CHAPTER - IV

CHANGING TREND IN CENTRALISATION
The educational decisions taken and the policies formulated during the triennium (1902-1905) continued to hold good from 1905 to 1919, when under the India Act of 1919 "Education" became a transferred subject under the charge of a Popular Minister. In fact, the implementation of these decisions and policies was done with greater zeal. The provincial departments of education continued to work out the broad lines of policy laid down by the Central Government during the triennium.

Following this policy, it was decided that private enterprise should be drastically controlled and efforts should be directed towards improvement rather than expansion. The inspectorate was strengthened and a drive for better
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instruction was launched. The doctrine that State should not interfere in education was abandoned. The Government of India was of the view that, the State could have the initiative and inspiration for implementing educational decisions from the Centre. These decisions, however, did not reflect the popular demand, which was for more autonomy and more powers to provincial governments. This policy of Centralisation, in-directly continued in a different form. The 'Director-General' of Education (a functionary of the Central Government), who was entrusted with the task of preventing the Government of India from going wrong and to secure the community of principle and of aim did have a vocal say with the State governments. The Central Government did not like that the provincial governments should establish their own educational systems. They pleaded uniformity in the system. Lord Curzon in 1905 decried the decentralised policy in education and supported Centralisation in the following words:

"Is there an educational policy of the Government of India at all? If so, is it observed, and what is the machinery by which it is carried out? Is there any due supervision of this vast and potent engine of creative energy, or after its furnace has been fed, are the wheels left to go round, and the piston rod to beat, without control? I cannot

---
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answer these questions as I should wish. There seems to me to be a misdirection, and, in some cases, a waste of force, for which I cannot hold the government free from blame. I observe a conflict of systems which finds no justification in the administrative severance, or in the local conditions, of separate provinces and areas. In the praise worthy desire to escape Centralisation at headquarters, we appear to have set up a number of petty kingdoms, a sort of Heptarchy, in the land, whose administration, in its freedom and lack of uniformity, reminds me of the days of the Hebrew judges, when there was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes. Elasticity, flexibility, variety, our system must have. But it will lose half its force if they are not inspired by a common principle and directed to a common aim... .... ....

I hold the education of the Indian people to be as much as a duty of the Central Government as the police of our cities, or the taxation of our citizens. Indeed more so, for whereas these duties can be safely delegated to subordinate hands, the Government can never abrogate its personal responsibility for the living welfare of the multitudes that have been committed to its care. 

If the views of Lord Curzon are considered to be the views of the Central Government, it means the Central Government wanted to have control over the provinces in the matters of education. It did not intend to abrogate its responsibility for controlling and subsidising the States. In 1905, the Government of India announced a recurring grant of 5 lakhs of rupees, which was to be continued for five years. Of the total of 25 lakhs, 11½ lakhs were allotted to universities for administration, inspection, travelling charges, the purchase of land and the erection of buildings; 13½ lakhs were given to provincial governments for the improvement of colleges. 7

Owing to the huge grants to universities, the provincial governments lost their interest in the University education. They looked towards the Central Government for guidance. The supremacy of the Indian Government over the university education aroused severe criticism. The Indian Newspapers of Bengal and Bombay were very critical of Central Government's control. 8 The Government of India policy of education was considered the usurpation of legitimate right of the provincial governments in higher education. 9 Unmindful of this criticism the centre had control over the universities in India. These seats of higher learning were established by the Central Government action. They were not independent
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bodies of learning their members were nominated by the Centre. Therefore, the universities executed the policies of the Government of India and not of the provincial governments.

Though primary education was the direct responsibility of the States, yet by providing subsidies, the Central Government exercised its control over this level of education. In 1905 a grant of Rs. 35.40 lakhs recurring was distributed among the States for the spread of primary education.¹⁰ This grant was not given without its strings. The States were directed to follow the Central government guidelines in the field of primary education. The provincial governments were told to act upon the Government's Resolution on Educational Policy of 1904, which reviewed the 1870 decentralised policy of Lord Mayo reversed it and enunciated, its new policy aimed at Central Government control of education.¹¹ The provincial governments were categorically told to follow the lines of general policy laid down under the resolution of 1904.¹² The adoption of this policy also placed a temporary check on the development of secondary education.

In 1910, education instead of remaining tagged to Home Department of the Central Government, became a full-fledged Department. The executive council was enlarged by the addition of a member for education, whose portfolio,

besides "Education", included sanitation, local-self government, archaeology and other matters. A separate secretary was also appointed. A Bureau of education was started at the Centre for the purpose of publishing occasional reports on educational matters, besides the annual and Quinquennial reviews of the progress of education and building up an educational library. With the help of these agencies the Central Government considered the question of General Policy, coordinated the work in various provinces and submitted schemes which were beyond the sanctioning powers of the provincial governments, after examining and giving its opinion, to the Secretary of State for India. In 1910, the post of 'Director-General' of education in India was abolished or rather absorbed into the new department which comprised, besides the member of Council, two secretaries and an assistant-secretary, to coordinate and correlate the educational policies of both the Government of India and provincial governments. Defacto the policy of 1904 appears to be "Centralisation" but drifting towards de jure it was as defended by Mr. H. Sharp, who remarked that "the Government of India did not control institutions", but considered question of general policy, correlated when necessary the line of advance made in the various provinces, examined, approved or submitted to the
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Secretary of State for India, schemes which were beyond the sanctioning power of the provincial governments, and allotted imperial grants.\(^{16}\)

Mr. Harcourt Butler was made the first member for education. That he had no intentions to encroach upon the powers of provincial governments. This fact is clear from his observation as President of the Conference on the education of the 'Domiciled Community' in India. "In the papers which have been circulated to you, the proposal has been made that the education of the domiciled community should be centralised under the direct control of the Government of India. As a member of the Government of India, I must appreciate the confidence placed in us, but I must also point out that such a proposal is directly opposed to the accepted policy of decentralisation. In my own experience, I can say that the needs of the domiciled community vary in different parts of India, and it would be altogether undesirable in the interests of that community for the education department of the Government of India to take direct charge of their education over so vast an area. Further, I can conceive nothing more injurious to the domiciled community than that the Local governments, who give so much employment to them and are interested in their welfare, should be divorced from all concerned in the education of their children. I can, however, assure you that the Government of India will cooperate heartily with the local governments.

to effect necessary reforms, worked out in consultation with them with due regard to varying local conditions.17

It is clear that Lord Butler reposed confidence in the policy of decentralisation. He assured the cooperation and help of the Central Government in the spread of education. Thus, the actual administration in education rested with the provincial governments. Each province had a department of Public Instruction except the small province of Coorg, where supervision was managed from Madras. In January 1911, a department of education was formed in the North-West Frontier province, while prior to this archaeology and education were managed by one office. The inspecting agency, was included in the Punjab service. A Director of Public Instruction was appointed for the North-West Frontier province and Baluchistan.18 He acted as the agent of the provincial government whose approval, he was required to secure in important matters. "He advised the provincial government as to the educational policy to be pursued and when the policy was decided, he himself was responsible for carrying it out. His proposals to the provincial government were made through one of the Secretaries to the State government. The Secretary was a member of the Civil Service. The only exception was in the Punjab. There the Director was also an Under Secretary and largely performed the functions of a Secretary.19

Thus, the control of "Education" was in the hands of the provincial governments. But it does not mean that Centre was precluded from the sphere of education. The Government of India did control the general policies of education.

Sir Harcourt Butler prepared a case for a large imperial grant for education.\(^20\) He hoped that this grant-in-aid would help the Central Government to promote education in the provinces. He intended to introduce free and compulsory education.\(^21\)

Having such encouragement from the Central Government, the provincial governments took many steps for the spread of education such as, opening of new schools, construction of buildings etc. The States increased the allocation to education from their revenue.\(^22\) In the meantime, great efforts were made for introducing universal, free and compulsory education by Mr. Gokhale who introduced a "Bill" to this effect in the Central Legislative Assembly.\(^23\) The Central Government referred the question of introducing free and compulsory education\(^24\) to the Provincial Governments.\(^25\) One of the bill's strongest opponents was the Governor of Bombay, Sir George Clarke, who strongly advised...

\(^{20}\) Butler to Hardinge, 22.6.1911. B.P. (32-9).
\(^{21}\) Ibid.
\(^{22}\) Progress of Education in India, 1912-1917, P.108.
\(^{23}\) Member of Centre Legislative Assembly.
\(^{24}\) Progress of Education in India 1907-1912, P.124.

Hardinge against making primary education either free or compulsory. In his opinion, the educated classes were 'aware of the power the Vernacular press would be able to exercise when the masses could read and it was merely to wield a great influence with the illiterate peasants that they were agitating for free elementary education.' He further stated that the desire for free education was 'partly at least unreal and Gokhale's Bill appeared hopelessly unpractical and not socially intended.' The Times' found the arguments used by the Governor of the Provincial Government in opposing Gokhale's Bill, 'absolutely unconvincing'. In the opinion of the Government of India, "the mass education would be bad and nurseries of sedition." It would inculcate dislike of the British Government. This was the reason that the States did not show any interest in the development and spread of free and compulsory primary education.

The Finance Member warned that the ultimate cost of freeing primary education would be much greater than Butler's estimate and desired that the financial implications should be carefully considered. With the 'opium revenues shrinking, any increase in education expenditure was a grave prospect.' Carlyle and Jenkins* also had their doubts,
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and these were echoed in the Indian Council. Sir William Lee-Warner* thought Gokhale's bill 'mischievous' and one which would cause widespread alarm. 32 K. Gupta, an Indian Member of the Secretary of State's council, on the other hand favoured the bill and failed to see anything 'pernicious' in the bill. 33

Faced with the opposition within the Government and of the provincial governments, from members of his own Council and from Home government, Hardinge gave way. 33A The bill was, therefore, rejected by 38 to 13 votes. On the ground that "it would be premature and impractical, so long as the demand for education was in excess of the supply and so long as the supply of education was limited by financial considerations." 34 It depicted the stern view of the Centre towards mass education. Gokhale held that "no bill in his time had received such 'weighty, such enthusiastic, such over-whelming public support', but clearly it was the fate of Indians of his generation to serve their country by their failures, later generations would be privileged to serve her by their successes." 35

The rejection of Gokhale's bill made it clear that the Centre supported by Provincial Governors could be more powerful than the voice of the public at large as claimed by Mr. Gokhale. It evinced the predominant role of the
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Centre and the position of helplessness of the States. In 1911, the Centre wished that arrangement for exchange of professors of Art and Technical Colleges be made to establish liaison between the Centre and the States. But the position materially did not change.

In 1912, a historic address of His Majesty, the King Emperor changed the position when stated:

"It was his wish that there might be spread over the land a net work of schools and colleges from which would go forth loyal and manly and useful citizens able to hold their own in industries and agriculture and all the vocations in life. And that was his wish too, that the homes of his Indian subjects might be brightened and their labour sweetened by the spread of knowledge with all that follows in its train, a higher level of thought of comfort and of health. It was through education that his wish would be fulfilled; and the cause of education in India would ever be very close to his heart." 37

As a result of this declaration, Lord Montagu, in the House of Commons reported that a grant of £330,000 annually would be spent mainly on primary education. Subsequently, a further grant of Rs.50 lakhs was announced for the primary education. A recurring grant of Rs.35 lakhs was also made for primary education. In the following years, the Government of
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India gave grants to the Universities to facilitate higher teaching and research. The sums allotted were as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-recurring grants</th>
<th>Rs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Calcutta</td>
<td>22 lakhs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bombay</td>
<td>3 lakhs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Madras</td>
<td>7 lakhs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Punjab</td>
<td>4 lakhs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Allahabad</td>
<td>5 lakhs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recurring grants</th>
<th>Rs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Calcutta</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bombay</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Madras</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Punjab</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Allahabad</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These subsidies were but a prelude to more extensive activities of the Central Government in future. The Central Government gave grants-in-aid of Rs. 7,52,000 recurring and Rs. 36,18,000 non-recurring. These sums included two special grants of Rs. 30,000 and Rs. 42,000 for the cities of Madras and Calcutta respectively. These subsidies were intended to provide facilities for the expansion of education among the Indians. Grants were also assigned for the improvement of
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Muhammadan education. In Madras a recurring Central grant of Rs. 30,000 was made for the expansion of Muhammadan education.\(^{43}\) Similarly a recurring grant of Rs. 34,500 was given to Bengal for Muhammadan education and Rs. 45,880 were assigned for Muhammadan girls.\(^{44}\) This generosity of providing doles to the State-governments, indicated that the Central Government was taking keen interest in the educational affairs of the States.

The Resolution of Government of India of 1913 created a dichotomous situation. On one hand it stated that "each province had its own educational system, which had grown up under local conditions and became familiar to the people as a part of their general well-being. In view of the diverse social conditions in India, there could not in practice be one set of regulations and one rate of progress for the whole of India. Even within provinces there was scope for greater variety in types of institutions than existed then. The Government of India had no desire to centralize provincial systems or to attempt to introduce a superficial uniformity. Still less did they desire to deprive provincial governments of interest and initiative in education."\(^{45}\)

---

43. Indian Education in 1913-14, P.25.
On the other hand in the same Resolution, the Central Government expressed its desire to review the "Educational Policy" in India at intervals. The power of reviewing the educational policy of India as a whole showed their persistent interest in the educational affairs of the State-Governments. As a consequence, the Government of India decided to assist the Provincial Governments through large grants-from the Central revenues. The Secretary of State approved this decision. Therefore, in the following year the biggest lump-sum grant of Rs.3.87 crores was provided for general education. With this grant, the Government of India developed some federal functions in education e.g., the research and publication functions. In addition to grants, the Centre Government gave encouragement to the Provincial Governments for the expansion of education in their States, but this policy of expansion of education made the provincial revenue fairly inelastic and the provinces became unable to keep pace with the rapidly growing commitments of an expanding educational system. Thus, the Central Government came to their help and started the practice of giving grants-in-aid to the provincial governments for educational development over and above the agreed contract arrangements. This financial aid from the Centre was not without its strings. The
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Government of India began to control the educational matters of the States by hosting educational conferences, reviewing general policy and providing adequate education to Anglo-Indian and European Classes. By this dual role of the Central Government it is inferred that the Government of India wanted to retain the control in some way or the other.

The Resolution of 1913 further suggested that the secondary education should be improved in the country. As a result of this proposal, the Universities Act of 1904 was to be amended, for it did not provide any adequate powers for controlling unaided and unrecognised schools. A bill was, therefore, drafted to amend the 1904 Act. It proposed to make registration compulsory for all schools, government or private aided or unaided. The registering authorities were to be school boards formed by provincial governments. The bill was to be applied to the whole of India. This proposed amendment created doubts among the public that the Central Government was not in favour of decentralization. Therefore, the attitude of the Central Government towards secondary education was resented all over the country. It was stated in the press that 'Bengal would emphatically protest against this proposal to bring
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high schools wholly under the control of the education department.\footnote{Sanjivani, 10.7.1913.} Amrita Bazar Patrika stated that "the move to take away from the university the right to recognise schools and to replace the matriculation with a school final examination, were described as 'the long-apprehended snatching away of the jurisdiction of the University over secondary education';\footnote{Amrita-Bazar Patrika, 9.7.1913.} and as steps 'to cripple the sphere of activity of the Calcutta University and bring all branches of education under the control of the Central Government'.\footnote{Bengalee, 10.7.1913.} These measures, it was feared, would result in fewer high schools and fewer students appearing for matriculation and would therefore, narrow down the path of higher education.\footnote{Nayak, 9.7.1913.} Indeed, this proposed Central Government control was described as 'a veritable death sentence'.\footnote{Amrita-Bazar Patrika, 26.6.1913.} The dangerous over activity of the new fangled education department of the Government of India, its new battles with Calcutta University and supremacy over provincial governments became the 'all-absorbing topic among the Indian Public.'\footnote{Native News-Paper Reports, Bengal, 1913.}

Therefore, appeals were made by the press to the Viceroy to intervene and 'withdraw from a position which had excited the liveliest apprehension and alarm in the
minds of the educated community'. Faced with this public outcry, Hardinge decided to postpone the bill till 'a time of greater tranquility'. But H. Sharp, the Education Member of the Government of India, was against this last minute withdrawal. He questioned the wisdom of introducing the bill, if it was not to be decided upon. The problem of controlling secondary education, therefore, remained unsolved.

In the domain of Primary Education, the Resolution of 1913 stated:--

"The propositions that illiteracy must be broken down and that primary education has, in the present circumstances of India, a predominant claim upon the public funds, represent accepted policy no longer open to discussion. For financial and administrative reasons of decisive weight, the Government of India have refused to recognise the principle of compulsory education, but they desire the widest possible extension of primary education on a voluntary basis." Development of primary education was, therefore, a recognised policy of the Central Government. Though the Government of India rejected Mr. Gokhale's bill for free and compulsory education, yet it requested the provincial

---
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governments for extending the application of the principle of free elementary education amongst the poorer and more backward sections of the population". Thus, the doors for enactment of compulsory primary education by the provincial governments were opened. Commenting on this, Nurullah and Naik stated that "the work of Mr. Gokhale was taken up by the late Mr. Vithalbhai Patel. It was mainly due to his exertions that the Bombay primary education Act was passed, enabling the municipalities, under certain conditions, to introduce compulsory education within their areas." This act aroused great interest and the next few years witnessed intense activity in favour of compulsory education. At this stage, the Central Government's viewpoint was changed and it relented toward the accepted policy of decentralisation. Henceforth, the activities of the Government of India were of coordination and supervision of the educational affairs of the provinces. School at 'Sanawar' presented a good example of Centre-State participation and coordination in the educational matters. Mr. C. A. Barron, the Chief Secretary to the Government of Punjab stated that "the progress of normal schools and training classes continued to be very satisfactory. Much remained, however, to be done to improve the conditions under which European teachers were trained at Sanawar.

---

This institution was a joint concern of the Imperial Government and of the province, as the majority of the students come from other provinces. It enunciated that the Centre Government did not intend to centralise education. It rejected the demand made by some props of European Education that European education should be centralised under the Government of India. The Central Government emphasized that decentralisation was the accepted policy of the Government and it was convinced that if the Centralisation removed some difficulties of the European education, it was certain that more problems would crop in. The Government of India would only have the supervisory powers.

For this purpose, in April 1915, an officer was attached to the education department of the Government of India, who would be able to tour and keep himself in touch with the provincial governments without interfering with their discretion or interrupting the process of decentralisation. The Government of India started decreasing the strength of its education department. The Secretaries were reduced to one, whose duty was to submit all cases of educational interest to the Member. A post of education commissioner was created. This was really a revival
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of the post of 'Director-General' of education, which was abolished in 1910. The commissioner toured extensively, discussed questions with provincial governments and advised the department on educational cases. The creation of a separate department under the education commissioner became the venue for discussing common problems, pooling experiences and a source of disseminating educational information.\footnote{72} This led to the cohesion of partnership between the Centre and the States on educational matters.

In 1916, more powers were given to the States. The States in real sense were enjoying the status of the units of federation. On their own part, the provinces also delegated powers to the local bodies for bringing efficiency in the educational system of the country. Mr. H. Sharp stated that "the Government of India issued a resolution on local-self government and also passed orders on the questions raised by the 'Royal Commission' on 'Decentralisation'.\footnote{73} Later on, the decision of the Commission was endorsed by the Central Government and was implemented by the States. The Local bodies were given greater share in the control of such education as was entrusted to them.\footnote{74}

But decentralisation was only limited to the primary school education. In the domain of university education, the Central Government reserved the powers. It was quite evident
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from the results of the Indian Universities Act of 1904. The main purpose of the Act was to establish the control and supervision of the Central Government over university policy. This control was more direct and effective in 1917 than it had hither-to been. The Universities of India were under the terms of the Act of 1904, in theory though not in practice, among the most completely governmental universities in the world. Universities were established by the Government action. They had been from the first not independent corporations of learning but bodies mainly nominated by the Central Government. The Universities enjoyed the defined powers, which were delegated to them. They were subject to constant supervision by the Central Government.

Though the Government of India handed over the affairs of education of four origin universities to the respective States yet the powers of the fifth were still with the Centre. In all the universities except Calcutta the "Chancellor" was the Governor of the province in which the University was situated and the government was the provincial government. Whereas in Calcutta the "Chancellor" was Governor-General of India and the 'Government' was the Government of India.
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The provincial government of Bengal had nothing to do with the affairs of the Calcutta University.\textsuperscript{78} The Governor of the province acted as Rector of the University under clause 18 of the Act of 1904. He had no original powers except that of being the medium of communication between the University and the Government of India.\textsuperscript{79} When the other provinces were given more powers in educational affairs, the Government of Bengal was yet under the control of the Central Government for its University education, whereas other levels of education such as higher, secondary and primary was governed by the Government of Bengal. This division of responsibility and power between two authorities 1000 miles apart seemed illogical, likely to lead to confusion and delay and apt to make the exercise of the control ineffective.\textsuperscript{80} This unnecessary control of the Imperial Government was criticised by Mr.J.G.Cumming, one of the members of the Imperial Legislative Council. He stated that "it seemed to him that there was a general principle involved and that principle was a well known one in administration. 'where there was responsibility, there should be authority and in fact, power or authority could not be divorced from responsibility without serious consequences. Since the Government of India had moved from their former headquarters in Calcutta, the position of the
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Government of Bengal was such that it had a responsibility of which it could not divest itself.\textsuperscript{81} This drawback was clearly recognised by His Excellency the Viceroy. He assured the provincial government for decreasing this control. He stated in his convocation address at Calcutta University:

"Since I assumed Office, I have been very conscious of the grave inconvenience of the distance which separates the University from its chancellor and the Government of India. It is impossible for us to have that close and intimate knowledge of your affairs which only residence on that part can give."\textsuperscript{82}

This convocation address had led to the demand that the Central Government should transfer to the government of Bengal its function, in relation to the University of Calcutta. But this move was obstructed on the ground that the University of Calcutta exercised jurisdiction over the Colleges in the provinces of Burma and Assam.\textsuperscript{83}

But due to great pressure, Sir Sankaran Nair, member of the Viceroy's Council, accepted the demand on behalf of the Government of India and stated that "implementation of the demand would be delayed until the proposed universities of Patna and of Rangoon should be established."\textsuperscript{84}
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\textsuperscript{84. Ibid.}
Calcutta University affairs were not only the instances of the Central Government interest in the University education, the Government of India had control over the General Educational Policy of the country. Mr. Gauranaganath Banerjee, member of the Calcutta University Commission was very vocal of this control of education. He stated that "the provincial government alone possessed the power and disinterestedness to bring coordination and unity between independent and sometimes antagonistic interests to see that the general interests of the entire nation were adequately secured."\textsuperscript{85} Whereas Mr. F. W. Sudmerson, member of the Calcutta University Commission was in favour of the Control of the Government of India over the Universities. He stated that "it was essential that the way be not barred to an easy passage from one university to another, and the whole of India should be similarly opened to migration. It would be difficult to secure this unless there be a central controlling body."\textsuperscript{86} Mr. Baroda Frosand Dey, member of the Calcutta University Commission urged that "while the powers of the Government of India should be of a general supervisory character, it might play useful part by acting as arbitrator in case of differences between a university and the provincial governments.

\textsuperscript{86} Ibid.
It was found that the persons in whose hands the actual administration of education in the provinces remained, even did not want to administer it. This viewpoint was expressed by the staff of the Serampore College:-

"We are doubtful of the wisdom of leaving all the university problems of the province to be settled by the provincial government. We are likely to witness in due course considerable advance in the direction of granting a large measure of autonomy to the Indian provinces, something on the lines, perhaps of what already exists in the United States of America. We are of opinion, however that the cause of university education in America has suffered through the individual States exercising supreme power in the matter of University Charters. Thus, some of the American States have granted university powers to institutions which are little better than secondary schools, while other States rigidly maintain the best university traditions. We have no special schemes to put forward as to the relation that should exist between the Government of India and the provincial government in these matters, but we are strongly of the view that the Government of India should not be a negligible factor."87

Such outbursts of the authorities encouraged the Centre to maintain deep interest in the affairs of the Universities. Though this interest in 1917 was not as keen

as in 1904, yet the Government of India, without interfering in details exercised a general coordinating influence. 88 The Central Government took the responsibility by collecting and disseminating information and by giving advice and financial assistance to provincial governments and universities. The Saddler Commission also supported such functions of the Central Government when it stated:

"It must be obvious that the Government of India can perform an invaluable function by defining the aims of general policy, by giving advice and assistance to provincial governments and to universities, by acting as an impartial arbiter in cases of dispute, by protecting disregarded interests, by supplying organised information as to the development of educational ideas in the various provinces, by helping to obtain the services of scholars from other countries, by coordinating the work of various universities and by guarding against needless duplication and overlapping in the provision of more costly forms of education." 89

The Centre also held a series of conferences of representatives of all the provinces on various matters of special interest. It issued from time to time full and carefully considered resolutions on educational policy,
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in which general principles had been laid down for the guidance of the provincial governments.  

The Government of India wanted to establish a link with the provincial governments for the development and expansion of education. The Centre advised the Secretary of State and formed the channel of communication between him and the provincial governments. It had to see the enforcement of complicated regulations by which the educational services were controlled.  

A Bureau of education was created. It advised the Central Government in regard to the distribution of central subsidies for education. The Calcutta University Commission commented on the distribution of subsidies and the effect of them on the provincial governments. It stated that "subsidies had been, in recent years, on a much more generous scale than ever before; and the mere fact that it now supplied so large a proportion of the available funds, gave to the Government of India and its department of education a great influence in shaping the general educational policy of Indian Empire".  

Therefore, there was hardly any change in the keen interest of the Government of India, rather the Central interest in education continued to show a spurt till the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms made education a transferred subject despite the Government of India's opposition.  
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The Montagu-Chelmsford Report disclosed the enormous powers which the Government of India possessed and it also revealed how in varying degrees, it exercised a great influence on the provincial legislation, finance and administration. It reported that the Government of India was one and indivisible. It stated that "from this point of view the provincial governments were literally the agents of the Government of India." The codes of instructions also imposed "definite restraints upon the powers of provincial governments to create new appointments or to raise emoluments." The Central Government had the right to recall powers, if the State-Government abused it or neglect it and in extreme cases, the Government of India could suspend the governments of the provinces. Therefore, the Centre was very powerful, inspite of the fact, education was being decentralized.

It was also incumbent on provincial governments to submit for the previous sanction of the Central Government and the Secretary of State, all projects for educational legislation before introduction. Similarly, the Universities were subject to the several university acts which had been passed from time to time by the Central legislature, and

---
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therefore, all amendments to those acts were subject to the same authority. Legislation for the creation of new universities was also introduced by the Central Government. The Centre was not only concerned with the administration, it was also responsible for General policy in education. 99

The provincial governments resented the Central Government dictatorial methods of defining their policy. They were becoming more and more critical of Central control and were outspoken in their comments. 100 The States developed their own individuality and aired their own opinions, just as the Central Government became increasingly impatient of interference from the Home government. 101 As a result of State-Governments' protests the Central Government relented its control and avoided to thrust upon the provinces its schemes and investigations. The Government of India even dropped the idea of introducing the Calcutta University Report in the provinces except in Bengal. 102 Though the Centre thought that certain points connected with the report might not be without use in the provinces and some of the recommendations made by the Commission were likely to be found valuable for wider application, yet it did not compel the states to introduce them. 103
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The Central Government role in financial matters during 1905 to 1921 was predominant. Fiscal policy was framed by the Government of India. The Provincial Governments were, therefore, at the mercy of the Centre. They were not competent to spend more than their allotted budgets. They were eager and very keen to get more and more finances from the Centre for the promotion of education. Provincial expenditure in relation to total expenditure on education was also increased between 1905 and 1921, but it was very meagre. "It increased from 33% in 1907 to 34.3% in 1912 and 34.7% in 1917, till it reached 49.1% in 1921. This shows an increasing proportion of Central Government contribution towards education during the period till it reached almost half the total expenditure on education. The proportion of the Central Government contribution almost doubled itself in two decades. Total expenditure increased by Rs. 1,436 lakhs and the provincial grants to education by Rs. 79.8 lakhs during this period. This proportion between the increase in these two was approximately 18:1. This ratio was 7:1 for the period 1881-1902. This shows that the rate of increase of provincial contribution was less than half of what it was during the 19th century."\textsuperscript{104} The reason of this decrease was that, it included the Central Government grants. Mr. Misra stated that "once these Imperial grants were received, they were included in the provincial revenues and termed provincial

\textsuperscript{105} Misra, Atamanand: Educational Finance in India, P. 164.
contributions. If these Imperial grants were reckoned separately, the provincial contribution would dwindle down to only 22.1 per cent of the total educational expenditure. Contributions from provincial revenues therefore, alone were 3.8 per cent less than what they were in 1901-02. This shows how the States depended upon the Central Government for their undertaking educational schemes. "The provincial governments were not increasing their contributions and they were contentedly enjoying the sunshine of the Imperial grants." 106

The States became so dependent that it was difficult for them at this stage to go without the Imperial grants for education. From 1907-08 till 1910-11, no Imperial grants of importance were given. Rs.10,000 a year was allotted to the Government of Punjab for the maintenance of the European training class at Sanawar and Rs.10,000 to the Calcutta University for the establishment of the Minto-Professorship of Economics. 107 With these scanty grants from the Centre, the provinces could not make stride development in education. They needed subsidies for the rapid progress of education in their provinces. The Government of India put forward a general policy by making available to the provincial governments the means for accomplishment. 108

The Royal Commission on 'Decentralisation' recommended in respect of these grants that "the system must be maintained provided that it involves no increase of administrative

106. Ibid, P. 310.
control by the Government of India, and that the views of provincial governments were taken as to the relative urgency of objects. The object should not always necessarily be the same in every province and recurring grants might gradually be converted into shares of growing revenue.109 The Central Government, after considering the recommendations of the Royal Commission recomenced the Imperial grants. At the close of 1910-11 a non-recurring grant of 93 lakhs* was distributed. At the 'Imperial Darbar' in December of the following year a grant of Rs. 50 lakhs a year for popular education was announced. A further grant of Rs.10 lakhs a year for university and secondary education was made available from 1912-13. In the same year a non-recurring grant of Rs.387,18 lakhs was made. In 1913-14, a further recurring grant of Rs.55 lakhs was distributed in specified amounts for different forms of education together with a small non-recurring grant of 0.95 lakhs. In 1914-15, a recurring grant of Rs.5 lakhs was made for any educational purposes, selected by the various provincial governments and a non-recurring grant of Rs. 12.25 lakhs, which included Rs.10 lakhs for the erection of hostels by the University of Calcutta.110

This liberal and favourable fiscal policy was checked by the war. As a result of this war provincial governments were precluded from drawing freely upon the unspent balances

of Imperial grants. With these restrictions the conditions of the provinces became very lean. Educational developments were checked. The provinces once again requested the Centre for help. The Government of India allowed the provinces to avail of the recurring grants in 1915-17 but no new grants were made. However, a grant of Rs. 30 lakhs was provided in 1917-18 and a further grant of Rs. 30 lakhs recurring for primary education was announced in 1918-19.

This financial help to the State governments was not without strings. The Central Government had advisory powers. Time to time the Government of India issued a number of circulars, defining general policy of the Government. It passed numerous resolutions which dealt with subjects as varied as the improvement of primary and Vernacular education, the abolition of fees in primary schools, the training of primary and secondary school teachers, the improvement of secondary education, the education of Muhammadans, the education of girls and women, the education of factory children, text book committees, educational literature and the boy scout movement.

Except performing General functions of above-mentioned nature, the Central Government had no desire to intrude upon the educational sphere of the provinces. The Government of India did useful work in numerous conferences of the
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provincial educational officers. The decisions of these conferences were issued in the form of resolutions of the Governor-General and circulars of the Government of India. These documents dealt with various aspects of the problems and made valuable suggestions for solving them. Report on constitutional reforms stated that these suggestions of creative activity had been beneficial and had contributed to the admitted efficiency of the provincial governments.

For providing more powers to the Provincial Government, Lord Montagu made a declaration on August 20, 1917, in the House of Commons. He stated:-

"The policy of His Majesty's Government of India are in complete accord, is that of the increasing association of Indian in every branch of administration with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire. I would add that progress in this policy can only be achieved by successive stages. The British Government and the Government of India, on whom the responsibility lies for the welfare and advancement of Indian people, must be the judges of the time, and measure of each advance and they must be guided by the

cooperation received from those upon whom new opportunities of service will be conferred and by the extent to which it is found that confidence could be reposed in their sense of responsibility.¹¹⁶

This historic announcement of 20th August 1917, proposed a gradual transfer of the authority to Indians' hand.¹¹⁷ Therefore, this declaration was a great landmark in the constitutional history of India. It was the first momentous announcement of British policy towards India.¹¹⁸ It laid the foundation of decentralisation in administrative affairs and initiated a responsible government. On the basis of this 'Declaration' a joint report was prepared by Mr. Montagu, the Secretary of State and Lord Chelmsford, the Governor-General.¹¹⁹ This report formed the basis on which the reforms of 1919 were worked out. The report stated that "the guiding principle should be to include in the transferred list those departments which afforded most opportunity for local knowledge and social service, those in which Indians had shown themselves to be keenly interested, those in which mistakes which might occur, though serious, would not be irremediable, and those which stood most in need of development."¹²⁰

¹¹⁶. Montagu's Declaration in the House of Commons on August 20, 1917.
Therefore, consistent to the report, education became a transferred subject under the Government Act of 1919.

Prior to the introduction of the Act, the Government of India exercised general supervision and control over education throughout the country. Schemes involving legislation or large expenditure came up to the Central Government. The system of doles-including grants for education was in force. When the Government of India had any surplus revenue and the demand for educational expenditure was insistent or its need was obvious, subsidies were granted to provincial governments for general or specific purposes. But with the enactment of Government of India Act, the Control of education in the provinces came to them. In short, education became a provincial subject.

Therefore, the period of 15 years from 1905 to 1919 witnessed many changing trends in the role of the Central Government. During 1905 to 1910, the Government of India followed strictly the policies formulated during the trennium (1902-1905). The control of the Central Government was relented during 1911 but after a year, it assumed more powers. In 1912, the Government of India shelved the mass-education demand and rejected the introduction of compulsory primary education bill. However, the Centre
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continued the subsidies to the provinces. The Resolution of the Government of India 1913, proposed that the Centre should perform supervisory and advisory functions. It also encouraged the mass education movement. The Calcutta University Commission was very vocal on the Government of India's domination over the affairs of the Universities. Prior to the introduction of the Montford Reforms, the Central Government exercised general supervision, coordination and control over the provinces in matters educational. The supremacy of the Government of India remained up to the time when "Education" became a provincial transferred subject entrusted to the charge of ministers.¹²²

---

¹²² Memorandum on the Progress of Education in British India between 1916-1926, P.7.