

VOTES FOR WOMEN

EDITED BY FREDERICK AND EMMELINE PETHICK LAWRENCE

VOL. VI. (New Series), No. 257.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1913.

Price 1d. Weekly (Post Free) 1/4d.



“WHAT A PITY IT WON'T GO QUIETLY!”

CONTENTS

Our Cartoon	285	The Cabinet and Liberal Women	272
The Outlook	285	Militancy for Non-Militants, By Emmeline Pethick Lawrence	273
Women and War, By Mrs. St. Clair Stobart	267	"The Surprise," By Dollie Radford	273
The Prime Minister's New Pledge	268	"A Week of Militancy"	274
The Liberal Women	268	Prisoners of War	275
The Labour Conference	269	The Bulgarian Mother	276
"The Women Aroused," By Constance E. Maud	270	Women and Local Government	276
"Votes for Women" Fellowship	270	New Fiction	276
The Norfolk Peasants' Rising in the sixteenth Century	271	The Prime Minister in Scotland	277
		Forcible Feeding	278
		Correspondence	278

DEDICATION

To the brave women who to-day are fighting for freedom; to the noble women who all down the ages kept the flag flying and looked forward to this day without seeing it; to all women all over the world, of whatever race, or creed, or calling, whether they be with us or against us in this fight, we dedicate this paper.

THE OUTLOOK

Ten days have now gone by since the new pledge as to Woman Suffrage was given by the Government. Each of these days has seen more clearly established the worthlessness of the pledge, and the determination of women to accept nothing less than a Government measure for their enfranchisement.

Why the Pledge is Worthless

Apart altogether from Parliamentary intrigue—the evil possibilities of which were made apparent during the weeks which immediately preceded the Speaker's recent ruling—and the risk which a private Member's Bill would run if it were opposed by the House of Lords, there is a fatal flaw in the procedure outlined by the Government. This flaw must in-

evitably result in the conversion of the Suffrage majority which actually exists in the present House of Commons into a minority, and in the consequent defeat of the Suffrage Bill.

The Essential Factor for a Non-Party Majority

Theoretically, a vote may be carried in the House of Commons either by a party or a non-party majority. In the first case, the Government make it a party question; they put on their Whips to tell in favour of it, and by threatening that its defeat will destroy the Government they reduce opposition within their own ranks to so small a figure that the party majority is maintained. In the second case, the vote is carried by securing a majority composed of men drawn from both parties, who between them are able to defeat a minority of men also coming from both sides of the House. It is of the essence of this second method that the Government of the day should remain strictly impartial, and therefore it can only come into operation in cases in which the Government consider the result immaterial to themselves.

Government Neutrality Impossible

The fallacy in supposing that a Woman Suffrage Bill can be carried by this second method of procedure lies in the fact that in a matter so important as a revision of the franchise laws the interests of the Party in power are certain to be involved. A really neutral attitude on the part of the Government is therefore impossible, and one of two things will inevitably happen. Either the Bill will be originally drafted and introduced on really non-party

lines—in which case it will be unacceptable to the Government, and some Minister will be put up at a later stage to give it its death-blow—or the Bill will be drafted in the first instance in a form which favours the Government, in which case it will lose the support of friendly members of the Opposition. In neither case will it be carried into law.

The Fate of the Conciliation Bill

The Conciliation Bill was a measure contrived on a really non-party basis, having been drafted by a committee of genuine Suffragists drawn from all parties in the House of Commons. Experts computed that it would have enfranchised about a million women, and that there was reason to suppose that the support of these new voters would be distributed among the parties in much the same proportion as the existing electorate. This was not good enough for the Government. Mr. Lloyd George denounced the Bill in 1910 as unfit for a Liberal Government to sanction, and declared that if facilities were to be given to a non-party measure they must be given to one capable of free amendment (that is to say, to a measure which the Government could change into something more favourable to their party). The conditions of the Government were, however, complied with in 1911, but facilities were refused for that year and promised for 1912. In the meanwhile, the Conciliation Committee, who were in charge of the measure, realising that any substantial alteration of the Bill would mean the destruction of the compromise on which it was based, were busy obtaining from M.P.'s pledges to vote for the Bill, the whole Bill,

and nothing but the Bill. So successful were they that there seemed a good prospect that the Bill would actually be carried. In view of this contingency the Government again interfered by announcing the introduction of the ill-fated Franchise Bill; this announcement, in the historic words of Mr. Lloyd George, "torpedoed" the Conciliation Bill.

The Bill of Next Session

When Mr. Asquith's statement was first made on Monday in last week, it was originally supposed that a Committee, or a "Cabinet," as it was jocularly called, would be formed of members favourable to Woman Suffrage, selected from all parties, on whom would devolve the duty of forming and taking charge of the new Bill in the Session of 1913. Mr. Balfour even went so far as to suggest that he himself would be a member of that Committee, and that Mr. Lloyd George would perhaps be its chairman. If this course had been pursued, and in the result a measure equally favourable to both parties had been evolved, it would, no doubt, have ultimately suffered a fate similar to that of the Conciliation Bill. But events took an entirely different turn. Instead of a non-party Committee getting to work on a neutral Bill, a purely party Committee, consisting of those Suffragists who are members of the Liberal Party, were summoned together to meet on Thursday in last week.

"An Essential Product of Liberalism"

Writing on the previous (Wednesday) night, "P. W. W.," of the *Daily News*, after stating that Mr. Lloyd George intended to be present himself, went on to say:—

It has been decided by the conveners of the meeting to consolidate Liberal forces before attempting to construct a "Cabinet." Conservative help will be welcomed, but the first necessity is to secure a straightforward Bill which can be defended as an essential product of Liberalism on any Liberal platform.

At the same time, Mr. Whitehouse, M.P., secretary of the Liberal Pro-Suffrage Committee, told a representative of the *Standard* that Liberal Suffragists had never consented to the proposal to form a Cabinet, and that there was, in fact, no prospect of their doing so at the present stage.

Liberal Suffragists to Act by Themselves

The actual meeting of pro-Suffrage Liberals took place as arranged, and no less than five members of the Government were present and took an active part in the discussion—the Attorney-General, the Solicitor-General, Mr. Macnamara, Mr. Ellis Griffith, and Mr. F. D. Acland; Mr. Lloyd George himself was detained in the House, but sent a message through the Attorney-General. According to the usually well-informed London correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, the result of the meeting was that

the revival of any composite body like the Conciliation Committee is extremely unlikely. The feeling was expressed at to-day's meeting by several members and by at least one member of the Ministry that it would be better for Liberal suffragists to come to a decision by themselves as regards their plans for taking advantage of the Prime Minister's pledge.

He added that this view found particular favour among the members of the Irish Party who were present.

The Effect of the Decision

The effect of this decision of Liberal Suffragists is that the new Bill will not be a non-party Bill, but a Liberal Bill constructed by, and with a view to the advantage of, the Liberal Party. Under these circumstances it has no chance of securing the full support of Unionist Suffragists; in fact, it may easily find the whole Unionist party solid against it. Says the *Globe*: "In certain quarters the position is not yet fully understood, but the fact that the Radical Suffragist M.P.'s found it advisable to meet alone last night, in consultation with the Women's Liberal Federation, is a sign of the times. We see it suggested to-day that this attitude on the part of the Radicals caused surprise in the lobby. As a matter of fact the meeting was the first evidence of the effect of the new wedge the Government have driven into Votes for Women." The writer goes on to predict that with a few possible exceptions Unionists will not give their support to the Bill. Coming as this does from a source hostile to Woman Suffrage, it is, nevertheless, a statement of simple fact.

We are Under No Delusion

Let us make our position perfectly clear. We have not the smallest objection to obtaining Votes for Women by means of a Bill which is the "essential product of Liberalism." If, in addition, the Bill is one which favours the Liberal Party machine as against the Unionist Party machine, that is no concern of ours. But we are under no delusion. If a Bill of this kind is to be carried, it must be carried

by the full force of the Liberal Party, including Government support, Party Whips, and the normal machinery by which the Party majority is maintained in the House of Commons. It cannot be carried by an unofficial group consisting solely of those supporters of Woman Suffrage who are at the same time members of the Coalition; for the simple reason that by themselves they do not constitute a majority of the House.

Private Member's Bill has No Chance

Let us restate the position. A private member's Bill, drawing support from both sides of the House, could only be carried provided the Government were prepared to remain neutral not merely as to the actual voting but as to the nature of the Bill itself. This proviso was not fulfilled in the case of the Conciliation Bill, and it is already evident that it will not be fulfilled for the new Bill. More than that, it is a proviso inherently incapable of fulfilment under modern political conditions. We therefore say definitely that this method of attempting to deal with Woman Suffrage is foredoomed to failure, and only those can advocate it who are either deliberately putting women off or who have themselves not sufficiently considered the situation. We are thrown back on the only other method, the one which is in strict accordance with the practice of the Constitution, the introduction by the Government of a Government measure for the enfranchisement of women.

An Anti-Government Policy

How clearly these facts are appreciated by women is evidenced by the unanimity with which the Suffrage societies have rejected the worthless pledge for facilities for a private Member's Bill and have demanded a Government measure. On page 268 will be found some of the resolutions which have been carried by the different societies supplementing those that we gave last week. Of course, the mere demand for a Government measure is not enough by itself; to be effective it must be coupled with an immediate anti-Government policy. We are glad to see that practically all the societies forming the group affiliated to the Federated Council have decided to take this course, and we hope to hear that this policy is the one in future to be pursued by the N.U.W.S.S.

The Labour Party

The Labour Party adopted a friendly resolution at their recent National Conference in London, calling upon the Government to take up the Suffrage Bill if it passed its second reading in the House of Commons, and binding Labour M.P.'s to oppose any further extension of the franchise unless women were included. If the Labour Party were a party in opposition, this result (except in so far as the proposal to take up the Bill after second reading falls short of a Government measure) would be wholly satisfactory. As it is, however, the Labour Party form an integral part of the Coalition; the transference of their votes to the Opposition would before very long bring about the defeat of the Government. They have, therefore, a definite responsibility for Government policy, and this responsibility they cannot shed by the adoption of any attitude, however friendly. Under these circumstances, it is a necessary corollary to the anti-Government policy that Suffragists shall withdraw all support from Labour candidates until such time as the Labour Party shall bring the necessary pressure to bear on the Government to cause them to place Woman Suffrage on the Government programme and introduce a measure to give effect to it.

Liberal Women

Prior to the declaration of the Prime Minister last week it had been arranged that the Council of the Women's Liberal Federation would be called together when the fate of the Woman Suffrage amendments to the Franchise Bill had been decided. Instead of this, the Executive met and passed a resolution expressing their "disappointment" at the Speaker's ruling, and their "regret" that Mr. Asquith could not see his way to promise a Government measure, but nevertheless pledging themselves to try to make the most of such opportunity as was provided. The Executive further decided to postpone the proposed meeting of the Council until after the introduction of the new Bill. It is too early to judge whether the majority of Liberal Women's Associations throughout the country will acquiesce in this weak attitude towards the Government, or in the postponement of the meeting of the Council; but undoubtedly among individual members there are signs of a determination to adopt a much more vigorous policy. The spirited speech of Mrs. Cobden Hirst in the dock at Bow Street should convince the Government of the danger they are running in further estranging their women, and the letter which we reprint from the *Manchester Guardian* is, as the writer says, another sign of the direction in which the wind is blowing.

Militant Action

The guerilla war conducted by the militants continues with unabated vigour. Pillar-boxes in dif-

ferent parts of the country have been tampered with, and the campaign has been extended to the Tower of London, the Archbishop's Palace, and to the golf courses. However much the public may dislike and resent these actions, they are a sign that large numbers of women feel keenly their exclusion from citizenship, and do not intend to let Society rest until their grievances are redressed. We are glad to see that the strong protest made last week in our columns by Mr. Nevinson against the treatment meted out by the police to Mrs. Drummond has drawn the attention of the *Manchester Guardian* to the facts, and that that paper is demanding an inquiry.

"No Work Fitted for Women"

It is a strange proof of an extraordinary misconception that the British Red Cross Society, entrusted with the financial resources to equip a trained medical and nursing staff, should have decided "that there was 'no work fitted for women' in the Balkans." Mrs. St. Clair Stobart has demonstrated that there are "women fitted for the work." Everybody with authority to speak now admits freely that the women were right and the men were wrong. Had this brave, practical woman not insisted on breaking down the barrier of red tape raised against her, had not she and her convoy privately raised the necessary funds, overcoming well-nigh insuperable difficulties, unnecessarily placed in her path, British women alone amongst the great nations of Europe would have been unrepresented at the scene of action, British prestige would have suffered loss, and the soldiers of the allied armies fighting for their liberty would have lacked the assistance which proved invaluable to them.

Items of Interest

Mrs. Despard was released from prison on January 30, her fine having been paid by an unknown person.

The Irish Woman Suffrage prisoners have been refused first-class treatment in prison, and have adopted the hunger strike.

An Equal Suffrage amendment to the Constitution has passed the legislatures of New York State and the State of Nevada. In each case it will have to be ratified by a referendum of the electors before it becomes law.

A combined meeting of protest against the worthlessness of the Government's new pledge, organised by the Federated Council of Women's Suffrage Societies, was being held on Wednesday night, as we went to press, in the Queen's Hall. A report of the meeting will appear in our next issue.

TAILOR SPORTS SHIRTS



TAILOR SPORTING SHIRT in Silk and Wool material in a large variety of striped guaranteed Tailor cut, Narrow yoke across back. Link cuffs. Price 14/9. Sizes 12, 13, 14, 15, 16. Also in Zephyr, 10/6; and in striped washing silk. Price 29/6.

Debenham & Freebody
Wigmare Street.
(Covendish Square) London.W.

WOMEN AND WAR

By M. A. Stobart (Mrs. St. Clair Stobart), Commandant-in-Chief, Women's Convoy Corps



Some men are capable of taking a share in national defence, and it is therefore assumed that men in general are worthy of Imperial responsibilities and of having a voice in national affairs. Are some women also capable of taking a share in national defence—without being a nuisance or a burden on men? This was the question I set myself to answer when, four years ago, I founded the Women's Convoy Corps. For I have always felt that unless woman can be of service in spheres of work that are national and imperial she is not worthy of a place in national and imperial parliaments. So long as her interests and sympathies are confined to the home and parish, so long must her influence remain solely domestic and parochial. A woman has always been ready, as everybody knows, to sacrifice herself for her home, her husband, and her child, but until she is equally ready, or is permitted, to sacrifice her home, her husband, and her child for her country she will never be on an equal footing with man.

If it is right for the man that he should consider the welfare of his country before the welfare of his family, why should the same high moral not apply equally in the case of woman? If it is the sacrifice which for the man constitutes the virtue and the heroism, why should not the greater sacrifice entailed upon the woman who leaves home and family for work in hospitals of war constitute an even greater virtue and heroism? For when all is said and done, the result to the home and family is probably more disastrous if the man is killed than if the woman dies. For whereas the death, upon the battlefield, of the man—the breadwinner—may entail the destitution of the family, the death of the wife and mother in a fever hospital would cause to the family at home chiefly sorrow and inconvenience. In any case, it is left to a man's own conscience to decide between his country and his family, and could not a similar decision be left with equal safety to the consciences of women?

To me it seems then obviously right that some women should offer their services in time of war. But are they capable of giving service that is of value without the assistance of male hewers of wood and drawers of water? That was the question at issue between myself and the British Red Cross Society, when, at the outbreak of the Balkan War, I offered the services of trained members of the Women's Convoy Corps to help the sick and wounded in the Balkans. The British Red Cross Society announced that they were sending out no women with their men's units, as there was "no work fitted for women" in the Balkans. I considered that this was synonymous with saying that there were "no women fitted for the work," and I knew better. So I determined to go out and see for myself whether there was indeed no service which trained and disciplined women could render to a people whose nursing and surgical resources must in such an emergency be severely strained.

I went to Bulgaria, where I imagined that the brunt of the fighting would take place, and everywhere I found, as I had expected, that the work of

trained women was sorely needed. I offered the services of the Corps, and these were gratefully accepted by the Queen, by the Croix Rouge, and by the head of the Medical Military Department. The latter requested me to cable at once for my colleagues to come out and improvise a hospital at Kirk Kilisse, then about to become the headquarters of the Bulgarian Army. The story of our adventures on the journey and of our work when we arrived need not here be repeated. It is only of importance to mention that the work of this hastily improvised hospital was in every department—nursing, surgical, culinary, and administrative—conducted by women, and that during the two months that we were at work we treated 729 cases—many of them of a ghastly and serious nature—with only one fatality. And all this, of course, under conditions of sanitation, food, language, &c., of more than ordinary difficulty.

It must not, however, be thought that there was anything wonderful in what we did—the only wonder is that it could possibly in this twentieth century be thought wonderful for women to do work which was so obviously women's work. For until the time shall come when man shall no longer think war heroic, surely all work connected with the care of the sick and wounded and with hospital administration, should be in the hands of women—whatever may be the conditions of the campaign? And the Women's Convoy Corps have perhaps served a useful purpose, for by the success of their work and by the spirit with which

they endured hardships and privations and tackled difficulties which women are not generally called upon to face, they have, I hope, helped to establish the fact that, though untrained and undisciplined women are not wanted—anywhere—trained and disciplined women are, without being a burden on men, capable of rendering national, even international, service in time of war.

It will interest our readers to know that the Corps of whom Mrs. St. Clair Stobart speaks in her article consisted of sixteen women, including, besides herself, three medical women, Drs. Hutchison, Ramsbotham, and Tudor; two Sisters, Miss V. Adams and Miss P. Gadsden; four other trained nurses, and six members for general duty as dressers, nurses, cooks, &c. On their arrival at Sofia, where Mrs. Stobart met them, the Queen of Bulgaria gave them an audience and sent them on their way the following morning, to Jamboli, with a case of provisions for their long train journey. At Jamboli they hoped to be able to take in a stock of provisions for their seven days' trek to Kirk Kilisse, but a raid upon the shops produced only a few sour brown loaves, two boxes of sardines, and a couple of hundred eggs. They trusted to finding food in the villages on the way, and succeeded in securing forty ox carts, twenty-eight for their equipment, and twelve for themselves. Then, two people in each wagon, they started on their march across the plains of Thrace and the mountains of Rhodope, with an escort of two policemen and two soldiers who marched alongside with fixed bayonets, making it their business to keep the drivers in order. Mrs. Stobart gives a delightful description of this journey in her account of the whole expedition which appears in the February issue of *The Contemporary Review*.

At Kirk Kilisse they presented themselves at the headquarters of the Commandant to receive their orders, and were told to select from the deserted Turkish houses any buildings they could convert into a hospital. They chose three together in a narrow street, with a fourth for the staff; and within thirty hours "the Women's Convoy Corps hospital was a going concern": lines of bullock wagons from the battle fields of Chatalja and Lule Burgas were at the doors, and from these the terribly wounded soldiers were lifted out and transferred to the beds in the hospital till these gave out, after which the patients were placed on sack mattresses in the halls, corridors, and outhouses. The Corps stayed there seven weeks, until, in fact, they decided that there was no longer any work to do with which the local authorities could not deal. Besides the fourteen wards with their eighty-four beds, there was also an out-patients' dispensary. "Shrapnel, grenade, Mauser, and Mannlicher bullets, each told its graphic tale, the Turkish Mauser being the most merciful in its effects. But the men bore the bullets no grudge, and as these were extracted invariably held out their hands for the prized mentar."

Of the two photographs that we are kindly permitted to reproduce as illustrations, one shows the Women's Convoy Corps on its long trek from Jamboli to Kirk Kilisse; and the other shows a group of doctors, nurses, patients, cooking staff, &c., in front of the improvised hospital at Kirk Kilisse.



THE PRIME MINISTER'S NEW PLEDGE

What Is It Worth?—Increasing Dissatisfaction Among Suffragists

Almost universal condemnation has now been poured upon the Prime Minister's new pledge to Woman Suffragists. If we except the Liberal Party Press and the Party organizations, we can truly say that no support has been found for it. The Labour Party, at its annual Conference on January 31, deplored its inadequacy by an overwhelming majority. Every Suffrage Society of any standing has now repudiated the new offer, and demands a Government measure in its stead; the Women's Co-operative Guild has done the same. The greatest interest continues to be shown in the Press all over the country with regard to the extraordinary situation created by the Speaker's ruling and the failure of the Government to placate the women they have tricked. Outbursts of militancy, with which we deal on page 274, continue to occur daily, and numberless indignation meetings are being held by Suffragists, both militant and non-militant. After we go to press the first meeting of the new Federated Council of Woman Suffrage Societies will be held in the Queen's Hall, to protest against the Government's treatment of the whole question, and to demand a Government measure; and on Thursday, February 6, a meeting of the Conservative and Unionist Franchise Association at the Horticultural Hall, presided over by Lady Castlereagh, at which Lord Selborne will speak.

In the House of Commons the preliminary steps have been taken towards the course of action to be adopted by Suffragist M.P.'s in the coming session. Liberal Suffragist M.P.'s were first in the field on Thursday, January 30, when they met and elected a committee, the first meeting of which took place on Tuesday, February 4. On Tuesday also a meeting of the Liberal Anti-Suffragists was held in the House, and on Wednesday another was held of Conservative Suffragist M.P.'s. Some account of these conferences, and also of the meeting between the Executive of the Women's Liberal Federation and the Liberal Suffragists on January 30, will be found on this page. No steps have been taken towards the formation of the "Cabinet" proposed by Mr. F. E. Smith during the debate in the House last Monday week. The Liberal Suffragists, says the *Times*, "will discuss matters informally with Unionist Suffragists, but their present intention is to act in the matter as Liberals."

The London Correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* confirms this statement, and adds that he is of opinion that the Conservative Suffragists in the House will support the Bill, but will not assist in drafting it; he believes that any revival of a composite body like the Conciliation Committee is regarded as unlikely.

DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT MEASURE

Since our last week's issue all the remaining Suffrage Societies of any importance have joined in the demand for a Government measure for Woman Suffrage in lieu of the Private Bill introduced by the Prime Minister on Monday, January 27.

The Irishwomen's Reform League have passed a resolution stating their "opinion that the Government have been guilty of most culpable negligence in failing to ensure the legitimacy of the women's amendments to the Reform Bill, and that Mr. Asquith's pledges to suffragists can only be honourably redeemed by the introduction of a Government measure for the enfranchisement of women." They therefore "demand a Government Measure, and will not accept or support any Private Member's Bill."

The Women's Tax Resistance League, at its third annual meeting on January 30, carried unanimously the following resolution:

"That this meeting indignantly refuses to accept the Prime Minister's offer of facilities for a Private Member's Bill for Woman's Suffrage next session. It further demands that the Government itself be responsible for such measure this session, and calls upon women to resist taxation by every means in their power as a protest against this continued denial of justice."

The Executive Committee of the Conservative and Unionist Women's Franchise Association met on January 31, and resolved "That this committee feels that a Government measure is the most satisfactory method of dealing with the question

of the enfranchisement of women, and very much regrets that the Government has found it impossible to adopt this method."

A good fighting resolution has also been passed by the Executive Committee of the Free Church League, which places on record "its strong indignation at the Government's failure to redeem its pledges, and emphatically asserts its demand for a Government measure."

The League was also issued a strong manifesto, in which, after repudiating the new Government offer, it says: "The women have now learnt their lesson and made up their minds. Henceforth they demand a Government measure, and if only they will stand shoulder to shoulder, the Government must yield. The women will now be satisfied with nothing less. The flag which they hoped they were carrying to speedy victory has once again been wrenched from their tired hands. But they have already raised it again, and will never rest till they have carried it to its goal."

The Executive Committee of the Men's Federation for Women's Suffrage has also passed a resolution, placing on record "its indignation at the failure of the Government to redeem its pledge in connection with the women's amendments to the Franchise Bill," and demanding the introduction into the House of Commons forthwith of a Government Bill to enfranchise women on equal terms with men.

On behalf of the New Constitutional Society Mrs. Cecil Chapman has issued a statement expressing its "profound indignation" at the "bitter deception" practised on the Woman Suffragists, and announcing that it "will do its utmost to oppose in every way a Government which has brought lasting discredit upon itself and upon the Liberal party by failing to keep its word, and it reaffirms the demand for a Government measure, by which alone the great subject of woman's enfranchisement can be adequately and fairly dealt with, and without which no measure of equal magnitude has ever been put upon the Statute-book."

At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Actresses' Franchise League, it was resolved to express "the deep indignation of its members at the position in which their cause was placed owing to the action and inaction of the Government." They further rejected the Government offer of "a private member's Bill, with special facilities next session," which would lose the protection of the Parliament Act, and reaffirmed their demand for a Government measure.

THE WOMEN'S CO-OPERATIVE GUILD

A statement has been unanimously agreed to by the Central Committee of the Women's Co-operative Guild declaring that "the offer of a Private Member's Bill with special facilities is not an adequate fulfilment of the Prime Minister's pledge, which can now only be fully redeemed by a Government measure. This, we continue to maintain, should be an Adult Suffrage Bill." The statement concludes by saying that nothing "can restore the lost confidence of women except a Government measure."

SUFFRAGE MEETINGS IN THE HOUSE

The Liberal Suffragist M.P.'s
In the House of Commons on Thursday, January 30, a preliminary meeting, to discuss the steps to be taken next Session in view of the new pledge, was convened by Mr. Dickinson and Mr. Whitehouse, who sent out a circular summoning all Liberal Suffragist M.P.'s who had been supporters of the Grey amendment. These numbered 180; between fifty and sixty responded. Neither Sir Edward Grey nor Mr. Lloyd George was present; the following members of the Government visited the meeting while it was in progress—Sir Rufus Isaacs, Sir J. Simon, Mr. Gulland, Mr. Ellis Griffith, Mr. Acland, Dr. Macnamara, and Mr. Trevelyan. Later, these were joined by representative members of the Women's Liberal Federation.
Sir Rufus Isaacs made the suggestion that some endeavour should be made to get an agreement between the various sections of Suffragists before drawing up a Bill; Sir John Simon supported a Bill on the basis of the Dickinson amendment, Lady Carlisle being of his opinion, while Mrs. Eva McLaren inclined to the Conciliation pro-

posal. Mr. Ellis Griffith, Dr. Macnamara, and Mr. Acland also spoke. An official account of the meeting issued afterwards by Mr. J. H. Whitehouse stated that the past aspect of the question was not discussed, the Prime Minister's offer being accepted, and also spoke of "the essential unity" of the meeting. The *Times* adds: "But this, presumably, was a pious aspiration."

The following resolution was adopted:—
That the following members of the group be appointed a committee to consider how best to take advantage of the offer of the Prime Minister, and as to the lines upon which the new Suffrage Bill should be drawn, with power to ascertain the views of other parties, and that the committee do report thereon to this group:—
Mr. W. H. Dickinson (chairman), Mr. Acland, Mr. Leif Jones, Mr. C. H. Roberts, Mr. H. McLaren, Sir A. Mond, Mr. Walter Rea, Sir C. Nicholson, Mr. A. Pensonby, Sir John Simon, Dr. Macnamara, Mr. Chiozza Money, and Mr. J. H. Whitehouse (secretary).

The Sub-Committee thus elected met on Tuesday afternoon. Sir John Simon was elected chairman, and Mr. Leif Jones honorary secretary—"which means," says the *Morning Post*, "that this, the largest of the Suffrage sections, intends to press forward the Dickinson proposal."

The Sub-Committee thus elected met on Tuesday afternoon. Sir John Simon was elected chairman, and Mr. Leif Jones honorary secretary—"which means," says the *Morning Post*, "that this, the largest of the Suffrage sections, intends to press forward the Dickinson proposal."

THE LIBERAL WOMEN

No council meeting has been summoned by the Women's Liberal Federation to deal with the new Suffrage situation, and it is stated that one will not be convened until next session. Meanwhile, the Executive Committee of the Federation have met and passed a resolution, proposed by the Countess of Carlisle and seconded by Mrs. Eva McLaren, recording their "profound disappointment" at owing to the committee of the North Lonsdale Liberal Association and on the Executive Committee of the North Lonsdale Central Committee of W.L.A.'s.

Women's suffrage has splendid friends among the Liberal members in the House of Commons, but by the Liberal Party we have been disappointed again and again. Until we can have a Government Bill we are not likely to win that measure of justice which the progress of civilisation has long called for, and which we believe to be essential for the social and moral improvement of our country.

Might it not be a help to our Liberal friends in the House who so staunchly champion our cause if Liberal women would take united action and throw off for a time the shackles of party and be simply law-abiding Suffragists? The Women's Liberal Federation has been going on step by step, but it has not yet done this. In the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies there are members of all parties, but party differences are sunk for the time in the one supreme common object. Many of the workers in that Union declare that until the vote is won they have no party, and that I think is the right attitude.—Yours, &c.,
ELIZABETH J. SATTERTHWAIT.

The Liberal Anti-Suffrage Group

On the same day the Liberal Anti-Suffrage group, convened by Mr. MacCallum Scott, also met in the House of Commons, under the chairmanship of Mr. Lewis Harcourt. Much regret was expressed at the dropping of the Franchise Bill, and even more at the very little prospect that exists of a measure of the kind being passed during this Parliament. The meeting decided to continue the opposition of the group to any form of Suffrage Bill, and the opinion was expressed that the measure to which the Government will give "facilities" is that associated with the name of Mr. Dickinson. But it was decided that nothing definite could be done till the Suffragist groups have produced a Bill or Bills.

The Unionist Suffragists

The Unionist Suffragists met on Wednesday afternoon to consider the Government proposals for next session. Sir Robert Cecil presided. "The views of this group," says the *Standard's* Lobby Correspondent, "are calculated to have a very decisive effect on the course of events, as while desirous of a measure of enfranchisement, it may be stated, without reserve, that they are not prepared to secure their end by means of the Parliament Act. It may thus happen that so far as next session is concerned, and assuming that the measure of enfranchisement to be proposed is of a moderate nature, they will be disposed to give it their support, but in subsequent sessions their attitude would be transferred into one of hostility if an attempt were made to carry through the proposals under the Parliament Act."

regard to any extension of the franchise to women has convinced me that I cannot conscientiously or logically any longer adhere to the Liberal Party. I have accordingly, with much regret, resigned my membership in the Women's Liberal Association, which I was instrumental in forming nearly twenty years ago, and of which I have lately been local president, and my membership both on the Executive Committee of the North Lonsdale Liberal Association and on the Executive Committee of the North Lonsdale Central Committee of W.L.A.'s.

Women's suffrage has splendid friends among the Liberal members in the House of Commons, but by the Liberal Party we have been disappointed again and again. Until we can have a Government Bill we are not likely to win that measure of justice which the progress of civilisation has long called for, and which we believe to be essential for the social and moral improvement of our country.

Might it not be a help to our Liberal friends in the House who so staunchly champion our cause if Liberal women would take united action and throw off for a time the shackles of party and be simply law-abiding Suffragists? The Women's Liberal Federation has been going on step by step, but it has not yet done this. In the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies there are members of all parties, but party differences are sunk for the time in the one supreme common object. Many of the workers in that Union declare that until the vote is won they have no party, and that I think is the right attitude.—Yours, &c.,
ELIZABETH J. SATTERTHWAIT.

A LIBERAL WOMAN'S SPEECH FROM THE DOCK

Mrs. Cobden Hirst, when sentenced at Bow Street last week to one month's imprisonment for breaking windows at the Home Office, made the following speech in Court:—

"Till recently I have always belonged to the Liberal Party—a Party which professes to believe as one of its first principles in 'No taxation without representation.' I once thought they believed what they said. Now, under this Liberal Government, there has been a Bill passed to give all Members of Parliament £400 a year as salary. Women are called upon as well as men to pay these salaries, yet women are not allowed to choose the representatives who go to the House of Commons to govern them. I did what I did as a protest against this shameful political injustice to women. And I chose to smash the Home Office windows especially as a further protest against the disgraceful way in which women political prisoners have been treated under a Liberal Government."

A LIBERAL WOMAN REBEL

The following letter from a Liberal woman appeared in the *Manchester Guardian* on Wednesday, February 5:—
To the Editor of the *Manchester Guardian*.
Sir, I am well aware that I am an obscure person and that I live in an obscure place, but on the principle that "a feather shows which way the wind blows" I should like to state that the prevention in practice which the Liberal Party persists in with

THE LABOUR CONFERENCE

Both on the first and second days of the Labour Conference, which met on January 29-31 in the Lambeth Baths, the Woman Suffrage question was prominent. On the opening day, during the presidential address, there were many interruptions from women spectators in the gallery, and from one who was a delegate in the body of the hall. It appears that the interrupters were members of the Working Women's Deputation who interviewed Mr. Lloyd George last week, and that they attended the Conference in order to put their grievance before it, their request to address the delegates from the platform having been previously refused. When Mr. George H. Roberts, M.P., pointed out that Labour bodies were in favour of the full enfranchisement of all men and women, a woman in the gallery called out, "Are you in favour of turning the Liberals out unless they give women the vote?" Some uproar ensued, during which she was led out. Another woman, who also wanted to know what the Labour Party was going to do in the matter was similarly ejected.

After the luncheon interval another interruption occurred during the election of tellers, when a woman said to be a delegate from the Potteries, rose and, amid considerable disorder, said she wished to propose an urgency resolution condemning the Government for its treatment of the Suffrage question.

"Are you a delegate, madam?" asked a steward, anxiously.

"I am better than a delegate," she answered proudly; "I am a woman who wants the vote!"

Amid cries of "Put her out!" "Sit down!" and "Order!" she continued her speech. "We women have worked for the Labour cause," she said, "we have given our money; we have stood by you in your strikes—what are you going to do for us? We must and will have the vote!" She was eventually removed by the stewards, protesting indignantly.

The Suffrage Debate

On the second day of the Conference, January 30, Mr. H. J. Rolf proposed the following resolution:—

"That this Conference reaffirms its previous decisions regarding the enfranchisement of women, deplors the position created by the ruling of the Speaker, considers that the pledge of the Prime Minister can only be adequately and safely redeemed by the Government providing facilities during the coming session for a free vote of the House of Commons on a woman's measure, and should it obtain a second reading the Government becoming responsible for it through all its subsequent stages. It calls upon the Parliamentary party to do all in its power to expedite the passage of a Bill during the coming session giving votes to women on a broad and democratic basis."

Mr. Snowden's Speech

Mr. Stephen Walsh, M.P. (Miners) having opposed the amendment, Mr. Philip Snowden, M.P., made a strong appeal on its behalf, describing the recent action of the Government as "another mockery to the women." He asked to refer the matter back to the Standing Orders Committee in order that there might be an amendment calling for a Government measure; but this was declared out of order. He therefore spoke to the amendment as it stood, denouncing Mr. Walsh's attitude against it as an attempt "to sneak votes for men at the expense of the agitation carried on by the women," and saying that the women were in an infinitely worse position now than they were a week ago. He mentioned the experience of the House of Commons believed that there was a ghost of a chance of six or eight million women being en-

franchised on a private member's Bill. That idea was just another mockery of the women, and they had been tricked long enough.

"In the words of the late Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman he continued: "Enough of this fooling; we will have no more of it." Down with the Government! Let us say that the whole force of the Labour movement will be on the side of the women in demanding that the Government shall make this a Government measure. That will be the only way in which you will get a solution of this important matter; the Parliamentary party and the amendment was carried by 850,000 to 437,000.

Mr. Walsh, M.P., and the Miners

Speaking on Saturday night to his constituents, Mr. Walsh condemned the action of the Labour Conference in carrying the amendment, announced that he was about to seek the opinion of his constituents and of the Miners' Federation on the matter, and in the event of their disapproving of his attitude towards Woman Suffrage (which amounts to an academic support of womanhood suffrage as long as it does not stand in the way of manhood suffrage) he would not remain another week in Parliament."

Does it Mean a Labour Split?

The Labour Press Agency says: "There are various indications that the Labour Party are now faced with a situation from which escape may only be found through the disruption of the party. The adoption by the Labour Party Conference of a resolution committing the party to the publication of opposition of any franchise measure that does not include women has now strained the relations between the Social and moderate sections to breaking point. If in the course of the next session of Parliament a Franchise measure of the nature indicated is proposed, it is practically certain that the miners' representatives in the Parliamentary Party, who in the past have refused to adopt the policy now urged on them, will challenge the right of the annual conference to lay down the lines upon which the Parliamentary Party shall act. Such a challenge must inevitably result in a conflict between the two sections."

A Unionist Comment

The other day we had Mr. Henderson making a protest against the gross dishonesty involved in the so-called pledge to women. . . . But it amounts to nothing for everybody knows that the Labour Party would not dare to carry the protest further than a speech. We gather from the interruptions at the Labour Conference that the women are not in the least impressed by this sort of sham gift. It would be surprising if they were.—*Morning Post*, Jan. 31.

LABOUR OPINIONS

The incidents in connection with the withdrawal of the Franchise Bill have made the Private Member's Bill less attractive to the Labour Party. The Prime Minister's reputation has been seriously damaged by his conduct of this crisis and by the proposal he has made for the further treatment of this question of woman suffrage. The Liberals will make women suffrage a Government measure when they see no other way to go; and they will do it if they will have to go.—Mr. Philip Snowden, M.P., in "The Christian Commonwealth."

The public would be on the side of the unemployed if workless men showed half the fighting spirit voteless women have shown.—Mr. F. W. Jowett, M.P., in the "Clarion."

The proposed Joint Committee or "Cabinet" will be sitting on a Coroner's Jury.—*Daily Herald*, Jan. 31.

Parties being divided as they are—the Speaker being what he is—members holding their promises as lightly as they do—there is only one way in which the Government can fulfil its solemnly undertaken obligations in this matter, and that is by bringing in a measure of its own. Otherwise they are, in effect, declaring war against the Women, and must be made to take the consequences of that. . . . Mr. Snowden, M.P., made a strong appeal on its behalf, describing the recent action of the Government as "another mockery to the women." He asked to refer the matter back to the Standing Orders Committee in order that there might be an amendment calling for a Government measure; but this was declared out of order. He therefore spoke to the amendment as it stood, denouncing Mr. Walsh's attitude against it as an attempt "to sneak votes for men at the expense of the agitation carried on by the women," and saying that the women were in an infinitely worse position now than they were a week ago. He mentioned the experience of the House of Commons believed that there was a ghost of a chance of six or eight million women being en-

franchised on a private member's Bill. That idea was just another mockery of the women, and they had been tricked long enough.

"In the words of the late Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman he continued: "Enough of this fooling; we will have no more of it." Down with the Government! Let us say that the whole force of the Labour movement will be on the side of the women in demanding that the Government shall make this a Government measure. That will be the only way in which you will get a solution of this important matter; the Parliamentary party and the amendment was carried by 850,000 to 437,000.

Speaking on Saturday night to his constituents, Mr. Walsh condemned the action of the Labour Conference in carrying the amendment, announced that he was about to seek the opinion of his constituents and of the Miners' Federation on the matter, and in the event of their disapproving of his attitude towards Woman Suffrage (which amounts to an academic support of womanhood suffrage as long as it does not stand in the way of manhood suffrage) he would not remain another week in Parliament."

Speaking on Saturday night to his constituents, Mr. Walsh condemned the action of the Labour Conference in carrying the amendment, announced that he was about to seek the opinion of his constituents and of the Miners' Federation on the matter, and in the event of their disapproving of his attitude towards Woman Suffrage (which amounts to an academic support of womanhood suffrage as long as it does not stand in the way of manhood suffrage) he would not remain another week in Parliament."

Speaking on Saturday night to his constituents, Mr. Walsh condemned the action of the Labour Conference in carrying the amendment, announced that he was about to seek the opinion of his constituents and of the Miners' Federation on the matter, and in the event of their disapproving of his attitude towards Woman Suffrage (which amounts to an academic support of womanhood suffrage as long as it does not stand in the way of manhood suffrage) he would not remain another week in Parliament."

THE WEEKLY PRESS

We fear that the House of Commons is committing itself once more to a policy in regard to Woman Suffrage that will almost certainly end as unsatisfactorily as similar policies have always ended before. . . . Once more women are being encouraged to stand by their hopes on a foundation of sand. When the party built house and all the scaffolding comes down with a run the women will feel, as they have so often felt

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE ON THE BILL

In the House of Commons on Thursday, January 30, Mr. King asked the Prime Minister (1) whether the Committee to be set up to draft a Women Suffrage Bill will be nominated by the Committee of Selection or by the House; (2) whether the Committee of this House to be set up to draft a Women Suffrage Bill will be appointed this Session; and (3) whether the Women Suffrage Committee which it is proposed to form will be presided over by the Chancellor of the Exchequer or by the Leader of the Opposition; and whether it is intended that during the proceedings next Session on the Women Suffrage Bill the House should be temporarily led by the Chairman of this Committee?

Mr. Lloyd George (for the Prime Minister): The question of the formation and appointment of such a Committee, as that to which my hon. Friend refers, rests entirely with the supporters of the Government for Women Suffrage, and is not a matter for the Government. I am not in a position to give my hon. Friend the information he desires on the other points raised in the question.

Mr. Harry Lawson: Can the right hon. Gentleman say how this Committee will communicate officially with the Government in respect of the allocation of the time of the House and other matters?

Mr. Lloyd George: There is no Committee at the present moment; therefore I could not answer that. I am not certain that I shall be able to answer it when the Committee is appointed.

Sir J. D. Rees: Will the resulting Bill have preference over all others, irrespective of the ballot and of the claims of other Bills?

Mr. Lloyd George: I could not reply to that.

In the House of Commons on Monday, February 3, Mr. Hunt asked whether, when a private member's Bill is introduced next session for giving votes to millions of women, it is the intention of the Government to allow the guillotine to be used for the purpose of passing it, and if it is to be allowed to come under the Parliament Act and to be passed into law before the judgment of the people has been taken on the question of giving votes to women?

The Prime Minister: These questions were fully dealt with on Monday last in the speeches of the Chancellor of the Ex-

chequer, the Foreign Secretary, and myself. It would be premature now to add anything to what has then been stated.

Mr. Hunt: Can the right hon. gentleman not give us "Yes" or "No" to these very straight questions?

The Prime Minister: They deal with a prospective and contingent future.

IRISH INDIGNATION

A copy of the following letter has been sent to the Prime Minister, Mr. Lloyd George, and Sir Edward Grey, by the Irish League for Women's Suffrage. It is signed by the organising secretary of the league:

I am instructed by the executive committee of our League—which represents both Irish women and men in London—to convey to you your strong and emphatic protest at the action of the Government in (1) failing to carry out their offer of a Government measure in connection with the Bill out of the time at their disposal. It would be premature at present to make any statement as to details of the next Franchise Bill.

The League feels strongly that the possible ruling of the Speaker should have been anticipated by the Cabinet—who can be supposed to be experts in Parliamentary procedure if not Cabinet Ministers?—and, failing this, the League urges that as a matter of honour and fair play the Government should have at once overruled the Speaker's ruling. Not having done so, the only honourable course open to them is to introduce this session a Government measure giving votes to women. Nothing else will satisfy the women, and the League submits that if such Bill be not introduced the Cabinet, individually and collectively, must and will be responsible for such deeds of lawlessness as Suffragists may feel compelled to have recourse to in advancement of their claims of citizenship. Lawlessness has brought Home Rule to the threshold of Ireland—we ask you, sir, if lawlessness and torture are to be the only arguments which will influence a Liberal Government to give citizen rights to women?

chequer, the Foreign Secretary, and myself. It would be premature now to add anything to what has then been stated.

Mr. Hunt: Can the right hon. gentleman not give us "Yes" or "No" to these very straight questions?

The Prime Minister: They deal with a prospective and contingent future.

IRISH INDIGNATION

A copy of the following letter has been sent to the Prime Minister, Mr. Lloyd George, and Sir Edward Grey, by the Irish League for Women's Suffrage. It is signed by the organising secretary of the league:

I am instructed by the executive committee of our League—which represents both Irish women and men in London—to convey to you your strong and emphatic protest at the action of the Government in (1) failing to carry out their offer of a Government measure in connection with the Bill out of the time at their disposal. It would be premature at present to make any statement as to details of the next Franchise Bill.

The League feels strongly that the possible ruling of the Speaker should have been anticipated by the Cabinet—who can be supposed to be experts in Parliamentary procedure if not Cabinet Ministers?—and, failing this, the League urges that as a matter of honour and fair play the Government should have at once overruled the Speaker's ruling. Not having done so, the only honourable course open to them is to introduce this session a Government measure giving votes to women. Nothing else will satisfy the women, and the League submits that if such Bill be not introduced the Cabinet, individually and collectively, must and will be responsible for such deeds of lawlessness as Suffragists may feel compelled to have recourse to in advancement of their claims of citizenship. Lawlessness has brought Home Rule to the threshold of Ireland—we ask you, sir, if lawlessness and torture are to be the only arguments which will influence a Liberal Government to give citizen rights to women?

The League feels strongly that the possible ruling of the Speaker should have been anticipated by the Cabinet—who can be supposed to be experts in Parliamentary procedure if not Cabinet Ministers?—and, failing this, the League urges that as a matter of honour and fair play the Government should have at once overruled the Speaker's ruling. Not having done so, the only honourable course open to them is to introduce this session a Government measure giving votes to women. Nothing else will satisfy the women, and the League submits that if such Bill be not introduced the Cabinet, individually and collectively, must and will be responsible for such deeds of lawlessness as Suffragists may feel compelled to have recourse to in advancement of their claims of citizenship. Lawlessness has brought Home Rule to the threshold of Ireland—we ask you, sir, if lawlessness and torture are to be the only arguments which will influence a Liberal Government to give citizen rights to women?

IN THE PRESS

before, that they have been fooled. We are bound to say that they will have some reason. . . . The very attempt to allow the Private Member's Bill to enjoy the privileges of the Parliament Act would cause the majority of Unionist Suffragists to vote against the measure.—*The Spectator*.

We may, we hope, take it for granted that the Government and the Liberal party realise how closely the traumatic cleavage which has come over the prospects of Woman Suffrage affects their honour and their fortunes. So far as the Prime Minister is concerned, we can well understand that it must have brought him near to the point of resignation. A Minister who contracts a public obligation and finds himself unable to redeem it has, as a rule, only one of two courses open to him. He must obtain a free release from his creditor, or he must himself relinquish office. The first of these resources has not been open to Mr. Asquith, and he has not adopted the second. . . . It is no answer to those who demand its fulfilment to say that the pledge had better not have been given, or that the head of a great political organisation cannot expect one interest alone. Such a journey would destroy the people's faith in statesmanship. In public as in private life, faith must be kept with all suitors, however distasteful their claims may be.—*The Nation*.

The partisans of female suffrage have just caused to feel aggrieved at the manner in which their hopes have once more been disappointed. . . . The circumstances attending the repulse of the suffragist attack are generally spoken of as if they chiefly concerned the feminist movement, and to a minor degree the prestige of the Government. More than either, the well-being of the nation is prejudiced by the slipshod, halfhearted treatment which the question has received, since it was boomed into public notice a few years ago.—*Outlook*, Feb. 1.

On one thing we are resolved. We shall not rest until a united Government will apply to this nerveless House the party discipline which it expects, and apply it

to secure the enfranchisement of women. We find ample encouragement for this great adventure in the events of this week. The Government has been shaken and irreparably damaged in its prestige. It has lost one of its principal Bills. The "torpedo" of Manhood Suffrage looks very like a boomerang.—*Common Cause*.

THE UNIONIST VIEW

There is already more than sufficient evidence to show that the Prime Minister's new way of dealing with the question of Woman Suffrage has only brought new trouble on the Cabinet and fresh perils to the public. . . . The only people who have seen clearly from the beginning have been the women themselves.—*Globe*, Jan. 31.

What that offer means is now fully realised by all parties. It is, as we have said, either an insult to the King and the country or an insult to the women; and therefore only another way of tricking the women.—*Globe*, Feb. 1.

THE LIBERAL WHITEWASHER

We see nothing better than to go on. The course proposed can alone secure something like a free vote, without which no Suffragist Bill can win. If after helping us to pass the Bill this year, Unionist suffragists decline to pass it next year for Parliament Act purposes and insist on waiting for the General Election before sending it a second time to the Lords, we shall have to submit. The suffrage cannot be carried without Unionist support; and suffragists cannot expect Unionists, or Liberals either, to give their support on any terms inconsistent with honourable adherence to their regular party principles and pledges. Impatience on their part is natural, but to try short cuts can only lengthen their journey. Least of all is there ground for imputing ill-faith to the Government.—*Daily Chronicle*, Feb. 3.

The Liberal Suffragist M.P.'s are convinced that Liberalism will suffer all along the time unless the Gordian knot of Women's Suffrage be cut by a courageous legislative stroke.—P. W. W., in the "Daily News," Jan. 30.

THE URBITOR BURBERRY

The permanent characteristic of the British climate is its changeability—settled contrary—changes of weather—which call for something out of the ordinary as protective covering

THE URBITOR, under these conditions, is invaluable. No other overcoat or weather-proof offers so many advantages. Bethe weather mild or chilly, an URBITOR is the coat to wear. In the former case, it is light and air-free; in the latter, its dense weaving prevents penetration by wind or cold.

The weather may be wet or fine; an URBITOR is the best coat on each occasion. Its non-absorbent nature keeps out heavy rains in a wonderful way. There is no soaking, consequently no dragging weight of water to be carried.

THE URBITOR is made of pure wool coatings, especially manufactured by Burberrys for the purpose of obtaining the perfect weatherproof. The choice of patterns is unlimited, ranging through all colours and shades.

There are very many designs of THE URBITOR coat itself—models for every purpose.



Urbitor Burberry

Write for the book of THE URBITOR. It is well worth while.

BURBERRYS Haymarket, S.W., LONDON; 8 and 10, Boulevard Malesherbes, PARIS; Basingstoke; and Appointed Agents in Provincial Towns.

NATHAN

(FROM MESSRS. BRADLEY, CHEPSTOW PLACE, W.)

Mr. NATHAN begs to announce that he is opening premises at 167, HIGH ST., KENSINGTON, as a first-class LADIES' TAILOR, on February 8, 1913. Mr. Nathan has secured a well-known skirt-fitter from the same house.

BOOKS WHICH MAKE FOR HEALTH AND HAPPINESS

Send a postcard for handsome Booklet Catalogue of Progressive Literature.

THE HEALTHY LIFE BEVERAGE BOOK. By Valentine Knaggs, L.R.C.P., etc. A remarkable and invaluable compendium of nutritive, refreshing, curative, and tonic liquids. An encyclopaedia of useful facts. 1s. net. Postage 2d.

INDOLENCE, ITS CAUSES AND CURE. By H. Valentine Knaggs, L.R.C.P., 2nd Edition. Opens up a new era in rational curative methods. 1s. net. Postage 2d.

ONIONS AND GREES. By H. Valentine Knaggs, L.R.C.P., 2nd Edition. Interesting folk-lore and valuable information concerning these two poisonous plants of the blood. 6d. net. Postage 1d.

C. W. DANIEL, Ltd., 3, Amen Corner, London, E.C.



THE HEALTHY LIFE. Sane, Lively, Interesting. Aims at uniting all that makes for healthy living. ONE PENNY, POCKET SIZE. On sale at all Bookstalls. Get a copy to-day or send 1s. 6d. to the Publisher for a year's post free supply.

"THE WOMAN ALONE"

By Constance E. Maud

At the Gymnase in Paris, Brieux' latest play, "La Femme Seule," is creating an enormous amount of interest, and is played to a crowded house every evening. Like his former play, "Les Trois Filles de M. Dupont," it shows this author to be a redoubtable champion of the woman's cause. No stronger case for the woman courageously endeavouring to earn her own living in an honest way, yet handicapped and baffled at every turn, has ever been put before the public. Yet this is no exceptional or extreme case, but one out of a thousand such going on around us, and exciting no comment save a shrug of the shoulders, or perhaps a sigh, from the men and women who would gladly see better conditions, but confess themselves powerless to make them.

The part of the young heroine, played by Mlle. Jeanne Provost, is an exquisitely artistic performance. Whether she is gay or grave, tender, scornful or despairing, there is a nobility and sincerity about her acting which convinces.

The story is that of a young girl, left an orphan at eighteen, and adopted by godparents of the rich bourgeois class, who, being childless, settle a good dowry on her for her marriage, an event shortly to take place as the play opens, when we find her at the age of twenty-three engaged to a young man, approved by her family as well as herself.

In the intervals of a gay performance of private theatricals, we learn that the godparents have been reduced suddenly to poverty by the dishonesty of their lawyer. To the despair of the two young people, the engagement is broken off by the rich parents of the young man, who is dependent upon the latter; and the girl, refusing to be a burden on her godparents, resolves to earn her own living.

This is a step far more unusual in France than in England, and mainly for two reasons. In the first place French people generally arrange their families in proportion to their income, and do not bring into the world a swarm of children for whom they cannot possibly provide in a decent and fair way. In the second place, the French regard the future of their daughters as of equal importance with that of their sons, and provide for them accordingly by putting aside a sum of money for a dowry, to be made over to the girl on her marriage, or, should she choose to enter a convent, on her taking the veil.

It is therefore comparatively rare that a girl of the bourgeois or the upper classes finds herself obliged to enter the arena and fight for her bread together with those of the classes born to work, the tens of thousands, even millions, who in the nature of things can have no dot provided for them, and have often not only themselves, but a sick parent or younger brothers and sisters to provide for.

The battle of life is hard enough for the average man, though backed with the help of his trades unions, his good, strong muscles, and above all, his weapon, the Vote; but as for the woman, "standing alone," M. Brieux shows with relentless truth that the handicap of sex confronts her pitilessly at every door on which she knocks seeking employment. Man stands there, barring her way, and this, even when she seeks work only among women, doing work essentially for women.

In the office of a woman's newspaper, where the girl at last finds employment, the husband of the editor makes her life impossible, obliging her either to become his mistress or to leave. At the workrooms of a kindly cloth merchant, where, after many vicissitudes, she finds a haven of refuge in honest labour, she and all the other women employed are driven forth by a strike among the men, who refuse to allow their employer to give work to any female rivals, as they regard them. There is but one legitimate way, M. Brieux cynically points out, for the "femme seule" to earn her living, and that is the one in which she finds no opposition from man since she is ministering to his pleasure and in no way competing in the overcrowded labour market. M. Brieux' heroine is of fine stuff, a proud, generous, noble nature, capable of the highest self-sacrifice. She refuses to injure her lover's prospects by marrying him without his parents' consent, in spite of the fact that, inspired by her, he makes himself a position presently where he is independent of their help. In the end circumstances prove too strong for her, and M. Brieux' "femme seule," with every other way closed to her, takes the only one left open.

And if these things are true in the "green country" of France, where the position of women is, and always has been, incomparably better than that of Englishwomen—for the Frenchwoman may be a judge or a taxi-driver, and marriage is regarded as a partnership—think only what must be true in the "dry country," where most girls have no dots, where a mother is not legally a parent, and where Mr. Lloyd George's fine new Insurance Act provides that the maternity benefit for the pain and peril of child-bearing shall be handed over to the husband.

"VOTES FOR WOMEN" FELLOWSHIP

Colours: Purple, White, and Green

Our appreciation and congratulations are due to two of the members of the Fellowship who have this week, each in her own way, broken the record in valuable service.

Miss Boulting has sold during the week no less than thirteen dozen copies of the paper with her own hands. Miss Harris has secured thirty additional members of the Fellowship. Neither of these striking successes have been obtained without real hard work and unflagging effort.

The Editors of the paper, and the contributors who generously give their valued service, deeply appreciate this co-operation on the part of the readers and members of the Fellowship with them in their work.

We all rejoice in the new foundations which are being laid for building up the Woman's Movement. Where thousands are at work, and each one fulfilling her own task with single-hearted zeal, no power of ignorance and darkness can long resist the pressure of the forces of progress.

There is plenty of work to be done to introduce the paper to new readers and to secure the display of the poster by newsagents and at railway bookstalls. Among the uses to which it is proposed to apply the Fellowship Fund is to send the paper to the offices of certain important newspapers in America and Australia, so that the true meaning of the movement may be understood in those countries. Special contributions for this purpose are invited.

FELLOWSHIP FUND SUBSCRIPTIONS		£ s. d.	
Already acknowledged	149	2	4
Miss Florence Dale	0	2	6
Donation from Ileson Meeting	3	0	0
Mrs. A. H. Haigh	1	0	0
Total		156	2 10

"THE MAN'S SHARE."

— BY —

F. W. PETHICK LAWRENCE.

(The speech delivered by him from the dock of the Old Bailey, May, 1912 together with a biographical note.)

PRICE ONE PENNY.

On sale at VOTES FOR WOMEN Publishing Offices, 4-7, Red Lion Court, Fleet Street, E.C.



To be obtained in 1d. and 3d. packets from all Stores, Grocers, or Oilmen.

Send 1d. stamp to Dept. 'V' for Free Sample.

JOHN KNIGHT, LTD., Soapmakers by Appointment to H. M. KING GEORGE V. The Royal Primrose Soap Works, LONDON, E.

Exhibition and Sale of White Goods

— at —
PETER ROBINSON'S
Regent Street House
Feb. 10 to Feb. 22



Hand-made Night Gowns at 8/11 each.

Examples of the excellent Sale Values offered in every section devoted to white goods.

- R.S. 1. In strong fine long-cloth, with high neck and long sleeves, yoke and cuffs embroidered by hand ... 8/11
- R.S. 2. In nainsook, prettily trimmed with good imitation crochet lace, finely tucked and feathered 8/11
- R.S. 3. In nainsook, trimmed fine imitation Valenciennes lace, small tucks and Swiss *entree deux* threaded ribbon .. 8/11
- R.S. 4. In sheer lawn with yoke hand-embroidered and trimmed Cluny lace; quite a new shape, with no scarf on shoulders 8/11

Orders by post receive special and prompt attention. All purchases are forwarded carriage free in Great Britain.

CATALOGUES of the many other Bargains for sale on request.

An Early Season

The unusual earliness of Easter this year indicates a correspondingly early season, and ladies will, therefore, see the necessity of ordering their Dress requirements betimes. The Advance Spring Styles in Coats, Gowns, Millinery, Blouses, etc., are ready, and may now be inspected at our REGENT STREET House.

Peter Robinson's of Regent Street
PETER ROBINSON, LTD.

THE NORFOLK PEASANTS' RISING IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY*

"We desire Liberty and an equal use of all things. This will we have. Otherwise these tumults and our lives shall only be ended together."—The Rebel's Complaint.

The language of rebellion is eternally the same; for all rebellions are one. Those words from the "complaint" of the Norfolk rebels in 1549 might serve as a manifesto for any body of Freedom's soldiers. Such words have in them the dignity and recklessness of true justice, and the dull fact that the Norfolk rising failed is external and irrelevant.

In reading old histories one always wonders if the heart of man has changed or ever will change. To-day in the Highlands of Scotland, wandering through what seems a lovely desert, you will pass ruin after ruin. These bits of low wall and heaps of loose stones are not the ruins of castles, but of the homes of simple men who have been driven from their loch-sides and glens to leave space for the easy slaughter of deer. It was the same trouble that roused the peasantry of sixteenth century England. The avarice and wrong-headedness of the landlords, who found that more money could be made out of cattle and sheep than out of human beings, changed the whole character of English country life. The tenant and his family were of less use than a flock of sheep, therefore they had to go and leave room for the more profitable animal. Mr. Clayton, in his very interesting study of the Norfolk rising, quotes Sir Thomas More:—

"They turn all dwelling-places and all glebe land into desolation and wilderness. Therefore, that one insatiable cormorant may compass about and enclose many thousand acres . . . the husbandmen be thrust out of their own . . . by one means or another they must needs depart away . . . out of their known and accustomed homes, finding no place to rest in."

Those displaced and hunted people, homeless and starving, were the occasion for the passing of vagrancy laws of a brutality even more simple and direct than those of to-day. Unemployment was to be put down by force; but force failed as it is bound to in such cases, and the peasants, instead of being cowed, took to open revolt.

The Norfolk rising began first spasmodically among the peasants themselves, whose healthy anger expressed itself by the breaking up of enclosures, the tearing down of palings, and other attempts to proclaim their right to the land. It was some little time before Robert Kett, himself a landlord, came forward and by his leadership lent coherence to the discontent. The story of his brave struggle must be read in Mr. Clayton's pages. There are all the usual elements with most of which Suffragists are not unfamiliar. There are the grieved authorities anxious to conciliate, and in their inability to understand the rebel's mind offering palliatives and concessions, the rejection of which grieves them still more. There is the utter failure of the comfortable citizen to respond to the appeal of those who are in arms against authority. But besides all that there was the fact that the countrymen as a whole were not ready and prepared to rise, and that one general, however brave, could hardly accomplish the whole work. So it all ended in what the world calls failure. Robert and William Kett were hanged, the lot of the peasants seemed to grow worse, the landlords went on enclosing the land. But still all was not lost, a milestone had been fixed in the road to Liberty, and the Norfolk peasants' rising will never be forgotten.

Mr. Clayton needs no introduction to any worker for Votes for Women, and his book should be eagerly read by all those who, like himself, love fair-dealing and hate oppression in whatever department of life they may be found.

(Other Book Reviews will be found on page 276.)

BOOKS RECEIVED

- "The Value and Destiny of the Individual." By Bernard Bosanquet, LL.D., D.C.L. (London: Macmillan. Price 10s. net.)
- "Hilary's Career." By Parry Truscott. (London: T. Werner Laurie, Ltd. Price 6s.)
- "Veiled Women." By Marnaduke Piekthall. (London: Eveleigh Nash. Price 6s.)
- "Lady of the Night." By Benjamin Swift. (London: Eveleigh Nash. Price 6s.)
- "New Wine and Old Bottles." By Constance Smedley. (London: T. Fisher Unwin. Price 6s.)
- "George Elliott." By Viola Meynell. (London: Herbert and Daniel. Price 2s. 6d. net.)
- "The Westminster Review." February. (London: E. Marlborough and Co. Price 2s. 6d. net.)
- "Better Times for Working People." By James Glas. (London: Ormiston and Glass, Limited. Price 7d. net.)
- "The Voice of One Crying in the Wilderness." By Josephine Butler. (Bristol: J. Arrowsmith, Limited. Price 6d. net.)
- "Women's Tax Resistance League. Third Annual Report" (London: 10, Talbot House, St. Martin's Lane, W.C. Price 1d.)
- "Penal Reform League Quarterly Record." (London: 1, Harrington Square, N.W. Price 6d.)
- "Report of the Executive Committee of the Irish Women's Suffrage and Local Government Association for 1912." (Dublin: Irish Women's Suffrage Society.)

* "Robert Kett and the Norfolk Rising." By Joseph Clayton. (London: Martin Secker. 8s. 6d.)

WILLIAM OWEN

WESTBOURNE GROVE, LONDON, W.

IMPORTANT SALE

Paris and Vienna Model Hand Made LINGERIE.

Manufacturer's Stock of Ladies' Underclothing

MODEL TEA GOWNS and BLOUSES.

Unmade Robes and Tunics, FOR DAY AND EVENING WEAR.

Ladies' Woollen Underwear, Hosiery, Furs, and

KNITTED COATS,

Lace & Swiss Curtains

CURTAIN NETS, MADRAS MUSLINS.

Blankets, Down Quilts

CHINA and GLASS.

Carpets, Rugs & Linoleum.

NOW IN PROGRESS.

CATALOGUES ON APPLICATION.

WILLIAM OWEN, Ltd.

Westbourne Grove, London, W.

The House Famous for Good Value.

Articles and News contributed for insertion in *VOTES FOR WOMEN* should be sent to The Editors, *VOTES FOR WOMEN*, 47, Red Lion Court, Fleet Street, E.C., at the earliest possible date, and in no case later than first post Monday morning prior to the publication of the paper.

The Editors cannot hold themselves in any way responsible for the return of unused manuscripts, though they will endeavour as far as possible to return them when requested if stamps for postage are enclosed. MSS. should, if possible, be typewritten.


Subscriptions to the Paper should be sent to The Publisher, *VOTES FOR WOMEN*, 47, Red Lion Court, Fleet Street, E.C.

The terms are, post free, 6s. 6d. annual subscription, 3s. 3d. for six months inside the United Kingdom, 3s. 8d. (£2.25c.) and 4s. 4d. (£1.15c.) abroad, payable in advance.

The Paper can be obtained from all newsagents and bookstalls.

For quotations for Advertisements, apply to the Advertisement Manager, *VOTES FOR WOMEN*, 47, Red Lion Court, Fleet Street, E.C.

By Royal Warrant.



THE **GOLDSMITHS & SILVERSMITHS COMPANY, LTD.**

FAMOUS FOR THEIR GEM JEWELLERY, GOLD & SILVER PLATE AND WATCHES.

The Public supplied direct at Manufacturers' Cash Prices.

112, REGENT STREET, W.

A NEW DEPARTURE IN JOURNALISM.

'THE YOUNG CITIZEN'

Edited by ANNIE BESANT.

A new magazine for boys and girls of college age, with special pages for children. No. 1 NOW READY.

CONTENTS:

FROM THE FRONT. By the Editor.
 THE LORD BUDDHA. By one of his Bhikkus of Lond. Ago.
 LETTERS ON CITIZENSHIP. By G. S. ARNDT, M.A., LL.B.
 WOMEN'S EDUCATION AT MYSORE. By ELIZABETH SEVER.
 INDIAN LABOURERS. By ANNIE BESANT.
 MEMORY FOR STUDENTS. By ERNEST WOOD.
 THE ROUND TABLE. By HENRY WATTS.
 SERVANTS OF THE EMPIRE, THE STAR IN THE EAST, THE GOLDEN CHAIN, and CHILDREN'S PAGES are regular monthly features.

This paper is meant to help the youths and maidens of the Empire to become good citizens, noble men and women, brave, truthful, and honourable. It will, each month, hold up before its readers as an inspiring ideal some great Servant of the World, some one who sided with the world to make a step upward "on the golden stair" which leads humanity from animal to Divinity, from brute to God. It will seek these examples in all races and creeds, for everywhere have lived the Heroes of our race. It will seek to inspire its readers to Service—for ideals left unpracticed become hardenings of the heart—and it will ever bear in mind that noblest test of greatness: "Greatest among you is he that doth serve." Subscription, 2s. 6d. per annum, post free; single numbers, 4d. post free, from

THE THEOSOPHICAL PUBLISHING SOCIETY,
 161, New Bond Street, London, W.

OPPOSITE THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

THACKERAY HOTEL
 Great Russell Street, London.

This large and well-appointed TEMPERANCE HOTEL has Passenger Lift, Electric Light throughout, Bathrooms on every floor, Spacious Dining, Drawing, Writing, Reading and Smoking Rooms, Fireproof Floors, Perfect Sanitation. Telephone. Night Porter.

Bedroom, Attendance, and Table d'Hôte Breakfast, Single from 5s., 6s. to 8s. Table d'Hôte Dinner, Six Courses, 2s.

I will Travel and Testimonials on Application.

Telegraphic Address "Thackeray London."

Telephone 822 Chiswick.

THE LAVENDER LAUNDRY
 Stratford Road Acton, W.

We solicit the Custom of all who believe in supporting Women's labour, and who appreciate having their Linen washed in honest, wholesome fashion without the aid of chemicals.

Excellent Testimonials.
 Phone or write for Price List.
 Our own Vans collect and deliver daily in London.
 Special Department for Country orders.

BADGES & BANNERS
 FOR DEMONSTRATIONS, Etc.

Medallists for every Society. Makers to the N.W.S.P.U.

TOYE & CO.,
 57, Theobald's Road, London, W.C.

WOMEN'S FREEDOM LEAGUE.

PUBLIC RECEPTION TO RELEASED PRISONERS.

CAXTON HALL.
 Monday, Feb. 10th, 8 p.m.

Speakers—MRS. DESPARD and Others.
Chairman—MISS CICELY HAMILTON.

Tickets, 1/-, from 1, Robert Street, Adelphi, W.C.

THE

GOVERNMENT'S BROKEN PLEDGE

WOMEN TAX PAYERS

Unite in protest against a Government which has broken faith with the women.

PAY NO TAXES
 until women are granted the rights of citizenship.

NO TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION

Consult the Women's Tax Resistance League,
 10, Talbot House, St. Martin's Lane, W.C.

VOTES FOR WOMEN

4-7, RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET.

Telegraphic Address:—Votfowom, London.
 Telephone:—Holborn 1305.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1913.

THE CABINET AND LIBERAL WOMEN

Amid much that defies political prophecy, one fact stands out perfectly clear: the Liberal women hold the immediate fate of Woman Suffrage in the hollow of their hand. Entrenched as they are in every constituency of the country, with over a thousand organised branches, and with an enrolled membership of not less than 200,000 women, they can, if they will, exert a form of pressure on the Liberal Government which is irresistible.

It is not necessary for them to adopt methods of violence or lawlessness; it is not necessary for them to pursue the Government with active hostility, or even to take up a positive anti-Government policy. By merely registering a public vow of abstention from active support, and by totally refusing to give any service whatever until their just demands are conceded, they can enforce their will, for the simple reason that the Liberal Party would not dare to take the field at election time unless it was sure, in advance, of the support of its women.

It is difficult to understand how women who combine political acumen with a sense of personal dignity can take any other course. Here is a Party which professes to include among its principles such watchwords as "government of the people by the people," "taxation without representation is tyranny," and "government rests on the consent of the governed." To these doctrines it seems a necessary corollary that since women are part of the people, and since they are subject to be taxed and governed, they shall also be included among the electorate. How, then, can women continue to offer to this Party their allegiance, and to act for it as hewers of wood and drawers of water, unless that Party is prepared to accept the enfranchisement of women as a fundamental part of its creed, and unless the Government supported by that Party are prepared to place it on their pro-

gramme and make it the subject of immediate legislation?

We shall be told, no doubt, that there are difficulties in the way, that there are persons in high places to consider, that there are members of the Cabinet opposed to this reform. And when we ask whether the fundamental principles of liberty are not greater than the prejudices of individual members of the Cabinet—and whether, if some Liberal statesmen are illiberal, others cannot be found to replace them, we shall be told that that suggestion might with reason be applied to the less important members of the Government, but as the Prime Minister himself is an anti-Suffragist, to ask for a Government measure is evidently to ask for the impossible.

A few months ago, even a few weeks ago, this argument might have carried weight, but it will not do so to-day. It is now generally understood that Mr. Asquith has no intention of retaining his office much longer, and that he is shortly to be succeeded by a man who is an avowed advocate of Woman Suffrage. When this event happens, all the leading men in the Cabinet will be in favour of the reform, and the inclusion of Votes for Women in the Government programme will present no real difficulty. But unless the Liberal women recognise to-day the futility of trusting to the proposed facilities for a Private Member's Bill, and unless to-day they make their resolute demand for a Government measure and announce that in default they will carry out a political strike, there is grave danger that their loyalty will be exploited, and that when the new situation arrives they will be left still outside the fold.

Moreover, what of the future of the Liberal Party itself? The effect of the continued refusal to place Woman Suffrage on the official programme will mean the further estrangement of much of the best progressive womanhood of the country. We make no secret of the fact that we ourselves and many like us shall encourage open hostility to the Government; the continued attacks of militant Suffragists will lead to reprisals, and both attack and reprisal will further damage the prestige of the Party. Finally, the distrust of Liberalism and the disbelief in the sincerity of the utterances of Liberal statesmen, which the events of the last seven years have implanted in the hearts of women, will be grievously increased, and under no future circumstances will they ever be wholly uprooted.

On the other hand, if at the instigation of the Liberal women the Liberal Party frankly set aside all their past mistakes and make themselves responsible for the immediate passage of a Woman Suffrage Bill, the Party will have the solid backing of nearly all the thinking women of the country; it will face the future with the assurance that comes from the fact that it is in line with the inevitable march of the forces of destiny.

We call, then, upon the Liberal women not to lag behind in this great fight. This is a critical moment not merely for Woman Suffrage, but for the Liberal Party, for only those who are in the van of progress to-day will be able to lead women when the vote is won. We call upon them to declare a definite political strike, and to hold to this resolve till their terms are conceded. No doubt, to some this may bring the loss of personal homage, to others it may mean that family advancement will be retarded, on all it will impose the necessity of clear thinking and of being prepared if necessary to stand out alone on behalf of their convictions. We call upon Liberal women to put all these private considerations on one side, and to be influenced solely by the public interest. Only by so doing will they be worthy of their womanhood and of the great traditions of which they are the inheritors.

MILITANCY FOR NON-MILITANTS

By Emmeline Pethick Lawrence

The Movement for Woman's Enfranchisement in the United Kingdom has passed through a great political crisis. There has been a political earthquake. The houses built upon the sand have fallen. But prison walls cemented with old conceptions and foregone conclusions have suddenly given way also, and through the gaps a people, long imprisoned in mental obscurity, is emerging into the light.

Against the destruction of ill-founded hopes we set real and definite gains—an immense revolution in public opinion to which all the newspapers of the country have testified; the withdrawal of the Government's Manhood Suffrage Bill, for which there was and is no demand in the country, and which was only introduced for the purpose of defeating Woman Suffrage; and above everything else the fact that all sections of the Suffrage Movement are once again united in their demand. With steadfast determination they are calling for a Government measure, and are declaring themselves in opposition to the Government in power which refuses this reasonable and just demand.

United thus, not only in our ultimate, but also in our immediate aim against a common enemy, the time has come for us all as Suffragists to consider whether we cannot realise a much closer unity of strategy, and whether the different sections of the Movement, while not necessarily adopting identical methods, cannot play into each other's hands to the great discomfiture of our opponents.

Can those who are spiritually militant, and who feel that mere words at the present moment are inadequate to the situation, find any expression in action? That is the question! It was presented to me in sharp and definite form at the close of a great meeting in Dublin last week. "Cannot some form of militancy without violence be devised?" asked one who had given over fifty years of a strenuous life in devoted service to the Woman's Cause. It is a question not to be lightly or superficially answered, but to be very seriously and earnestly considered.

It must be remembered that violence played no part in the campaign of the militant movement when that campaign was first initiated, nor had it any place in its policy for a long period of its existence. Public opinion was startled. Political complacency was rudely shocked. The law—the iniquitous law that exacts from women the duties of citizenship while tyrannously refusing the corresponding rights—was challenged. The by-law that forbade women to demonstrate their legitimate grievances in the way sanctioned by historic usage was defied and broken. That constituted the militancy of a long five years' campaign, during which the question of women's enfranchisement was lifted from the limbo of oblivion, where it had been consigned by politicians in 1884, and brought to the very front of the political arena. "Yes," say many of the critics of the Militant army to-day, "we have no fault to find with militancy of that kind. The fundamental mistake was made when women resorted to acts of physical violence in pursuance of their campaign."

I am not going to argue that point now. Everybody in this Movement knows by my record what I believe. So long as we live in a physical world under material conditions, I hold physical force has to be taken account of, and has to be used as an expression and an instrument of moral and spiritual and intellectual force, and that reason and judgment are given to us to enable us to determine at what time and under what condition it is necessary or expedient to use it.

A New Situation

But putting that question aside, and recognising that there are people who are conscientiously or temperamentally opposed to active violence of any kind whatever, is not the whole Suffrage Movement confronted to-day with a new situation, which

demands a reconsideration of ideas, a readjustment of policy, and a rearrangement of the forces now at our disposal all along the line?

The spirit of militancy, born in a few independent minds some seven or eight years ago, has influenced the temper of the womanhood of this country to an extraordinary degree, and has created a new type amongst younger women by the substitution of new ideals of conduct and character. It has modified and to a great extent transformed the mental attitude of men towards them. The world is ready to accept the kind of political militancy by which it was outraged a few years ago. Cannot those Suffrage societies which form the great middle Suffrage party avail themselves at the present juncture of this most noticeable change in public opinion?

Moreover, the laws of the political game by which politicians had been able to trifle with the Woman's Movement were not known and understood a few years ago except by a few clear and politically trained intellectuals. To-day the trickery and chicanery of politicians when dealing with this question has been demonstrated before the eyes of the whole world, and, thanks to the political education that they have received on this subject, the mass of professional and working women are stirred to indignation to-day at the insult and injury done to them in the name of Parliamentary procedure.

What half-a-dozen women felt seven years ago is felt by uncounted thousands to-day. Public opinion is ready and numbers of women are ready for demonstrations of protest organised upon lines of "militancy without violence," calculated to bring effective pressure to bear upon the Government.

We cannot expect the initiators of the militant policy to retrace their steps. Pressed by the logic of circumstances as by the duty of setting the pace, they have gone on. "Gone too far," says the world to-day. Well, Society always passes that verdict upon its pioneers. Often history reverses it. Whether it will do so in this case or not only the future can say. Meanwhile, we are concerned with the present. The moment offers possibilities and opportunities to which it would be folly to remain blind. The essence of good diplomacy is to be able to seize new situations and change plans and policies to meet altered conditions and new needs.

The Middle Party

Between the militants who have frankly declared themselves rebels against the social order until they win due recognition as part of the body politic, on the one hand, and those Suffragists who frankly declare themselves the submissive servants of the Liberal Party on the other, there is a vast middle body of Suffragists composed of many Suffrage societies—a middle party daily increasing in numbers, influence and power. It is for this middle party to consider whether the crisis has not arisen which demands the adoption of a policy of "militancy without violence."

That an earlier development of this policy did not succeed in attaining its immediate object, the enfranchisement of women, is no argument against it. In the earlier days the compulsion to action was only felt by the few, and that action was carried out in defiance of current public opinion. To-day it could be carried out by the many, and with the sympathy and moral support of thousands of thoughtful people who have become educated by the course of events.

I suggest three methods by which the militant spirit could find expression in widely concerted and organised action on the part of women and men, with the support of the main body of the Suffrage Movement:—

1. Determined opposition at bye-elections to all candidates who are nominees of the Coalition Government.
2. Determined and organised questioning of Cabinet Ministers at all public or semi-public gatherings, whether distinctly political or not.

3. Resistance of the payment of Imperial taxes, including the Insurance poll-tax.

The first extension of militant policy needs little explanation. It has been adopted by most of the societies in principle already, and only needs effective development.

The second policy challenges the instinct and love for free speech so rightly planted in the British heart. The matter calls for much clear thinking and plain speaking, and space prohibits me from dealing with it at length in a general article. Women are denied the only kind of speech that counts in the political world. Their voice is stifled when taxes that they have to pay are to be decided, or when laws that they have to obey are being made. They have a right to call to account the men whose salaries they help to pay. The challenge given at a public meeting should be one that the whole audience can understand. The cause and justice of the quarrel, as between one human being and another, should be made clear. "You have taken my money, and I want its equivalent." "Before you talk of new laws that I have to obey, tell me how you propose to give me my say." Suffragists should insist on a certain number of questions in relation to this momentous political issue being answered and a certain time devoted to the subject of Woman Suffrage before a public Minister is allowed to hold forth on any other topic, whatever it may be. This form of protest is sound, just, and sensible. It is honoured by usage, it is applauded by all political parties when it happens to serve their own particular interest. If properly organised by both Women's and Men's Societies, and carried out effectively and with numbers, it would supply more pressure of a political kind than any other method that has yet been tried.

The third method is more difficult and fraught with greater risk and inconvenience. It is less direct as a means of political pressure, but well worth the trouble and annoyance as a means of rousing public opinion and enlisting sympathy and support. Tax resistance has a secure and honourable place in the history of political militancy. It has been adopted as a protest again and again by oppressed peoples. It is associated in the memory of the English nation with the honoured names of Pym and Hampden. It formed the first stage of the protest of the American people against the tyrannical rule of an overbearing monarch. It has formed part of a crusade conducted in our own times in the name of religion, and led by well known and revered divines.

This policy has been adopted by more than one Suffrage organisation, and could be made an even more effective demonstration of the withdrawal of women's consent from a Government which is in every essential definition of the word a tyranny, if it were adopted as a united policy by the main body of the Suffrage Movement.

I appeal for the attention of all Suffrage Societies to these suggestions, and for the serious consideration of them as the basis of a practical policy of "militancy without violence," and shall heartily welcome any expression of opinion with regard to the matter in the columns of this paper.

THE SURPRISE,
 Jan. 27

Amazing must the end be deemed
 By those whose duty took no ease,
 Till all the devious ways were seen
 Through which to guide the smiling green
 Young first of our "facilities."

Incredible it must have seemed
 To those who had the mite in hand,
 So wisely started for success;
 How could such careful guardians guess
 Untimely death so subtly planned?

Surprise shall hold them, till a fire
 Drops downward as a spark from Heaven
 To kindle justice to a flame,
 And burn that carelessness to shame
 Which let so great surprise be given.
 DOLLIE RADFORD.

"A WEEK OF MILITANCY"

Up to the time of going to press the actions of the militant suffragettes and the panic they have created have filled many columns of the newspapers day by day, and on Friday last the *Globe* came out with the following poster: "Public Peril: More Threats and Outrages: Cabinet Responsibility." In addition to the breaking of windows and attacks on pillar-boxes, in London and many other places, several new forms of militancy have been entered upon, including damage to golf greens in the neighbourhood of Birmingham, and the firing of bullets marked "Votes for Women" from a catapult.

ROYAL PALACES CLOSED

The authorities at the end of last week decided to close several places usually open to the public. Among these are the Royal Palaces of Kensington, Hampton Court, Kew, and Holywood, while a particularly careful look-out is, it is stated, being kept at the National Gallery, Tate Gallery, British and Natural History Museums, Guildhall, and British Museum, where all muffs, bags, and parcels have to be given up, and visitors are carefully watched.

AT THE TOWER

The announcement of these precautions followed quickly upon the breaking of the glass show-case in the Jewel House at the Tower of London on Saturday by Mrs. Cohn, the Leeds tailor, who was a member of Mrs. Drummond's deputation of working women, and whose speech on the conditions of tailresses' work made a great impression on Mr. Lloyd George and the other Ministers who were present. Mrs. Cohn was taken to Leman Street Police Station, charged at the Thames Police Court, and committed for trial on a charge of committing wilful damage. A report on the matter was made to the authorities of the Tower, of whom Field-Marshal Sir Evelyn Wood as Constable is the principal, and it was decided temporarily to close the Jewel House to all strangers.

THE PRIMATE'S WINDOWS

At the Westminster Police Court on Thursday, January 30, Mrs. Henrietta Hunt was brought up, and was charged by the police with "using insulting behaviour whereby a breach of the peace might have been occasioned." Police Constable Arnett stated that on Wednesday afternoon he saw the defendant "bash" in the front windows of Lambeth Palace with a heavy bottle tied with ribbon, supporting a letter addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Six windows were broken, the damage amounting to about £2.

Inspector Hockings said that the Archbishop, whom he had seen, did not desire to prosecute for wilful damage, on the ground that it would further the object of the prisoner to gain notoriety and publicity. Inasmuch, however, as the prisoner threatened to go back to the Palace to commit further damage, the witness framed the charge against her. The defendant also said she was going to try and interview the King.

The Defendant: I mean to say that I will not keep the peace. I will do whatever I can until women get the vote. The Archbishop, the head of the Church, should help us. I admit smashing the windows, but I don't know how you can call that insulting behaviour.

Mr. Barker (for the prosecution): I think it does amount to that at the house of a person of high position.

The Magistrate: I am not prepared to rule it is not, in such circumstances, to be regarded as insulting behaviour. The defendant has raised the point, and I am bound to notice it. It would have been better if she had been charged with the damage, though the Inspector acted rightly in preventing any possible further trouble. Still, there is a little difficulty about it. The defendant, he added, might not find such a lenient person to deal with next time as the Archbishop. He should have sent her to prison most assuredly had she been charged with the malicious damage. Now she would be bound over in 40s to be of good behaviour for three months.

Defendant: I won't be bound over. I won't accept it.

The Magistrate: That will do.

Mr. Barker: What happens if she persists?

Mr. Horace Smith: Fourteen days in prison.

The defendant, refusing to be bound over, was committed to Holloway under powers of the Statute 34, Edward III., Chap. I. "As a loose, idle, and disorderly person, disturbing the public peace."

Mrs. Hunt was released on the following day, no reason being given.

"A WEEK OF MILITANCY"

On Thursday night, January 31, the *Manchester Guardian* London correspondent under the above title wrote:—

"The appearance of some central parts of this imperial City to-day would suggest to a stranger that street-fighting had begun—as indeed it has between the militant suffragettes and the shop windows. In Cockspur Street, near Charing Cross, the casualties have been greatest, the shop windows of the two great sheets of glass that form the windows of the Hamburg-America line offices (which have been twice smashed) were replaced, and immediately the glaziers had finished the carpenters set to work to board up the new glass. At Oceanic House over the way tarpaulins are being put over every window at nightfall. In Oxford Street and Regent Street many shop windows are boarded, and some firms have engaged special watchmen to do duty all night on the pavement. Police and commissioners are lurking on the watch in most unsuspected places. In Whitehall many windows are now covered with a screen of wire fixed in temporary wooden frames, and the windows of the National Liberal Federation offices, in Parliament Street, are so protected. People who have summer sunblinds externally let them down at nightfall, and the jewellers are in a great hurry to unroll the iron screens that protect their treasures."

GOLF GREENS

Saturday's papers reported that the putting greens on the golf courses in the neighbourhood of Birmingham had been damaged. In some cases the greens were torn up; in others the words "Votes for Women" were stained on them with a burning acid. Serious damage, says the *Sheffield Telegraph*, was done. The acid had burned and shrivelled the turf up, and all will have to be re-turfed. The *Standard* says that the question is being asked, "What sport or pastime is safe if such tactics are adopted?" It quotes a prominent golfer as having said: "Breaking the windows of Government buildings is bad; the crusade against the panes of business houses is worse, but the attack on one of the most necessary and delightful sports of the people is the worst of all."

Dr. Pooler, of the Castle Bromwich Golf Club, is reported in the *Daily Express* as having said: "We golfers have nothing to do with political and other troubles. It is all very well to damage letter-boxes and other Government property, but when it comes to interfering with golf greens the action of suffragettes is absurd and ridiculous in the extreme."

CATAPULTS

On Friday, January 31, Miss Jackydwara Melford was fined 40s. at the Westminster Police Court for "discharging a missile to the common danger at Victoria Street, Westminster." A constable said that on Thursday night he saw Miss Melford on a motor-bus in Victoria Street. As the bus was passing the Westminster Palace Hotel she shot a bullet from the catapult. He at once stopped the vehicle and discovered the catapult in her muff. Subsequently a leaden bullet weighing over 1oz was found in the basement of the hotel. On it were impressed the words, "Votes for Women." No damage was done. The fine was paid by her father.

PRESS COMMENTS

A first-class measure . . . has also been lost, and heaven alone knows what trouble is in store with the suffragette viragoes, who have this time a certain amount of reason for considering that they have been "dished." All this to save a possible split in the Cabinet!—*Truth*.

"Fooled again" is the only possible comment upon the Woman's Suffrage imbroglio. But you cannot go on fooling people for ever, as the Government seems to suppose.—*Financial News*.

On Tuesday evening many West End firms took the precaution of boarding their windows, and where this was not done police were stationed. But the women mocked at protective measures, and were successful in damaging windows at Messrs. Marshall and Snelgrove's, T. Lloyd and Co.'s, Liberty's in Regent Street, and Gamage's in Holborn.—*Draper*.

At Stratford Police Court, in a case where a letter had been unanswered, it was suggested that that might be due to suffragettes, and it was stated in one case 150 invitations to a wedding went astray.—*Northern Leader*.

"MRS. DRUMMOND AT THE GATE"

Mrs. Drummond, the circumstances of whose arrest and sentence to fourteen days' imprisonment (in default of paying a fine of 40s.) we related last week, was released from Holloway on Thursday afternoon, January 30, after about twenty-four hours' imprisonment. Her fine had been paid by some person unknown. She was interviewed about four o'clock by the Governor of Holloway, who informed her that she was at liberty to go. When she inquired how that had come about, she was told that her fine had been paid. Mrs. Drummond asked, "By whom?" She was told that a gentleman had paid the fine, and she left Holloway assuring the Governor that in her opinion the fine had been paid by Mr. Lloyd George. The answer to this was an enigmatical smile.

On Monday last Mrs. Drummond sent another request to Mr. Lloyd George to fulfil his promise to receive the Working Women's Deputation again. She wrote:—

As I am now out of prison, and have to some extent recovered from the effects of the violence with which I was treated by the police, who were instructed to prevent my going to see you on January 28, I now write to ask that you will appoint a time and place at which I and my deputation of working women can wait upon you. There is, I am sure, no need to remind you that at our last interview you promised you would see us again after the fate of the women's amendment to the Franchise Bill had been settled. I call upon you to fulfil this promise and receive my deputation.

To avoid misunderstanding, let me say that no more private interviews will serve our purpose. The question we have to discuss is of serious national importance, and the public have, therefore, the right to know what we say to you and what you say to us. I suggest to-morrow (Tuesday) for the interview.

On Tuesday Mrs. Drummond received the following reply:

Treasury Chambers, Whitehall, S.W. February 3.

Dear Madam, — With reference to your letter of to-day's date, I am desired by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to point out that he offered to meet yourself and one or two other representatives of the Women's Social and Political Union on the morning after the final decision on the Franchise Bill had been taken, and that instead of accepting the invitation, you and other members of your union came to the House of Commons and created a disturbance. In these circumstances, Mr. Lloyd George cannot undertake to receive another deputation as you suggest.—Yours faithfully,

H. P. HAMILTON.

In a further letter Mrs. Drummond said:—

I am amazed by the terms of your letter. What you offered to us was a private interview, which, as I have already explained, is obviously no fulfilment whatever of your promise to receive us in public deputation. I must, therefore, renew the request that you will, in accordance with your pledged word, accord to myself and my deputation of working women a public interview for the purpose of discussing the prospects of woman suffrage.

The *Manchester Guardian*, in its issue of January 30, quoted a passage from Mr. Henry W. Nevinson's article in last week's *VOTES FOR WOMEN* (in which he described the assault made upon Mrs. Drummond by the police on her way to the House of Commons from the Horticultural Hall), and added the comment: "Mrs. Drummond's own account of the incident, as given in the police court before the magistrate, differs from the foregoing in several particulars."

Mrs. Drummond's own account, given in the same paper, was to the effect that "the police had twisted her in some way or another, and that when she faintered from the pain a policeman let her 'drop like a log, face downwards, on the pavement, not realising, perhaps, that I was in a faint.'"

Mr. Nevinson replied to the note in the *Manchester Guardian* in a letter which appeared in that paper on January 31, in the course of which he says: "I submit that when a woman has been rendered

unconscious from pain her own evidence as to what happened is not necessarily the most accurate. It is generally known that a person who has fainted, or has been stunned, usually retains only a confused memory of the few previous moments, and often forgets them altogether. But . . . the important question is, why the police should have assaulted her at all. . . . The police had evidently received orders to allow her, with a small deputation, to come right up to the door of the House. . . . Why, then, did the police violently set upon Mrs. Drummond before she had got more than 200 yards from the Horticultural Hall, from which she started? Whether you take my account, that she was thrown down, or take hers that she was twisted, that she fainted from the pain, and was dropped like a log, face downwards, on the pavement, that question remains unaltered."

Demand for an Enquiry

A comment upon this letter appeared in the *Manchester Guardian* the same day, in a leader headed "Militants and the Police," from which we quote as follows:—

"There is, at any rate, no doubt that the authorities had agreed to allow the deputation of which she was a member to reach the House of Commons unmolested, and that some 200 yards from its starting place Mrs. Drummond was so handled by the police that she fell on the pavement and suffered such severe pain that she fainted. A general belief that a constable, even when exasperated, is much less likely than a civilian to use more force than is needed for self-defence is one of the best possible safeguards of law and order. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that any case which tends to upset that belief, as does this one, should be the subject of full enquiry."

Mrs. Drummond's Account

Mrs. Drummond herself bore out Mr. Nevinson's interpretation of the whole matter in her speech made at the London Pavilion last Monday, when she stated that on leaving the Horticultural Hall on Tuesday night, January 28, she and the women with her evaded one or two police men who tried to stop them. They turned into Rochester Row and passed some women, and, added Mrs. Drummond, "I imagined that their anger was aroused at the women's getting past them. One of them turned and caught me by the right arm and twisted it to such an extent that the pain caused me to faint. I must then have been thrown down on the pavement, and my doctor says I must have been thrown with great force, because I was sick afterwards, which shows that I sustained slight concussion. The first thing I remember when I came to was Miss Sylvia Pankhurst asking someone to help me to get up, and the policeman saying that I was too ill to go on. I thought to myself 'The Government intend to maim me so much that I shall not get forward.' So I said to Miss Sylvia Pankhurst and the others, 'If you stick to me I will go forward.'"

The case of Mrs. Drummond was further dealt with by Miss Sylvia Pankhurst in her defence at Bow Street on Wednesday last. See page 275.

IN THE PRESS

Their leaders are allowed to defy the law with impunity, to make speeches of the most threatening kind, and to put into execution their menace to the business life of the community. Yet nothing is done by the Home Secretary; he confesses himself impotent and beaten; the law is put into force only to be derided; imprisonment has become a farce. And all this futile and incompetent Minister can do is to hint at an extension of the system of "ticket of leave." If the Government have no methods but those of weakness and cowardice, let them make way for Ministers who will deal honestly by the women and honestly by the nation.—*Globe*, Jan. 31.

So Helpful!

The electors are not likely to be coerced or bullied into conceding votes for women, and while it would not be wise for the advocates of women's suffrage to "sit still and do nothing," we regard the threats that are now being uttered with regret.—*Nottingham Guardian*.

Denying that any member of the Government would resign on the Suffrage question, Mr. Herbert Samuel said that the Government "had too many great tasks in hand to justify a quarrel upon this one issue." We are afraid that the Pillar Box Outrages have embittered the INFANT SAMUEL.—*Punch*.

THE PRIME MINISTER IN SCOTLAND

Mr. Asquith visited Scotland last week, and addressed a meeting of his constituents at Leven on Wednesday evening, January 29. "The Suffragettes," notes the *Dundee Courier*, "were on the warpath. . . . Mr. Asquith, accompanied by Miss Violet Asquith, Sir James and Lady Low of Kilmarnock Castle, and guarded by Scotland Yard detectives, did not arrive until the hour of meeting. They entered by the rear of the building, where a large crowd had assembled, but the police maintained perfect order, and the Premier entered the hall un molested."

This momentous statement is intensified by the following graphic description:—

"Just as the doors were closed and many people had failed to gain admittance the tumult began. The militant Suffragettes from England made a determined effort to rush the doors. 'We want inside,' they shouted, and pressed forward with great determination. The police were taken somewhat unawares, and the pressure was so great that the officers were pinned against the walls and doors in front of the hall. What with the encouraging shouts of some of the younger members of the dense throng, the hoing of others, and the shrieking of the women in the forefront, the situation was indeed threatening. The police, with the assistance that could be spared from the other side of the building, however, ultimately got the upper hand, but before the crowd could be dislodged many of the constables had lost their chin-straps and shoulder-straps. The police arrested a woman named Morrison, who spoke with an English accent, and she was taken to Methil Police Office. During the meeting these spasmodic rushes continued, and the women shouted angrily at being so effectively checked. At the conclusion of the meeting . . . the Premier and his daughter motored safely away to Kilmarnock. . . . Kilmarnock Castle and the approaches thereto are well guarded by members of the Fifehire Constabulary."

"Freedom"

On Thursday Mr. Asquith received the freedom of the City of Dundee, but without many reminders of the freedom which he so stubbornly denies to women. When he opened his mouth to speak in the Kinnaird Hall, says the *Manchester Guardian*, "a young woman under a gallery simultaneously opened hers and began what promised to be a concurrent address. She was exhorting Mr. Asquith to be a statesman and not a politician when she was removed."

"Mr. Asquith once again faces the Suffrage Music," was the title of a photograph in Saturday's *Daily Graphic*, while the *Daily Sketch* described the scene as "Scottish Suffragists on the Premier's Track," and further explained that Mr. Asquith, in the picture, is "waiting patiently until the suffragists had been ejected to begin his speech."

The *Dundee Evening Telegraph* thus describes the scene in the hall:—

"The Premier had no sooner come to the front of the platform and withstood the fire of the flashlights of the photographers than the demonstration of the militant Suffragettes commenced. First a young lady under the west gallery interrupted, and was no sooner run out than another lady seated in the very centre of the reserved section of the front of the east gallery rose and commenced to speak. When the stewards approached she nimbly climbed over the front rail of the gallery, and there she managed to cling while the more men tugged to get her away. This performance savoured of gymnastics, and the men below seemed to become somewhat nervous. Then there were interludes in various parts of the hall, including a determined effort by a young fellow in the back gallery. The stewards had to be wary in their work, for there was evidence that the assembly, though impatient of the interruptions, would not brook rough treatment of the interrupters."

Quite half the gathering, it is said, consisted of women. Mr. Asquith, says the Central News, "stood stoically watching the scene."

"Hunted"

The *Daily Express*, under the title, "The Hunted Premier," gave a graphic description, and noted that after the first inter-

ruption the Prime Minister had reached precisely the same word in his address when the second occurred. One of the "interruptions" which caused so much excitement apparently consisted of the word "No!" This incident, it is stated, so disturbed the meeting that the Lord Provost had to rise and make a special appeal to the audience to keep their seats. The *Express* adds: Still another interruption occurred when Mr. Asquith said, "It is a peculiar satisfaction to me to-day that I should receive the freedom of Dundee." "You are not worthy of it!" shouted a young man, whose name is given as McIntosh, and who is said to be a student from Edinburgh.

"How dare you come to Dundee, you traitor to women!"

The Press states that a man who interrupted fought so persistently that the police and stewards were compelled to resort to the expedient of "frog-marching" to get him out of the building. Preparations for the Suffragettes—not for the Prime Minister—had begun a week before the meeting took place, and the state of panic into which the conveners of the meeting were thrown is thus described by the *Dundee Evening Telegraph*—

"The Suffragettes may fairly claim that without engaging in militant work they set the powers that be very onerous tasks. Our police and firemen, with slaters and other allies, engaged in a form of Guy Fawkes' search of the Kinnaird Hall and surrounding buildings. From vaults to roofs the whole quarter was carefully searched for lurking 'persons.' The searchers, however, had to be content with the reward of duty done. . . . The dread of the Suffragettes seems to have become a day and night terror to authorities here, there, and everywhere."

The Dundee Branch of the Women's Freedom League organised a big protest meeting in Dundee in which other Suffrage Societies joined. The following declaration was issued:—"We object most emphatically to any honour bestowed on a man who absolutely refuses to confer justice on women, and considering that Dundee is a woman's city, and its trade is produced by women's labours, we think it an insult that such a man should dare show face here, and accept freedom from those to whom he denies it."

Miss Margaret Morrison was arrested outside Leven Town Hall on Wednesday, as described in the above account, and was brought before the Sheriff, at Cupar, charged with throwing pepper in a policeman's face, and other offences. It was stated that the defendant managed to lock a policeman out of the passage leading to the cells, then broke some windows, and, as the police broke open the door, threw a bucket of water over the first man who entered. She refused to admit the jurisdiction of the court, declined to give her name, or to assist the police in any way to identify her. She was fined £20, with the alternative of 30 days' imprisonment.

WHY?

It has been decided that men only will be admitted to Mr. Birrell's meeting at Newcastle-on-Tyne next week.—*Evening Standard*, Jan. 31.

THE FORWARD CYMRIC SUFFRAGE UNION

At a meeting of the London members of the F.C.S.U., held last Monday, with Mrs. Mansell-Moulin in the chair, the following resolution, which was proposed by Mr. George Lansbury, was passed:—

"This meeting of the F.C.S.U. desires to express its profound indignation at the way in which the Prime Minister has failed to carry out his solemn and repeated pledge, and rejects with scorn the Government's offer of a private member's Bill next Session. As this offer fails to carry out the pledge—the pledge remains—and as the Franchise Bill is now dead, this meeting demands the immediate introduction of a Government measure to give votes to women on equal terms with men. Failing this, it calls upon Mr. Lloyd George to resign his seat in the Cabinet."

Mrs. Mansell-Moulin, who sent a request on behalf of her Society to Mr. Lloyd George, asking him to receive a deputation from it, received a reply from him, dated January 30, saying he would be "very

happy to receive a deputation of his countrywomen," but it "must represent all sections of Welshwomen interested in that question."

To this letter she replied as follows:—"Dear Sir, — I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of January 30, and in reply to inform you that it is not the wish of the members of our Union to be received by you at the same time as representatives of party women's organisations, and of Societies of women which stand for other causes and are only interested in the suffrage question. Our point of view is not the same as theirs, for the F.C.S.U. is the only Cymric Union that pledges its members, both men and women, to work for the enfranchisement of women before any other cause."

"We do not consider it our business to communicate with other associations in Wales. We received a letter from your Secretary on December 17, 1912, saying you hoped to be able to arrange for a deputation of the F.C.S.U. to meet you when the Franchise Bill came before the House of Commons."

"We wish to say that as it was our Union which asked for the interview last year and received your message, we feel we have a right to ask you to receive our deputation apart from any other associations, and we trust that in view of the urgency of the situation you will consent to do so.—Yours sincerely,

"E. R. MANSELL-MOULIN,
"Hon. Organiser, F.C.S.U."

THE WORD "OBEY"

At the third annual meeting of the General Council of the Church League for Women's Suffrage, a resolution was passed urging Convocation "in its revision of the marriage service so to modify the service that it shall not continue to suggest that the wife owes any duty of obedience to her husband other than that consideration for his reasonable desires which is equally due from him to her."

At the same meeting a resolution was passed deploring "the position in which the women's suffrage question has been placed through the miscalculations of the Government." And a third resolution expressed its opinion that "women prisoners in the goals of Great Britain be allowed to see the ministers of their religious denominations, if they so desire, without the presence of a wardress."

AMERICAN COMRADESHIP

(Special to VOTES FOR WOMEN.) Following upon the resolution passed by the Labour Conference last week, we have received the following telegram from two prominent New York Suffragists, well known for their social reform work in that city:—"Congratulations on achieving Labour support."
(Signed) "LELLIAN WALD,
"BEKE ALICE LEWISOHN."

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN AMERICA

Two more States in America are on the way to obtaining Woman Suffrage. The State Legislature both of New York and of Nevada have adopted the proposal to extend the franchise to women. Before this change in the Constitution can be effected it will be necessary for the question to be submitted to a Referendum in both States.

A FRENCH SUFFRAGIST ON MILITANCY

Madame Marguerite Durand, who stood for a Paris borough at the last municipal elections (purely for propaganda purposes, for French women have not yet won the municipal franchise), and obtained 2,500 votes, which were counted as blanks, has been giving her views on militancy to the Paris correspondent of the *Standard*.

"It is quite impossible, and would be out of place, for French women to judge their English sisters," she says. "They are clever, well-educated gentlewomen, and if they choose methods which at first sight seem strange to us, they have probably very good reasons for doing so. In 1845 French women acted in much the same way, and suffered similarly. All means are good to a good end, and we cannot forget that Frenchmen had to go much further before they could obtain their present civic rights. It was then fire and sword and the guillotine, and though it seems very horrible when we look back upon it, it appears to have been the only and necessary means to the end. At present I cannot imagine French women suffragists employing English tactics, because we are too afraid of ridicule. The English ladies have braved this, and gone further, and nothing proves that one day we may not do the same."

A New Name for French Suffragettes

M. Maurice Donnay has coined a new name for the French Suffragettes in his play which is now running in Paris. Rejecting the term "fémiste" as too serious, he calls her an "Eclairceuse," one who lights or shows the way—a pioneer, in fact; and the term, it is said, is already being applied to any woman who sets out to make a career for herself and break down the conventions. The play in question by no means supports the woman's movement but that does not augur badly for the new name, since the word "Suffragette" itself originated in a storm of insults and obloquy.

Take it when you're young—you'll have a good digestion when you're old.

The dinner gong sounds gladly in the ear of the woman who has a good appetite.

Good mustard, freshly made, not only sharpens the appetite, but enhances the flavour of meat; and materially assists the digestion and assimilation of the food. Enjoy your meals by helping yourself to Mustard.

Colman's D.S.F. Mustard
Be sure that it is Colman's.

SCHWEITZER'S COCOA
THE OLDEST and STILL THE IDEAL COCOA

Values in Blouses

Very attractive in this display of Blouses. The materials are of the best quality—price considered; the prices are the lowest possible—quality considered. There is variety in style as well as price.

DA 11.—Dainty Blouse in white Lawn, with pretty collar and cuffs 5/7

DA 9.—New Idea. Lace and Ivory lined through Jap Silk 9/11

DERRY & TOMS

KENSINGTON, LONDON, W.

Great SALE of HOSIERY, Underclothing, GLOVES & BLOUSES

Underwear Bargains

Having secured this stock under the most favourable conditions, we are consequently in a position to offer them at extraordinarily low price.

BL 45.—An Unusual Opportunity. Ladies' Knickers as sketch, with embroidery and 1/11 1/2 ribbon 1/11 1/2

BL 32.—Longcloth Nightdress, trimmed embroidery as sketch; full size 3/11 1/2

Sundry Bargains

D 13.—Lisle Hose. Heeled, mastic, & sax, with open lace front & sm-4 broderies 1/6

BL 62.—More Antique Skirts, will not pill, beautifully sent finish. In good shades of ivory, grey, mole, helio, amethyst, brown, navy, sage, tea rose, sky, and black ... 10/6

D 14.—Wide Drop Stitch Lisle Hose. In mole, sage, grey, and silver. A really smart Stocking ... 1/3

IN this announcement we give a few typical examples of our Sale Values—bargains which challenge comparison with those of any other Store. The stocks are fresh and comprise New Spring Goods. A personal visit is best; but our Special Catalogue contains thousands of tempting bargains, and practically brings our Store to your home. Write for a copy—to-day.

Sale Commences Tuesday, Feb. 11th, and continues throughout the week

Special Glove Offers

We take pride in presenting such desirable qualities at these prices. Here are three of the most attractive glove offerings of the sale.

Smart Glove, 8-button length. "Reindeer Finish," in grey, white, black, mole, and beavers 2/11 1/2

Smart Glove, Buckskin finish, very soft skins, in drabs, greys, white, black, and moles. Most useful and reliable Glove. Very special ... 1/6

Choice Reindeer Finish Glove, with 2 pearl buttons, in black, white, slate, beaver, mole, tabac champagne. Beautifully fitting glove ... 1/11 1/2

Real Foot Ease

'BENDUBLE' House Shoes

give a sense of ease and restfulness equalled by no other shoe at any price. The secret lies in the velvety softness and easy flexibility of the specially selected leather from which they are made.

EASY, ELEGANT, SILENT, DURABLE

"Benduble" House Shoes provide comfort with elegance, durability with daintiness. Their silent, squeakless tread makes them invaluable in the sick room. They are as durable as finest British leather and workmanship can make them.

Worn by hundreds of Nurses all over the country.

Made in all sizes and half-sizes, with narrow, medium, or hygienic shape toes.

Per Pair 5/11 (Two pairs post free). Postage 4d.

Call at our Showroom or SEND FOR FREE BOOK, which contains full particulars of "Benduble" Footwear and other specialities.

BENDUBLE SHOE CO.

(Dept. C.), 443, WEST STRAND, LONDON, W.C. (1st Floor.)

Hours—9.30 to 5. Sats—9.30 to 1.

"The last word" in comfort.

SEND TODAY FOR FREE BOOK

ISLINGTON DENTAL SURGERY

69, Upper St. London, N.

MR. CHODWICK BROWN, Dental Surgeon.

MR. FREDK. G. BOUCHER, Asst. Dental Surgeon

Established 55 years.

Gas Administered daily, at 11 and 3, by a Qualified Medical Man. FEE, 7s. 6d.

A record of 30,000 successful cases. Nurse in attendance. Mechanical work in all its branches.

THE BEST ARTIFICIAL TEETH from 5s.

Send Postcard for Pamphlet. Tel. No. 6348 Central No Show-case at door.

TENTATIVE

attempts are being made by many people at food reform. The ever-present difficulty is the "main dish" as dinner. An earnest effort to solve this difficulty has resulted in our offer of fifteen dainty savory outlets and patties for half-a-crown, post free. Cheltenham Food Reform Depot, 2, Clarence Street, CHELTENHAM. Details, post free.

HAYFORD'S

"SPECIAL" SKIN GLOVES. REALLY WASHABLE.

WHITE. 2 Buttons, SAXE, to pull on.

CREAM-NATL. 2/11 & 3/11. Elastic Wrist.

GLOVE STORES, SLOANE ST., S.W.

William CLARKE & SON,

341, GRAY'S INN ROAD, KING'S CROSS, W.C. 85, QUEEN'S ROAD, BAYSWATER, W.

COAL.

Silstone 27/-	Roaster Nuts 23/0
Best Household .. 23/6	Large Kitchen .. 22/6
Special House .. . 23/-	Stove Coal 21/6
Best Nuts 24/6	Anthracite Nuts .. 40/-

Coke, per Chaldron, 15/-.

Telephones: 3656, 1592 and 2718 North, 565 Paddington, &c.

RESTORE THE VOICE WITH

EVANS' PASTILLES

Invaluable for Throat & Voice

Send Penny for Sample to the Sole Manufacturers: EVANS BROS, LESCHER & WEBB, LTD., LIVERPOOL and LONDON (Name this paper.)

EVERY MOTHER

who has fed the

BEST BABY IN THE WORLD

on dairy milk must have had the fact brought home to her many times that this is a most unnatural diet, if only through the trouble and sickness it often entails, and the preventive remedies used to overcome the difficulty. Experience has proved that

NUTO CREAM

provides a perfectly natural substitute. Very young children take it through their feeding bottles. Many mothers have substituted the diet with beneficial results. It is the natural milk of nuts and the vital products of the vegetable kingdom. It builds up healthy bodies, makes bonnie babies, winsome lads and lasses, and proud fathers and mothers. It invigorates even strong men. The sick can take and assimilate it when all else fails. Try it and you will become enthusiastic about it, but this is only one of the twelve delightful surprises that comprise

'Pitman' Vegsal Soups.

Per 2 oz. tin, 3d., to make 1 pint soup; 1 doz. assorted box, 3/-; 1 lb. tins, 1/8, with full instructions. Ask your grocer for them, or sample tin sent post free. 5d. 1 dozen box, 3/6; 2 dozen, 6/- carriage paid from

"PITMAN" HEALTH FOOD CO.,

223, Aston Brook Street, Birmingham.

Full catalogue of Health Foods, with Diet Guide and copy of "Nuts and All About Them," post free, two stamps.

OUR TRANSFORMATIONS GIVE UNIVERSAL SATISFACTION.

UNIVERSAL HAIR CO.

ESTABLISHED 1895.

ANY STYLE 30/-, or EXTRA FULL OF HAIR, ANY STYLE 2gns. & 3gns.

For Light, Grey, Pale and Auburn, Shades extra is charged.

For GOODS ON APPROVAL SEE OUR ILLUSTRATED CATALOGUE (POST FREE) ON APPLICATION.

FINEST QUALITY PURE EUROPEAN HUMAN HAIR ONLY USED.

REMYNANCE MUST ACCOMPANY EACH ORDER.

SWITCHES OF PURE HUMAN HAIR.

16-ins.	2/3
18-ins.	3/6
20-ins.	5/-
22-ins.	7/6
24-ins.	12/6
26-ins.	18/6
28-ins.	21/-

ANY LENGTH TO ORDER.

TOUPET, ONLY 15/6.

CHIGNON WITH CURLS, 17/6.

SWATHES OF PURE LONG HAIR FROM 15/6.

84, FOXBERRY ROAD, BROCKLEY, LONDON, S.E.