

1st February, 1922

THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES
(Official Report)

SECOND SESSION

OF THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1922



SIMLA
SUPERINTENDENT, GOVERNMENT CENTRAL PRESS
1922

CONTENTS.

	Page
TUESDAY, 10TH JANUARY, 1922	1333-1487
New Year's Greetings.	
Oath.	
Statements laid on the Table.	
Questions and Answers.	
Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
Address of Welcome to H. B. H. the Prince of Wales.	
Statement of Government Business.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : the Abandonment of the Policy of Repression.	
Congratulation of Honours.	
Panel of Chairman.	
Committee on the Functions of the Deputy President.	
Ruling on Standing Order No. 38.	
Notice of Motion under Rule 11.	
Motion for Adjournment.	
The Indian Electricity (Amendment) Bill.	
The Indian Factories (Amendment) Bill.	
WEDNESDAY, 11TH JANUARY, 1922	1489-1512
Statements laid on the Table.	
Amendment of Standing Orders.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Policy of Repression.	
THURSDAY, 12TH JANUARY, 1922	1513-1560
Oath.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Indigenous Systems of Medicine.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Indian Mercantile Marine.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Prevention of Overcrowding in Railways.	
MONDAY, 16TH JANUARY, 1922	1561-1612
Oaths.	
Questions and Answers.	
Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
Statement laid on the Table.	
Address of Welcome to H. R. H. the Prince of Wales.	
Select Committee on Standing Orders.	
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill.	
The Delhi University Bill.	
• Vol. II—Pt. II.	

TUESDAY, 17TH JANUARY, 1922 1613-1656

Unstarred Questions and Answers.
 Select Committee on Standing Orders.
 The Civil Marriage (Amendment) Bill.
 Message from the Council of State.
 The Civil Marriage (Amendment) Bill.
 The Mussalman Waqfs Registration Bill.
 The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill.
 The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill.
 The Interest Act 1839 Amendment Bill.

WEDNESDAY, 18TH JANUARY, 1922 1657-1736

Oaths.
 The Civil Marriage (Amendment) Bill.
 The Indian Emigration Bill.
 The Indian Income-tax Bill.
 Resolution *re* : abandonment of the Policy of Repression.

THURSDAY, 19TH JANUARY, 1922 1737-1789

Unstarred Questions and Answers.
 Ballot for Bills.
 Statement of Government Business.
 Resolution *re* : Committee on certain sections of the I. P. C. and C. P. C.
 Resolution *re* : Elected Standing Committees with the Government of India.

FRIDAY, 20TH JANUARY, 1922 1791-1813

Governor General's Assent to Bills passed by the Legislature.
 The Civil Marriage (Amendment) Bill.

TUESDAY, 24TH JANUARY, 1922 1815-1889

Questions and Answers.
 Unstarred Questions and Answers.
 Messages from the Council of State.
 Resolution *re* : Committees on Currency and Exchange.
 Resolution *re* : the abolition of Impressed Labour, Conveyance and Provision.

WEDNESDAY, 25TH JANUARY, 1922 1891-1941

Statement laid on the Table.
 The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill.
 The Delhi University Bill.
 The Indian Income-tax Bill.

THURSDAY, 23TH JANUARY, 1922

Situation in Guntur.
Statement laid on the Table.
Questions and Answers.
Situation in Guntur.
Statement of Government Business.
Governor General's Assent to Bills passed by the Legislature.
Resolution *re* : Votable and Non-votable items in the Budget.
Resolution *re* : Export of Manures and Oil Seeds.
Message from the Council of State.

SATURDAY, 28TH JANUARY, 1922 1991-2050

The Delhi University Bill.
The Indian Income-tax Bill.
Amendment of Standing Orders.
The Police (Incitement to Disaffection) Bill.
The Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill.
The Indian Emigration Bill.

TUESDAY, 31ST JANUARY, 1922 2051-2073

Questions and Answers.
Unstarred Questions and Answers.
Arrangement of Government Business.
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill.
The Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill.
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill.

WEDNESDAY, 1ST FEBRUARY, 1922 2075-2102

Bills passed by the Council of State.
The Indian Lunacy (Amendment) Bill.
Resolution *re* : Women's Franchise.

FRIDAY, 3RD FEBRUARY, 1922 2103-2151

Questions and Answers.
Statement of Business.
Resolution *re* : Examination of the Indian Penal Code.
Resolution *re* : Reduction of Madras Contribution to Central Government.
Resolutions withdrawn.
Resolution *re* : Separation of the Andhra Districts from the Madras Presidency.
Resolution *re* : Committee of Inquiry on Expulsion from Cantonments.
Presentation of Report of Select Committee on Standing Orders.
Resolution *re* : Committee on Retrenchment.

	PAGE
MONDAY, 6TH FEBRUARY, 1922	2153-2220
Questions and Answers.	
Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
Motion for Adjournment.	
The Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill.	
The Benares Hindu University (Amendment) Bill.	
The Indian Emigration Bill.	
TUESDAY, 7TH FEBRUARY, 1922	2221-2243
The Indian Limitation (Amendment) Bill.	
The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Suppression of Traffic in Women and Children.	
The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill.	
Discussions in Select Committee.	
WEDNESDAY, 8TH FEBRUARY, 1922	2245-2282
Presentation Ceremony and Royal Durbar.	
The Indian Lunacy (Amendment) Bill.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Committee on New Arms Rules, 1920.	
Disturbances in the United Provinces.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Withdrawal of Martial Law in Malabar.	
Disturbances in the United Provinces.	
THURSDAY, 9TH FEBRUARY, 1922	2283-2342
Oath.	
Question and Answer.	
Unstarred Question and Answer.	
Statement of Business.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Improvement of Medical Education in India.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Equality of Status for Indians in Africa.	
SATURDAY, 11TH FEBRUARY, 1922	2343-2366
Questions and Answers.	
Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
Governor General's Assent to the Benares Hindu University (Amendment) Bill.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Indianisation of the Services.	
MONDAY, 13TH FEBRUARY, 1922	2393-2428
Oath.	
Questions and Answers.	
Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
Motions for Adjournment.	
The Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill.	
The Delhi University Bill.	
The Special Laws Repeal Bill.	
The Indian Criminal Law Amendment Repealing Bill.	
Amendment of Standing Orders.	
Time for Balloting.	

WEDNESDAY, 22ND FEBRUARY, 1922 2499-2498

Questions and Answers.
 Unstarred Questions and Answers.
 Message from the Secretary of State.
 The Indian Limitation (Amendment) Bill.
 The Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill.
 The Delhi University Bill.

THURSDAY, 23RD FEBRUARY, 1922 2499-2558

Questions and Answers.
 Government Policy in regard to Non-co-operation Movement.
 Governor General's Assent to Bills.
 Statement of Legislative Business.
 Resolution *re*: Technical Training of Indian and Anglo-Indian
 Youths.
 Resolution *re*: E. and P. Service and Military Officers in Judicial or
 Administrative Posts.
 Messages from the Council of State.

MONDAY, 27TH FEBRUARY, 1922 2559-2615

Statements laid on the Table.
 Questions and Answers.
 Unstarred Questions and Answers.
 Amendment of Standing Order.
 The Indian Income-tax Bill.
 The Indian Ports (Amendment) Bill.
 Resolution *re*: India's participation in the British Empire Exhibi-
 tion.
 Resolution *re*: Prohibition of Traffic in Mipor Girls.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 1st February, 1922.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber at Eleven of the Clock. Mr. President was in the Chair.

Mr. President: The Secretary will lay on the table the Bills, if any, passed by the Council of State at its meeting yesterday.

Secretary of the Assembly: In accordance with rule 25 of the Indian Legislative Rules, I lay on the table the following Bills that were passed by the Council of State on the 31st January, 1922:

- (1) Bill to repeal certain provisions of the Indian Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1908;
- (2) Bill to repeal certain special enactments supplementing the ordinary criminal law.

THE INDIAN LUNACY (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent (Home Member): Sir, I move for leave to introduce:

‘ A Bill further to amend the Indian Lunacy Act, 1912.

The proposals in the Bill are fully explained in the Statement of Objects and Reasons which is before Honourable Members at the moment, but there are certain matters of principles which I should like to place before Honourable Members while asking them to grant me leave to introduce the Bill. The first point to which I need refer is, that we seek in this Bill to emphasise the curative side of the treatment that is afforded to lunatics in asylums. At present, this is somewhat lost sight of owing to the title of these asylums in which lunatics are confined. Government do, as a matter of fact, at present give the best curative treatment they can to these unfortunate people, but we are not sure that this would always be the case in other asylums which may be licensed under the Act; we propose, therefore, to insert this addition to the definition to facilitate the action of Local Governments in insisting that proper curative treatment is afforded to all lunatics and also to enable Local Governments to withdraw licenses from private asylums if the facilities are not adequate.

The second principle involved in the Bill is really consequential on the system of Provincial autonomy that has now been conferred on the provinces. Under that system, as Honourable Members are aware, the different Provinces have certain revenues of their own and are liable for certain expenditure. Now, in practice, lunatics from one province are frequently confined in an asylum which is situated in another; and the Bill provides the means by which in such cases recoveries may be made from the province which may fairly be charged with the expense of maintaining such lunatics. It follows in this respect the principle of the English Poor Law, with which many Members are familiar. We propose that where a lunatic has been resident in any province for five years before he is placed in the asylum, the charges for the maintenance in the asylum shall be levied from that province. In other cases or where the lunatic

[Sir William Vincent.]

comes from outside British India, the charges will, in the first instance, be paid by the province in which the committal order is made, subject, in the latter case, to recovery from the State of which the lunatic is a subject. Honourable Members who are interested in the subject will also observe that in the maintenance charges we have necessarily included certain charges arising out of the capital cost of these asylums. We believe that large asylums will prove the most economical and humane method of treating these unfortunate people; and it is obvious that large asylums cannot be maintained in a small province; these provisions, therefore, to which I refer, by which, while lunatics are sent to an asylum outside the province, the necessary charges are recovered from the province which ought to be debited with that expenditure, facilitate the establishment of large asylums. May I say in conclusion that the criticisms which we have received from Local Governments in regard to this Bill have been almost entirely favourable; indeed, we have been asked to go a little further than we propose to go at present; and those points raised by the Local Governments will be considered later.

Mr. President: The question is:

‘That leave be given to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Lunacy Act, 1912.’

The motion was adopted.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

RESOLUTION RE: WOMEN'S FRANCHISE.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated: Labour Interests): Sir, I beg to move the following Resolution which stands in my name:

‘That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he should so amend the Legislative Assembly Electoral Rules, as to remove the sex disqualification in the matter of registration, on the electoral roll, of persons who are entitled to vote in the elections held for the Legislative Assembly.’

Sir, it is rather unfortunate for a mere man like myself to move this Resolution. (Laughter.) Sir, when I speak on behalf of labour, some friends ask me whether I had worked as a workman, and I have to reply that I had not. I am in the same predicament to-day. But, Sir, although the Resolution is going to be moved by my weak voice, I assure the Members of this Assembly that the appeal which I propose to make through this Resolution has the support, expressed or silent, of half the population of this country. Sir, at the very outset, I propose to make it very clear to the Members of this Assembly that the Resolution which I propose to move to-day is a very modest one. It does not seek to remove the disqualifications that attach to the sex of woman in all matters, either intellectual, social, economic, civil or military. I do not seek to remove all these disqualifications. Not that I approve of these disqualifications; I do not approve of them at all; but to-day the demand which I propose to make is not that all these disqualifications should be removed at once.

My only demand is that the disqualification which attaches to the sex—the fairer sex—in the matter of giving votes for the election of Members of the Assembly should be removed. I do not ask by this Resolution that the women of this country should be enabled to be candidates for the elections of Members of the Assembly. I do not ask for that. (A Voice: ‘Why not?’) I am not seeking that through my Resolution to-day. I do not ask this Assembly to create a larger number of rivals for those who are

already in the field. I again repeat that I am not at all against women coming and sitting in this Assembly. I would like them to come here; but I understand the feelings of some of my colleagues. I know many of them—at least some of them—feel shy and nervous in the presence of women. I understand that feeling, and, out of respect to that feeling, I do not make any proposal of that kind by this Resolution. There is another reason why I do not make that proposal to-day, and it is administrative. I hope, that will appeal to my Honourable friend, the Home Member. Sir, if I seek to change the rules for the qualifications of candidates for Membership of the Assembly, that change will require the approval of the Government of India first, then of the Secretary of State, and then these Rules will have to be kept on the table of the House of Commons and of the House of Lords. Great difficulty is involved in getting the sanction of all these august bodies. This point is very clear; the rule which fixes the qualifications of candidates is Rule 5 in the Book of Rules, 'Qualifications of elected Members.'

'A person shall not be eligible for election as a Member of the Legislative Assembly if such person :

- (a) is not a British subject; or
- (b) is a female; or
- (c) is already a member of any legislative body.....etc.'

I do not seek any modification of this rule. Therefore, those of my colleagues who are against women standing in competition with them in the elections to this Assembly need not be afraid at all.

Then, again, my Resolution is very reasonable, because I am not seeking that every woman in the country should have a vote. I am not asking for universal suffrage for women. The number of women that may be enfranchised, even if this Resolution is passed, will be very small indeed. Only those women will get a vote under this Resolution who pay income-tax, or who pay a very heavy land tax, say, Rs. 50, Rs. 60 or Rs. 75, or who pay a heavy municipal tax. Therefore, the number of women that will be given the vote under this Resolution will be very small indeed. I cannot say how many women will be enfranchised. I wanted that information to be given to me by Government. I asked a question in the last Session at Simla, but unfortunately, we all know that Government, in matter of social reform and perhaps in matters concerning women, stand neutral, and they, therefore, refused to give me that information. I am thus unable to give an estimate of the number of women that will be enfranchised if my Resolution is passed.

Then, Sir, there are also other limitations to the demand which is made in my Resolution. One is that my Resolution, even if it is passed to-day, will not apply to the whole country. It will only apply to those Presidencies where the Local Councils have removed the disqualification for the election of Members of those Councils. This is very clear, if we read Rule 7, which fixes the qualifications of voters for the Members of the Legislative Assembly. I will read that rule for the information of Members. This is Rule 7, regarding Electoral Rolls:

'Every person shall be entitled to have his name registered on the electoral roll of a constituency who has the qualifications prescribed for an elector of that constituency and who is not subject to any of the disqualifications herein set out, namely :

- (a) is not a British subject; or
- (b) is a female; or
- (c) has been adjudged by a competent Court to be of unsound mind; or
- (d) is under 21 years of age :

[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

Provided that, if a Resolution is passed by the Legislative Assembly, after not less than one month's notice has been given of the intention to move such a Resolution, recommending that the sex disqualification for registration should be removed, either in respect of women generally or any class of women, the Governor General in Council shall make regulations providing that women or a class of women, as the case may be, shall not be disqualified for registration by reason only of their sex.....'

Mark the next words :

'... if they are not so disqualified for registration as electors for the Legislative Council of their own province.'

The last words make it absolutely clear that, even if we pass this Resolution, it will apply only to those provinces where women are qualified to vote for the election of Members to the Local Councils.

Sir, this explanation will set at rest the fears of many of my colleagues in this matter, as, at present, this Resolution will apply only to the Presidencies of Madras and Bombay, because the Local Councils of only those two provinces have removed the sex disqualification of voters for the election of members to these Councils. In the other provinces, this has not yet been removed. Therefore, even if we pass this Resolution to-day, it will apply only to Madras and Bombay. My colleagues from the other provinces will certainly support me, but, even if they do not support me, I am quite sure there is nothing in this Resolution for them to fear as long as the Local Councils are not prepared to remove the sex disqualification in the election of Members of their Local Councils.

Then, Sir, my Resolution, although it is being discussed in the Legislative Assembly which legislates for the whole country, does not seek to remove the sex disqualification for election of Members to the Provincial Legislative Councils. It is right, after the declaration of provincial autonomy, that the disqualifications existing for the election of Members should be removed by the Provincial Councils themselves. I do not, therefore, seek that. Neither do I seek that the disqualification of women for the elections of the Council of State should be removed. I am quite sure that, in the Upper House, there is hardly any room for such a modern idea as the enfranchisement of women. I, therefore, do not seek to remove the disqualification that exists for the election of Members of the Council of State.

Sir, there are several of my colleagues who may think that my Resolution may compel some women, who remain in *purdah* or in *gosha*, to come and vote. But I assure them that my Resolution does not compel any person to come and vote. It only gives freedom—it only gives the right—to vote. If some women, so enfranchised, wish to remain in *purdah* or in *gosha*—or if some men choose to keep their women in *purdah* or in *gosha*—let them do so. I do not want them to remove the *purdah* or *gosha* by this Resolution. They are at liberty to keep their women at home, they are at liberty to prevent their women from giving their vote at the election. The Resolution is not compulsory, but absolutely voluntary and, for that reason, those people who observe *purdah* or *gosha* will not be disturbed at all. Sir, I have thus stated how limited the scope of my Resolution is and what a modest demand it makes. As regards the merits of the question, I need not speak long to this House. If I had to speak to an uncultured and uneducated Assembly, I should have spoken, even for an hour, as to why women should be enfranchised. But I know that the Members of this Assembly have studied the history of the social conditions of this country very thoroughly. They know that in ancient India there were no restrictions to the movements of women, to the development, intellectual, social or

moral, of women. The restrictions that we see in the law as against women are, in my humble judgment, the inheritance of our contact with the West. Sir, the Members, at least the Hindu Members, of this Assembly, know very well that in ancient India many women were educated. They were allowed to discourse on subjects like *Vedant* and there was hardly any restriction upon their civic rights. Those of my colleagues here who belong to that most democratic religion, I mean the Islamic religion, which places women on the same basis as men, even as regards inheritance, know that that religion puts no restriction upon the civic rights of women. Then, Sir, I have also got some colleagues here, who take pride in calling themselves free Britons. Sir, the people of England have already given the franchise to the women of their country. In that country, a woman can rise to the highest position possible for her, and I therefore feel that those of my colleagues here who belong to that country, and who call themselves free Britons, will certainly support my Resolution. Sir, even in recent times, we have had women who ruled over this country as sovereigns with great glory. We have had women who fought in battles with great success. But, leaving aside that historical time, even at the present time, there are women who have made a name in all movements, political as well as social. Who has not heard of the great work which that noble English lady, Mrs. Besant, has done for this country? Who has not heard of the great literary work done by Mrs. Naidu and who has not heard of her political activities to-day? Who does not know the great social work which Mrs. Ranade has done and is doing in Poona? Sir, who is here who does not feel proud of the women of this country who have recently been taking part in the political movements of this country? I have heard several of my colleagues here mentioning with great pride that the women of this country are taking interest in the political movements of this country. Sir, therefore, I need not speak much to-day on this question. I also feel confident that my Resolution will be adopted by this Assembly to-day. We know there are several parties in this Assembly. One party calls itself the Democratic party, others call themselves Liberals, and I need not tell them that the basic principles of Democracy and Liberalism are Freedom and Equality. Sir, when I remember this, I feel quite confident that my Resolution will be approved by this Assembly. Some Englishmen express the fear that, when Indians get Self-Government, the rights of the weaker classes, the rights of the masses may not be properly safeguarded. When the Joint Parliamentary Committee considered this question, they, very shrewdly in my opinion, left the decision in this matter to the Indian Councils. They perhaps thought that, by leaving this matter to the Legislative Assembly and the Provincial Councils, they would be able to test the Indian people and see how far they will safeguard the interests of women. Sir, at one time I felt very angry with the Joint Parliamentary Committee for this decision, but, knowing the views of my colleagues in this Assembly, I feel delighted to-day that we have got an occasion to prove to the Joint Parliamentary Committee as well as to the whole world that the interests of the weaker classes are perfectly safe in the hands of this Assembly. Then, Sir, I also know the sense of chivalry of the Members of this Assembly. I am quite sure they will not be a party to placing any stigma upon the women kind of this country, the stigma of incapacity to vote. For these reasons, Sir, I do not propose to go into the merits of this question at any length. I feel that the Members of this Chamber are ready to do justice to the womenkind of this country. With these words, I commend my Resolution for the acceptance of this House.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent (Home Member): Sir, the Mover of this Resolution seemed to me unduly nervous of his own proposals, for his speech was really made up of apologies, such as: 'I am really not going as far as you think. My proposal is a very modest one, I do not want this, I do not want that.' And if I can say anything in order to re-assure him, to give him a little confidence, I shall be only too pleased. But it was a little surprising that while adopting his attitude towards his non-official colleagues, he thought it necessary to attack or to have a jibe at Government. I have often wondered why the Honourable Member thought it necessary to take this line. Sometimes I have wondered whether, being a nominated Member, he thinks it necessary to do this to show his independence. (Laughter.) I assure him there is really no necessity for it. We fully appreciate his independence. But, when he attacks the Government on the ground that it is indifferent to the welfare of women, then I must join issue with him at once. (Hear, hear.) I will cite before this Council two instances to prove my point. I was in the old Council when the Government introduced a Bill for the protection of children, girls, from a life of vice, a Bill designed to help to bring them up in decent surroundings. Well, Sir, it was not owing to the actions of Government that that Bill never became law. This was due to the efforts, and unceasing opposition of the orthodox community. Again, at this moment, we have given notice to this Assembly of a Resolution to provide for the protection of young women and children whom it is sought to abduct and procure for immoral purposes which, I hope, will be accepted. On this occasion we have, of course, a more liberal Assembly, of which the Honourable Mover is a Member and I hope to secure the fullest support. But it is, I submit, unfair to charge us with indifference to the welfare of women, a charge for which there is no foundation.

Again, as to this question of women's franchise, I am informed by my Honourable colleague (Sir Malcolm Hailey) that the question was very carefully considered by the Franchise Committee when it made its inquiries, and the almost unanimous opinion of non-official witnesses examined in the Provinces was against the grant of this. (Mr. N. M. Samarth: 'Except in Bombay.') The Honourable Member is quite right. There were certain centres where the proposals were approved and Bombay was one, I believe, but the general feeling, I think I am right in saying, was entirely against female suffrage. Is it fair, then, to blame the Government for giving effect to non-official opinion on this subject? Sir, I apologise for this digression. I really got up to speak not so much on the merits of this proposal, but on the attitude of Government, because there may be official Members of this Assembly who have very decided views on this matter. I do not know that there are any, but there may be.

The first point I wish to make clear is, that the question before the Assembly is not whether women should be eligible for election as Members. That question does not arise; it can only be decided by an amendment of the Electoral Rules which are made by the Governor General in Council and cannot be altered or amended by this Assembly; though, of course, the Assembly might make recommendations regarding such an amendment. The question before the Assembly at present is merely whether women should be put on to the electoral rolls or not, and the Joint Committee decided that, on that point:

'The Government of India should be instructed to make rules, so that, if a Legislative Council so voted, women might be put on the register of voters in that province.'

The Committee say that they :

'do not feel themselves able to settle this question as urged by the majority of the witnesses who appeared before them. It seemed to them to go deep into the social system and susceptibilities of India, and, therefore, to be a question which could only, with prudence, be settled in accordance with the wishes of Indians themselves as constitutionally expressed.'

They again advert to this question in their first report on the Draft Rules under the Act and say that they think it essential that a constitutional change of this importance should be effected only as a result of a genuine and considered opinion of the majority of the Council, and they have therefore provided that, before a Resolution on the subject can be moved, the Mover must give not less than one month's notice.

There is one difficulty we have actually experienced in interpreting that rule which I might mention on which we are taking legal advice. It will not affect the result of this Resolution, but I am sure the Honourable Member's attention has been drawn to the words 'any class of women', in the rules. Now, we are not quite clear about the exact meaning of those words; but, in any case, this would not affect the principle of the Resolution now before the Assembly.

Sir, having regard to what the Joint Committee have said and the previous attitude of Government in this matter, I think that we shall not be accused of lack of sympathy with reforms in this matter if we say that the question should be settled in our judgment in accordance with the wishes of Indians themselves as constitutionally expressed in this Assembly. It is a matter which affects them very much more than it affects us, and, for that reason, the Members of the Executive Council will not vote on this question at all. But I want to make this quite clear, that other official Members of this Assembly have full freedom to vote and speak as they like. I hope that every Member here will be clear on this point. If, for instance, my Honourable friend, Mr. Bray, has strong feelings on this subject, he can get up, and express them, but I am not in the same fortunate position. I may also inform the House that Resolutions on these lines have so far been adopted, I believe, by the Madras and Bombay Councils, so that the effect of this Resolution, if adopted, will be to give women the vote in those two provinces. Bengal has turned the proposal down (Cries of 'Shame') and I believe my own province also has refused to enfranchise women. In some provinces, this question has not been discussed. The net result, therefore, will be that, if this Resolution is adopted, it will mean that for the electorates in Madras and Bombay, women will not be disqualified from being voters only by reason of their sex; but this Resolution will, for the present, have no effect in other provinces.

Baba Ujagar Singh Bedi (Punjab: Landholders): The Resolution before us to-day is such that it deserves the due deliberation of the House. I myself have pondered over it for a considerable period of time and have come to the definite conclusion that the present circumstances of the country, both social and educational, do not seem to support it.

At the very outset; I intend to dispel the idea, if any Honourable Member be labouring under it, that I regard the weaker vessel as being inferior to man in any way, intellectually, socially or politically. Far from that. I have all honour and reverence for the tender sex.

There was a time when Indian ladies shone to their great credit in the firmament of true greatness. They stood shoulder to shoulder with men

[Baba Ujagar Singh Bedi.]

for their culture, erudition and knowledge. They have left such volumes in politics, jurisprudence, logic and mathematics, that the world has not been able to produce their like even in the 20th century.

Woman in those days was regarded as the equal of man. She enjoyed all those privileges which the women of an advanced and cultured country enjoy. It was because of this her social position (*vidia*) and learning that she was called *ardhāṅgy*, the half of the human body, the essential of the human machinery.

The fault lies with us if she is found in the present degenerated condition. The egoism and tyranny of man debarred her from all educational and social activities, because of which she had to see the present days.

In the ancient days of India's glory, it was a custom, regulated by *dham* *shastar* that, whenever somebody desired the attainment of some object, he had to undertake a *yag*. In this *yag*, the presence of the wife was essential by the side of her husband, otherwise the *yag* was not regarded as complete.

I say it emphatically, with all the force that I can command, that this *yag*, which we have undertaken to attain self-autonomy and *swarajya*, cannot be achieved or complete, unless and until our ladies share our task in legislation and sit side by side with us to achieve this noble object.

Our Indian philosophy teaches us that no undertaking can be complete unless three things converge, that is, *desh* (country), *kal* (time) and *vastu* (thing).

We have got two things with us, namely, the *desh* and *vastu*, but the third thing which is essential, the *kal*, is missing. We are to wait for the time to complete our undertaking. Therefore, let us join our hands to bring about this missing thing—the time. We should make our ladies fit for the task which is before us. We should afford them education, so that they may be able to help us in these matters.

If my Honourable friends will bring the vista of the past glory of their country before their eyes and compare it with their present situation, they will realise the immaturity of the Resolution.

It may be said by some of us here that we should follow, whatever has been and is being done in the West, as in England. But we ought to realise that we are not in the same condition as those countries. To slavishly follow the West, which is not only far ahead of India, both educationally and politically, but is also diametrically opposed to her from the social point of view, would be a course replete with many a hindrance, and would involve the Legislature in a regular labyrinth of difficulties, to extricate themselves from which would be by no means an easy matter.

- I regard the removal of the sex-disqualification in the matter of registration in the electoral roll, to be premature.

It is premature because it is a broad day-light fact that Indian women are not sufficiently educated as yet to take any genuine interests in such vital and all-important matters as legislation and police.

The sad fact that only 2 per cent. of our women are educated, and the majority of that percentage only to the extent of reading and writing ordinary letters, is well known to all of my friends. To expect as such that our women, surrounded as they are by the four walls of their houses and

debarred socially from all educational institutions, would help us in the legislation of the country is to expect impossibilities.

My friends may quote one or two instances of highly-educated ladies, like Mrs. Sarojini Naidu and Chaudhurani Sarala Devi and others, but they are an eye among the blind, an oasis in a desert.

Again, it is inexpedient, because only those can be expected to perform the diverse duties entrusted to them who are best suited to them, who, by their tact, training and experience, can prove themselves to be truly worthy of the task imposed upon them. Is it not fantastic to expect a child to command an army? In the same line of argument, I would like to ask, if it is not inexpedient to expect our women to legislate on matters beyond their comprehension, knowledge and understanding.

To add to all this, I would like to point out to my Honourable friends that a nation cannot be expected to make any genuine progress unless it is through evolution.

The progress, to be certain, sure and stable, must be systematic, organised and evolutionary. In the West, if my friends point out the parallelism, the removal of the sex restrictions was brought about after centuries of constitutional struggle.

India also should follow the foot-prints of the western countries and should wait patiently for the time, which is not so very distant, when our ladies, being fully educated and prepared for the task to be imposed on them, shall lend us a helping hand in the better government of the country.

I do not mean by this that franchise should not be extended to women. All that I hold is, that the time is not ripe for the change as yet. If, however, my friends think otherwise, and convince me of the same, I shall have no hesitation in backing up their voice.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I heartily support this motion and I am sure my Honourable friends will be agreeably surprised at the attitude I am taking. Orthodox as I appear to be, and devout Hindu as I am, I cannot with any conscience say that this Resolution is in any way premature.

Sir, we in the South enjoy the privilege of associating with an educated fair sex, with a fair sex which is quite capable of taking care of itself. It may be due, Sir, to our want of contact with our Muhammadan friends that we have not got those ugly *ghosa* habits which confine women inside the house or behind the *purdah*. Our women are quite free. Those belonging to the most respectable families are free to go about by themselves. They go to the temples, they go to the riverside, they go to the bazaar. And, Sir, they are able to manage our households much better than we men can do. Though I feel myself competent to come here and criticise the Budgets placed before us by the Government of India, I dare not criticise my home budget! Nor could I do so with any effect.

Sir, the women of the South are noted for their learning, for their wisdom and for their sound commonsense. Our women have enjoyed the privileges of the franchise for years past. I may mention for the information of the House that our municipal franchise (in district municipalities) have for years past granted freedom to women and that the franchise has been wisely exercised. Sir, if we turn to Madras City, there are about 600 women voters in my ward, and nearly 400 of them went to the poll, and

[Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar.]

I am sure that I had a majority of the women voting for me when I was returned to the Madras Corporation.

It will, therefore, be no new thing in our part of the country. It will be highly prized and valued, and it will be soundly exercised.

Sir, every student when he begins to learn his alphabet in the South learns from a text-book which was written by a woman. In this book every letter of the alphabet is converted into a short moral saying; the first letter 'A' for instance, is 'that you must learn to do charity.' '*Aram cheyya virumbu*'. Sir, this work was compiled by a Dravidian woman, Awayar, whose name is still cherished with respect; and, as I told you, her text-book is the first text-book used in all our vernacular schools. And in our religious ceremonies, when we worship our family gods, one of the compulsory verses that we have to recite every day was composed by a woman. She is still cherished as a saint, one of the most revered saints of the South—by name, Andal, born in Srivilliputtur. She was also a Dravidian woman. And, therefore, we allow the greatest freedom to women in the South, and, although I am not quite willing to allow them yet to share in making laws and regulations, the time is sure to come; and, when that time comes, I am sure that the South will take the first step forward. Sir, I heartily support the amendment.

Lieut.-Col. H. A. J. Gidney (Nominated: Anglo-Indian): Sir, I rise to support this Resolution very whole-heartedly. I give in to no one in this House in the anxiety that is shown in this Resolution, because I welcome any movement for levelling up the women of India with the women of other countries. Sir, it is truly said that no nation can be greater than its mothers, and in supporting my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, in this very noble effort of his for the uplifting and emancipation of the women of this country, I feel that I am treading on firmer and less debatable ground when I refer to the women of my community, who, I may remind this House, are, in every respect, women of this country. They are born, bred, live and die in this country, and their interests in the country, are second to none of their Indian sisters. Therefore I speak with more certainty when I speak about the women of my community in their claims for the suffrage and for participation in the responsibilities of citizenship.

Sir, a reference to various official statistics and records makes it perfectly clear that, from the population, wage earning, and payment of various taxes, points of view the women of my community—I mean the Anglo-Indian and Domiciled European community—are practically equal in number to the men. In education, which is universal in my community, men and women are practically on an equal status. This is proved by a reference to the official publication called '*Statistics for British India for 1919-20*' and which record shows that 22,568 boys and 21,354 girls are receiving education in our various schools and colleges. Our women are to be found in all spheres of life, paying their taxes as do our men and, in not a few cases, they form the sole supporters of families. Wherever you turn, be it the Government, the Army, mercantile offices, be it in the Railways, the Schools or the Hospitals—in every department, you will find women of my community occupying positions of trust and responsibility. It must, therefore, be obvious to this Honourable House that a large number of my women-folk have not only proved their worth to be trusted with a vote but, that they are equally qualified with men in every respect to be included in the electoral roll. I submit, it is unjust to disfranchise my women-folk and to give the right to vote to many men who

are not so worthy. Surely this House will not tolerate such an injustice? Remember this Resolution confines itself in a very narrow way, only to 'persons who are entitled to vote in the elections held for the Legislative Assembly.' There are a number of women in my community who come within that category and it is in support of these women as also the rest of the women in India who will receive the freedom to vote in the elections for this Assembly, that I offer my support to the Resolution put forward by my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi.

Sir, there was a recent inquiry made in Calcutta which was called the Calcutta Domiciled Community Inquiry Committee, 1918-19, and the information that it provides is of great interest, reflecting, as it does, the indisputable claims of the women of my community to the right to vote at these elections and even at all Provincial Council elections. It shows the following statistics relating to the Anglo-Indian women workers per hundred working men—*Industries 30, Transport 5, Trade 22, Public Administration 4, Arts and Professions 114, and other occupations 59.*

Since that year, 1918, I submit, my women have been employed to a larger extent and these figures have consequently been greatly augmented. I therefore think, Sir, that I have shown beyond any doubt that, as far as my community is concerned at any rate, the women-folk have indisputably earned their right and claim to vote for election of Members to this or any Assembly. I have just heard one Member of this Honourable House—and I regret to see it was my friend, Baba Ujagar Singh Bedi, who, I thought, was a champion of the fair sex of his country, the Punjab, say, that the present time was too premature to give women the vote. Sir, we have to make a beginning and I submit that the very temperate and moderate Resolution that has been put before this Council by Mr. Joshi does not in any way deserve to be stigmatised as premature. I would ask him to note that this Resolution does not touch the ignorant village women. It touches only those women who occupy a higher and more select and educated status in life, women who are and do activate themselves in the political life of their country and, whose husbands are generally politicians, and who no doubt discuss politics with their wives. It is these women, Sir, to whom it is sought to give the vote and not to every woman in India.

The Honourable the Home Member said in his speech that when the Franchise Committee sat, most of the Governments, except Bombay, were not in favour of giving the vote to women. I gave evidence before that Committee, and I was certainly in favour of it. But times have changed since the sitting of that Committee. The politics of India, both for women and men, have vastly altered. We find to-day Indian women taking an equally active part in politics as do the men. The women of my community are actually alive to their political needs and surely we cannot deny them a vote. Why? To-day we have Lord Northcliffe, a person occupying a very distinguished position, saying in the Press that one of the most serious portents in the present political atmosphere in India is the participation of Muhammadan women in politics; and it is these women whom we want to guide and teach in the political work of India and whose guidance and help we wish to avail ourselves of. I therefore say, Sir, that this Resolution has everything to commend it. My Honourable friend, Mr. Rangachariar, has given his able support to it, a support which is both pleasing and valuable, coming as it does from the distinguished Member from Madras, a Member who is one of the most orthodox Hindus in this Assembly.

[Lieut.-Col. H. A. J. Gidney.]

Sir, I have no doubt that some of my Muhammadan friends in this House will reject this Resolution as it violates the *purdah* system of their women-folk. But Mr. Joshi has very rightly pointed out that the Resolution is not compulsory and that those who do not wish to take part in the election, or avail themselves of this privilege, can remain within the four walls of their *purdah*.

But I would like very much, with all respect to my Muhammadan friends, to ask them how they like it. I say, with all respect to them, that as long as we in India—and I am of India—cultivate this four-walled system, so long as we become slaves to this enforced silence, so long as we are a party to this shutting up of our women, so long will India remain in the position in which she is now, that is, there will be no progress at all as compared with other nations. Emancipate your women. Start female suffrage as Mr. Joshi tells us in this limited capacity, and we will have with us a flood of opinion that will be second not even to ours. I, therefore, Sir, support this Resolution very heartily.

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary (Calcutta: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I desire to give this motion my personal support. I am sorry, I am very sorry that I am not able to speak on behalf of my province as a whole, as represented by the Majority Vote of its Council. I hear a voice crying 'shame', I am not ashamed of the situation, because I understand it. Madras and Bombay have long been much more fortunately situated with regard to social conditions than Bengal. I do not desire to refer at length to those conditions, because they may not be agreeable to many, and I do not in this concern want to rouse again racial and religious animosity. If the voting of the Bengal Council was analysed, I think the matter could be gone into more deeply than is necessary for our purposes here to-day. There are peculiar combinations of circumstances in Bengal that unfortunately made it impossible for those whose views are the views of Mr. Joshi to carry their point; but I do not despair that in time, in the near future, we shall have another vote, and we shall be able to come up to the Assembly in the way that Mr. Joshi has come up for Madras and Bombay. The greater regret was that, when a plea was put forward *de novo* on behalf of Anglo-Indian women, with regard to whom no objections could be urged, even then the motion was lost in Bengal, strange to say, because of the very reasons to which I referred and which did not apply to them. My Muhammadan friends have not yet spoken, and I believe they will be able to throw some light on the situation that will ease the situation regarding non-Muhammadan Bengal. I could not agree to wait, with Mr. Bedi, till the counsels of perfection, of which he speaks, were attained. If he were to be taken at his word, I think that Sir Malcolm Hailey's dictum the other day would stand with which I utterly disagree. Parliament has allowed its many advantages and benefits after hard and long struggle, said he, and we must not be precipitate. Are we to go through the same struggles and strivings here and then succeed? Has the Mother of Parliaments worked and struggled and striven in vain? We are the rich inheritors of all that she has attained, and, if the right be worth having, let us have it without that struggle, long drawn and ghastly. That is and ought to be our advantage. Sir, it is not necessary, for the purposes of this Resolution, to go back to the achievements in ancient India, or even immediately pass modern India, for the matter of that. Things are moving fast and we have to take note of them. What right have we, in this Assembly, to stand in the way of the

Madras and Bombay women getting what their provincial Councils have already agreed to in the case of the local Councils? That is the small point here before us, and I give it my support, not because the proposition is circumscribed in the way that Mr. Joshi has properly circumscribed it, but because personally I am prepared to go further and agree to the larger measure. Mr. Joshi shrewdly made an observation of which Sir William Vincent has taken no note. He said, it was 'shrewdly' left to the decision of the local Councils themselves whether they were going to show that they were fit to get further measures of Self-Government or whether they were going to condemn themselves. Sir William Vincent, who has stood out for the Government, has not taken note of this. I do not myself think that there was any shrewdness concerned in the matter at all. It was only right and proper, where the difficult woman question is concerned, that the people themselves should be left to work out their own salvation; and how they worked it out would show what further they deserve to get. When province after province comes up, through their representatives here for sanction of what they themselves agree to, it ought to be up to this Assembly to endorse what has been done there, and not to stem the idea because others are not ready or willing.

The movement forward will be a premium upon future progress and ensure better status for women all round. Women's rights in
 12 Noon. this country are not what they may well be in some respects, particularly with regard to property and general civic abilities. If a movement like this fructifies, what is bound to be the next step? Those who value their womenfolk will see that they have suitable property qualifications to earn votes. We have heard from Mr. Bedi about the need of women's intellectual and educational advance before the contemplated steps can be taken. Strange to say, that has not been insisted on in the case of the mere man. He may be an illiterate millionaire or he may be paying just a modicum of income-tax or municipal tax, and he is allowed to vote and no question is asked about his intellectual calibre. But as soon as the woman's claim is put forward, we say 'Let her wait till her intellectual and educational attainments are what we superior people think they ought to be.' That, I think, Sir, is a point of view that will not find favour in this Assembly. We do not want to wait for and go through all the experiences of the West in this or any other matter. We do not want our windows to be broken. We do not want to go through all the suffragette troubles in the West. I think we ought to benefit by them.

Sir, Bengal has had shame cried on it, and I have got to submit to it. But, may I remind those that have been observing things in the past how Cambridge undergraduates have of late been behaving towards would-be lady graduates, and may I also remind them that it is now more than 40 years that Calcutta gave her degrees to women. Therefore, you are not to come to hasty conclusions as to sinister motives and perverse conditions in Bengal. There may be forces in operation which we do not adequately understand, and mere charity, if nothing else, should make people pause before pronouncing shame upon the province which has its undoubted complex difficulties. Sir, I believe that our vote here to-day will set the pace of the other provinces.

Maulvi Miyan Asjad-ul-lah (Bhagalpur Division: Muhammadan):

(The Honourable Member spoke in the Vernacular.*)

* The original speech and a translation of it will be printed in a later issue of these Debates.

Mr. S. C. Ghose (Bengal: Landholders): Sir, I have much pleasure in supporting this Resolution of my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi. The time has come when we cannot possibly keep back the ladies from coming on the electoral roll. Education has spread so much as also civilisation has spread so much that they can form an independent opinion of their own which they have learnt to imbibe from their European sisters. We speak of the *purdah* system. Coming as I do from Bengal I can say this much that the *purdah* system is not in vogue there so much as it was before. If you go to Darjeeling, you find ladies coming out very freely. If you go to Madhupur, you also see ladies going out freely. If you go to Baidyanath Junction and other health resorts, you also see ladies moving freely. I do not, therefore, understand why it is said that the *purdah* is still very much in vogue in Bengal. It may be that in some villages the *purdah* system is still in vogue, but that is no ground why the modest demand of the Honourable Mr. Joshi should be rejected. What he wants is that the electoral roll to the Legislative Assembly should be so amended that sex disqualification might be removed. He does not want to force it upon ladies in order to give effect to his proposal. The ladies may vote or may not vote at their pleasure; it will be only a privilege granted to them. It is not necessary that they should use it, but the only thing that he wants is that the franchise should be given to women by putting them on the electoral roll to the Legislative Assembly. So far as this Assembly is concerned, the number of female voters will not be very many. I represent the Bengal landholders, and there are only about 400 of them on the roll among whom there would possibly be only half a dozen female voters and I do not think that, if these women are put on the electoral roll, they will materially affect the elections. We shall be selfish if we do not allow this progress. I have heard to-day that the time has not yet come when we can give our ladies the franchise. But I think the time has come so far Bengal is concerned. There is not a single house in Bengal from where girls are not sent to schools: some of them go even to English schools. They are being educated equally with the boys and they get high education. They can form opinions of their own and they would like very much that their opinions should have some weight in matters affecting their interests. In matters political we have seen that they are working side by side with the men. Some of the women have come out of their seclusion and are trying to help the men in their political life. If there be any reason, it is only a selfish reason that their names should not be borne on the electoral roll. It is not the point whether they exercise this right or not; they may or may not be willing to use it. The only ground that is urged against the grant of the franchise to women in Bengal is that the *purdah* system is in vogue there. But the *purdah* system is fast disappearing and we have to move along with the times. And if we do not do so betimes we should lag behind in the march of progress. It is, therefore, a very modest demand on the part of my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, that the sex disqualification should be removed and I beg to support it whole-heartedly.

Mr. P. E. Percival (Bombay: Nominated Official): I do not wish to discuss the question of woman suffrage generally, but I should like to refer briefly to what may be described as the constitutional aspect of the case. Mr. Joshi has pointed out that this Resolution has been accepted by the Bombay Legislative Council. A part of the Reform Scheme is that greater latitude, greater freedom, should be given to the local Legislative Councils in all matters such as education, excise, and so forth. Now, Sir, the main question in regard to this Resolution, it seems to me, is

whether it is right for this Assembly to override the wishes of the Bombay and Madras Legislative Councils in a matter which concerns those provinces only.

The Bombay and Madras Legislative Councils have taken the view that women are sufficiently advanced in those provinces to vote in elections held under the Government of India Act of 1919; and there is no logical reason why the Members of the other provinces, even if they do not wish to have woman suffrage in those Provinces, why they should oppose the wishes of the elected Members of the Bombay and Madras Legislative Councils in the view that women should vote in their Presidencies. So far as the Bombay Legislative Council is concerned, it was not a chance or casual vote. The matter was discussed at great length on two days. Officials and non-officials spoke on one side or the other. The final conclusion was that the Resolution in favour of woman suffrage was carried by a majority of more than two to one. It is, therefore, perfectly clear that the elected Members of the Bombay Legislative Council, and I believe that the same applies to Madras, are strongly in favour of the view that women should be allowed to vote in the elections under the Government of India Act. I submit, Sir, that it is only right, whatever opinion Honourable Members themselves may hold on the question, that they should give effect to the wishes of the Bombay and Madras Legislative Councils, as expressed by the Members of those Councils.

There is only one other point to which I should like to refer, and that is the practice in other countries. Now, let us take the case of the United States of America. Previously, woman suffrage was not in force in the United States as a whole; but it was in force in certain particular States. At that time, when woman suffrage was in force in certain States, the women from those States were allowed to vote in the election of the President of the whole Republic; that is to say, the fact that women in other States were not allowed to vote did not stand in the way of women voting in the States in which woman suffrage had already been granted. The same point arose in Australia. Before 1902, there was no general woman suffrage in Australia, but there was woman suffrage in certain States. At that time, namely, in 1900, it was laid down in the Constitution of Australia, that women in the States where woman suffrage was in force, should be allowed to vote on matters affecting the Constitution of Australia as a whole, even when women from other States were not allowed to vote. Therefore, the logical and reasonable position is that women from the Bombay and Madras Presidencies should be allowed to vote in this matter, even if the other provinces do not wish to have that suffrage; and, in regard to the other provinces, there is no obligation whatsoever that they should introduce woman suffrage until they think it desirable to do so. I submit, therefore, that the wishes of the Bombay and Madras Legislative Councils should be given effect to by this Assembly.

Mr. J. P. Ootelingam (Nominated: Indian Christian): I rise to support the Resolution of my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, although I am not quite sure if there is any immediate urgency for such a measure. Mr. Joshi in his advocacy has wisely followed the line of least resistance. He does not ask for the removal of sex disqualification in the matter of the candidature of ladies for election to the Assembly, and in support of that position he mentioned that Honourable Members in this House, at any rate, a number of them, may feel shy or nervous in the presence of ladies and are, therefore, not willing that they should be candidates for election to the Assembly.

[Mr. J. P. Cotelingam.]

Perhaps, it is the law of self-protection or self-preservation that stood in the way of Mr. Joshi making such a demand. But, Sir, when Councils such as Madras and Bombay have removed sex disqualification among those entitled to vote, it follows, as a matter of course, that that disqualification should be removed also in the matter of registration on the electoral rolls for election to the Legislative Assembly. In Madras, as was pointed out by Mr. Rangachariar, women have this privilege conferred upon them in the case of Municipal elections, and it may be a piece of information to this House if I mention, that recently when the Madras Government appointed District Educational Councils, and there are nearly 24 of them, in every one of these Councils Government have appointed educated ladies to represent the women of each district. There are in every one of them, besides Inspectresses of Girls' Schools, Indian ladies to represent the women of each district. I, therefore, think that Mr. Joshi has made out a case against sex disqualification in connection with the Regulations that govern the elections to the Assembly, but, I must say, I was struck with something like dismay when he referred to the time when Indian Annie Besants and Sarojini Naidus galore will be stumping the country. Although I do not think that this measure will usher in the millenium and, although I am not quite sure that the extension of the franchise to women will be an unmixd blessing, I support the Resolution.

Colonel Sir S. D'A. Crookshank (P. W. D. Secretary): Sir, at the outset, I wish very cordially to endorse the words which have fallen from my friend, Colonel Gidney, in his expression of the great value of the services which the womenfolk of his community have rendered to the Government in the various offices, more particularly so those ladies who help in my own Department, or rather the Department which I represent, that is to say, the Posts and Telegraphs. Their services, I may, perhaps, be permitted to remind the House, are of the very greatest value, and I am sure all who have had business to do with them will realise how considerate and useful they are. When I looked at this Resolution, the first thing I asked myself is this: 'If a woman is capable of ruling in her own house, as I think, it will be admitted by all, she is perfectly capable of doing, why should she not be capable of lending her assistance towards the Government of the country?' If this Great Empire of India is to advance to the immense destinies which one sees lying before her, one can only wish that this sex disqualification will be removed so that the women of this country will be able to join forces with the men and voice their opinion in carrying it forward. Perhaps no greater or more worthy monument to the memory of our beloved Queen Victoria could be left than that this Resolution, which has been so ably put forward, should receive the unqualified support of this House. Sir, there are many points on which I join issue with my friend, Mr. Joshi, but in championing the cause of labour, and in respect of this Resolution I cordially support him.

Dr. H. S. Gour (Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, while I heartily support the Resolution moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, I confess, to a certain amount of regret, that a discordant note has been struck in certain quarters in this House. I am surprised to find my old and esteemed friend, Baba Ujagar Singh Bedi, amongst the champions of a reactionary movement intended to thwart and arrest the progress of time, but I have hope for him, and I hope, Sir, I shall be able to convert him, because he has expressed himself as still open to conversion. He tells us

that the time is premature for an advance in the direction of female emancipation. I ask my friend, when the time would come when we should make an advance. If 50 years hence a similar Resolution were to be moved, I am sure, Sir, that some one would rise and say, that the females of this country are not sufficiently advanced and educated to justify an advance. I ask my Honourable friend: 'If we had made an advance 50 years ago, what would have been the position of women of this country to-day?' I assure him that he cannot light one side of India and keep the other side in Cimmerian darkness. An advance has to be made and I would ask my friend to take his courage in both hands and advance with us along the line of progress and reform. As for my friend who delivered his long oration in Urdu, which, I fear, many Members of this House must have enjoyed and a few of them must have felt surprised at, because it was wrapt in classical garb, all I can say to him, if he thinks that there is any danger to religion and to the customary *pardahnashin* character of his creed, is that this Resolution will leave him and his co-religionists wholly unaffected. If he desires that the womenfolk of his community should not emerge from their places of seclusion, I am sure, that neither the electioneering officers nor anybody else will use the slightest pressure upon them, but, if he cannot advance, let him not retard the pace of those who are ready to go forward. Let him not follow the dog-in-the-manger policy of saying to those who are in favour of the advancement of the women of this country: 'So long as we are not ready to go forward you shall not go forward also'. He tells us: 'We are here *pardahnashin* people, our women are kept in harems; and how can we allow our womenfolk to go out and vote?' I heard, Sir, from the Honourable Mover, that there is a possibility of converting some Members of this House also into *pardahnashin* men. He confessed to a feeling that he and a few others of this House would feel shy in the presence of lady Members of the Legislative Assembly. I can give my Honourable friend an assurance that what he will lose in the *pardahnashin* character of the *harem* he is likely to gain by the fresh acquisition which will be made from the would-be shy Members of this House, if ladies sit here. So the loss will not be entirely unrequited. But, Sir, this is a subject upon which I should think there would be hardly any room for discussion. The question is one which, I submit, concerns our mothers, our sisters and our daughters: and, if we prize political emancipation, if we value the franchise, and if we are struggling and fighting for the enlargement of our liberties, can we conscientiously deny to our female relations what we value and prize as a national asset? How can we, I submit, advance without having along with us our better-halves? And it is, in that spirit, Sir, that I ask the Honourable Members of this House to lend this Resolution their support. But, Sir, as Honourable Members will see, this Resolution deals with the removal of the sex disqualification, confining itself to the political franchise. My amendment, Sir, asks this House to support my claim for what I may call the forensic franchise.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: I rise to a point of order. Is the amendment in order?

Mr. President: Before I pronounce my opinion, I should like to hear the counter-argument which the Honourable Member proposes to put forward.

It is at least an open question whether the Resolution is for the removal of the sex disqualification or for an amendment of the Legislative Assembly Electoral Rolls.

Dr. H. S. Gour: I say, Sir, the removal of the sex disqualification which is entirely within the competence of this House will not be complete, unless you stamp out of the Statute Book, if it is necessary, a blot which shuts out our female folk from the practice of the profession of law. I would ask this Honourable House to remember the short history of this movement. In 1916, Miss Regina Guha passed her examination of B. L. in the University of Calcutta and she applied to the Honourable Judges of the Calcutta High Court for her enrolment as a legal practitioner. The Honourable Judges met at a Special Bench, and Honourable Members will find the case reported in 44 Cal., page 291. Now I wish to take you through the provisions of the standing law. (Cries of 'No, no'.) It won't take you a minute. ('No, no'.) Under the Legal Practitioners Act, any person is qualified to apply for such enrolment, and under the General Clauses Act 'a person' is held to include both a man and woman. Consequently there was no legal impediment to the enrolment of a duly qualified Graduate in Law in the High Court in Calcutta. But that was in 1916 when the Removal of Sex Disqualification Act was not passed by the mother of Parliaments as it was three years later in 1919. Their Lordships of the Calcutta High Court said, that it was perfectly true that, both according to the etymological sense as according to the context of the Indian Legal Practitioners' Act, the word 'person' made a woman eligible for enrolment as a legal practitioner. But they said, the thing had never been done, and they were not prepared to make an innovation. Her petition was rejected, and Miss Guha subsequently died, I fancy, broken hearted. (Laughter.) In 1921, five years later, another lady from Orissa, Miss Hazra, filed a petition before the Honourable Judges of the Patna High Court, and I have before me the judgment of Their Lordships. They said that there was no legal impediment to the enrolment of Miss Hazra as a legal practitioner, but in view of the fact that the Calcutta High Court in 1916 had held that such enrolment was limited and confined only to persons of the male sex, they could not make a deviation. But, at the same time, one of the learned Judges of that Court opined that it was for this Legislature to decide whether women Graduates in Law should be made eligible for enrolment. Well, Sir, about the same time, another lady law Graduate, Miss Cornelia Sorabji, filed an application before the Allahabad High Court, and I am glad to congratulate the Honourable High Court of the Honourable the Law Member that they had the good sense to enrol her as a duly qualified legal practitioner. (Hear, hear.) The position has now become anomalous. The two High Courts are not many miles apart. In one place, a lady Graduate in Law is duly enrolled and is eligible to practise the law as her profession in the same manner as a man. Go a few miles lower down the Gangetic plain, and you find another High Court exclaiming: 'The law seems to be all right, but we will follow the Calcutta practice, unless we are set right by the Indian Legislature.' Well, Sir, you know that the Inns of Court have for a very long time interpreted the word 'person' to mean only persons of the male sex. But now we find that this word 'person' has been interpreted to mean persons of either sex, and ladies have been admitted within the portals of that august body, the Inns of Court.

The members who will be called to the Bar of the Inns of Court in England cannot be shut out from practising by the High Courts of this country. Some ladies have already been called to the Bar there. Some of them are, at the present moment, prosecuting their studies with a view to be called in future, and I think it is necessary that we in this House should declare that the word 'person' shall not exclude persons of the female sex, when there is no legal impediment to their practising the

profession of law. In the course of their judgment, the Patna High Court pointed out that, while sections 6 and 8 of the Legal Practitioners' Act which mention persons who are eligible for enrolment as pleaders, are limited to men, section 36, which deals with persons who practise the trade of touts in connection with the Courts, states that they may be either men or women. In other words, while the word 'person' in one connection means both men and women, in another connection also dealing with the practice of the Law it is merely confined to men. When I read these judgments, I am reminded of some of the speeches made here. We are told, the thing is absolutely impossible. One of my friends said, we love women so dearly that we want them to remain in our houses and not to cross the threshold. Another friend said, woman's primary duty is in the house. I say, Sir, that the whole question is a question of justice and not a question of favour, as some of the other Members of this House seem to think. Are you prepared to give justice to your female folk? Are you prepared to deny them their right to practise the profession of law? As Colonel Gidney has told you, they are to-day successfully practising the profession of medicine; and they are honourably discharging other public and responsible duties. The great war was won with the assistance of women. The great war could not have been won had it not been for the sacrifices that the women of England—and, let me add, that the women of this country—made for the achievement of that great national purpose. Sir, if nothing else entitles the women of this country to their rights and privileges, it is the great service they have rendered to you and to the nation in the immediate past. And I say, Sir, that, even if it was a question of favour and not a question of primary human right, I would still ask the Assembly to remember the great services of women in the past and to support their claim to-day. Sir, I move my amendment, which runs as follows:

'That the following be added at the end of the Resolution:

'And the Government be further pleased to remove the sex bar held to disqualify women from enrolment as legal practitioners in the Courts of this country'.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: May I draw your attention, Sir, to Standing Order 38 at page 86. It says:

'An amendment must be relevant and within the scope of the motion to which it is proposed.'

The scope of the motion of Mr. Joshi is to enable women to be registered on the electoral roll of the Assembly. How the enrolment of women as advocates or pleaders in Courts is relevant to that subject I fail to see. I, therefore, take the objection that it is not a proper amendment.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent: May I just explain the attitude of Government on this matter? I confess, Sir, that it was with some surprise that I saw a notice of this amendment of Dr. Gour's this morning. And there was some excuse for my surprise, for one would think, to hear the eloquent speech the Honourable Member has made, that he has always constantly had in his mind this idea of freeing women from the restrictions which now operate to their prejudice in the legal profession. But, when I look at the terms of the Resolution of which the Honourable Member gave us notice but a few days ago, I find no trace of any action to remove the disqualifications of women in this respect.

Mr. President: Order, order. Is the Honourable Member dealing with the point of order raised by Mr. Rangachariar or with the amendment?

The Honourable Sir William Vincent: I was going to deal with the point of order. For the moment, I was pointing out that the Honourable

[Sir William Vincent.]

Member, though he had an opportunity, did not mention the subject of his present amendment in his Resolution, which he ought to have done and that I received notice of this amendment very late in the House this morning. Government, at the same time, are unwilling to oppose an amendment of this kind, or rather, I ought to say, to oppose the discussion of an amendment of this kind. Indeed it would be a somewhat discourteous act. Though I feel, the more one gets mixed up in these questions relating to women, the greater become one's difficulties, as in other occasions of life. However, if you decide, Sir, that the amendment is not altogether out of order, then the Government do not wish to object to the discussion to-day.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is aware that I am not a lawyer and, therefore, I take perhaps a slightly different view from that which he has taken. It would be possible, following closely the letter of the rule, to take the point made by the Honourable Member from Madras. Nonetheless, I consider that this is a Resolution for the removal of the sex disqualification. Therefore, though I consider further that the point is open to doubt and is not for that reason to be taken as a binding precedent, I allow the Honourable Member from Nagpur to move his amendment.

Khan Bahadur Zahiruddin Ahmed (Dacca Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I support the spirit of the Resolution, but, at the same time, I must say, it is much ahead of the time. There is no demand in the country for this franchise. There may be a few solitary cases here and there, but no universal cry for it. I admit, there are womenfolk in certain classes in India, who want it and I do not wish to stand in their way. We have come to such a time when we find that women are fighting the battles of Swaraj along with men and it will be a monstrous wrong to deny this privilege to these ladies. When it is granted, it will no doubt bring Swaraj nearer—at least by five years. But I must point out one difficulty—one great difficulty—and it is this. If this Resolution is accepted, it will be given the womenfolk a double vote. They not only command the votes of their poor husbands, but they encroach on the votes of their brothers, cousins, fathers and sons. If they are allowed a separate vote of their own, in addition to these, then, I am afraid, they will be totally irresistible. Whether this plural vote is to be allowed to them or not, is a matter for this Honourable House to decide.

With these few words, Sir, I say that the privilege should be given to those who want it.

Sir Godfrey Fell (Army Secretary): Sir, I feel that the time has come when something should be said on the other side of this question, and I, therefore, propose to undertake the rôle—the unwilling and ungallant rôle—of *advocatus diaboli*. I have listened for more than an hour and a half to a string of speakers who, with varying degrees of emotion, varying degrees of eloquence, but with an unvarying degree of apparent conviction, have supported the Resolution moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi. I asked myself, what is the reason for this unanimity? Such unanimity is very rare in this Assembly, and it makes one feel somewhat suspicious. Now, the two main motives which impel human action are love and fear. I ask myself, which of these motives has influenced the speakers to-day? (Laughter.) I think the clue has been afforded by the speech made by my Honourable friend, Mr. Rangachariar: Mr. Rangachariar has confessed

to the Assembly—and I hope to make further use of this confession hereafter in another connection—that he dare not criticise the domestic arrangements made by the ladies of his household. I believe it is precisely the same motive—fear—which has led him and other speakers to support the claims of the fair sex to a right to vote in election to this Assembly.

What, Sir, are my reasons for opposing this Resolution? I am perfectly aware that I am leading a forlorn hope. I know that, when this Assembly rises, as I suppose it will have to rise before very long, and when I slink home, I shall not be received, as most of the speakers to-day will be, with enthusiasm and with acclamation; but I shall be made to feel, in a number of ways, that I have been guilty of inexcusable temerity and have displayed a most regrettable and unwise reactionary tendency. Indeed, I feel that I have probably already earned the dislike and the contempt of the large number of fair ladies who are gracing the galleries with their presence to-day. Nevertheless, Sir, I claim to have shown that I am not lacking in personal courage in stating my opinions on this subject; and I am, therefore, free to confess to this House that the reason why I oppose this Resolution is from the very same motive that impels, in my opinion, other Members to support it, and that is fear. But, Sir, my fear is not fear of domestic consequences; my fear is based upon public grounds. Now, Sir, as the last speaker has just said, to grant women the right to vote will mean giving them a double or treble vote, and that is my chief objection to this Resolution. We know that 'the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world'; in other words, that we are all influenced by the opinions of our womenfolk. Are we to allow them not only to influence us in the seclusion of our homes, but also gradually to oust us from the position which we now hold of being entrusted with the public affairs of the country? It is not that I fear the incapacity of women; it is their capacity of which I am afraid. I quite admit, Sir, that the time must come, with the spread of education, when the women of this country must be given votes. But I ask whether that time has yet come. I ask whether, if they had a vote, women could return abler Members of this Assembly than we now have. (*Voices*: 'Yes'.) I entirely differ. We are told that we cannot put back the hands of the clock. But what I ask, Sir, is: 'Is it necessary for us to put them on?' I think not.

Maulvi Abul Kasem (Dacca Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I feel a little diffidence in addressing the House at the present moment. In the first place, I find that the Resolution moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, has received cordial support from the majority of the House and it must be a matter of very great gratification to him that in this instance, at any rate, he has forced himself into the citadel of orthodoxy and conservatism in the person of Mr. Rangachariar. I feel diffident, Sir, because I find myself here in the presence of the gallery of ladies who are adorning our galleries this afternoon

Mr. President: Order, order. This is the second time that reference has been made to the presence of persons in the gallery, who, from the point of view of the Chair, are invisible. ('Laughter' and 'Hear, hear'.)

Maulvi Abul Kasem: Mr. Joshi has distinctly said that his Resolution does not go beyond granting the franchise of voting at elections for this Assembly and that only to two provinces, that of Bombay and Madras; and naturally, coming as I do from the ungallant province of Bengal, (*Voices*: 'No', 'no'), it does not affect me much. Although I am prepared to support the Resolution as it stands, I want it to be distinctly understood that I do so because it does neither affect the province from

[Maulvi Abul Kasem.]

which I come nor the community to which I belong. (Hear, hear.) I do not approve of the principle at all. It has been said by some of the distinguished Members of this House that the time has come when we should emancipate our womenfolk. I take objection to that expression. We do not and never have enslaved or imprisoned our women. In the words of a great British statesman and orator, uttered on a historical and memorable occasion, we do not imprison but enshrine our ladies within the fold, and it is not the jealousy of the men but their reverence for women that protects them from the impertinent gaze of the stranger; and, as long as it does not interfere with the religious or the social customs of the Mussalman community, as has been suggested by my friend, Dr. Gour, and as has been stated by Khan Bahadur Zahiruddin Ahmed, let those communities and those provinces which want them have the franchise, but do not thrust this upon others. So, I would be quite satisfied if, when the rules are changed, the members of my community are excluded from it. Mr. Joshi has said that it does not compel any particular individual to come forward and vote, it is only a voluntary permission that it gives and that it only removes a disqualification. But he should remember that, except perhaps serving on the jury, there is no compulsion in any case, whereby a man or a woman may be compelled to give a vote. As has been pointed out by my friend on my left from Bihar, to give franchise to the Muhammadan ladies would mean that a large percentage of them will not either vote or go to the polling station, or record their vote in any other manner which may be proposed and suggested. Therefore, they will be at a disadvantage, because the ladies who will go and vote, though they will be a very small number, will at least be a cause for changing the result of the election itself

Mr. N. M. Joshi: The Muhammadans have got special representation.

Maulvi Abul Kasem: That is in the case of a contest between two Muhammadan candidates. Suppose one Muhammadan candidate has got a larger majority of supporters in the male section of the population, and another, at the same time, enjoys the confidence of the ladies, who will not go and vote for him because they resent the idea of going to the polling station and taking part in the franchise, people who will go and exercise their franchise will have preference and they will have an advantage over the others. In this connection, I want to say that I would have very much welcomed the proposal, if it had been made, to have ladies as Members of this Council. Certainly I do not object to their coming to this Council and voting on the ground of either ability or education.

It has been said that, with the spread of education, this thing is bound to come off. I say that, so far as education goes, and so far
 1 P.M. as the electorate goes, I do not think that our ladies are less educated or less competent to exercise the franchise than the male section of the population. They understand their business pretty well and sometimes much better than men. They manage their own properties in my part of the country and look after their own affairs. But the difficulty is, that they will not exercise the franchise. Let those who want to exercise the franchise have it, but, if in a particular community the majority will not exercise it, it will not be advisable to give the right to a minority.

Now, Sir, it has been said that time is progressing and that the hands of the clock should not be set back. I say, I cannot understand whether it is a set-back or not or whether you are going into the right path or into the wrong path by the imitation of western people. Whether it

is a move forward or a move backward is a matter of opinion and of some difference too, so far as I am concerned. There are a large number of people who believe and think with the Persian poet:

'I am afraid you will not reach Mecca, Oh! you villager, because the road you are pursuing leads to Turkestan, or in a different direction altogether.'

Sir, another amendment has been moved by Dr. Gour, asking that ladies should be permitted to appear as members of the bar, and I see no reason why this privilege should be denied to them. Ladies who pass their examinations are as competent as males to practise at the bar, and it will be great advantage, especially to my community, because they will be of great assistance to *pardahnashin* ladies, since they could take up their cases and fight them out without the intervention of a male and a tout. Therefore, Sir, the amendment, as it stands, has my whole-hearted and entire support, and I hope, Sir, that this House will accept the amendment as it stands.

I have only one word more to say and that is, that I do not regret that my province has rejected this proposal, and, although I support Mr. Joshi, I want it to be distinctly understood, and I have explained my position here, that I do not approve of the principle which underlies it.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent: Sir, I want to deal very shortly with this amendment of Dr. Gour's if I may, because I feel it has introduced a very difficult subject into this debate and that I may be able to suggest a solution of the difficulty which will meet the wishes of many Honourable Members. I think that many of us feel, certainly the Government feel, that this amendment in regard to women appearing as legal practitioners has been rather sprung upon us at the last moment and that many of us here have not had time to consider it fully. With all respect to the ruling from the Chair, Sir, it is a very great extension on the original proposal, which, we all thought, dealt with the question of suffrage. That Resolution would, moreover, by reason of the rules and regulations, if accepted, have only applied to two provinces, whereas, now, the Assembly is asked to commit itself to an entirely different and much larger proposition, namely, the right of women to practise as legal practitioners throughout the whole of India. Now, there must be arguments on both sides in regard to such a matter, and that is apparent even from the decisions which the Honourable Mover of the amendment has read out to the House. When he moved the amendment, I was, however, as I explained, very anxious not to take advantage of a possible technical ground of objection in view of the anxiety which the Honourable Mover and some of his supporters took in his amendment, but I suggest that a way out of the difficulty would be that the Government should give an assurance that they will consult the High Courts and the Local Governments on this question and then, later, when public opinion has been sounded, it will be open to any Member of this Assembly to move a fresh Resolution on the point. (Hear, hear.) In that way the Honourable Mover's object will be secured. He will be enabled to stand before this Assembly as the champion of the fair sex and as an eloquent advocate of their rights. At the same time, Members of this Assembly will not be asked to come to a premature decision on a question of such vital importance. I hope and I have some reason to believe that this suggestion will meet with the approval of the Honourable Mover of the amendment.

Dr. H. S. Gour: Sir, in view of the assurance given by the Honourable the Home Member, I not only accept his assurance but resign by championship of the fair sex in his favour. (Laughter.)

The amendment* was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan (Tirhut Division: Muhammadan): Sir, I rise to support the Resolution so ably moved by my Honourable colleague, Mr. Joshi. When women are not exempted from the payment of taxes, when they have to pay taxes, common fairness and bare justice demand that they should not be deprived of the right of representation. According to the laws of the land, they can sue and be sued, can prosecute and be prosecuted and can transact business. Our own laws, I mean the Islamic Laws, have given them the right of inheritance; and, as owners of properties, they can appoint servants and carry on business. In such circumstances, there is no reason to suppose that they will abuse their right of voting if they are given the power of voting. Besides this, as regards the *purdah*, the Islamic Laws have permitted our women to go out with their veils on. Not to speak of other countries, such as Egypt, Persia, Turkey, Turkestan and other places, even in India, ladies, while going on pilgrimage, go about from one place to another with their veils on. Even at present you will see such a high personage as, for instance, Her Highness the Begum of Bhopal, and cultured and highly respected ladies, such as the mother of the Ali brothers and the wife of Mr. Muhammad Ali besides others, going about with their veils on. In the same way, if they have got the right of voting, they can go with their veils on the polling booths and, if they do not like even to go there, there is no reason why, for the sake of the scruples of only a few ladies, others should be deprived of this right. I, therefore, support this Resolution. There is nothing in our religion—I have read the Koran and can understand it—against this. The Koran simply says, that women should not be allowed to go out with their faces open. With their veils on, they can go everywhere, and with all deference to those who hold the contrary view, I say, they are entirely wrong; it is simply a matter of prejudice. As a Mussalman I say so, and, therefore, there is no reason why our community as a whole should be deprived of this right. There may be persons who may have scruples about it, and will not go to the polls; nobody compels them, nobody brings any pressure to bear upon them. Therefore, both on the ground of the emancipation of women and also on national grounds, and also on religious grounds, as I have stated, I heartily support this Resolution.

Mr. K. G. Bagde (Bombay Central Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I rise to heartily support the Resolution moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi. From our experience and knowledge of the deliberations in this House, it is not surprising to us if any proposal based on liberal principles is opposed on religious grounds. But it is really surprising to see a Resolution like this opposed by my Honourable friend, Sir Godfrey Fell. He said, that in his opposition to this Resolution, he was influenced neither by the sentiment of love nor by the sentiment of fear, and when I listened to him, I listened with great interest in the hope that in his balanced state of mind and head, he would give us some reasons at least on which he based his opposition: but, unfortunately for me, I did not hear any reasons from him at all. I, therefore, do not attach much importance to his opposition.

* Vide page 2093 of these Debates.

Now there is another aspect from which this Resolution should be viewed, and that aspect, I think, is important. Some persons here have urged that women in this country have not sufficiently advanced and, therefore, the franchise should not be extended to them. Now, if the Honourable gentlemen mean that they are not sufficiently educated, then I would point out to them the state of education that obtains with regard to the male section of our population. The percentage of literacy among men is not very high. But we do not oppose the franchise which has been granted to men under the Reforms. Why then should we grudge the same to the women of this country? But I attach more importance to this Resolution because the extension of the franchise brings in its wake a political awakening and political education, and that political education is very important. If you look at the history of our public activities before the introduction of the Reforms, you will see that political activities were confined only to cities; but the extension of the franchise, under the present Government of India Act, has given the right of voting even to a man in a distant village, with the result that all this political agitation has now reached the remotest villages. If a similar extension of franchise were made in the case of women, I believe that that political awakening would spread among the womankind of this country and it would help along our political progress very much.

Now, Sir, all of us are aware that there is a deplorable and, I may say, somewhat hopeless contradiction in our public activities in connection with some vital national problems. Whenever there is a political question at issue, there are many people who become fiery, very enthusiastic and very impatient to accelerate the rate of progress towards the political future of this country. But the moment they are confronted with any social problem, all of a sudden, some of them cry halt—not only do they cry halt, but they take a complete right-about turn, and, instead of looking to the future, look back to the past and would even re-trace their footsteps. This, Sir, has done more harm to our national cause than could be done by the staunchest enemies of this country. If we want to advance nationally, we cannot ignore social problems, and therefore I appeal to all my friends here to support this Resolution. I hope that my appeal will not go in vain, and I trust that this Resolution will not meet with the fate of foundering on the rock of opposition as another Resolution did the other day. With these few words, I support the Resolution.

Rao Bahadur C. S. Subrahmanayam (Madras ceded districts and Chittoor: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, this Resolution of Mr. Joshi, worded as it is with great circumspection and practically narrowed down to only two Provinces, is one that is intended to remove an existing anomaly, an anomaly which is indefensible. A man that pays a few rupees in taxes or rates has got a vote. Well, I know personally a good many who have been elected to this Assembly who will bear me out when I say that many of these men no better than bipeds when they came to the polling station had their hearts with a particular candidate but they could not name the candidate to the polling officer being too stupid and illiterate to tell the polling officer the name of the candidate in favour of whom they were to record the vote. And I know I was a victim myself in some cases, where a man having gone down to give his vote to me but did not and I lost a vote. The system which allows such a man to vote and to influence the election of Members to this Assembly—well, if they can do that, what is the sin in allowing women who pay rates and taxes to come and vote—that is, women who own property in their own name. It is not every woman who is going to get the

[Rao Bahadur C. S. Subrahmanayam.]

vote in this way, but only a very few women who own property in their own names. They may be wives or mothers, or the daughters of very wealthy people, but they will not on that account be voters. It is only in those special cases where a woman has separate property, property which stands in her name, and has been registered as a voter, that comes under this Resolution.

All the argument about female education not having advanced far enough in this country is entirely beside the point. That has nothing to do with this question. If you were going to give every woman in the country a vote, that argument would hold good. But you have given illiterate men, men who do not understand what they are doing, votes. You are asked to give votes to a very much smaller number of women who hold property, who pay rates and taxes, and who are probably in point of intelligence much better qualified than men in a corresponding position. Now, that is the only point which is now before the Assembly, because the Resolution is worded in such a narrow restricted manner.

Well, a discussion like this must needs raise many other points and it has raised some. It is a study in psychology—I mean a fair and amiable study in psychology that my friend, Rao Bahadur Rangachariar, the protagonist of orthodoxy in this Assembly, should give his whole-hearted support to this Resolution. But my friend, Mr. Cotelingam, who represents the most advanced section of the Indian community in my presidency and probably the whole of India, a community which has contributed a large number of educated and cultured women, stood up and gave his half-hearted support and paid some back-handed compliments to Mr. Joshi and others. There is one thing gratifying in it—and that is that he is consistent; he is not a radical in politics and he is not a radical in social matters; and therefore it will please the Honourable the Home Member that there is one Member at any rate here who is consistent all round.

Now, Sir, there is another anomaly in my presidency. The department of education is manned (or womanned) by a large number of ladies. There are a good number of them, graduates of the University; and one of them recently had the whole department of education in her hands; she was the Deputy Directress of Education and that lady, if she resigned her appointment to-morrow—though probably as an official she may not have a vote—would not be entitled to the vote. But the sort of people I referred to could be asked, could be persuaded and prevailed upon to use the vote, while this lady has not got a vote. There are also a good many others, Indians, Hindus, who are head-mistresses of schools and inspectresses of varying grades, and these are ineligible to vote. Now, I ask this Assembly, is not that an absurd anomaly, that cultured educated women who pay taxes should not be given the vote, but that you should allow a man, however uncultured or uneducated, the vote?

Take another section of women, those employed in the medical services. My province has got a very large number of women who are employed on the medical side. They are in the same position. So far as my Muhammadan friends are concerned, they form a distinct compartment. If the franchise is extended to them and if they do not choose to exercise it, it does not affect them. If there was a mixed electorate, it might be said that the Hindu women could turn the scale or some such trouble might arise. But so long as they are in a separate compartment, they need not raise any objection and quote us verses from the Holy Koran which no one here has been able to understand.

There is another trouble about this matter. In my province, 25 years ago, women had the vote in municipalities; they were eligible to vote at municipal elections. But our Madras Government is a very forward Government and it took it away in the Act of 1908. Why it took it away, no one knew; and I understand that the Select Committee that sat about three years ago, of which I was a Member, said : ' No, you shall not give the vote to women '. But I understand from my friends that they have turned a new leaf and they have got the vote, that is, in mufassil municipalities women have also got the vote. If Honourable Members belonging to the provinces other than Madras and Bombay fear from this Resolution that the women of their own provinces would make a demand and therefore they ought to oppose this Resolution, I think that fear is a far-fetched fear. I would ask them, while it does not affect them, it only concerns the two provinces which have already voted strongly for this measure, not to obstruct the demand that is made on behalf of those two provinces.

There is another matter about which some of my Honourable friends are in great fear, that is, of women becoming Members of this Assembly. I wish they were. We all know that women are quick at repartee, at taking the situation with a considerable sense of humour; and if there were half a dozen ladies in this Assembly, probably some of us would not speak as we ordinarily do; we should take greater care and make ourselves a little more articulate, a little more understood by our audience, and probably put in a little more life in what we say than we are now apt to do. Therefore, I welcome the day when there will be some women in this Assembly. The presence of women would probably improve our methods of debate and the manner of debate. Therefore, Sir, I do not look with alarm to the time when women would sit in this Assembly and I ask my Honourable friends who have those great apprehensions to reconsider their opinion and to await with perfect equanimity and confidence the day when that will happen.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Sir, I am not generally in the habit of congratulating myself; but to-day I congratulate myself upon the support which I have obtained for my Resolution. Sir, from the very beginning I expressed confidence in the sense of justice of the Members of this Assembly. But unfortunately the Honourable the Home Member interpreted my confidence as an apology. I assure him, it was not an apology; but it was mere confidence in the Members of this Assembly which, only a few minutes more will show, was amply justified. Sir, the Honourable the Home Member also criticised my attitude on certain matters concerning the Government. I only want to say this, that I criticise Government and criticise them strongly sometimes, because I feel that constituted as we are to-day, it is for the Executive Government to initiate policies in the matters affecting the working and the other weaker classes. Moreover, I criticise Government because I feel that Government does not do sufficient, although I appreciate what little they do sometimes. Sir, on the merits of the question I do not want to say much. The whole Assembly, almost unanimously I am quite sure, is going to support my Resolution. But one thing I want to make clear. My Resolution will apply for the present to the Presidencies of Bombay and Madras; but it will not be fair unless I make it clear that as regards the other Presidencies, it will remain hanging over their heads, and, as soon as the local Councils remove the disqualification, my Resolution will become effective in those Presidencies also.

Mr. President: The question is:

That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he should so amend the Legislative Assembly Electoral Rules as to remove the sex disqualification in the matter of registration, on the electoral roll, of persons who are entitled to vote in the elections held for the Legislative Assembly.

The Assembly then divided as follows:

AYES—41.

Abdul Majid, Shaikh.
 Ahmed, Mr. K.
 Akram Hussain, Prince A. M. M.
 Bagde, Mr. K. G.
 Bajpai, Mr. S. P.
 Barua, Mr. D. C.
 Bray, Mr. Denys.
 Carter, Sir Frank.
 Chatterjee, Mr. A. C.
 Chaudhuri, Mr. J.
 Cotelingam, Mr. J. P.
 Crookshank, Sir Sydney.
 Dentith, Mr. A. W.
 Faridoonji, Mr. R.
 Ghose, Mr. S. C.
 Gidney, Lieutenant-Colonel H. A. J.
 Ginwala, Mr. P. P.
 Gour, Dr. H. S.
 Gulab Singh, Sardar.
 Iswar Saran, Munshi.
 Jatkari, Mr. B. H. R.

Joshi, Mr. N. M.
 Kabraji, Mr. J. K. N.
 Keith, Mr. W. J.
 McCarthy, Mr. F.
 Misra, Mr. P. L.
 Mitter, Mr. K. N.
 Mudaliar, Mr. S.
 Nag, Mr. G. C.
 Neogy, Mr. K. C.
 Percival, Mr. P. E.
 Pyari Lal, Mr.
 Rangachariar, Mr. T.
 Rao, Mr. C. Krishnaswami.
 Samarth, Mr. N. M.
 Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Mr.
 Sarvadhikary, Sir Deva Prasad.
 Sinha, Beohar Raghubir.
 Sohan Lal, Bakshi.
 Subrahmanayam, Mr. C. S.
 Way, Mr. T. A. H.

NOES—16.

Asjad-ul-lah, Maulvi Miyan.
 Bradley-Birt, Mr. F. B.
 Bryant, Mr. J. F.
 Fell, Sir Godfrey.
 Habibullah, Mr. Muhammad.
 Ibrahim Ali Khan, Lieutenant Nawab M.
 Muhammad Hussain, Mr. T.
 Muhammad Ismail, Mr. S.

Mukherjee, Mr. J. N.
 Nabi Hadi, Mr. S. M.
 Ramayya Pantulu, Mr. J.
 Renouf, Mr. W. C.
 Sinha, Babu Adit Prasad.
 Spence, Mr. R. A.
 Ujagar Singh, Baba Bedi.
 Zahiruddin Ahmed, Mr.

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Half Past Ten of the Clock on Friday, the 3rd February, 1922.