the Council that the two members whose opinion he cited were in the minority and that a contrary view had been adopted by the five members who formed the majority of the Commission.\*

---

\* The majority refer to "the remarkable expansion of Post-graduate teaching under the direct auspices of the University," and summarise their views in the following passage :

"It has been achieved as a result of the new principle laid down in 1904, and by the help of large grants from the State, and private benefactions on a scale hitherto unexampled in Bengal. It showed that much could be done by the University to concentrate and consolidate the teaching resources of Calcutta. It showed that these resources were greater than had been supposed. It set, in some respects, new standards of method in University teaching, which might be expected to exercise their influence in course of time upon the work of the colleges. Taken in conjunction with the concurrent reorganisation of the colleges rendered necessary by the Act, and with the attempt to deal with the problem of students' residence rendered possible by large Government grants, it represents an expenditure of labour and thought so great, and a skill in organisation so considerable as to inspire solid hopes for the future." (Report, Vol. I, p. 76.)

The speaker did not also place before the Council what the majority thought of the note appended to the report by the two members in minority. The following extract from the majority report (Vol. V, p. 351) will make it obvious why the speaker did not mention these facts to his colleagues in Council :

“ We desire to say that the appended notes were submitted in their final form on the day fixed for the final revision of the last two chapters and for the signature of the report. The principles concerned have been fully considered during our sittings, and we think that it will be found that every crucial point raised in the notes is dealt with in some part of the report. While we do not propose to discuss the details of our colleagues' documents, we must not be regarded as accepting the interpretation placed by them upon various passages of the report to which they refer; nor can we be regarded as accepting the accuracy of the statements made by them.”

We shall not pause to speculate what would have been thought of an advocate, who attempted to make a similar use of evidence or precedent in a court of justice. But we shall proceed at once to what seems us to be an even more striking instance of this tendency to make improper use of evidence. The same speaker invoked the authority of the late Sir Rashbehary Ghose, the greatest benefactor of the University, in support of his own disapprobation of the work of the University. He relied on the circumstance that Sir Rashbehary Ghose had, by his testament, left the residue of his estate to the National Council of Education and not to the University—the implication was that Sir Rashbehary Ghose had lost faith in the University, or, at any rate, had “grave doubts” as to the competence or good faith of those who administered University affairs. The speaker, however, omitted to state that the very testament of Sir Rashbehary Ghose, which contained the residuary gift in favour of the National Council of Education (whereof he had been the President since its foundation), also contained a bequest of two and a half lacs of rupees in favour of the University, even though the University had already been the recipient of two princely gifts from him in 1913 and 1920. We need not deal with this point further, as the matter was mentioned by the Vice-Chancellor before the Senate on the 6th August, 1921\*

---

\* “ This posthumous gift furnishes incontrovertible evidence that Sir Rashbehary Ghose retained to the last his confidence in this University. I make special reference to this aspect of the matter, because a persistent rumour has been current for some time past that a desperate attempt was made by more than one well-wisher of this University to create in the mind of our great benefactor an impression that the people, whom he had trusted with the earnings of a life-time, had proved themselves unworthy of his confidence. This story, if true, would only indicate the depth of possible depravity of human nature; on the other hand, the story, if false, indicates the existence of men who are not slow to calumniate even the mighty dead. For, do we not know that Sir Rashbehary Ghose would be the last man in the world to listen to idle tale-bearers, or be guided by them in his actions? ”

This very speaker utilised his reference to the second gift of Sir Rashbehary Ghose to sustain a charge of grave dereliction of duty on the part of the University authorities, alleging that "laboratories and workshops for Applied Chemistry and Applied Physics and for other such subjects expressly mentioned by Sir Rashbehary Ghose in his trust deed have not yet been earnestly taken up nor completed, though a large sum must have by this time accumulated in the funds of the University." The facts relevant in this connection have only to be narrated to establish conclusively that the charge is entirely unfounded. Sir Rashbehary Ghose made over to the University the securities comprised in his second trust on the 16th March, 1920. The annual income is Rs. 40,005; deducting the salaries of the two professors of Applied Physics and Applied Chemistry and the stipends of the four scholars attached to them, a balance of Rs. 24,405 would be left annually to meet the cost of equipment of laboratory and workshop as also current expenses. It is manifest that the balance thus available is totally inadequate for the purpose of equipment of a laboratory and a workshop. This was fully realised by the Board of Management of the Ghosh Fund; by the Governing Body of the College of Science, and by the Syndicate. Whatever income accrued in the shape of interest on the securities, was spent in the first instance for the equipment of a laboratory for the department of Applied Chemistry. It was clearly impossible to meet, from the income, the capital expenditure involved in the erection and equipment of a workshop. A detailed statement was accordingly drawn up by the Professor concerned, and 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 a letter to the Government of Bengal asking for financial assistance. This letter has already been set out in an earlier part of this report. Reference was made to the gift of Sir Rashbehary Ghose, and it was pointed out that the most essential need was an adequate workshop which, it was estimated, would cost Rs. 2,25,000, namely, Rs. 75,000 for building and Rs. 1,50,000 for appliances. No answer was received in reply to this request during a period of more than nine months; the University was then informed by a letter, dated the 15th November, 1921 (already set out), that no assistance could be given by the Government. Meanwhile, the difficulties of the students, already under training, rapidly grew more and more acute. But while the members of the Legislative Council were vigorous in their attack on the University, the University authorities themselves were not idle. They reduced the plans for the workshop to the utmost extent possible, and induced a Calcutta firm to undertake the work and to receive payment

in four annual instalments, the first instalment of Rs. 25,000 to be paid in advance. Even this sum, however, was not available. Upon the advice of the Board of Accounts, with the concurrence of the Board of Management of the Ghosh Fund, supported by the opinions of leading counsel, and with the sanction of the Senate, the Syndicate thereupon applied to the High Court for permission to change the investment in the Ghosh Fund, so that an increased income might be obtained for the benefit of the Trust. The High Court granted the application. The history of this investment is contained in the following statement, which was laid before the Senate on the 4th March, 1922 :

“ 3½ p. c. G. P. notes for Rs. 10,50,000 being the equivalent of Rs. 6,25,000 were endorsed to Hajee Ganny Ahamed on the 19th September, 1921, and were received back from him on 22nd February, 1922. Hence the G. P. Notes were in his possession for five months and three days. Interest for the above period at the rate of 3½ per cent. amounts to Rs. 15,618-12-0. This amount the University did not get. But a total sum of Rs. 51,064-11-6, on account of interest was paid by the mortgagor during this period of five months and three days. Thus the University made a profit of Rs. 35,445-15-6 in this transaction. Deducting Rs. 2,625, being the amount charged by the Bank as withdrawal fee on the above G. P. Notes, we get a clear net profit of Rs. 32,820-15-6.”

The result of this transaction was, as stated above, a net profit of about Rs. 32,821, which alone rendered it possible for the Syndicate to pay to the contractor the first instalment of Rs. 25,000 and to commence the construction of the workshop. The work has not yet been completed. The University has, however, made itself responsible for about Rs. 1,10,000 out of which the sum of Rs. 25,000 only has been paid. What then is the true position? The University authorities have strenuously endeavoured to provide a workshop for the department of Applied Chemistry and have spared no effort to raise money with a view to meet the capital outlay involved. The custodians of the public funds, on the other hand, though approached, have made no response whatsoever, while the “ representatives of the people ” have deemed it a profitable task to charge the University authorities with dereliction of duty. We may leave it to others to judge where the responsibility will lie, if, to the misfortune of the country, the attainment of the object which Sir Rashbehary Ghose had in view is defeated or delayed.

#### ATTACK ON UNIVERSITY OFFICERS AND TEACHERS

We have already indicated that one of the speakers in the Council frankly admitted that his “ knowledge of the University was more or less second-hand ” and that he had “ never visited it since he left it unscathed.” It is remarkable that none of the gentlemen who bitterly criticised the University was a

member of the Senate, or presumably had first-hand acquaintance with University affairs. Still, these gentlemen proceeded to attack vehemently the University, its officers, and teachers. One feels constrained to enquire, what opportunities they had, in the course of their careers, to acquaint themselves with the details of University work? What were their qualifications to pronounce judgment upon academic matters? These questions may be inconvenient, but cannot be avoided, because the mere fact that a gentleman occupies a seat on the Legislative Council does not necessarily furnish a guarantee of his competence to form a sound judgment on academic affairs. Apart from this, a further question arises,—is it open to individual members of the Legislative Council to abuse the officers and teachers of the University—they are not servants of the Government, or of the Council, much less are they subordinate to individual Members of the Council. We consider it lamentable that the officers and teachers of the University should be liable to unfounded attacks by individual Members of the Council, which cannot but be regarded as a grave abuse of the statutory freedom of speech enjoyed by them. The gravity of the situation is clearly intensified when such attacks are founded admittedly on second-hand information, and the question may well be asked, who were the informants? We find that one member of the Council had, indeed, the courage to maintain that the attack on the University had been engineered from purely personal motives and not from a desire to promote educational interests. We are not concerned with these conflicting theories, but this much is clear that men, sincerely anxious to promote the welfare of the University, cannot be assisted by uninformed and prejudiced criticism abounding in sweeping generalisations of a condemnatory character.

#### IMPUTATION OF "PETULANCE"

Some of the speakers have, in language which we have not the inclination to imitate, imputed 'petulance' to the University. This conclusion they have drawn from what they consider to be the indefensible refusal of the University to answer all their questions or to supply information whenever demanded. We have already discussed the constitutional aspect of this matter. We now desire to emphasise that there is no foundation for the charge that there has been a 'petulant' refusal on the part of the University to answer questions or supply information. On the other hand, any impartial judge of the series of questions which have been put in Council with regard to the University,—in most cases, by persons who are never known to have taken any interest in matters educational,—will



feel convinced that many of them were not genuine requests for information, and that some of them, at least, contained thinly-veiled imputations upon individuals connected with the work of the University. It must further be remembered that there is a clear distinction between supply of information for the use of the Government and supply of information for immediate communication to the public. In every University, probably in every public corporation, there are many matters which must for a time be treated as confidential and cannot be published without serious detriment to its work. Apart from this, in the case of every University, there are many matters, particularly those connected with examinations, which must be treated as confidential, and their disclosure cannot be demanded even by the most exalted person outside the academic sphere. While we are on this topic, reference may be made to demands for financial information. The University has never refused to give information on financial matters, if required by the Government for its own use; but when such information is required by individual members of the Council, the matter stands on a different footing; it cannot be maintained that every individual member of the Council is entitled, as of right, to demand information regarding the finances of the University whenever he chooses, before it has been made available by the University for the use of the general public. Under the law, the University accounts are and can be audited only once in every year. When such audit report is submitted to the Government, the Government may, after the University has been afforded an opportunity to comment thereon, place the matter before the public. The attitude of the University in this respect may be gathered from the following extract from a letter dated the 11th March, 1922, addressed by the Registrar to the Secretary to the Government of Bengal (See Appendix III) :

“The Syndicate have directed me to inform Government that in the opinion of the Syndicate it is not necessary to appoint a committee to obtain financial information regarding the University, inasmuch as such information in detail is already in possession of the Government. The accounts of the University are continuously audited by officers deputed by the Government for the purpose, and that work is so minutely done that it usually occupies 8 to 9 months every year. The audit has been completed up to June, 1920. The accounts for 1920-21 are now in course of audit, and any financial information relating to that period, which may be required by Government, may be obtained from their officers who are now auditing the accounts of that period. As regards later period, financial information will be supplied, whenever asked for.”

We cannot leave this topic without the remark that some of the questions put in the Council seemed to imply that the University had made improper use of its Funds, and some of the speakers made pointed references to the supposed misuse of what is known as the Fish Market Fund, although they

had obviously no personal knowledge of the subject. As the Fund came into existence, and the incident mentioned by the Members of the Council took place, at a time when the University had no relations with the Government of Bengal, a statement on the subject has been supplied to the Government of India ; it may be conveniently set out here, as it contains the facts about this matter :

"From the 19th November, 1920, to the 2nd January, 1921, the University found it necessary to make a temporary overdraft on the Bank of Bengal in its Account Current. The amount of the overdraft varied from Rs. 34,000 as maximum to Rs. 20,000 as minimum. The Bank proposed that the securities in the Fish Market Fund would be treated by them as security for the temporary overdraft. The Syndicate agreed to this proposal.\* The interest on the amount overdrawn for the six weeks amounted to Rs. 53-6-3 and was paid out of the current funds of the University. On the 3rd January, 1921, there was a large surplus in the current account in favour of the University after meeting the overdraft. The entire amount in the Fish Market Fund has always been intact and available for expenditure on such building as it may be decided to erect on the site. No part of the Fund has been spent for the general purposes of the University. In the opinion of the Syndicate, they did not act in excess of their powers in this matter."

Such is the prosaic account of a transaction, which, it was supposed by some, had furnished an opportunity to the authorities of the University to "misappropriate" University Funds in some mysterious manner. We do not feel called upon to determine the legal aspects of the matter or to investigate and narrate here the full history of the Fish Market Fund—when and how it came into existence, how the Government of Bengal made an ineffectual attempt to keep in hand the surplus which rightly belonged to the University, how the market itself was for several years retained by the Government of Bengal in its own possession, and how it was ultimately recovered by the University.

#### CHOICE SENTIMENTS

Several of the speakers, perhaps carried away by their zeal to advocate the reform of this University, expressed their sentiments in language so choice that we cannot but include some specimens in this report, though the assertions are indefinite, unsupported by evidence, and, consequently, incapable of contradiction :

1. "These Post-Graduate professors have time enough to fill up the columns of newspapers with all sorts of nonsense in

---

\* This took place at a meeting of the Syndicate, held on the 15th November, 1920, when the members present were, the Hon'ble Sir Nilratan Sircar (Vice-Chancellor), the Hon'ble Mr. W. W. Hornell (Director of Public Instruction, Bengal), the Hon'ble Sir Asutosh Mookerjee, Rai Bahadur Dr. Upendra-nath Brahmachari, J. N. Dasgupta, Esq., S. C. Mahalanabis, Esq., Birajmohan Majumdar, Esq., Lt.-Col. B. H. Deare, T. H. Richardson, Esq., Rev. Dr. W. S. Urquhart, Manmathanath Ray, Esq., Charuchandra Biswas, Esq., Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar, and Pramathanath Banerjee, Esq.

abusing people who point out the defects of the present system of the educational policy adopted by the Calcutta University; they have time enough to dance attendance at the residences of selected members of the Syndicate, but they have no time to deliver lectures to the students for which they are paid."

2. "Examiners' fees have been reduced so low that all sorts of corruption have begun to creep into the system of examination."

3. "It has been asserted that those who have been appointed Post-Graduate professors or teachers do not always possess the requisite qualifications for teaching those subjects they are placed in charge of."

4. "It is openly given out that the Registrar is incompetent for the office he holds, as is apparent from the letter he had addressed to Mr. Sharp. Sarcastic remarks are made that the nearness of the fish market has perhaps some bearing on the language used in the letter."

5. "Our University, a thing which we love, is now the mighty training ground of students in the art of flunkeyism and the science of sycophancy. Moral strength is not always acquired in that University in these days."

6. "You are asked to show receipts and give replies, and you refuse and get fidgety, this is the kind of thing you would expect from a hysterical girl, and not from such a great academic institution as the University."

7. "I need not go into details. My knowledge of the University is more or less secondhand; I have never visited it since I left it unscathed. But even with that knowledge, I know that there have been appointments which should never have been made. Posts have been given to men who have no proper knowledge or training."

8. "A public corporation created by a statute of our own predecessors, for, as regards the University, the Bengal Government has actually stepped into the shoes of the Government of India, a corporation receiving annually financial help from us, and knowing also that by next March it must have to come up to us for a sanction of its demands, that such a body with incomparable petulance can flout our Minister and deny our authority is inconceivable to me. Had it been an individual and not a corporation, I would have considered him moonstruck, fit only to be lodged in an asylum."

9. "So far as I am aware, there is a persistent and a genuine demand that there should be a sifting inquiry into how finances are kept, not merely of the Calcutta University but of many public bodies. That is only a sign of the times, and the reason is that while people sincerely subscribe, those who are charged with the administration of funds have a tendency of being insincere and extravagant."

Comment is needless.

#### CONCLUSION

A careful perusal of the Proceedings of the Council has convinced us that the reform which is most urgently needed in the best interests of the University and of the public, is the representation of the *Senate* on the Council. We are not unmindful that one of the seats on the Council is allocated to what is known as the University Constituency. That constituency is composed in the main of graduates of this University, and the person, elected by them, cannot necessarily be deemed as the representative of the *Senate*. He need not be, and in the present instance he is not, even a member of the

Senate. In such a contingency, he cannot be in intimate touch with the work entrusted to the Senate, nor can he possess that amount of detailed and up-to-date information on University affairs which is requisite to enable a person to discharge his duties as the spokesman of the Senate. It may be usefully recalled here that when the composition of the Bengal Legislative Council was determined in connection with the Reform Scheme, this University had no relations with the Local Government; indeed, it was intended at that time that for some years, even after its reconstruction in accordance with the report of the University Commission, it should, as before, stand in a special relation to the Government of India. In such circumstances, whatever apparent justification there might have been for the refusal of the application of the Senate to secure direct representation on the Council, it cannot be denied that the situation has radically altered since the University was brought into touch with the Local Government by Act VII of 1921. The matter is, indeed, too obvious to require elaboration; it is plainly immaterial that some members of the Senate may by chance find places on the Council from other constituencies. What must be regarded as a paramount and urgent need is that the Senate should be authorised to elect to the Council its own representatives, who may, whenever the occasion arises, speak on its behalf with knowledge and authority. If this reform should be effected, the repetition of what took place in the Council on the 29th August, 1921, would, one might well hope, be rendered impossible. For, even if we are constrained to admit that there may be, perhaps always will be, in all public assemblies, some members whose acts and utterances may not be invariably inspired, solely by a regard for public good, yet, we feel confident that a preponderating majority, when apprised of the facts, will resolutely refuse to lend their ears to tale-bearers, will fearlessly discharge the duties of their responsible positions, and will thereby justify the trust reposed in them.

In conclusion, we desire to place it on record that we have, without hesitation, utilised, in some places, the materials collected and the report framed by the Committee which was appointed by the Senate on the 13th March, 1922.

ASUTOSH MOOKERJEE.  
 NILRATAN SIRCAR.  
 G. C. BOSE.  
 ASUTOSH CHAUDHURI.  
 HIRALAL HALDAR.  
 J. WATT.  
 GEORGE HOWELLS.  
 BIDHAN CHANDRA ROY.  
 JATINDRANATH MAITRA.

*The 8th July, 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 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.

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:

*Non-recurring Grant.*

	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 "
<b>TOTAL</b> ...	<b>32 lakhs</b>

*Recurring Grant.*

	Rs.
(1) Professorship of Applied Mathematics ...	15,000
(2) Professorship of Modern History ...	15,000
(3) Professorship of Comparative Philology ...	15,000
<b>TOTAL</b> ...	<b>45,000</b>

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:—

	Rs.
Inspection of Colleges ...	25,000
Travelling Expenses of Fellows ...	5,000
University Law College ...	20,000
	{ 10,000
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.	8,000
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 student 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 of the University, 8 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 Taraknath Palit.*

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."

---

## APPENDIX III

CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF BENGAL  
ON THE SUBJECT OF THE RESOLUTION CONSIDERED  
IN THIS REPORT

*From W. C. Wordsworth, Esq., M.A., Deputy Secretary to the Government of Bengal, to the Registrar, Calcutta University, No. 2504 Edn., dated the 2nd December, 1921. (The Hon'ble Mr. P. C. Mitter, C.I.E., Minister in charge.)*

"I am directed to forward for the information of the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate a copy of the Resolution moved by Babu Rishindranath Sarkar regarding the appointment of a Committee to enquire into the finances of the Calcutta University, at the meeting of the Bengal Legislative Council held on the 29th August, 1921, together with the proceedings of the Council, pages 138-175 of the Council Proceedings, Volume V (copy enclosed). The matter is now under the consideration of Government and the observations of the University are invited on it."

## RESOLUTION.

(Under the rules for the discussion of matter of general public interest.)

*Calcutta University.*

Babu Rishindranath Sarkar: "This Council recommends to the Government that, with a view to determine what financial assistance, if any, should be given to the Calcutta University, a committee, consisting of two financial experts, and two members of the Senate, to be nominated by the Government, and three non-official members of this Council not holding any office in the University, to be elected by the Council, be appointed at an early date to enquire into and report on the general working of the University, in particular its financial administration, and recommend such urgent measures or reforms as may be necessary."

*From the Registrar, Calcutta University, to the Deputy Secretary to the Government of Bengal, Education Department, No. Misc. 4606, dated the 13th December, 1921.*

"With reference to your letter No. 2504 Education, dated the 2nd December, 1921, on the subject of the resolution moved by Mr. Rishindranath Sarkar, M.L.C., regarding the appointment of a committee to inquire into the finances of the University, I am directed by the Hon'ble the Vice-Chancellor and Syndicate to inform you that the following resolution was recorded by the Syndicate at their meeting held on the 9th December, 1921:

'That the Deputy Secretary to the Government of Bengal, Education Department, be informed that in order to enable the members of the Syndicate to form an opinion on the subject, it is necessary that 21 copies of the Proceedings should be forwarded to the University.'

*From the Registrar, Calcutta University, to the Deputy Secretary to the Government of Bengal, Education Department, No. Misc. 5130, dated the 17th January, 1922.*

"I have the honour to invite your attention to this office letter No. 4606, dated the 12th December, 1921, and to request that the copies of Proceedings asked for therein may be supplied at an early date."

*From the Registrar, Calcutta University, to W. C. Wordsworth, Esq., M.A., Deputy Secretary to the Government of Bengal, No. D.O.-G. 81, dated the 30th January, 1922.*

"You spoke to me the other day regarding supply of 21 copies of the Proceedings of the Council meeting held on the 29th August, 1921, which contain the debates on the subject of the resolution moved by Mr. Rishindranath Sarkar regarding the appointment of a committee to enquire into the finances of the University. I have ascertained from office that the copies have not been received. I sent you a reminder on the subject on the 17th instant."

*From the Deputy Secretary to the Government of Bengal, to the Registrar, Calcutta University, No. 379 Edn., dated the 22nd February, 1922.*

"With reference to your letter No. Misc. 4606, dated the 12th December, 1921, and subsequent reminder, I send herewith 15 copies of the Debates in Council on the resolution of Babu Rishindranath Sarkar regarding the appointment of a committee to enquire into the finances of the Calcutta University.

*From the Registrar, University of Calcutta, to the Deputy Secretary to the Government of Bengal, Education Department, No. Misc. 6090, dated the 2nd March, 1922.*

"I am directed to inform you that your letter No. 379 Edn., dated the 22nd February, 1922, together with the copies of the debates mentioned therein, was laid before the Syndicate on the 24th *idem*. The Syndicate have ordered the copies to be circulated to the members with a view to appoint a Committee to consider the various points raised therein. This will necessarily take time and I shall communicate to you the decision of the Syndicate later on."

*From the Registrar, Calcutta University, to the Secretary to the Government of Bengal, Education Department, Misc. No. 6250, dated the 11th March, 1922.*

"I am directed to reply to your letter No. 379 Edn., dated the 22nd February, 1922, forwarding 15 copies of the Debates in Council on the resolution moved by Mr. Rishindranath Sarkar.

I have to observe at the outset that the Syndicate was not in a position to take into consideration the question raised in the Resolution till the 24th February last, as will appear from the following statement of dates :

Dates.

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.

Your letter of the 22nd February, which was received on the following date, was placed before the Syndicate on the 24th. The Syndicate thereupon directed that the copies of the Debates be circulated to the members of the Syndicate and that the matter be brought up after a fortnight. This order of the Syndicate was communicated to you in my letter No. Misc. 6090, dated the 2nd March, 1922. The matter was considered by the Syndicate last night. The Syndicate have directed me to inform Government that, in the opinion of the Syndicate, it is not necessary to appoint a committee to obtain financial information regarding the University inasmuch as such information in detail is already in possession of the Government. The accounts of the University are continuously audited by officers deputed by the Government for the purpose, and that work is so minutely done that it usually occupies 8 to 9 months every year. The audit has been completed up to June, 1920. The accounts for 1920-21 are now in course of audit and any financial information relating to that period, which may be required by Government, may be obtained from their officers who are now auditing the accounts of that period. As regards later period, financial information will be supplied whenever asked for. The resolution and the speeches appear to the Syndicate, however, to raise wider issues, which must be considered by the Senate, and the Syndicate have accordingly directed the matter to be placed before the Senate for such consideration. The Senate will meet on the 25th instant for the purpose.

*Resolution of the Senate, dated the 25th March, 1922.*

That the action taken by the Syndicate in the above matter be approved and that the further consideration of this matter be referred to a Committee of nine members of the Senate.