

1905.

Education Department, Bengal.

File $\frac{2-D}{3}$

Nos. 189-205.

Power of Professors in relation to students of Colleges.

LIST OF PAPERS.

- 189-190. Letter from the Principal, Presidency College, No. 273, dated the 23rd February 1905, regarding the disciplinary power of the Professors.
- 191-192. Circular letter to all Principals of Government Colleges, Nos. 4404-4414, dated the 18th March 1905, inviting opinion on certain proposed rules on the subject.
193. Letter from the Principal, Dacca College, No. 785, dated the 22nd March 1905.
194. Letter from the Principal, Patna College, No. 996, dated the 22nd March 1905.
195. Letter from the Principal, Civil Engineering College, No. 908/3 D., dated the 27th March 1905.
196. Letter from the Principal, Chittagong College, No. 169, dated the 27th March 1905.
197. Letter from the Principal, Ravenshaw College, Cuttack, No. 227, dated the 30th March 1905.
198. Letter from the Principal, Hooghly College, No. 236, dated the 30th March 1905.
199. Letter from the Principal, Presidency College, No. 384, dated the 1st April 1905.
200. Letter from the Principal, Rajshahi College, No. 9, dated the 5th April 1905.
201. Letter from the Lady Principal, Bethune College, No. 74 D., dated the 27th April 1905.
202. Letter from the Principal, Sanskrit College, No. 26, dated the 29th April 1905.

Replies to the above circular letter.

203. Letter to the Government of Bengal, General Department, No. 298, dated the 9th January 1906, proposing certain rules conducing to the maintenance of discipline in colleges.
204. Letter from the Government of Bengal, General Department, No. 520, dated the 3rd February 1906, sanctioning those rules subject to certain modifications.
205. Circular to all Principals of Government Colleges, No. 37, dated the 26th February 1906, forwarding those rules.

POWER OF PROFESSORS IN RELATION TO STUDENTS OF COLLEGES.

[Nos. 189-190.]

No. 273, dated Presidency College, Calcutta, the 23rd February 1905.

From—P. K. RAY, Esq., D.Sc., Offg. Principal, Presidency College.

To—the Director of Public Instruction, Bengal.

WITH reference to your No. 2718, dated the 18th February 1905, I have the honour to forward herewith for your approval a copy of the Proceedings of the meeting of the Instructive Staff of the Presidency College held under the presidency of Mr. Prothero, late Officiating Principal, of the College on Wednesday the 21st December 1904, to consider the principle which should be observed about the disciplinary powers of the Professors of the College.

ENCLOSURE.

Proceedings of the meeting of the Instructive Staff of the Presidency College held in the Principal's room on Wednesday the 21st December 1904 at 2-30 p.m.

Present:

Mr. M. Prothero, Offg. Principal in the chair.	Babu Sarada Prasanna Das.
Mr. G. W. Kuchler.	Shams-ul-ulama Abul Khair Md. Siddiq.
„ J. A. Cunningham.	Mr. J. N. Das Gupta.
Dr. C. E. Cullis.	„ M. Ghosh.
„ J. C. Bose.	Babu Gopi Bhushan Sen.
Mr. I. Tipping.	Babu Binayendra Nath Sen.
„ S. C. Mahalanabis.	Babu Kali Prasanna Bhattacharjea.
„ H. B. Rae.	Babu Hriday Chandra Banerjea.
Babu Syama Das Mukerjea.	Mr. H. E. Stapleton.

Resolved that the Professors' power of punishment on their own authority be as follows:—

- (1) To mark absent or suspend a boy for misconduct for a week at the most.
- (2) To fine any individual boy up to Rs. 5 for any fault committed and detected either in the lecture-room or on the College premises.
- (3) To fine a class collectively for misconduct either in the lecture-room or on the College premises up to a maximum of Re. 1 per head where the fault cannot be brought home to any individual.

[Nos. 191-192.]

Nos. 4404-4414, dated the 18th March 1905.

From—A. PEDLER, Esq., F.R.S., C.I.E., Director of Public Instruction.

To—all Principals of Government Colleges.

I HAVE the honour to invite your attention to this office Circular No. 46, dated the 3rd April 1890, and to request you to favour me with your opinion on the following rules, defining the powers which a Professor in a Government College may exercise in matters of discipline, independently of the Principal.

2. The rules are—

(a) On their own authority, Professors may mark absent or suspend a student for misconduct, for a week at most.

(b) On their own authority, Professors may fine, up to a limit of Rs. 5, any individual student for misconduct committed either in their lecture-rooms or on the College premises.

(c) Cases of misconduct, when the fault cannot be brought home to any individual must be reported by a Professor to the Principal, who will, after consideration of the report, issue such orders as appear to him to be necessary.

3. These rules are based upon resolutions which were passed at a meeting of the Professors of the Presidency College which was called at my request to consider the question. They have been modified by me in certain respects, and in their present form appear to me to be desirable.

ENCLOSURE.

Circular No. 46, dated Calcutta, the 3rd April 1890.

From—A. CROFT, Esq., Director of Public Instruction, Bengal.

To—all Principals of Government Colleges.

In continuation of my Circular No. 45 of this day's date, on the subject of the maintenance of discipline in schools, I have the honour to communicate to you the following further instructions with regard to colleges.

2. In considering the question of the maintenance of discipline in colleges where from the nature of the case, positive rules, the method appropriate for schools, were comparatively ineffective, the Government of India observed that the tone of a collegiate body as a whole could only be raised by distinct moral teaching, and by careful moral supervision. The question was how such supervision could be made more effective and how the sentiments and habits of students might be best influenced for good. In this matter far more was to be expected from the example and personal qualities of the Principal and Professors than from rules; but rules in support of authority might be useful, and from that point of view, the following regulations might be beneficially enforced:—

(a) that weekly meetings should be held by the Principal and the Professors to consider questions of discipline;

(b) that the Principal should have the power of ordering the expulsion or rustication of a student, and of fining him for disorderly conduct; and

(c) that every Professor should have the power of suspending a student for a limited period of time, and of fining him without reference to the Principal.

3. After receiving the opinions of Local Governments on these suggestions, the Government of India issued the following order:—

“The suggestions (enumerated above) for the improvement of discipline in colleges, have received favourable consideration by Local Governments and Administrations. In Bombay and the Central Provinces the rule as to weekly meetings of College Councils will be adopted. In Bengal and the North-Western Provinces and Oudh, the rule is considered unnecessary; and in the Punjab fortnightly meetings have been prescribed. The rule empowering a Principal to expel, rusticate or fine a scholar is accepted everywhere. The rule giving power to a Professor to suspend a student for a limited time, or to fine him without reference to the Principal, is accepted by Bombay, Bengal, and the Central Provinces. In the Punjab it is definitely restricted to students of the Professor's own class; and it is understood that this limitation is also contemplated in the three provinces just mentioned. The Governments of Madras and the North-Western Provinces and Oudh favour the autocracy of the Principal in matters of discipline. The Government of India is content with the measure of acceptance which its suggestions as to colleges have met, and does not wish to press them further on the Governments which have not found themselves able to adopt them.”

4. In directing that these orders should be issued to all educational officers engaged as Professors in Colleges, the Lieutenant-Governor drew attention to the many opportunities which the study of ethics, and other occasions of college life, afforded to teachers for moral instruction of a character to influence their pupils and to make a permanent impression for good upon them. It is unnecessary for me to do more than to draw your special attention, and that of the Professors of your College, to the opportunities which they thus enjoy, and to the obligations and responsibilities which such opportunities impose upon them.

[No. 193.]

No. 785, dated Dacca, the 22nd March 1905.

From—C. H. BROWNING, M.A., Principal, Dacca College.

To—The Director of Public Instruction, Bengal.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge receipt of your No. 4404, dated 18th March 1905, asking for my opinion on rules defining the power which a Professor in a Government College may exercise in matters of discipline independently of the Principal and to state as follows:—

The rules in themselves appear to me to be reasonable enough, but I should object to the phrase "independently of the Principal." There cannot in a college be a number of co-ordinate authorities and any disciplinary powers which it may be deemed advisable to confer upon Professors should be conferred upon them as wielding a delegated authority. I would therefore add a further rule (d) as follows:—

(d) Professors should immediately report to the Principal any case in which they have exercised the powers conferred upon them by rules (a) and (b) for his confirmation.

I may add that the additional rule now proposed appears also to be necessary in order that the Principal may be kept informed of the state of discipline and punishments in the various classes.

[No. 194.]

No. 996, dated Bankipur, the 22nd March 1905.

From—H. R. JAMES, Esq., M.A., Offg. Principal, Patna College.

To—The Director of Public Instruction, Bengal.

In reply to your No. 4408, dated 18th March 1905, I have the honour to say that I consider the rules proposed give sufficient powers to professors without giving too much, except in one particular. I am doubtful how far it is advisable to give one Professor power to suspend a student from the class of another. I am certainly in favour of giving independent disciplinary powers to Professors and there is advantage in defining the extent and limits of those powers. They would not, as far as my experience goes, often need to be resorted to, but they are wanted as a reserve.

2. As regards the wording: I think (a) as it stands is a little ambiguous from attempting to express too much. I take it that a Professor would not "mark absent" from any class except his own, whereas suspension applies (I suppose) to all classes. If, as I suggest, the right to suspend were omitted, the ambiguity would be removed. I should also prefer to put the rules in the singular "A Professor on his own authority:" and as there are Lecturers who are not Professors I should say "Professor or Lecturer" since the Lecturer's authority needs to be maintained, whether he is technically a Professor or not.

3. I therefore note below the alterations in wording that I should suggest:—

(a) When a student is guilty of misconduct at a lecture, the Professor or Lecturer may at his discretion mark him absent from that lecture or from any number of lectures not exceeding six.

(b) A Professor or Lecturer may on his own authority fine up to a limit of five rupees any individual student for misconduct committed either in his lecture-room or elsewhere on the college premises.

(c) Cases of misconduct, when the fault cannot be brought home to any individual, must be reported by a Professor or Lecturer to the Principal, who will, after consideration of the report, issue such orders as appear to him to be necessary.

[No. 195.]

No. 908/3-D., dated Sībpur, the 27th March 1905.

From—A. MACDONELL, Esq., Offg. Principal, Civil Engineering College.

To—The Director of Public Instruction, Bengal.

WITH reference to your letter No. 4410 of the 18th March 1905, I have the honour to reply that I approve of the rules given therein. I think everything should be done to support the authority of a Professor in his lecture-room.

The only exception I can take is to the words "or on the college premises" in the last part of (b). If, at the time a Professor observes any misconduct on the part of a student on the college premises, that student is under his control then he ought to have the power of punishing immediately. If not, the Professor should report to the Principal.

[No. 196.]

No. 169, dated Chittagong, the 27th March 1905.

From—KAILAS CHANDRA BHATTACHARYA, Principal, Chittagong College.

To—The Director of Public Instruction, Bengal.

WITH reference to your letter No. 4412 of the 18th instant, I have the honour to inform you that the modified rules defining the powers which a Professor in a Government College may exercise in matters of discipline independently of the Principal, appear to me to be reasonable and fair. Rule (a) is understood to apply only to the Professor's own lecture period or periods.

[No. 197.]

No. 227, dated Cuttack, the 30th March 1905.

From—B. V. GUPTA, Principal, Ravenshaw College.

To—The Director of Public Instruction, Bengal.

WITH reference to your letter No. 4407, dated the 18th current, I have the honour to state that I approve fully of rules (a) and (c) and also of rule (b) with the clause "or on the college premises" left out.

I should, however, have no objection to retain the clause, if the exercise of the power in question were restricted to cases with which the Professor as such is personally concerned.

Thus in a case where a student is guilty of general misconduct on the college premises, the Professor should not have the power of punishing the offender, but may report the matter to the Principal who is after all the officer responsible for the maintenance of discipline in the college; but a case in which the Professor is insulted or regarded with disrespect, he should be invested with the power of punishment.

[No. 198.]

No. 236, dated Chinsura, the 30th March 1905.

From—R. SHAW, Esq., M.A., Principal, Hooghly College.

To—The Director of Public Instruction, Bengal.

IN reply to your letter No. 4405, dated the 18th March 1905, I have the honour to state that the rules as given in your letter, defining the powers which a Professor in a Government College may exercise in matters of discipline, are in my opinion satisfactory and sufficient, provided that every case is reported to the Principal for his approval.

I may add that when a question arose regarding the powers of Professors to punish independently of the Principal, during my incumbency of this post in 1901, after consulting Circular No. 46, dated 3rd April 1890, I instituted rules which were practically the same as rules (a) and (b) in your letter, with the proviso as above. Although interference with the independent powers exercised by Professors is to be deprecated and avoided as much as possible I consider that all cases of fine or suspension by Professors should be reported to the Principal for approval and that an appeal to him should be open to the defaulter. This has now been the practice in this college for the period I have been in charge and has been found to work satisfactorily.

[No. 199.]

No. 384, dated Calcutta, the 1st April 1905.

From—P. K. RAY, Esq., D.Sc., Offg. Principal, Presidency College.

To—The Director of Public Instruction, Bengal.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Mr. Jackson's letter No. 4409, dated the 18th March 1905, in which he asks for an expression of my opinion on the rules laid down therein, defining the powers which a Professor in a Government College may exercise in matters of discipline independently of the Principal.

2. In reply I have the honour to express my full concurrence with the rules.

[No. 200.]

No. 9, dated Boalia, the 5th April 1905.

From—BABU KUMUDINI KANTA BANERJI, M.A., Principal, Rajshahi College.

To—The Director of Public Instruction, Bengal.

In compliance with your letter No. 4413, dated the 18th March 1905, calling upon me to submit my opinion on the draft rules defining the powers which a Professor in a Government College may exercise in matters of discipline independently of the Principal, I have the honour to say that the rules are calculated to be wholesome and that they may be adopted with a slight modification of the first two of them, the third being retained as it is.

The rules in their modified form—

(a) On their own authority, Professors may, *in their own subject*, mark absent or suspend a student for misconduct, for a week at most.

(b) On their own authority, Professors may fine up to a limit of two rupees any individual student for misconduct committed either in their lecture-rooms or on the college premises.

[No. 201.]

No. 74-D., dated Calcutta, the 27th April 1905.

From—Mrs. KUMUDINI DAS, B.A., Lady Principal, Bethune College.

To—The Director of Public Instruction, Bengal.

WITH reference to your letter No. 4414, dated the 18th March 1905, inviting opinion on certain rules defining the powers which a Professor in a Government College may exercise in matters of discipline, independently of the Principal, I have the honour to state that the rules seem to be desirable on the whole. It may, however, be mentioned that rule (b) fixing the maximum limit of fine at Rs. 5 though good in principle may not be equally suited to all Colleges.

The circumstances connected with the Presidency College are somewhat different from those of other institutions as the rate of fee there is Rs. 12 a month and the pupils attending that College mostly come from rich families. As such I venture to think that the limits of fine should always be determined in accordance with the means of the pupils.

[No. 202.]

No. 26, dated Calcutta, the 29th April 1905.

From—MAHĀMAHĀPĀDHYĀYA HARA PRASĀD SHĀSTRĪ, M.A., Principal, Sanskrit College,
and Registrar, Sanskrit Examinations.

To—The Director of Public Instruction, Bengal.

In reply to your letter No. 4406, dated the 18th March 1905, and the subsequent reminder, I have the honour to report that the rules proposed by the Professors of the Presidency College at a meeting for the purpose of enforcing discipline by the Professors independently of the Principal have my entire approval. I would only suggest that the fine limit might be Rs. 2 instead of 5, and the Professors might be authorised to punish for misconduct within the College premises the students of their class only and not students of other classes in this summary manner.

[No. 203.]

No. 298, dated the 9th January 1906.

From—A. PEDLER, Esq., F.R.S., C.I.E., Director of Public Instruction, Bengal.

To—The Secretary to the Government of Bengal, General Department.

THE question of the maintenance of the discipline in Colleges and the extent of the power of punishment to be allowed to individual Professors was considered by Government in the years 1889-90, and I have the honour to enclose a copy of this office circular No. 46, dated 3rd April 1890, which was based on Government orders on the subject contained in their resolution dated 7th October 1889.

2. From cases which from time to time have come up for decision, it appears desirable that somewhat more definite rules than those contained in the circular above quoted, should be laid down, and accordingly I have to request that the sanction of Government may be accorded to the following rules, which have been framed after consultation with the heads of Government Colleges:—

(i) A Professor or a Lecturer in a College may, on his own authority, mark a pupil absent or suspend him from attendance at his own lectures up to the period of a week. The fact of the punishment should be reported to the Principal of the College for information.

(ii) On his own authority a Professor or a Lecturer may fine up to a limit of Rs. 5 any individual student for misconduct in his own lecture-room or in any place immediately adjacent to his own lecture-room provided that in such place the student is not then under the control of another Professor or Lecturer.

The fact of such punishment should be reported to the Principal of the College for information.

(iii) On his own authority, a Professor or a Lecturer may fine a class collectively for misconduct either in his own lecture-room or in any place immediately adjacent to his own lecture-room (provided that in such place the class is not under the control of another Professor or Lecturer) up to a limit of Re. 1 per head, when the fault committed cannot be brought home to any individual or individuals. The fact should as usual be reported to the Principal for information.

(iv) When a Professor or a Lecturer finds any cause of complaint in the conduct of a student, or a number of students, or of a class, not in or adjacent to his own lecture-room but in any other place within college limits, he should report the matter to the Principal of the college for the necessary action to be taken,

[No. 204.]

No. 520, dated Calcutta, the 3rd February 1906, General Department,
(Education Branch).

From—G. GORDON, Esq., I.C.S., Offg. Secretary to the Government of Bengal.

To—the Director of Public Instruction, Bengal.

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 298 of the 9th ultimo, proposing certain rules which you consider will conduce to the maintenance of discipline in colleges.

2. In reply I am to say that the Government sanctions the rules subject to certain modifications in rule (iii) which should read as follows :—

(iii) " A Professor or a Lecturer, with the previous sanction of the Principal, may fine a class collectively for misconduct either in his own lecture-room or in any place immediately adjacent to his own lecture-room (provided that in such place the class is not under the control of another Professor or Lecturer) up to a limit of Re. 1 per head, when the fault committed cannot be brought home to any individual or individuals."

3. I am to explain that the alterations in the above rule have been made in view of its exceptional character.

[No. 205.]

OFFICE MEMORANDUM.

THE following additional rules for the maintenance of discipline in Government Colleges have been sanctioned :—

I. A Professor or a Lecturer in a College may, on his own authority, mark a pupil absent or suspend him from attendance at his own lectures up to the period of a week.

II. On his own authority, a Professor or a Lecturer may fine up to a limit of Rs. 5 any individual student for misconduct in his own lecture-room or in any place immediately adjacent to his own lecture-room, provided that in such place the student is not then under the control of another Professor or Lecturer.

III. A Professor or a Lecturer, with the previous sanction of the Principal, may fine a class collectively for misconduct either in his own lecture-room or in any place immediately adjacent to his own lecture-room (provided that in such place the class is not under the control of another Professor or Lecturer) up to a limit of one rupee per head, when the fault committed cannot be brought home to any individual or individuals.

IV. When a Professor or a Lecturer finds any cause of complaint in the conduct of a student, or a number of students, or of a class not in or adjacent to his own lecture-room, but in any other place within College limits, he should report the matter to the Principal of the College for the necessary action to be taken.

N.B.—The punishment inflicted by a Professor or a Lecturer under the foregoing rules should in every case be reported to the Principal of the College for information.

CALCUTTA,
The 26th February 1906.

A. PEDLER,
Director of Public Instruction, Bengal.

CIRCULAR No. 37.

COPY forwarded to all Principals of Government Colleges for information and guidance, in continuation of this office Circular No. 46, dated 3rd April 1890.

CALCUTTA,
The 26th February 1906.

A. PEDLER,
Director of Public Instruction, Bengal.

Précis.—Maintenance of discipline in Colleges.

Index.—GOVERNMENT COLLEGES—Discipline in —. (Education Department Circular No. 37, dated the 26th February 1906.)

1905.

Education Department, Bengal.

File $\frac{2-D}{3}$.

K.-W.—A PROGS. FOR THE YEAR 1905, Nos. 189-205.

SUBJECT :

*Power of Professors in relation to students of
Colleges.*

Notes and Orders.

No. 273, dated 23rd February 1905, from
Principal, Presidency College.

Of the three resolutions as to the power of Professors adopted by the Presidency College, (1) and (2) appear to be in accordance with the principle underlying this office Circular No. 46, dated 3rd April 1890.

But resolution No. (3) appears to be somewhat beyond the powers intended to be conferred in that circular, and apart from this it is perhaps desirable that in a matter, in which the fault cannot be established by proper evidence, the question whether the *whole class should be fined or not* should be decided after some calm consideration and at any rate *not without reference to the Principal*. Submitted for orders.

A.N.B.—6-3-05.

Yes, fining a whole class on failure to find out the real culprit or culprits may require the concurrence of the Principal.

K.B.B.—6-3-05.

The list of Professors present at the meeting at the Presidency College is not correct, for I was there myself and remember that Babus Aditya Nath Mukerjee and Satishchandra Viddyabhushan were also present, and that Dr. Bose and, I think, Dr. Cullis were not there. But the resolutions are, so far as I remember, correct.

Resolutions (1) and (2) seem to me to be free from objection. But I think that in Resolution 3 a Professor should only have power to fine a class collectively without reference to the Principal, if the misconduct occurs *during the time when he is in charge of it*. The power was extended to cover such cases as when a Professor in one room is disturbed in his lectures by a noise made by students in another when their Professor has not arrived. But I think that a question of this kind should be decided by the Principal on the Professor's report.

To Director of Public Instruction.

V. H. JACKSON—6-3-05.

I agree to (1) and (2), but I think in the case of (3)

Notes and Orders—continued.

I think we can now issue a circular on the above lines to the Principals of Colleges and ask if they agree to these powers. If they do, we can then go up to Government for sanction and include if necessary in our rules and orders.

A. PEDLER—7-3-05.

Carried out.
B.T.C.—7-3-05.

V. H. JACKSON—11-3-05.

Opinions of Principals on the following three points were asked :—

(a) On their own authority Professors may mark absent or suspend a student for misconduct for a week at most.

(b) On their own authority Professors may fine up to a limit of Rs. 5 any individual student for misconduct committed either in their lecture rooms or on the college premises.

(c) Cases of misconduct, when the fault cannot be brought home to any individual, must be reported by a Professor to the Principal, who will after consideration of the report issue such orders as appear to him to be necessary.

As regards (a) the Principals of the Dacca and Rajshahi Colleges state that the words "in their own subject or period" may be inserted in this rule. Mr. Shaw of the Hooghly College considers that all cases of fine and suspension by Professors should be reported to the Principal for approval and that an appeal to him should be open to the defaulter. The other Principals express their concurrence on (a). Mr. Browning objected to the words "independently of the Principal" on our draft. He too is of the same opinion with Mr. Shaw that the cases of fine, etc., by Professors should be reported to the Principal by which the Principals may be kept informed of the affairs in the classes. In Mr. James' opinion the student when guilty of misconduct should *only* be marked absent from lectures not exceeding 6.

Point (b).—Lady Principal, Bethune College, states that the limit of fine should be determined in accordance with the means of the pupils. Principals of Sanskrit and Rajshahi Colleges mark the limit of fine to Rs. 2. Principals of C. E. and Ravenshaw Colleges object to the words "or on the college premises." Cases coming under the above should in their opinion be referred to the Principal. In certain cases, of course, where the Professors are insulted or disregarded or where the students, who belong to a class under the control of a Professor, are found guilty, the Professors concerned may fine the particular boy or boys without any reference to the Principal.

Mr. Browning does not like that the Professors should do as stated in rules (a) and (b) independently of the Principal. He therefore recommends the addition of the following rule (d) :—

"Professors should immediately report to the Principal any case in which they have exercised the powers conferred upon them by rules (a) and (b) for his confirmation."

Mr. James wanted to extend the privileges allowed to Professors in rules (a), (b) and (c) to lecturers as well and therefore suggests that "or Lecturer" may in each case be inserted after "Professor."

Point (c) has been approved by all the Principals.

The above rules not being applicable to the Madrasah, Dr. Ross did not think it necessary to express his views on them.

Calcutta, 10th May 1905.

Demi-official from—the Head Clerk, Calcutta-Madrasah.
To—the Personal Assistant to the Director of Public Instruction, Bengal.

With reference to your office No. 4411, dated the 18th March 1905, I am directed by Dr. Ross to state, that the rules therein mentioned not being applicable to the Madrasah he does not think it necessary to express his opinion on them.

This reasoning is good for school students and hardly applies perhaps to college students, in respect of whom *suspension* is really a punishment as involving loss of percentage and also to a certain extent dishonour. It is, however, desirable that the Principal only will exercise this power.

A.N.B.
19-5-05.

Rule (a).—To mark a student absent by way of punishment while he is really attending the lectures would, I think, be better than to suspend him, in which case it would mean that he would not be under the control of any Professor but while away the time, as is naturally the case in such instances, and do whatever he likes. Suspension for a period of two or three days would not, it is believed, bring the beneficial result of putting a stop to the recurrence of misconduct for which he is punished, but may rather produce contrary result. I therefore venture to suggest that the words "or suspend" may be omitted from the rule (a), as suggested by Mr. James. Mr. James' suggestion to insert the words "or Lecturer" seems to be good and may be done.

Rule (a)—as modified above would therefore stand as follows:—

Rule (a)—"On their own authority Professors or lecturers may mark a student absent for misconduct for a week at most".

Rule (b)—The limits of fine may as proposed by certain Principals be Rs. 2 all round.

The words "or on the college premises" may be left out of rule (b). In such cases the Principal is the right person to decide of course on the report from the Professor.

Rule (b) therefore stands: "On their own authority Professors or lecturers may fine up to a limit of Rs. 5 any individual student for misconduct committed in their lecture rooms".

In rule (c) the words "or lecturers" may be inserted after "Professors".

Messrs. Browning and Shaw's suggestions that the cases coming under rules (a) and (b) should be reported to the Principal may be considered. The Principal being the head of the institution ought to know what are being done in the different lecture rooms. Moreover in cases of appeal such reports from Professors would facilitate the decision of the Principal. The Professor may therefore submit their reports to the Principal *for information* and not *for his confirmation* as suggested by Messrs. Browning and Shaw. Leaving out the words "for his confirmation" rule (d) may be added to the three rules (a), (b) and (c).

Kindly see Director of Public Instruction's orders on page 3 of the note sheet. Is it necessary to move Government to sanction the above rules?

For orders.

P. BASU—16-5-05.

I think we may add to rule (c), after the clause, "when the fault . . . individual"—"or which requires heavier punishment than a Professor is empowered to inflict".

Submitted.

A.N.B.—19-5-05.