9

*ON THE BOMBAY UNIVERSITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL : 3

Appointment of Rector in the University

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: Sir, I rise to support the amendment of my honourable friend Mr. Jadhav. It has been said by the honourable members who have preceded me that in the present financial circumstances of the University this office will be, an additional burden upon the meagre resources of the University. I think that argument is very cogent in itself, and in the few remarks that I wish to make, I should like to say that the office, administratively speaking, would be a superfluous one. Sir, I find that in 1914 the University of Bombay invited Sir Alfred Hopkinson, the Vice-Chancellor of the Manchester University, to advise the University upon a scheme of research proposed by the University, and I find, Sir, that officer making a report to the effect that this officer is not necessary. He is reported by the committee on University Reform, on page 9, to this effect :

> "He was not in favour of a salaried administrative head of the University and proposed to solve the difficulty of getting the increasing work done by employing a full-time Registrar and a paid full-time Secretary to the Joint Matriculation Board and by making more use of the University and College Professors for University administrative work."

If that was the opinion of such an expert as Sir Alfred Hopkinson in 1914, I do not see what new circumstances in the intervening period have arisen to compel us to force this officer upon the University. Further, I find that the office of the rector has no defined duties which he can perform. I. find it stated on page 162 of the report of the University Reform Committee that the Vice-Chancellor is to exercise general supervision over the University, and to have the power to see that the act, statutes and ordinances are observed. Now, Sir, referring to the position of the rector, the University Reform Committee also states on the same page that he is to hold office for five years and to be eligible for re-appointment, to be the principal executive and academic officer of the University and it is to be his duty to see that the act, statutes and ordinances are faithfully observed, and he should have all the powers necessary for this purpose.

---

*B.L.C. Debates, Vol. XXI, pp. 286-87, dated 3rd October 1927.

I do not see what is the difference between the duties attached to the office of the Vice-Chancellor and the duties that are going to be attached to the position of the rector. If the position as stated in the report of the University Reform Committee is what I have just placed before the House, then I do not understand how this office differs from that of the Vice-Chancellor on the one hand and from the office of the Registrar of the University on the other because I find on page 163 of the report of the same Committee stated that in the absence of the rector the Registrar will carry on his duties. Obviously, therefore, I do not see that the office of the rector is going to be in any sense distinct from that of the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar, and therefore calling for the appointment of a distinct officer. It is superfluous and in the present circumstances a burden on the University. On these grounds, I support the amendment of my honourable friend Mr. Jadhav.

***Discussion resumed**

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: I rise to support the amendment. I am not really in favour of principals of the different colleges coming into the University ; because I am one of those who hold the view that if the University, is to grow, the college organization must be subordinated to the faculty organization. It is my own feeling and I do not know how many honourable members share that view. If all the principals are allowed to enter they will carry into the University organization a spirit of the separatist and instead of integrating the University into one whole they will make University a disintegrated body. But my honourable friend Mr. Hamill has advanced the view that a University must really contain the minimum strength of the academic element that is necessary for the University to function. He has also pointed out that the University as at present constituted does not contain the academic element in sufficient strength. Sir, I think that the point made out by the honourable member Mr. Hamill is worthy of consideration, for I think that while we are democratising the University we must not forget that the University should have a sufficient academic element to enable the University to function as a body entrusted with the educational affairs of this presidency. I do wish that while providing for the presence of this academic element into the University we could have avoided the entry of the principals for the reasons I have already given. But I find that is not now possible, because by the definition in clause 3 teachers include professors. The principals are professors and they could come in whether the honourable member Mr. Dastur's amendment is accepted or not. His amendment is only explanatory and does not introduce any new change. I therefore support it.

*B.L.C. Debates, Vol. XXI, pp. 326-27, dated 3rd October 1927. This speech was delivered in support of Mr. Hamili's amendment to introduce the academic element in the university.

●●