

Home(1918) Department.
Education

Ordinary SERIES.

G.O. No. 596

DATED 7-5-18

INDEXEL

[Despatch Abstract.]

Legislative Council.-

Recording notes connected with the resolutions on the subject of the cancellation of the orders prohibiting students from taking part in political movements, moved at the meeting of the ----- held on the 12th February 1918 by the Hon'ble Messrs. B.V. Narasimha Ayyar, B. Venkatapati Raju and P. Siva Rao and requesting the Director of Public Instruction to submit a draft of the necessary amendments to be made in the Madras Educational Rules with reference to the orders issued in G.O.No. 559, dated 1st May 1917 as modified by G.O. No. 1531, dated 3rd December 1917.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH RESOLUTIONS ON MATTERS OF
GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST.

(For the Meeting of the 12th February 1918.)

[SUBJECT.—*Students and public meetings.*]

The Hon'ble Mr. B. V. NARASIMHA AYYAR :—

IV. This Council recommends to His Excellency in Council that G.O. No. 559, Home (Education), dated the 1st May 1917, may be cancelled.

The Hon'ble Mr. B. VENKATAPATI RAJU :—

IX. This Council recommends to the Governor in Council that the Government be pleased to reconsider the orders issued in G.O. No. 559, Home (Education), dated 1st May 1917, and G.O. No. 1531, Home (Education), dated 3rd December 1917, and confine to the Disciplinary Regulations, Chapter VIII (a) of the Madras Educational Rules.

The Hon'ble Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—

XXVIII. This Council recommends to His Excellency the Governor in Council that G.O. No. 559, dated 1st May 1917, and also the amending G.O. No. 1531, Home (Education), dated 3rd December, may be cancelled.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

attached Attention is solicited to the notes written in connexion with the resolutions on the subject of "students and politics" proposed to be moved at the meeting of the Legislative Council of the 20th November last but subsequently withdrawn. Since those notes were written, the Government have issued orders in G.O. No. 1531, Home (Education), dated the 3rd December 1917, vesting full discretion in heads of colleges in regard to the attendance of under-graduate students at political meetings, maintaining at the same time the policy of Government as enunciated in the previous order.

2. The Hon'ble Mr. B. V. Narasimha Ayyar now suggests that G.O. No. 559, dated the 1st May 1917, should be cancelled, while the Hon'ble Mr. B. Venkatapati Raju desires that both the G.Os. No. 559, dated 1st May 1917 and No. 1531, dated 3rd December 1917, should be reconsidered and that only the Disciplinary Regulations in Chapter VIII-A of the Madras Educational Rules should be enforced.

3. It is observed that circumstances have not changed for the better since the issue of the above orders to warrant their reconsideration. The proceedings of the recent Madras Students' Convention show that the students in this Presidency are in need of more control and guidance and can hardly be trusted to look after themselves.

4. Orders are solicited as to whether the resolutions should be discussed in Council, whether further particulars should be called for and who should be in charge of them.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—24-1-18.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—25-1-18.

I am for opposing the resolution.

P. R. AJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR—28-1-18.

Yes: strongly.

H. F. W. GILLMAN—28-1-18.

I agree.

A. G. C. ARDEW—28-1-18.

I agree.

P. ENTLAND—1-2-18.

No definite orders have been passed on paragraph 4 of the office-note above. It is presumed that the resolutions are not to be discussed in Council and that the Director of Public Instruction will take charge of them. A draft u.o. note informing Legislative accordingly is submitted for approval.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—4-2-18.

Orders will be passed next Friday.

R. RAMACHANDRA RAO—5-2-18.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH RESOLUTIONS ON MATTERS OF GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST.

[Meeting of 20th November 1917.]

[SUBJECT.—Cancellation of G.O. No. 559, Home (Education), dated 1st May 1917, regarding students and politics.]

The Hon'ble Mr. B. V. NARASIMHA AYYAR :—

VI. This Council recommends to His Excellency in Council that G.O. No. 559, dated 1st May 1917, regarding the attendance of students at public meetings, etc., be cancelled.

The Hon'ble Rao Bahadur V. K. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR :—

XI. This Council recommends to His Excellency the Governor in Council that it is absolutely necessary to withdraw G.O. No. 559, Home (Education), on the subject of students and politics.

The Hon'ble Mr. B. VENKATAPATI RAJU :—

XXIII. This Council recommends to the Governor in Council that the Government be pleased to reconsider the orders issued in G.O. No. 559, Home (Education), dated 1st May 1917, and confine to the Disciplinary Regulations, Chapter VIII A of the Madras Educational Rules.

The Hon'ble Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—

XLIV. This Council recommends to His Excellency the Governor in Council that the G.O. No. 559, Home (Education), dated 1st May 1917, may be cancelled.

The Hon'ble Mr. K. SADASIYA BHAT :—

XLV. That this Council recommends to His Excellency in Council that G.O. No. 559, Home (Education), should be withdrawn.

HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

In their circular No. 332-35, dated the 4th May 1907, the Government of India drew attention to the dangers with which higher education in India was threatened by the tendency of both teachers and pupils in colleges and schools to associate themselves with political movements and take a prominent part in organizing and carrying out overt acts of political agitation. They observed :—

" This tendency is of comparatively recent growth, and the Government of India have hitherto refrained from adopting specific measures to counteract its effects in the belief that parents, teachers and the more sensible or less impressionable students could not fail to realize that the spirit of lawlessness and resistance to authority thus engendered among the young is bound in the long run to set back the advance of genuine education, to injure the material prospects of the students, and to subvert the traditional foundations of Indian family life. The Governor-General in Council entertains no doubt that the great majority of sensible Indian parents whatever may be their political opinions, regard with the gravest apprehensions the imminent danger that education will be interfered with and the efficiency of schools and colleges impaired by the minds of pupils and students being diverted from their proper work and by the relaxation of discipline which must inevitably result from their being allowed to take part in political agitation.

" 2. The question affects the entire field of higher education, but the principle to be applied and the procedure to be adopted will differ according as school-boys or college students, school-masters or professors of colleges have to be dealt with. The case of the pupils of high schools presents little difficulty. In the interests of the boys themselves it is clearly undesirable that they should be distracted from their work by attending political meetings or engaging in any form of political agitation.

"3. The case of students of affiliated colleges stands on a somewhat different footing. They are no longer school boys but undergraduates, and a certain proportion of them are Bachelors of Arts who may reasonably claim some wider liberty of action than is permitted to school boys. In regard to them, therefore, the Government of India are not prepared to lay down as a general rule that mere attendance at political meetings, as distinguished from taking an active part in their proceedings, would necessarily call for the adoption of disciplinary measures against the college. Although, however, they admit that the degree of discipline which is essential for a school boy may be inappropriate and even undesirable in the case of a student, still they must insist upon the principle that colleges exist for the purpose of education, and they cannot regard with indifference the conversion of such institutions into centres for the dissemination of political doctrines of whatever character. If therefore certain students of an affiliated college were to attend political meetings and there so conduct themselves as to bring undesirable notoriety upon their college, or to engage in political agitation in such a way as to interfere with the corporate life and educational work of the place, and still more if such propagandism assumed the form of picketing and open violence, it is obvious that the local Government concerned could no longer remain passive but would be bound, in the interests of education, to take steps to procure the withdrawal from the college, at any rate for a period, of the privilege of affiliation to the University."

2. Accordingly the following regulations were inserted in the Madras Educational Rules:—

(1) Graduate and under-graduate students on the rolls of colleges under public managements are forbidden to take an active part in political agitation directed against the authority of the Government. Principals may further at their discretion forbid students to engage prominently in any public movement with which it seems undesirable that persons in *status pupillari* should be associated.

(2) If students of such colleges attend political meetings and there conduct themselves in any manner which is forbidden or unbecoming or engage in political agitation in such a way as to interfere with the corporate life and educational work of the college, the Principal of the college may suspend or expel them or refuse the grant of term certificates for a specified period and may also report their case to the University with the view of their being dealt with under Regulation 96 of the University Regulations.

(7) No manager or member of the staff or of the establishment shall be permitted to take part in political agitation directed against the authority of Government or to inculcate opinions tending to excite feelings of political disloyalty or disaffection; and the pupils should not be permitted to attend political meetings or to engage in any form of political agitation.

3. Owing however to attempts made by recently started political movements to bring under their influence students in colleges and schools and the need for protecting students from the undesirable consequences of such association the Government considered it necessary to supplement the instructions already issued. Accordingly the following further instructions were issued in G.O. No 559, Home (Education), dated the 1st May 1917:—

"The Government therefore direct that no under-graduate student in any college and no pupil in any school shall be permitted to take part in public political discussions, to attend political meetings, to join any political association or to take part in any movement with which it is, in the opinion of the educational authorities, undesirable that persons still in *status pupillari* shall be associated. His Excellency in Council directs that heads of colleges and schools, whether under public management or otherwise, shall strictly enforce these directions. In doing so they should have regard not merely to the declared purpose of a meeting, but also to the speakers who will address it."

4. The object and scope of the instructions was fully explained by His Excellency the Governor in his speech at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 24th May 1917 which is extracted below:—

"The question paper contains a reference to one of the recent orders issued by the Government on the subject of school boys and students at colleges. This subject has been under the consideration of the Government for some time and I take this opportunity of communicating our conclusions upon it to the Council rather more fully than has hitherto been possible.

"There is no foundation whatever for the suggestion that one of these orders was issued purposely at a date inconvenient to the Cuddalore Conference. The Honourable Member who asked a question in that sense is not, I believe, originally responsible for that suggestion of which

he has been, I fear, the innocent victim. The facts are, as I have already said, that this subject has for some time been under the consideration of the Government and the college recess was deliberately chosen for the issue of these orders as likely to be convenient to all concerned.

"Let me say in the first place that the object which the Government has in view is purely educational. Students remain as free as heretofore in their leisure to acquaint themselves, in their college debating societies and by such means, with the politics and public affairs of the world which they are about to enter. For support in the enforcement of these orders the Government look with confidence to school and college authorities, to the parents and guardians of scholars and students, and in the case of colleges to the students themselves.

"There is no foundation so far as I am aware for any general complaint against the conduct of college students in the Madras Presidency; and these orders have not been provoked by any action on the part of the students. Indeed they have been issued in justice to the students and to their rights as students, in order to secure to them during their student life full opportunities for study, for their equipment for life, and for the development and formation of character before entering upon their life's work. Immersed as most of us here are in public affairs, is there one of us who does not wish that he were better equipped for the discharge of his public duties? There may be some who are fortunate enough to have no regrets for time wasted and opportunities lost during the precious years of student life. If there are any such here, I congratulate them with all my heart. But I make bold to say that there is not one of us who does not recognize that, once these years have passed by, such opportunities are gone never to return in their early fullness. As the responsibilities of life increase, so do leisure and other means of self-improvement and cultivation diminish, to the infinite regret of most of us and probably to the detriment of our usefulness in the world. Thus these orders are intended to do justice to the students to secure to them their rights as students and the same opportunities as are enjoyed by students in other countries; rights and opportunities which no wise parent and no true lover of his country will grudge or deny to the rising generation. These orders have met with some adverse criticism; and in certain quarters, in which paradoxically the force of the educational considerations involved is admitted, the action of the Government has been denounced as opposed to the best interests of the country and Government regret to observe that it has been openly challenged by the announcement that counter-measures will be taken. I cannot think however that such criticisms will carry weight. I do not believe that the purpose of the Government in this matter will be misunderstood by students or by parents and guardians or by college authorities: and it is satisfactory and creditable to those concerned that there should be already signs that in this matter the Madras Government has the support not only of educationalists but also of the general body of public opinion."

5. The question was discussed at a Conference of Principals of Colleges held at Government House on the 18th July 1917. The nature of the discussions is set out in the subjoined extract:—

"The Principal of the Maharaja's College, Vizianagram, said that discussion of politics and religion was entirely prohibited in his college, as it was feared that it could only result in acute differences of opinion and friction. It was pointed out that political meetings were generally held in the vacation and that principals of colleges could not exercise influence or control at such times. In some cases parents themselves encouraged their children to work as volunteers at political meetings. A suggestion was put forward that the responsibility should be thrown on the promoters of such meetings. If the principal or any member of the college staff were required to watch and report which students attended political meetings, such espionage might destroy the good relations which should exist between students and teachers. His Excellency remarked that the practice of attending public political meetings had been on the increase among students and that the Government strongly held and were frequently advised that this could not fail to distract them from their proper work. He asked whether it would be possible for that practice to grow up without the cognizance of the principals and staff of the colleges or right that they should disregard it. It was suggested that its control was a matter for the police. His Excellency pointed out that that was entirely contrary to the view of the Government. Dr. Skinner said that if principals of colleges had been addressed privately calling attention to the evils, the effect might have been good. He added that he thought the Government Order was a mistake and expressed the opinion that if students were in these matters to be placed under the surveillance of the college staff mutual confidence would be impaired. Mr. Davey suggested that another course might be adopted: students might be openly and frankly warned not to attend a particular meeting and that a professor would be there to take note of the students who went to that meeting in spite of such warning. He contended that this was not espionage. It was urged, on the other hand, that such a step would create disunion and antagonism between principals and students and that professional sentiment was against the course suggested.

"His Excellency observed that in view of the numerous and strong representations which had reached the Government before the order was issued the Government could come to no other conclusion than that the issue of such an order was urgently necessary in the interests not only of students but also of their parents. It was unnecessary for him to repeat upon this occasion what

he had already said publicly as to the purpose of the order, which was briefly to protect the interests and rights of students during the years of their education, to help them to concentrate their efforts on the work proper to those years, and to avoid distractions of all kinds. If students were fully informed as to the limits of conduct laid down for them by their college authorities, no question of espionage must necessarily arise at all. This order was an educational order, issued in the interests of education, and to be enforced not by the police whose employment in any way in this matter the Government considered highly undesirable and indeed out of the question, but by college authorities. For its enforcement the Government looked with confidence to the principals of colleges, recognising that the practical working of the order, for which rigid rules are not at present appropriate, must be left to experience. There would be no alteration of the order. His Excellency concluded by saying that he was particularly grateful to those who had discussed the various bearings of the order from different standpoints, that the Government desired to support and facilitate the endeavours of principals of colleges, and that at all times any further suggestions for achieving the purpose in view would receive full consideration."

6. Subsequent to the issue of the order there have been disturbances among students in certain centres, e.g., Trichinopoly, Guntur, Madanapalle and Madurai. The memorial has also been addressed to Government by the students of the Basel Mission College, Calicut, and a deputation of certain citizens of Trichinopoly headed by the Hon'ble Mr. V. K. Ramanuja Achariyar is shortly to wait on His Excellency the Governor. The special session of the Madras Provincial Conference held recently has also protested against the terms of the order. The principal arguments advanced by the memorialists are :—

(1) that the Government Order is superfluous in the face of the disciplinary regulations contained in Chapter XVIII. A of the Madras Educational Rules ;

(2) that the order prohibits college students even from attending political meetings and that it takes away from them a privilege accorded to students in every civilized country and also deprives them of the chances of obtaining valuable education by attending the lectures of eminent men ;

(3) that it vests in heads of colleges who are in several cases actuated by strong racial and political prejudices to pronounce upon the character of the speakers at public meetings ;

(4) that it gives rise to a pernicious and sometimes revengeful spy system and thereby brings about suspicion and mutual mistrust among the students ;

(5) that it has a tendency to make the teachers act as spies and to diminish the respect and love which they otherwise command from their students.

(6) that it is an encroachment upon the legitimate aspirations of the younger generation who ought to be the citizens of the future ;

(7) that the mere attendance of students at political meetings cannot prove harmful as apprehended in the Government Order referred to above ;

(8) that the powers vested by the Government Order in principals of colleges and heads of institutions are often likely to be abused, inasmuch as the attendance of students at a meeting which may have little or no flavour of politics about it or which cannot be easily defined as purely or quasi-political or even non-political might be interpreted as an abnormal case of the violation of the Government Order and of course as a breach of discipline.

7. The above arguments appear to be based on the assumption that the students require little or no guidance in their most impressionable period of life and the heads of institutions cannot be trusted to exercise the discretion vested in them properly. No attempt is made to refute the fact that serious injury is caused to a student's studies by his attending political meetings and his future prospects in life are thereby frustrated.

8. It will be seen from the Chief Secretary's note, dated the 5th October 1917, that it has been decided not to modify the orders already issued.

9. Orders are requested whether the resolution should be discussed in Council, whether further particulars should be called for and as to who should be in charge of it.

N.W. 2-11-17

C.R. 3. 11. 17

R.R. 3. 11. 17

Extract from the Proceedings of a Meeting of the Council of the Governor at Fort St. George assembled for the purpose of making Laws and Regulations under the provisions of the Act of Parliament, 5 & 6 Geo. V, Ch. 61.

The Council assembled at the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at 11 a.m. on Tuesday the 12th day of February 1918.

RESOLUTION RE STUDENTS AND PUBLIC MEETINGS.

The Hon'ble Mr. B. V. NARASIMHA AYYAR :—" Your Excellency, Resolutions Nos. IV, V and VI are all practically to the same effect. I propose to discuss all these resolutions because they all come to the same thing."

His Excellency the PRESIDENT :—" Yes. You may do so."

The Hon'ble Mr. B. V. NARASIMHA AYYAR :—" My resolution is to this effect :—

' IV. This Council recommends to His Excellency in Council that G.O. No. 559, Home (Education), dated 1st May 1917, may be cancelled.'

" Your Excellency, in starting the discussion on these resolutions which are all practically the same, I wish to eliminate the possibilities of misunderstanding my position. In the first place, the main matter of contention relates to the attendance of under-graduates at political meetings ; and therefore the discussion, I take it, will be entirely confined to the question of under-graduates. Next, I hope it would be distinctly understood that it is not a political discussion that we embark upon, though unfortunately the reference to ' political propaganda ' in G.O. No. 559 makes some reference to politics necessary. I hope that the discussion will not be thought to be or made to be one of a political nature. The third safeguard that I wish to have at the outset is this. I presume it would be understood on all hands

(Mr. Narasimha Ayyar.)

[12TH FEBRUARY 1918.]

that every one is anxious that students should have the very best education that our institutions, whether Government or private institutions, could afford to give, that no one in this hall at any rate is anxious that their energies should be dissipated and their minds distracted by unhealthy attempts either at political propaganda of one sort or another or at religious propaganda or any other sort of propaganda. We are, all of us here, unanimous in desiring that the youth of this country should have as good an education as our institutions, whether under Government management or under private management, could impart.

"With these premises, I propose to point out how the three resolutions are practically one and the same. 'The first resolution, that is mine, prays that G.O. No. 559, Home (Education), dated 1st May 1917, be cancelled. The second resolution which is in the name of the Hon'ble Mr. Venkatapati Raju is to this effect:—

'V. This Council recommends to the Governor in Council that the Government be pleased to reconsider the orders issued in G.O. No. 559, Home (Education), dated 1st May 1917, and G.O. No. 1531, Home (Education), dated 3rd December 1917, and confine to the Disciplinary Regulations, Chapter VIII (a), of the Madras Educational Rules.'

"I shall presently show how this resolution comes to the same thing. The third which stands in the name of the Hon'ble Mr. Siva Rao prays that—

'VI. This Council recommends to His Excellency the Governor in Council that G.O. No. 559, dated 1st May 1917, and also the amending G.O. No. 1531, Home (Education), dated 3rd December, may be cancelled.'

"This resolution wishes in effect to leave the educational rules as they were in 1916 in-tact.

"I may point out that there may appear to be some difference in the wording of these resolutions. I hope that will not add to the complications already inherent in the subject that we are handling. I wish to invite the attention of Honourable Members of this Council to the disciplinary regulations contained in chapter VIII-A printed at page 24 of the Madras Educational Rules. Rules I and II under the heading of 'colleges under public management' are the rules that require special attention. The heading is 'Disciplinary Regulations' and the sub-heading is 'colleges under public management.' There is no provision for other colleges for the very best of reasons that neither in this country nor in any other country have the Government been found to be the proper persons to issue regulations to private colleges with regard to the discipline of their own boys. With reference to colleges under public management, this is the first rule: 'Graduates and under-graduate students on the rolls of colleges under public management are forbidden to take an active part in political agitation directed against the authority of the Government.' Honourable Gentlemen would note these words. What is forbidden is in relation to agitation directed against the authority of the Government, that is, sedition. Therefore, the rules as they originally were, appeared to require only abstention from taking part in seditious agitation. Everyone of us must say that this is a very wholesome rule. Otherwise, our boys would be in gaol or bound over for good behaviour. There are other rules that show that it is not only seditious meetings which should be forbidden. 'Principals may further at their discretion forbid students to engage prominently in any public movement with which it seems undesirable that persons in *status pupillari* should be associated.' This is the second portion. That is, the Government themselves forbid participation in sedition and Principals are expected to exercise discretion in forbidding under-graduates from engaging prominently in any public movement with which it is undesirable that they should be connected. The second rule goes further to elucidate the matter. The expression of the one is the exclusion of the other. The second rule makes it clear. 'If students of such colleges attend political meetings and there conduct themselves in any manner which is forbidden or unbecoming, or engage in political agitation in such a way as to interfere with the corporate life and educational work of the college, the Principal of the college may suspend or expel them or refuse the grant of term certificates for a specified period and may also report their case to the University with the view of their being dealt with under Regulation 96 of the University Regulations.' Then rule 4 which has a slight bearing on this says: 'Principals or other constituted college or hostel authorities may frame and issue from time to time disciplinary rules of a permanent or temporary character regulating the conduct outside the college or hostel precincts, of graduate and under-graduate students on the rolls so far as such rules seem necessary (a) to secure the observance of rules (1) and (2), (b) to maintain the credit and reputation of the college or hostel.' Rules 1 and 2 are with reference to students not taking part in seditious meetings and not engaging prominently in any public movement with which it would be undesirable that they should be associated. These are the rules as they originally were. You will see clearly that these rules are quite sufficient to empower principals or wardens of institutions framing either temporary or permanent rules and seeing to it that young men do not engage either in seditious or other undesirable forms of work. The rules nowhere forbid mere attendance. On the other hand, rule 2 implies that under-graduates might attend. There is a rule with reference to this under the heading of 'Recognized Schools' and with reference to them there is an absolute prohibition about their attendance at public meetings. From the educational rules, it is absolutely clear that till the year 1917

12TH FEBRUARY 1918.]

(Mr. Narasimha Ayyar.)

the rules distinctly permitted under-graduates attending political meetings, provided always, of course, that if there was anything particular that was done by the students besides being present, suppose, they engage prominently in any movement, or took steps which would affect the credit and reputation of the college—in those cases, there was sufficient power in the hands of the Principal to check such wrong action on the part of the students. That was till May 1917 the state of the rules. That, I presume, is the state of disciplinary rules and regulations with reference to education in other free countries. I shall come to discuss that question presently.

"Now the question is whether G.O. No. 559 which made an alteration of the rules is a desirable Government Order. I shall first deal with the question whether G.O. No. 559 which modifies these rules is a desirable modification. I shall take up G.O. No. 559 and point out what it is. G.O. No. 559 is headed rather ominously 'Students taking part in political movements.' You remember what the previous rules were. They were that they should not take active part but here the words used are 'taking part.' Further down, the ominous character is fully explained. It is a very short Government Order and I propose to read it. Though I have only 22 minutes I think it absolutely essential that I should read it as there is already a great deal of confusion. 'The attention of the Government has been drawn to the attempts which have of late been made to bring students in schools and colleges under the influence—what sort of influence it is not stated—of a political propaganda. His Excellency the Governor in Council is strongly of opinion that, in the interests both of educational advance and of the youths themselves, it is unwholesome and undesirable that students shall be involved in such discussions—a very vague phrase—and he has arrived at the conclusion that the time has come when action should be taken to deal with this tendency.' The tendency is, evidently, that of coming under the influence of a political propaganda. Then it says 'His Excellency in Council believes that to this end the parents and guardians of the students in question can give valuable aid by using their influence against the practice of students taking part in political agitation,—not taking active part, but taking any part,—and he trusts that they will realize the grave responsibility which lies on them in this respect. It is necessary also that the educational authorities should use their powers in the same direction. The disciplinary regulations which are contained in Chapter VIII-A of the Madras Educational Rules'—I have already read them to you—'already contain certain directions on the subject. It has, however, been represented to His Excellency in Council that the directions in this chapter are insufficient to meet the present situation and that it is necessary to supplement them by further instructions.' It is merely said that it is represented; fuller details are not vouchsafed to us as to in what particulars it has been found to be insufficient. It is said that it is insufficient to meet the present situation, that is, a political propaganda. Then come the instructions. 'The Government therefore direct that no under-graduate student in any college and no pupil in any school shall be permitted to take part in public political discussions, to attend political meetings, to join any political association, or to take part in any movement with which it is, in the opinion of the educational authorities, undesirable that persons still in *status pupillari* shall be associated.' This is what I may refer to as being the decretal portion of the Order. There are four clauses three of which are more or less already included in Chapter VIII-A. The noticeably distinct addition is in this matter, that under-graduates are forbidden under this Government Order from attending political meetings. As for the other students, I already promised by saying that there is no question at all about them. The main point is that under-graduates are forbidden from attending political meetings. The next portion of the Government Order makes it quite clear. 'His Excellency in Council directs that heads of colleges and schools, whether under public management or otherwise, shall strictly enforce these directions.' In doing so, they should have regard not merely to the declared purpose of a meeting, but also to the speakers who will address it.' The last line has been fruitful of much misunderstanding and misconstruction, though it is not of such importance that I should immediately deal with it.

"I wish therefore to point out what in this Government Order is the real or the basic principle of the policy underlying it. Whenever we refer to the policy of a new Government Order we mean the point of departure from the old. The first is the extension of the former rules applying only to Government colleges to private colleges. That is the first point. The second point on which I wish to lay stress is the absolute prohibition of all attendance of under-graduates at political meetings. You see, therefore, that that is the principle of the policy of this Government Order.

"Again, with reference to the policy, I shall have to read out to you the very next Government Order. I might be asked why I was reading a Government Order in so much detail which some people fancy has been superseded. I shall read the next Government Order and show the difficulties that have been created. G.O. No. 1531, Home (Education), dated 3rd December 1917, is to this effect: 'Representations have been made to the Government by various college authorities that while they are in complete agreement with the policy underlying G.O. No. 559, dated 1st May 1917,—you will notice that legal fictions have been extended to educational documents—namely the desirability of preventing the participation of students in politics the terms of the Government Order as regards the attendance of under-graduate students at political meetings are unduly rigid and deprive principals of the discretion which rightly belongs to heads of colleges.' This is a paragraph which however hard I have tried, I failed in my efforts to understand. The policy of the original Government Order was not in forbidding participation as distinguished from attendance, but it is prevention from attendance. That was the policy; but somehow, the authorities responsible for this Government Order have

RESOLUTION RE STUDENTS AND PUBLIC MEETINGS.

(Mr. Narasimha Ayyar.)

[12TH FEBRUARY 1918.]

understood it differently. Then comes the difficulty which I am now going to refer to. 'His Excellency the Governor in Council recognizes the force of this criticism and, while maintaining the policy of the Government Order, he has come to the conclusion that this can best be secured'—the policy referred to means that students should not participate in politics—'by entrusting its enforcement to heads of colleges'—I do not know what 'this' means, whether it is the enforcement of the Government Order or of the policy of the Government Order—'who will exercise their discretion in the circumstances of their respective institutions. He has accordingly resolved to commit to heads of colleges this discretion, believing that these authorities will loyally carry out the wishes of the Government and that in so doing, they will receive in full measure the support of parents and guardians of students.' Now, my difficulty has arisen out of this Government Order. If this Government Order did not stand there, there would be less of confusion. It would be quite clear that the former Government Order made out a case for absolute prohibition of students, and in so far as that was concerned, it was an absolutely faulty Government Order. I thought it was condemned on all hands and there was very little chance of that Government Order surviving. Some of my honourable friends believed that this old Government Order had been cancelled, and that there was no bar to students attending. I note that the Government do not wish to say so, —Government have expressed no inclination to say so. On the other hand, they say that they maintain the policy of the old Government Order and they want it to be enforced loyally by the various principals so that it is only a change in the manner of enforcement. Formerly, they thought that they themselves were responsible; but now they want others to be responsible. *Qui facit per alium facit per se.*

"What is the policy that is proposed to be maintained? It appears to me that what they wish principals to do, is to find out whether in the circumstances of their institution, the policy of absolute prohibition could be safely enforced. Suppose a college consists of 25 boys and if they are forbidden to join political meetings, the college might cease to exist—then in the circumstances of that institution, they could excuse violations of the law, because its enforcement is found to be impracticable! Whether that is what is meant or anything else, I cannot make out; but I shall wait for the explanation to be given by the Government to find out what is meant.

"I shall assume that the old Government Order is practically still in force and only the penalty is excused in certain cases where principals do not take too serious a view. I shall discuss how far the old Government Order is a proper measure. I shall point out that it is mischievous in several particulars and requires not only modification but total cancellation. The first point that I wish to bring to the notice of Honourable Members of this Council is that the admitted object of all of us is to promote a pure atmosphere, and that is the very thing that is defeated by this Government Order. I am quite anxious that students should not be driven to violent political excitement. Has this Government Order achieved that end? Or has it done the reverse? We find it has done the very reverse. Students who never cared to attend political meetings, now that it is tabooed, have taken to attending political meetings. In Sir W. Fraser's words on Wellington, we find at page 43 the following passage: 'when I was at Eton there was the strictest sumptuary law against wearing Wellington boots. The result was that every boy possessed a pair but not being allowed to keep them at his tutor's or Dame's house, they were invariably left at the boot maker's. The first thing done by every boy after he had 'got leave' was to go up town and to order his Wellington boots to be sent to his rooms. This was "de rigueur"; and I doubt whether any boy at Eton in those days went "on leave" except in "Wellingtons." Boys are boys everywhere.

"When there is a prohibition, the object of which is not intelligible and which does not command public approval, the first impulse is to violate it. Human nature is acting in certain ways and we have to take note of these facts. By merely tabooing political meetings, in point of fact we have driven large numbers into political associations who have been formerly content with reading newspapers. That is the mischief which is done by this Government Order. This is the opinion not merely of non-officials but also of persons in educational ranks. They have told me that they noted this with great pain to be the one effect of the Government Order.

"The second point which I wish to mention is that the object of keeping young men from excitement must be understood to be avoidance of undue excitement. We cannot taboo all political meetings. A lot of violent politics is reported in newspapers and boys read newspapers. They should not be excited by that form of politics; but otherwise boys must read newspapers and they must see how the world gets on and form mature opinions. There are certain movements which affect the whole of society and during the last four or five years, these movements have been affecting the whole of India and operating in every grade and class, raising great hopes of a renovated self-governing India with her literature, arts and sciences developed in accordance with the national genius and fulfilling her high destiny of making important contributions once again to the world's culture and civilization. It will be outrageous to ask the young men not to know and be influenced by these and to prepare themselves for their future career. Attempts at 'influence of a political propaganda' are referred to in the Government Order. If these attempts intimate to them that there is a glorious future, the attempts are proper, no Government Order ought to be issued to put down those attempts. But I do not know what the attempts are that are referred to in the Government Order.

"We cannot shut out students from the various impulses which are operating in society; and if we do they will be most stunted and will have a miserable career in after life. If this Government Order prevented them from taking any part in political discussions, this Government Order is wrong and must be cancelled.

12TH FEBRUARY 1918.] (Mr. Narasimha Ayyar; Mr. Venkatapati Raju.)

"My third contention relates to prestige, which superficial thinkers might fancy to be lost by the cancellation now suggested. As a fact it is the retention of the Government Order that weakens and it is its cancellation that will enhance prestige. An order of Government which cannot be obeyed makes their prestige suffer. We must warn Government, in spite of their good intentions, from taking steps which would have the result of issuing orders which will be mere dead-letters. The prestige of Government is not their special property or sole concern. The public are interested in its maintenance at least as much as the Government, as the former know that a Government with prestige can carry on cheap and efficient administration which in the absence of such prestige cannot be achieved except with a costly and irritating machinery of a standing army.

"The other point is that this new policy is mischievous in destroying the root of moral or even intellectual education. The very essence of proper education is the confidence between the pupils and the masters. We must have reverence for the teacher before we can benefit by his teaching. It is not actually what the master teaches, but the moral relation that forms the most important portion of education. What is the effect of this Government Order? We find in the case of several of these professors that they turn into police officers; it has made some to play the part of a spy or to get some boys to spy over others. Public life has been demoralized and education is deteriorating. We have laid the axe at the root of education by laying down this Government Order. Hypocrisy, servility and a number of other vices flourish. I wish to point out that friends of mine who have been to England and some English friends and persons who are acquainted with other countries tell me that there is absolutely no such thing corresponding to this in any free and civilized countries; under-graduates are not forbidden from attending political meetings. The Indian student is just like his compeer in other places. I am told some of the under-graduates there take to discussing high politics in their own way and attend all sorts of gatherings, but that their guardians, parents and wardens have the power to punish them if they did anything wrong. Let us compare conditions in India. I have been anxiously inquiring what is the reason of the promulgation of this order. Government have been informed that in the city of Madras there has been an undesirable ebullition on the part of young men and therefore this Government Order was issued. That is the historical explanation. It is not a justification, but a mere historical explanation of the Government Order from my standpoint. What strikes me is this: for a local evil it is hardly necessary to issue a Government Order which affects the whole Presidency. Supposing you find an evil prevailing in one or two places in the Presidency, have you exhausted all the remedies? Have you got in all the principals and consulted them and found out what they could do under the old rules? Absolutely nothing was done. This Government Order was got up in great haste and its immediate effect was the last evil which I am going to mention, namely, that it dwarfs and stunts the growth of boys in their University course.

"The first application of the Government Order—what was it? A number of young men were sitting at the Cuddalore Provincial Conference where a number of selected gentlemen who had no intention of supporting political violence or ebullitions on the part of students were considering questions which were to be placed before the Government. Students used to come up and fan us and bring us water and render such social services, and these students are called volunteers. Question No. 114 in May last asked whether the Government intended stopping social service of volunteers at Provincial Conferences. Government said that considerations of that sort would not affect them, but they said 'questions of educational importance alone have guided us in this Government Order.' That means social service and attendance for the purpose of social service is an evil. I do not know on such eminent men as Mr. Gokhale or Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya. My opinion is that this Government Order did not do any harm to any conference or to any political propaganda. They could take care of themselves, but they are harming the students most. The Government Order is defeating its own end. I have come very nearly to the end of my time under old rules. There is a lot of petty tyranny exercised by the last clause of the Government Order. Power is already given even under the old rules to prevent mischief by students. When this Government Order was issued, we find remarkable results. Even people like the Hon'ble Mr. Srinivasa Sastri may be called dangerous for young men to come near. Other eminent persons whom all of us honour may be considered in the wonderful wisdom near. Other eminent dangerous persons and so any contact between them and students may be forbidden. To my knowledge such ludicrous orders were passed regarding eminent persons by certain quixotic or servile teachers.

"It is sufficient for me to say that the old Government Order requires to be cancelled and not confirmed, as G.O. No. 1531 does. G.O. No. 1531 only leaves the punishment in the hands of principals. That is not sufficient. We want that the root of the matter should be gone into and the Government Order cancelled.

"With these words, I commend my resolution."

The Hon'ble Mr. B. VENKATAPATI RAJU:—"Your Excellency, in seconding this resolution moved by the Hon'ble Mr. Narasimha Ayyar I want to avoid moving my own proposition No. V because the same points are dealt with in his resolution. The question that I propose to place for the consideration of this Council in connexion with this subject is how far the State is placed for the consideration of this Council in connexion with this subject is how far the State is justified in interfering with educational discipline. I shall refer to the memorable speech of Your Excellency on the 24th of May in connexion with this Government Order on these points. Your Excellency laid down three propositions, the one is that the liberties of Indian students are not at all curtailed in India more than in any other civilized country. The second proposition

laid down by Your Excellency is that Your Excellency wants to protect the rights and interests of students and not at all to curtail their rights and liberties. The third proposition which Your Excellency laid down is that this Government Order was based purely on educational grounds and not at all on any political grounds or even with any political tinge in it. Now, we have to see how far these objects are attained either by the issue of this original G.O. No. 559 or the subsequent attempt at modification in G.O. No. 1531. In order to simplify matters Government themselves in G.O. No. 559 say with reference to what object that Government Order was issued, that is, students taking part in political movements and in indexing the present resolution also, the Government note that it is concerning students and public meetings. Out of the four points which are embodied in G.O. No. 559 there is no difference between the public and the Government with reference to three matters. With regard to taking part in public political discussions, it was never advocated either on the platform or in the press that under-graduates should take part in public political discussions. The second thing is that they are not entitled to join in political associations. Nobody wants them. The third is that they should not take part in any movement which is condemned by the educational authorities as undesirable. Nobody wants it. Therefore, the only point in dispute between the Government and the public is with reference to the attendance of under-graduates at public meetings. Nobody wants students studying in schools to attend political meetings. Chapter VIII-A provides that no students should attend any political meeting. We are not asking the Government to reconsider the educational rules under Chapter VIII-A. Therefore, the only question to consider is whether under-graduates should be prohibited absolutely from attending political meetings or whether they should be permitted conditionally with the permission of the principal and whether with reference to these conditions, any policy should be followed. In support of my observations, I would only read a few sentences from the speech of Your Excellency on the 24th of May in connexion with G.O. No. 559 : 'Let me say in the first place that the object which the Government has in view is purely educational. Students remain as free as heretofore in their leisure to acquaint themselves, in their college debating societies and by such means, with the politics and public affairs of the world which they are about to enter.'

“‘There is no foundation so far as I am aware for any general complaint against the conduct of college students in the Madras Presidency : and these orders have not been provoked by any action on the part of the students. Indeed they have been issued in justice to the students and to their rights as students, in order to secure to them during their student life full opportunities for study, for their equipment for life, and for the development and formation of character before entering upon their life's work.’”

"Thus these orders are intended to do justice to the students to secure to them their rights as students and the same opportunities as are enjoyed by students in other countries; rights and opportunities which no wise parent and no true lover of his country will grudge or deny to the rising generation."

"We, as representing the parents, whether yes or not, and every member of Government, who, I take it, is a true lover of this country, would not grudge or deny to the rising generation the liberties enjoyed by students in other countries like Germany or thoroughly civilized countries like America or a thoroughly constitutional Government like England, we do not find anywhere that the State interferes with educational institutions. The only interference of the State is that that the staff and the organization of educational institutions are proper; when they receive public funds, Government are interested in seeing that the funds given by Government are properly utilized and therefore they look to the staff and organization; the staff so that only properly qualified teachers are appointed, and the organization so that the standards are not lowered. Subject to correction, I say I was not able to find anywhere in any country that such disciplinary regulations are intended to be conveyed not only to their own institutions but to all other institutions that under-graduates ought to attend political meetings or no. Perhaps most Honourable Members of this Council are aware that the present Under Secretary of State, Lord Islington, thought it necessary to speak about the impending changes of the administration of the country, containing 350 millions, not to the outside public, but to the under-graduates of the Oxford University. It is not suggested anywhere that under-graduates are prohibited from attending any meetings, addressed by members of any political body. The present disciplinary regulations enable the college authorities to prescribe rules both inside the college and outside the college, for those who are living in hostels. Outside the college, the educational authorities are justified in promulgating rules, saying that the students ought not to bring disrespect to the college and that if they attend a meeting they must observe propriety. That was the sort of control that was found sufficient for the last half a century here. How all of a sudden additional powers were required I fail to notice. I may say in passing that in France, educational organization began in the year 1808 when Napoleon the First founded the University and said that it should fulfil a certain aim. I refer to that, because the present regulations are akin to those regulations of Napoleon. He wanted that education was intended to suit his own purposes, to produce officers and functionaries characterized chiefly by discipline. That is what Napoleon wanted. He said they ought to be trained in order to serve as an obedient nation to follow his commands. But in France they thought that such a measure and purpose were altogether unwholesome and therefore at present we notice in France that the authority of the Ministry extends only to staff, that is, to see that persons eligible and qualified are alone to be employed as teachers, and to look after the sanitary conditions. Instead of Government troubling themselves with students attending political meetings, it is

better that they attend to the sanitary surroundings and to provide, as is done in England, means for poor students studying in colleges. When we go to Prussia, the State regulates only the organization and curriculum. Even such an autocratic country as Germany does not trouble itself about this. In America we find that State education is saturated, as in Japan, with patriotism and with the instincts to prize freedom.

“ If the students and under-graduates are prohibited from attending any meetings addressed to their elders with reference to various points, how is it possible for them when they have to enter life to have opportunities for equipping themselves properly in life. Your Excellency stated that they were perfectly entitled to study politics. But politics should be studied not only in debating societies but in the world. As stated by Your Excellency, they need not take any active part but nobody should grudge giving them the right of knowing what is passing in the minds of their elders. If there is any body who preaches something against law and against the authorities of the realm the Government have got the complete power to stop such a meeting or to prevent such persons from speaking. What is the use of inflicting punishment on innocent people, while allowing the elders to speak as they please, provided they are within bounds? If the elders speak within bounds, why should not their children hear them? Even at home, they are entitled to hear what their parents say. Unfortunately, we had a statement by an Indian Member of the Government at a public meeting the other day wherein he stated that teachers and the taught ought not to be interfered with by the parents. After besetting them, the parents should leave them to the teachers to look after them. Is that the policy enunciated in any civilized country? Is it for any body to say that I ought not to tell my son what he should study or how he should behave? So long as he is in college, he must be under the control of the teacher and even outside the college he is bound to obey the orders of his teacher and take care that no bad repute is brought by him to his college. Beyond that, it is not possible for any Government to force any law upon the students whatever be their power. My only submission is that in the best interests of the country and the best interests of the Government they ought to leave the matter to the good sense of the parents and the students themselves, to which Your Excellency referred on the last occasion.

"One word more. In these matters, as the Hon'ble Mr. Pittendree suggested, we have disciplinary rules in regard to State-organized institutions. But what is the position with regard to the Christian College? He ought to be thankful that he has got the full power of dealing with his students. Instead of saying 'I want some other power over me' I think every Indian teacher ought to have power in himself unaffected by the interference of any body. Therefore, my final submission is that both the Government orders ought to be abrogated and that we ought to be satisfied with what is contained in chapter VIII-A. I am confident that this is a condition for the acceptance of this Council."

His Excellency the PRESIDENT:—"Resolution No. IV is proposed and seconded. We are taking on with this the discussion on resolutions No. V and No. VI."

The Hon'ble Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—“ Your Excellency, I wish to give my full support to this resolution. I sent notice of the same resolution and I am glad I am given an opportunity of giving out my views. I must say even at the outset that G.O. No. 559 goes far ahead of the existing regulation till then in force. The Honourable proposed has read to the Council the elaborate provisions contained in the Madras Educational Rules. They draw a distinction between pupils of recognized schools and under-graduates studying in colleges. In the case of pupils of recognized schools the rules prohibit all attendance at political meetings and they do so with very good reason; because they should be said to be still in *status pupillari*, in a state of protection. Pupils attending the high schools should, therefore, be prohibited from attending all political meetings whatever. But in the case of under-graduate students, those who study for F.A. and B.A. and Honours course and so forth, rules 1 and 2 prohibit them from taking an active part. They never prohibited them from attending a meeting. They only prohibit students engaging prominently in any public movement. But this later Government Order forbids them from taking part and from even attending political meetings and from engaging, never mind prominently, in any public movement with which it seems undesirable that persons in *status pupillari* should be associated. In my humble opinion, therefore, this Government Order, first of all, trenches materially on the liberty of the student. This Government Order containing such a drastic provision is hardly necessary for the under-graduate students. We need not expect that an under-graduate would come up to the college classes before he is 18 or 19 years old. And he is quite able to take care of himself. That is the first item for Your Excellency's consideration.

"The second point is that this later Government Order is no solution of the difficulty at all. We hoped that something would be done and that the policy underlying this G.O. No. 559 would be modified. On the other hand, it advocates that same policy. I have got that Government Order here. The policy underlying the old Government Order is confirmed and, instead of the Government taking the matter directly into their own hands, they pretend to give discretion to principals. I deliberately use the word 'pretend' because in the second paragraph Government expect that the principals will loyally carry out the orders of Government. In one paragraph they give discretion and full latitude to heads of colleges and in the other paragraph they say that they expect them loyally to carry out the wishes of Government.

(Mr. Siva Rao ; Mr. Stone.)

[12TH FEBRUARY 1918.]

There is absolutely no deviation, no departure in the policy laid down in the old G.O. No. 559 : there has been only a transfer of the agency, if I may so call it. What bore a political flavour before now bears an educational air. But in spite of the attempts made to disguise the real purport of it, we can make out the real motive of this Government Order as a political one and not as an educational one. I may just tell you that this Government Order was passed in May 1917 with reference to the students getting under the influence of a political propaganda ; in all probability, the reference was to the Home Rule propaganda that was then in the air. Other remedies could have been found for the purpose without trenching materially on the liberty of the students. Your Excellency, I still remember the words contained in the winding-up speech of the 24th of May. Your Excellency assured us that the object was purely educational and in no sense political. Your Excellency also assured us that this Government Order was conceived in the best interests of the students themselves, to create a calm and cool atmosphere for them, intended to promote their studies undisturbed by any other considerations and also that it was intended to equip them better in life. Now, Your Excellency, it is hard to understand how under-graduate students, if they are prohibited from attending any political meetings whatever, could possibly be equipped for life, how they would be useful citizens and how they could make up that political training which is as necessary as any other training. It was said then that students in this country would enjoy even under the present order the same privileges which students in other countries enjoy. With due deference to Your Excellency, from the best of accounts that I have been able to gather, students in other countries, especially under-graduate students, do not suffer—I am open to correction—under the same disabilities.

“Before proceeding further, I must say that this trenches materially on the liberty of the student class. It converts the teachers into spies. It creates a system of espionage ; it disturbs the harmonious relations which are so essential and which ought to prevail between students and teachers. There are also difficulties in enforcing the rules. The head of the institution will have to engage a staff to find out students attending public meetings and hunt them and then bring them up. It cannot but embitter the relations between the teachers and the pupils and I may also point out this difficulty in working it. The original Government order says that regard should be had not merely to the declared purpose of the meeting, but also to the speakers who will address it. This seems to have been intended against the speakers announcing some subject on paper in the handbills and then diverting into a political one. I submit this is a formidable responsibility to be laid on the shoulders of the teacher or the professor, that they have to judge the nature of any speaker ; and at this rate the Government or the professor of a college will have to maintain a list of public speakers in the land who deal with political subjects and give a sort of character to the speakers and say, ‘so and so is supposed to deal with revolutionary subjects. He is of bad character.’ Otherwise, I fail to see the possibility of carrying this out. One teacher may have a particular prejudice against a particular speaker and he may prohibit his students ; and the Government order does not lead to uniformity of practice. It would afford room to highly divergent practices and I submit it is very difficult to enforce it. I submit, Your Excellency, that the old provisions contained in the Madras Educational Rules are quite adequate to meet the evil. It refers to agitation directed against the authority of Government, which means revolutionary agitation. Now, the old Educational Rules apply to institutions under public management. Now the effect of the two Government Orders which are under consideration is to bring under them even institutions under private management. The old regulations are quite adequate to deal with the situation. For the reasons I have given it is not desirable to vest any more powers, even discretionary powers, in the hands of principals. It will lead to enormous hardship in working them out in practice.”

The Hon'ble Mr. J. H. STONE :—“Your Excellency, the Honourable Member of this resolution spared me some trouble by going into what I may call the law in this case by examining the provisions of the Madras Educational Rules and these Government Orders on the question and showing the relation of the various documents to one another. I have very little to add to this part of the discussion except one point and that is this : he told us that the Madras Educational Rules do not apply to colleges under private management. In that, he was perfectly correct ; but he has omitted to observe that these rules in chapter VIII-A have been made to apply to colleges under private management or at any rate to most of them by an entry in the Grant-in-Aid Code. Under the Grant-in-Aid Code it is a condition of the college receiving aid that it should obey the rules in chapter VIII-A.

“Coming to the more material part of the question, it is not a question of what the Government have laid down from time to time in this matter, but what the facts are in regard to the participation of students in politics and what the views of the Government are as to such participation. Government have formed their opinion, after discussing the matter with persons who may be supposed to be able to help them in forming such opinion, that the attendance of students at public meetings is undesirable. It has been truly pointed out by the Honourable Member that the most salient part of G.O. No. 559 is the prohibition of under-graduates from attending public meetings. In publishing that order, Government certainly declared that it was their opinion that it was undesirable that under-graduates should attend public meetings. In the subsequent order there was obviously no intention of departing from that principle. That view, which is a considered view of the Government, is that it is undesirable that under-graduates should attend public meetings and that, of course, quite apart from the other ways in which they might associate themselves with political meetings such as speaking

[12TH FEBRUARY 1918.]

(Mr. Stone ; Mr. Narasimha Ayyar.)

at public meetings, joining political associations and the like. The discussion therefore is clear-out—whether Government should recede from that position. I am now speaking only in order to oppose the idea of the Government receding from that position.

“Coming to the arguments which have been adduced as to why Government should recede from that position, for one thing we are told that students have been driven into political excitement by this Government Order. I wonder how much political excitement the order itself would have caused and how much political excitement it would have driven students into if students had been left to themselves. Nobody who has read the newspapers can say that the students have been left to themselves in this matter. Students of Guntur, Masulipatam and Trichinopoly had meetings and protested against this Government Order. I have left out some places. In all those places we found other people than students concerned in these meetings ; we found other people than college students, we found schoolboys standing up and speaking. I won't labour this point. If the students had been left to themselves we should have heard less of the excitement caused by the Government Order. Again, it is said that students can read newspapers and can be excited by newspapers just as by a public meeting. I should like to ask Honourable Members if they really believe in this, that people are influenced by what they read as much as by what they hear. If so, would not Honourable Members commit their speeches to the columns of the press, instead of speaking them in this assembly ?

“Then another point, public meetings of a purely political kind are intended to appeal to the feelings of people. That is the very object of the meetings. You get a lot of people together ; and people who have studied the psychology of crowds know very well the different state of feeling that is created in a number of people gathered, listening to an oration, from what is created in people sitting in their room and reading even the most declamatory writings. There is a distinct difference between attending public meetings and reading newspapers. The effect of public meetings on the immature minds of the students may be expected to be very much greater than the effect of public meetings on the minds of people of a mature age.

“As regards the political education of the students, nobody wants students not to receive political education. Nobody wants them not to read newspapers and receive such political education as may be derived from the reading of newspapers. That is absolutely at their disposal. They can also discuss political matters in their debating societies, and they can read political subjects in books which of course were written possibly in days of controversy but which now are not likely to excite but only to inform, because the heat of the controversy with which they were concerned is past. By studying politics in the past certainly a good deal of light is thrown on the study of present politics. Otherwise, why should we study history at all ?

“We have been treated to some theories of college discipline although I do not think the word ‘discipline’ has been used. It has been stated that if college authorities influence the students, they must be acting wrongly. I must protest against any idea of this kind. Students are at college so that they may be kept under discipline, and not left to their own judgment—to decide what it is desirable for them to do. I do not think even if colleges tell them not to go to public meetings, and prevent them, it can be said that they are subjected to any discipline greater than what may be reasonably thought necessary.

“Then we come to the analogies. Sir Harcourt Butler said that transmarine analogies are likely to be fallacious. At home, boys very often indeed go to public meetings, but under the danger of being called into account afterwards. It is not to be supposed that attendance by under-graduates in all cases in all universities is taken as a matter of course. It is not taken as a matter of course in Cambridge or Oxford. Students often go under the danger of penalty. I was rather amused to hear the old story of Lord Islington cropping up to-day. Lord Islington was not addressing the under-graduates at Oxford. I forget at present the precise name of the function over which he presided. But he was addressing people coming up for the vacation and not members of the university. I do not know it for a fact but I make a guess that the vast majority that Lord Islington addressed were rather elderly schoolmistresses.

“I think I have almost said as much as I need say, except perhaps that I might say a few words with reference to G.O. No. 1531 which certainly does create a situation very different from that of G.O. No. 559 notwithstanding what was said by the Hon'ble Mr. Venkatapati Raju and others to the contrary. The order leaves to the principals, in their discretion, the enforcement of the previous order. The order says that the Governor in Council considers that this can be best done, that the policy of the previous order can be best secured by entrusting it to heads of colleges who will exercise their discretion in the circumstances of their respective institutions. It makes a very great difference indeed. They will exercise their discretion in the circumstances of their respective institutions. Further, the Government state that in doing so, they believe that these authorities will loyally carry out the wishes of the Government. As I read the order, the Government do really leave the matter to the principals. The Government have declared that it is their conviction that it is undesirable for students to attend public meetings. They have told the principals that it is so and that it is their considered and fixed opinion and they now say ‘that being our opinion, we consider that you ought to do all you can to keep away students from public meetings.’ That is in plain language how I read G.O. No. 1531.”

The Hon'ble Mr. B. V. NARASIMHA AYYAR :—“Is it the policy or the enforcement of the policy that is referred to by the word ‘its’ ?”

RESOLUTION RE STUDENTS AND PUBLIC MEETINGS.

(Mr. Stone; Mr. Ramanuja Achariyar; [12TH FEBRUARY 1918.
Rev. Mr. Pittendrigh.]

The Hon'ble Mr. J. H. STONE :—"I cannot speak for the Government in this matter; I have not consulted them. As to the word 'its' I think the maintenance of the policy is referred to by it."

The Hon'ble Rao Bahadur V. K. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR :—"Your Excellency, I proposed to move a similar resolution at the November meeting, but Your Excellency said that there would be some settlement satisfactory to all parties and I was in hopes that Your Excellency would make such a settlement; but the final result is not at all satisfactory to my mind. It does make a difference from G.O. No. 559. It does leave a discretion to principals of colleges, but principals of colleges feel that they have not got a free hand. When Mrs. Besant came to Kumbakonam a few days ago, the principal of the Kumbakonam College prevented the students from attending her lectures. Just a week after, she went to Trichinopoly where all the students went to hear her. In one place, the principal of a Government college was afraid to exercise his discretion; in the other place, the principal of an aided institution did not feel that he was so much bound. I do not know if that was due to the fact that his students had got out of his hand. But this difference in treatment naturally causes irritation. Under G.O. No. 559 there was one general discontent. But this irritation is now much more emphasised. The Hon'ble Mr. Stone said that boys should not come under the influence of orators. I consider that they should come under the influence of orators. In Government schools we have what we might call a godless education and children are brought up without any belief in God and in their religion and they grow up to old life under that disbelief. It is an education in which patriotism has no place. The history of India that is placed in their hands is such that they do not know the great men of India and do not love them. Therefore, we are anxious that students should come under the influence of great patriots from time to time and have their emotional nature stirred up. I therefore strongly object to the Government Order and to its modification.

"In this connexion, I want to say one word in regard to the advice given by my Honourable Friend Mr. Rajagopala Achariyar at a public meeting the other day. He said 'leave the students and the teachers together. Don't interfere.' I regard that warning as directed against me also. I therefore want to tell him that the Hon'ble Mr. Rajagopala Achariyar is thinking of the days when Mann wrote his Institutes, when students were sent to teachers who received them in their household and fed and clothed them and taught the Vedas. Conditions are entirely different now. We have men who sell their learning, men who deprive students permanently of scholarships for writing a silly essay, teachers who send for police to turn out students. In that particular case the students were to blame, but I consider that the principal or a professor of a college must have been devoid of tact to have brought about that position. Are we to allow our boys to be under the tender care of such people? It is our duty to say whether students should attend a meeting or not. If the Hon'ble Mr. Rajagopala Achariyar's advice is taken, even Government have no business to come between the teacher and the students. They are an outside body. In this country, where there is a sharp difference at present between Government and the representatives of the people, it is not right that Government should issue an order prohibiting students from attending public meetings. I consider the Government Order and its modification to be an engine of oppression at present."

The Hon'ble the Rev. G. PITTEDRIGH :—"Your Excellency, I do not intend to make a speech of any length. I think the point has been sufficiently laboured. At the same time, it does seem to me that most of the discussion has taken place over the original Government Order rather than over the modified order. Some of you are perfectly well aware that at the last meeting of the Legislative Council I came here to support the Honourable Members who desired its cancellation or its modification on the ground that it did contain certain conditions that appeared to my mind and to the minds of many other educationists objectionable. But a great deal has happened since then. The new Government Order has modified it very considerably. I think I am at liberty to say that not a few, at all events, of those educational authorities who objected to it previously have now accepted it. They now recognize that they are not required to exercise an espionage over individual students or to bring them to book. Discretion is vested in them in order that they may exercise their power to see that students are not coming to harm in any way through political meetings or political influences connected with such meetings. I think that the majority of educational people have quite recognized a difference that is material between these two Government Orders. Therefore, I cannot now support the resolution as I should have done on a previous occasion.

"There is a good deal of confusion as regards a minor matter, that is, as to the Educational Rules contained in chapter VIII-A. In private conversation, I was told that these rules contained everything that was necessary. I do not know if members of this Council are aware of what educational people are quite aware, namely, that these rules in chapter VIII-A do not refer to colleges under private management. Public institutions under the management of Government or local boards or municipalities are known as institutions under public management. The colleges that are dealt with under chapter VIII-A are those which are managed by Government or local boards or municipalities. Those under the management of private persons or associations are public institutions under private management, and that means the great majority of colleges in the Presidency. For instance, out of the four colleges in Madras there is only one college that is under public management, while the others are under private

RESOLUTION RE STUDENTS AND PUBLIC MEETINGS.

12TH FEBRUARY 1918.]

(Rev. Mr. Pittendrigh; Mr. Rama Ayyangar;
Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao; Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao.)

management. So these rules in Chapter VIII-A refer to colleges under public management. The rules do not apply to the great majority of colleges. What the Hon'ble Mr. Stone said was that under the Grant-in-Aid Code the other institutions are brought in. That is, however, a secondary matter. While many of us felt the difficulty of the previous Government Order the majority, so far as I have consulted them, now consider that its objectionable character has been removed by the subsequent Government Order which places the discretion now not in the hands of the Government but in the hands of principals of colleges."

The Hon'ble Mr. K. RAMA AYYANGAR :—"Your Excellency, I have been feeling a difficulty in the matter. The Hon'ble Mr. Pittendrigh and the Hon'ble Mr. Stone have said that there is a good deal of difference between the present order and the old one. I should very much like that it is so, but we are concerned with the order as it stands. I find the wording here is this: it refers to the college authorities being in complete agreement with the policy of the former Government Order. Paragraph 2 says 'while maintaining the policy of the Government Order.' These are the two things which create considerable difficulty. Whatever views individual members might express the policy is not definite, it must include all sorts of meetings intended by the previous order to be covered; and the effect of it would be practically the prohibition of attendance at all political meetings. My Lord, unless the Government Order is withdrawn, and that is made specific, the point completely arises; and I do not think it is the wish of the Government that teachers should go behind the original order nor can they go behind it, if they are to loyally carry out the intentions of the Government. I do not think the order says that you can go behind the order, if the policy is to be maintained. By the wording of the subsequent order, he cannot feel relieved from the first Government Order. He must maintain the old thing. I do not know how the Hon'ble Mr. Pittendrigh and other members feel like that. An authoritative statement is necessary. I think the best thing under the circumstances is to accept the resolution so far and if necessary leave the position to the discretion of principals. The whole matter is there, as explained by the Hon'ble Mr. Stone, in the Educational Rules themselves."

The Hon'ble Mr. A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"My Lord, I feel it somewhat difficult to understand the position taken up by the Hon'ble Mr. Pittendrigh. If he found it possible on a former occasion to support the motion that G.O. No. 559 should be cancelled, and if, as explained by the Hon'ble Mr. Stone, there is no change of policy and the same policy is to be maintained, I do not find his difficulty in supporting the motion now before the Council. What is the effect of the modification? The agency for the purpose of enforcing the rules is changed. Instead of the Government themselves undertaking it, the discretion, it is said, is vested in educational authorities. The Hon'ble Mr. Stone has definitely told us that the policy is the same and that they are expected to carry out the policy loyally. This is the fixed opinion of Government that under-graduates should not attend political meetings. I thought the Hon'ble Mr. Pittendrigh would have thrown considerable light on the main question at issue, whether college students should be allowed or not to attend public meetings. Regarding that, he has not thrown any light.

"There is another point to be cleared about. We have not been told as to whether the disciplinary regulations which are incorporated in the Madras Educational Rules and which are extended to colleges under private management receiving grants-in-aid, whether they are not enough to meet the present situation and whether they do not give discretion which is necessary for the carrying out of any such disciplinary measures. All this has not yet been placed before the Council. It is only when we are satisfied that these disciplinary measures have been put in operation, have been tried and found wanting, that there is any justification whatever for a new Government Order or a new order being issued. The present discussion has not at all explained the position of the Government satisfactorily; and till that is done the problem cannot be satisfactorily solved. The present resolution before the Council must be supported."

The Hon'ble Rao Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"My Lord, I am afraid I shall not be justified in giving a silent vote in regard to this resolution. We all concede and I for one fully realize that the Government, in issuing these orders, were actuated by very good intentions. At the same time, I have grave doubts, and that was my difficulty all through—as to how these orders are to be enforced. My Hon'ble Friend Mr. Ramanuja Achariyar has already informed the Council that the second order has been interpreted in one way in Kumbakonam and in another way at Trichinopoly. It is quite likely that as time goes on, it will be within the power of principals of colleges and heads of institutions to ventilate their own political opinions or political leanings in an undesirable manner and sometimes to pillory public men by directing that the students should not attend so and so's lecture. I am really faced with the difficulty of choosing the lesser of the two evils. I know, as a matter of fact, the headmaster of an institution has prohibited that students should not attend the lectures delivered by a particular individual, whether political, social or religious. I do not wish to mention names or places. The gentleman concerned naturally felt aggrieved and I regret to say that the matter is now in court. I suppose the Government would not contemplate with equanimity that these squabbles between headmasters and other educational authorities and individual public men or persons who wish to deliver lectures should be decided by a court of law. My Lord, I share the anxiety of my Hon'ble Friend Mr. Pittendrigh and also your Excellency's

(Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao; Mr. Narasimha Ayyar.) [12TH FEBRUARY 1918.]

Government that the time of students should, as much as possible, be devoted to the main business of study and this is very important at this the formative period of their life while, at the same time, I share fully with my Hon'ble Friend Mr. Ramanuja Achariyar in the feeling for the need of high ideals and emotions and the cultivation of the higher emotions. I also feel, at the same time, that this Government Order places an authority in the hands of principals, which, probably, in the long run would be much more injurious than the results which the Government would avoid by this order. I think, therefore, on a consideration of all that has been said today, it seems to me that the principals have enough power and I suppose, after all, we have to rely on the personal influence of teachers over their pupils in carrying out this order.

"I think, on the whole, it is far better to rely on the discretion which is already vested in them in chapter VIII-A and leave the matter there. I should not like that Government should say that they have a policy apart, from the educational policy, that they have any political policy with reference to students which they should adumbrate in a series of orders for the guidance of teachers and students. It seems to me that it is far better to withdraw these orders and allow principals to deal with this matter under the old regulations, whatever may be the reasons which induced the Government to issue these orders. I am at one with my Hon'ble Friend Mr. Rajagopala Achariyar that the teachers should have more and more influence with the taught and I recognize very fully that the influence of parents at home is not as strong as it should be. At the same time, as I have already pointed out, even the later order places enormous difficulties in the carrying out of it. Assuming for the sake of argument that students disobey the principals' order what is to become of them. Is the principal going to watch all the students who went to public meetings or is he going to employ peons or the police as I have heard in connexion with another institution, or is he going to ask lecturers to look after the students? I am told that lecturers in a certain institution were asked to watch the students and they expressed their unwillingness on the ground that it was not a pleasant job. These are all considerations which are in our minds, considerations as to which of the two courses would produce the lesser evil in the long run. I may assure the Hon'ble Mr. Pittendrih that we do not wish to reduce in the slightest degree the influence of the teachers or principals over students, but what we do feel at the same time is that in connexion with public men who are supposed to have political leanings, the order would be construed according to the politics of the professor or the teacher, a thing which personally I should not like to see carried out in colleges. Perhaps your Excellency's Government may have to examine the politics of each teacher or principal. Your Excellency's Government may, I think, withdraw the second order as well, and see how the student population in this Presidency would behave in their colleges. I thought your Excellency's speech in May last gave clear indications that this order was not dictated by anything that was done by the pupils themselves. That was a point which, I am very glad, my Hon'ble Friend Mr. Venkatapati Raju has pressed with some insistence and it is that view of the matter which largely influences me in getting up on the present occasion and appealing to your Excellency's Government to place this matter beyond further controversy.

"Speaking with the experience of nearly 25 years, I have heard of only two or three occasions on which there was any trouble with the students. I know, I recollect the days when I was a student in Madras and I am fairly alive to the conditions in the mufassal. There was an incident known as the Christian College commotion which the Hon'ble Mr. Pittendrih is well aware of, which was not at all political, which settled down in a month or two and ended in the expulsion of two students who went to Calcutta and had their education there. Assuming for the sake of argument that these regulations are to be enforced in this way, it would be hard upon students who would naturally like to hear, off and on, persons who come to deliver lectures. As regards the mufassal, I might say that Mr. Pal's visit to my part of the country upset the students for a day and a half and at the end of the day and a half the whole matter was reported to the Government and 180 students were rusticated for 18 months. I do not think that students were either worse or better either for the lecture or for the rustication. For the last one year, there was some kind of excitement which probably led your Excellency's Government to issue this order. I see there is absolutely nothing which would justify the continuance of these orders, even if there was justification for the original issue under the circumstances. So, I think I am not at all sure that, in the carrying out of the instructions which your Excellency's Government have asked principals loyally to carry out, we shall not have more complications. As I said, it would reduce itself to the politics of the principal or the teacher and an examination of his own views. I think there is no need at all for the continuance of these orders. I do not wish to go into any other questions that have been raised."

At this stage the Council adjourned for a short interval.

The Council re-assembled after the interval at 2-50 p.m., when the discussion on the resolution of the Hon'ble Mr. B. V. Narasimha Ayyar regarding students and public meetings was continued.

The Hon'ble Mr. B. V. NARASIMHA AYYAR:—"Your Excellency, I fancied I would have had to answer only the spokesman on behalf of the Government, but I find further proof today of the confusion produced by the two Government Orders. It has misled another Honourable Member of this house into the belief that G.O. No. 1581 has varied the original Government

12TH FEBRUARY 1918.]

(Mr. Narasimha Ayyar.)

Order which the Hon'ble Mr. Stone has expressly stated it did not. I shall, therefore, first begin answering the objections of the Hon'ble Mr. Stone and next proceed to deal with some statements made by the Hon'ble Mr. Pittendrih.

"In the first place, I was rather glad to see that the Hon'ble Mr. Stone quite distinctly brought out the fact that G.O. No. 1581 did not make any alteration in the central pivot of G.O. No. 559, that is, the absolute bar to the attendance at political meetings so far as undergraduates are concerned. That is the key-stone of the policy of G.O. No. 559, and that is not altered. I am very sorry to see that the Hon'ble Mr. Pittendrih is not here. That is the point he overlooked. The whole of his argument proceeded upon an ignorance of that very statement. The Hon'ble Mr. Stone said that discussion should be concentrated on the question, should there be such an absolute bar or not? He asked the Honourable Members to express an opinion on that point. I think we should really express an opinion on that point. Dealing with that matter the Hon'ble Mr. Stone urged four or five considerations which he believed would induce the Honourable Members to support the policy of G.O. No. 559 and G.O. No. 1581. His first argument was this. He said that the argument that G.O. No. 559 has itself by creating some sort of taboo over politics attracted students to politics, ignored certain other facts. What were the facts which it ignored? The facts were that some others besides under-graduates took part in the excitement. This argument seems to me rather to grant my position; the fact that some others besides under-graduates were responsible for the total amount of the excitement does not go to show that the G.O. No. 559 did not produce in itself an excessive tendency to unduly enter into politics on the part of students. That is the first point.

"The second consideration urged by the Hon'ble Mr. Stone was that the difference between the spoken word and the written word, or the difference between mixing in an assembly and reading the proceedings, should be remembered. I quite recognize it. He is quite right in pointing out that personal presence is far more illuminating and impresses one far better than reading the proceedings. Therefore, the entire question is whether the proceedings should be conveyed to the mind of the student by means of newspapers or by means of attendance. If the proceedings are objectionable, supposing there is an exhortation to plunder or to commit murder or suppose some one declares that all property is robbery and there is no right to property and incites people to commit crime, whether the students read about it or hear it by attending the meeting it is equally objectionable. I won't ask him to attend such meetings. But when there is nothing objectionable and it is a purely political meeting, to put forward the argument that there is a difference between the spoken word and the written word is to put forward an argument which is ununderstandable. If political assemblies are useful, they are useful on account of personal factors; coming into contact with great men like Dadabhai Nowroji or Gokhale is really beneficial. Therefore, the point that the Hon'ble Mr. Stone presses is that political education is permissible if it is confined to newspapers and debating societies or reading history and debating about matters mentioned therein. When he stated that debating about politics amongst students is permissible, he gave away his point that politics were too exciting a topic. If students could get excited in their own debating societies by discussing current day politics in what manner is that excitement different from the excitement which they receive at public meetings? There are gatherings and gatherings. I do not think any teacher would tolerate his students attending a gathering where disorder is advocated or other objectionable features are present. But is the mere fact of politics a sufficient ground for stating that all political meetings should be debated upon by students in societies and yet the same that even current day politics could be debated upon by students in any assembly. It can only be politics should be objected to when they hear it discussed in any assembly. It can only be justified if there is a difference in the character of the persons with whom they come into contact, on the ground that they are undesirable. There is already a provision that students should be kept away from undesirable persons. Every father wants that his boy should be kept away from such persons. It is not politics that you are taking objection to, but only undesirable persons. Where then is the educational basis or justification for avoidance of meetings on the score of subjects dealt with therein? There again the ground urged by the Hon'ble Mr. Stone has failed.

"The fourth consideration, which looks rather like a reiteration of his position is one of the previous arguments put forward by him, that discipline is necessary and that the present provision is necessary. That is begging the question. That discipline is necessary nobody denies. Whether this particular prohibition of attendance at political meetings is necessary is the point.

"The fifth argument advanced by him is that English under-graduates attend political meetings, but under danger of penalty. You have that danger of penalty under the old rules in Chapter VIII which are practically on the same footing as the English rules. Why are you not content with these rules? Why introduce a separate set of rules with regard to politics? 'Political propaganda' is the expression used in G.O. No. 559. There were orders issued simultaneously in other provinces. In Bombay they declared against 'Home Rule propaganda' and they issued an order that a certain class of students should not attend Home Rule meetings. They had however the good sense to cancel that order. Here we have clouded the issue by employing vague phraseology; we simply say 'political propaganda.' I suppose it has the same meaning as the Bombay circular as all these provincial circulars have a family resemblance, sprout out at the same time—probably out of a mysterious central circular issued perhaps from Delhi. Why

(Mr. Narasimha Ayyar; the President; [12TH FEBRUARY 1918.
Mr. Stone.]

should it not have the same fate as the Bombay circular? Before the pronouncement of the 20th August some persons may have fancied that Home Rule meetings were undesirable, but since the Secretary of State has stated that it is a legitimate goal, a comparatively easily attainable goal, there is absolutely no reason why Home Rule should be tabooed. I am at liberty to quote the statement of Lord Carmichael who had a good deal of experience of the trouble-some situation in Bengal, namely, that young men in Bengal went to the anarchist camp in pursuit of patriotic ideals. A person who discussed the situation with Lord Carmichael pointed out to him that it was for want of legitimate vent for the legitimate ambition of young men—it was for that reason—anarchy was spreading, and Lord Carmichael said that if they could work under a legitimate banner for Home Rule they would be weaned away from their methods of crime. That is a statement which I am at liberty to quote. I wish to point out therefore that far from there being any harm being done by students coming under the influence of such a propaganda you will ennoble them for ever. The English parallel is very much against the Hon'ble Mr. Stone and the Government policy that he is seeking to defend.

"Then comes the last statement of the Hon'ble Mr. Stone. He says that G.O. No. 1531 makes a very great difference. At the outset he started by saying that G.O. No. 1531 left the matter exactly in the same position, so far as the key-stone was concerned, as regards attendance at political meetings, only instead of employing people themselves, the Government ask the professors to prevent the students from attending the meetings.

"Coming to the remarks of the Hon'ble Mr. Pittendrih, he has fallen into several errors. The first reason he mentioned for congratulating himself on the change is that espionage ceased, that the principals need not play the part of spies nor their assistants. The discretion conferred by the later Government Order in so far as their colleges are concerned, is whether they might condone punishment or not. There is nothing about espionage in the second Government Order. I fancy that espionage is still necessary because the principals are asked to enforce the rule; the professors are not perhaps required to play the part of spies, but the boys may be asked by the professors to play that part. That is so far as espionage is concerned. Let us come to the enforcement. The Hon'ble Mr. Pittendrih seems to think that the principals are now at liberty to allow their students to attend meetings; the Hon'ble Mr. Stone has said that was not the intention of the Government. The principals have to loyally accept and carry out the wishes of the Government, that is, that the Government Order must be enforced. The Government would not employ spies, but the principals will have to do it. I do not see that there is anything on which the Hon'ble Mr. Pittendrih can congratulate himself. There is not much discretion left to the principals. What the Government would not do themselves, they seek to do through others.

"Then with reference to chapter VIII-A it was urged that chapter VIII-A did not refer to other colleges. The Hon'ble Mr. J. H. Stone says the Grant-in-Aid Code does; the Grant-in-Aid Code covers them. It is an absolutely worthless item to be noticed. No change has been made; the change has been made only in the method of enforcement which is made more objectionable.

"Most of the objectionable features have been touched upon by various members, but there is one which, I think, is very important, and I should close my remarks by touching upon it; that is, the Government have to be particularly careful in the orders which they issue regarding educational institutions. The personnel of Government is largely a foreign personnel. I do not object to this personnel in this discussion but I only say that the Government have to be more careful than they need otherwise be. The Government Order refers to a movement to which people look forward with great hopes and it seems to strike at the movement itself. As I have already said in this discussion what becomes of the movement need not be considered here; the movement takes good care of itself, as in spite of obstacles it seems to be flourishing. So far as young men are concerned, with reference to the Government Order what will be their attitude? Your Excellency must remember that this is addressed not only to the students but to their elders. If you issue an order which is opposed to the views of the vast mass of the people, how can it be successful? Is that a situation on which any Government could compliment themselves? Is it desirable to have the vast masses of the people in opposition to the Government? The Government have a laudable object in view—the attainment of better education. By far the best means of attaining that end is to leave the principals to look after students under chapter VIII-A. If both these orders are done away with, the widely prevalent impression that the Government want to wean away the students from patriotic movements would be removed and the prestige of the Government would not suffer. It would not put the people in a spirit of opposition to Government. I hope this discussion will not have the effect of stiffening the back of the Government against the people; I hope the Government will concede this request in the same way as the Bombay Government have done."

His Excellency the PRESIDENT (to the Hon'ble Mr. Stone).—"Have you anything to say?"

The Hon'ble Mr. J. H. STONE:—"No."

His Excellency the PRESIDENT:—"We will take the division of the Council. The decision on this resolution will govern resolution Nos. V and VI also."

[12TH FEBRUARY 1918.]

The resolution was put to the Council and lost.

The Hon'ble Mr. B. V. Narasimha Ayyar demanded a division which was taken with the result that 11 voted *for* and 27 *against* the resolution.

For	Against
The Hon'ble Rao Bahadur V. K. Ramanuja Achariyar.	The Hon'ble Sir Alexander Cardew.
" Rao Bahadur M. Ramaachandra Rao.	" Mr. P. Rajagopala Achariyar.
" Mr. P. Siva Rao.	" Mr. L. Davidson.
" Mr. K. Rama Ayyangar.	" Mr. A. R. Kuapp.
" Mr. K. Sadasiva Bhat.	" Mr. R. Ramaachandra Rao.
" Mr. B. Venkatapati Raju.	" Mr. A. Butterworth.
" Yaqub Hasan Sahib.	" Mr. L. E. Buckley.
" Ahmad Tambi Marakkayar.	" Mr. M. E. Couchman.
" Mr. K. Chidambaranatha Mudaliyar.	" Mr. C. G. Todhunter.
" Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao.	" Muhammad Aziz-ud-din Sahib.
" Mr. B. V. Narasimha Ayyar.	" Lient-Col. G. G. Giffard.
	" Mr. T. Richmond.
	" the Raja of Bobbili.
	" Rev. G. Pittendrih.
	" Rao Bahadur A. Subbarayalu Reddiyar.
	" Mr. K. K. R. Kavalappara Muppil Nayar.
	" Sir Francis Spring.
	" Mr. J. H. Stone.
	" Sir Fairless Barber.
	" Mr. Gordon Fraser.
	" Mr. C. H. Higginbotham.
	" the Archbishop Aclen.
	" Mr. S. B. Murray.
	" Mr. W. J. J. Howley.
	" the Advocate-General.
	" Mr. H. F. W. Gillman.
	" Mr. R. A. Graham.

R. A. GRAHAM,
Acting Secretary to Govt., L. & M. (Legislative) Dept.

NOTES.

Page 20

An extract of the proceedings in the Legislative Council connected with the resolutions has been added to the file (pages 5 to 19 ante). No further action is necessary, the resolutions having been approved by the Govt. and Govt. The papers may, it is submitted, be

over
more

Recorded

Se
22.4.18
NK
25/4/18

CR
25/4/18

I think it advisable ^{now that} that, the resolution ^{has been lost, the 100 9-03} now embodied in the Madras Edulal Rules Act 1918 to be amended.

My
29/4/18

A draft order is submitted for approval

Se
29.4.18
NK
30/4/18

CR
30/4/18

Draft for consideration

My
27/5/18

H. F. the Governor.

His Excellency approves.

Done
11/7/18

By 10-5-18



Recorred notes connected with the resolutions on the subject of the
cancellation of the orders prohibiting students from taking part in political
movements, moved at the meeting of the — held on the 12th Feb. 1916 by the
Hon. Messrs. Mr. Narasimha Ayyar, B. Venkatasubrahmanyam and K. Sankar and
referred to the S. D. I. to submit a draft of the necessary amendments to be made in
the Madras Educational Rules with reference to the orders issued on 5-5-9 & 1-5-17
" " " " as modified by G.O. 1531 of 3-12-17

C. No. _____, From the _____, No. _____, dated _____ 191

” ” ” ” ” ” 191

ORDER.

knex

No. 596, dated 7. 5. 1918.

Recorded.

2. The D.P.I. is requested to
submit for the approval of Govt
a draft of the necessary amend-
ments to be made in Chapter VIII A
of the Madras Educational Rules
with reference to the orders issued
in G.O. no 559 H.M.E.D. 1.5.17
as subsequently modified by G.O. no
1531 H.M.E.D. 3.12.17

(Call Book)
 First reminder / Bessie after remarks.
 Subject ✓ OK
 To The D. & J.
 Recd. 10.5.18.
 1st reminder — 10.5.18

$$\begin{array}{r} 18 \\ 30418 \\ \hline 18 \\ 30418 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

3074128

When given for copying

When copied

When examined

When signed

191

REAP AGAIN G.O. No.
101

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURE TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DETC.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING WANT FOR DISPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

E.E.—

A = Copy in full.

B = Not to be copied.

F = Copy abstract only.

Q = Copy heading only.

9.5