

Mrs. Fawcett on the Referendum.

The Common Cause,

The Organ of the National Union of

Women's Suffrage

Societies.

VOL. III. No. 145.

Registered as
a Newspaper.

JANUARY 18, 1912.

ONE PENNY.

Notes and Comments.

The Referendum.

The newspapers during the past few days have been full of Women's Suffrage and the Referendum. Eleven leading articles on the subject have been brought to our notice. Every one will agree that it is a good thing that the daily press should talk about Suffrage. As for the referendum, our own views about it are very clear, and we are not confused by the babel of tongues among our contemporaries. We publish on page 700 an important letter from Mrs. Fawcett, and on page 703 an official statement from Miss Courtney which make the attitude of the National Union perfectly plain.

An Honest Foe.

We owe some thanks to the *Morning Post*; it is one of those sincere enemies who give one real help by tearing away the veils from a political situation. Its article in favour of the Referendum on Monday is a savage attack on another pro-Referendum paper—the *Westminster Gazette*. We do not admire the spirit of the article, and we hope that the *Westminster* is more sincere in its professions of friendship for Women's Suffrage than the *Morning Post* would have us believe; but the latter paper certainly clears up the situation, and shows what those who are the opponents at once of suffrage and of the present Government expect from the Referendum. "The Referendum," says this frank foe, "is a certain way of shelving Women's Suffrage. . . . Referenda usually result in a negative; in this case the negative result is as nearly certain as things ever are in this world. . . . Women, who have so often been deceived by men, have never been betrayed with more cynicism than in this proposed transaction of a Referendum in place of a pledge." After this we are not surprised that it goes straight on: "And yet, for our part, we see advantages in the Referendum proposal." From the peculiar point of view of this newspaper, it is one advantage that women should be betrayed, and another that they should be

betrayed by a Liberal Government. It is hardly the voice of the charmer, and Liberals who have the honour of their party at heart will listen to it only as a warning.

The "Times" and Liberal Principles.

The *Times* rather imprudently draws attention to the fact that the Anti-Suffragists are receiving very little support from prominent Unionists. Referring to the Albert Hall Anti-Suffrage meeting, it says:—

"Many peers, Liberal as well as Unionist, will be present on the platform, but so far no Unionist ex-Cabinet Minister has signified his intention of attending. Indeed, it is somewhat remarkable that the keenest workers in the campaign of the National League for Opposing Woman Suffrage are Liberals, an increasing number of whom are beginning to realise that there is no necessary connection between Woman Suffrage and Liberal principles."

We hope that Anti-Suffragist members of the Liberal Party will be gratified at being patted on the back by the *Times*, a paper so eminently fitted to judge of what constitutes Liberal principles. In the meantime we are gratified at its admission that there is no necessary connection between Unionist principles and Anti-Suffrage.

The I.L.P. Campaign.

An article in the *Labour Leader* for January 12th, announces the opening of the Independent Labour Party's "political equality" campaign, which will continue during February and March. In the resolution passed by these true friends of our cause after the announcement of the Government Reform Bill, it is strongly insisted on that no measure will be acceptable which does not include both men and women, and it is urged that proposals for franchise extension which do not confer citizenship on women should be definitely opposed. This declaration was gratefully acknowledged by the National Union at the special Council meeting last December, and at the same time the Council welcomed the declaration of the Labour Party, that "no measure for the extension of the franchise will be satisfactory which does not give votes to women." There is a



(Photo. Elliott and Fry.) MISS CLEMENTINA BLACK.

considerable difference between the respective declarations of the I.L.P. and the Labour Party. The former is much more than a statement of principle. It is a distinct assurance that the I.L.P. is prepared to stand by women in their struggle for enfranchisement, at the expense, if necessary, of any immediate future extension of the franchise to men. To quote the *Labour Leader* in the article referred to above:—

"There has been no agitation for manhood suffrage. There has been no cry from unenfranchised men pleading for the opportunity to serve as citizens in the counsels of the nation. Men unenfranchised have been dumb, yet their unnamed and unfeared wrongs are to be righted."

And again:—

"The special claim to be urged by the I.L.P. in this campaign is to stand by the women."

Although the statement of the Labour Party is less definite as to the tactics to be pursued, we have every confidence that it will consistently continue the support it has hitherto given us, and fight the Reform Bill in its final stage if it does not include a measure of Women's Suffrage.

The Price of Coal.

The threat of a coal strike, which is still hanging over us, has caused widespread consternation. If the strike took place, it is probable that no member of the community would escape inconvenience, but one group of people would suffer more than the rest, and that is the housewives. They have begun to suffer already, for the coal dealers have not waited to put up their prices, and many families, even in the comparatively well-to-do class, have begun to do with fewer fires, and to wish that they had larger cellar accommodation. It is the housewife who has to make arrangements for the family, and even if her budget is one capable of re-adjustment, the rise in the price of coal must inevitably add to her cares. But the poorer housewives cannot lay in a store of coal because they have no money with which to buy it, and no place in which to keep it. Just because they can only buy it in very small quantities, they always pay for it at a higher rate than their richer neighbours do, and for them it is not a question of managing with fewer fires, but of doing without any sufficient fire at all. In the painful budgets of the poor there is no room for re-adjustment, every rise in the price of necessities means sheer suffering: if bread is dear one goes hungry, if coal is dear one goes cold. And in this suffering women have the largest share—first, because they are the housewives responsible for making the insufficient food or fuel go as far as it can; secondly, because they are the mothers suffering through their children's bodies as well as their own; and, lastly, because they are even more helpless than the men of the community. A coal strike would be calamity for all, and we trust that it may be averted, but the mere thought of it ought to show people how much women's voices are needed in the State, whose task it is to preserve industrial as well as civil peace.

The Protest of Post Office Clerks.

On Saturday evening the Association of Post Office Women Clerks held a mass meeting in the Holborn Hall to protest against the introduction of assistant women clerks under the new scheme. The following resolution, moved by Miss Elizabeth Stirling and supported by Mr. G. Lansbury, M.P., was carried unanimously:—

"That this meeting of women clerks of the General Post Office expresses its strong indignation at the reduction in these scales of pay assigned to women for clerical work in the Post Office by the introduction of assistant women clerks, and regards any tampering with the scales fixed by the Hobhouse Committee as a distinct breach of faith; this meeting further records its dissatisfaction with the explanation given by the Postmaster-General in the House of Commons, which it considers an evasion of the real issue, and, further, calls upon him for the immediate withdrawal of this tentative scheme."

The danger threatening the women clerks is yet another example added to the many which show that it is always the women who go to the wall. In this case they are to bear the brunt of the reduction of expenses considered necessary in the Post Office.

The Law as it is Administered.

The following case, quoted from the *Manchester Guardian* of January 12th, seems to be an instance of cruelty inadequately punished. In one sense, of course, no punishment could be adequate for the brutal ill-treatment of a young child, and one does not want the law to retaliate savagely on a savage offence. But the public need more protection from criminals of this kind than is afforded by a fine or a short imprisonment, and, as we

have often pointed out, the bias of our present law, made and administered solely by men, is to lay too little stress on crimes against persons compared with that which is laid on crimes against property:—

"A dealer, named James Barker, and his wife were charged at the Longton Police Court yesterday with ill-treating a girl of seven years. It was stated that they adopted the girl three months ago, and had treated her so badly that she had degenerated from a bright, smart child to a nervous wreck. It was alleged that she was kept at housework from early morning until eleven o'clock at night, that she was continually abused and frequently thrashed, sometimes with a leather belt. On one occasion, it was stated, Mrs. Barker threw a brush at her with such force that her head was cut open and the brush broken. On another occasion she was thrashed because she failed to borrow a button-hook she had been sent out for. The girl appeared in court with her head bandaged and black eyes. A doctor stated that the ill-treatment might have serious permanent effect on her health. Both the defendants denied the cruelty. They said they had done nothing more than correct the child for faults. Mrs. Barker, who was stated by neighbours to have been the worst of the two, was fined £10, with the alternative of two months' imprisonment. Her husband was fined £5, or one month. Time in which to pay the fine was refused."

The Enlightened Parent.

The *Nation* of last week contains, among many articles of interest, one that we would specially commend to our readers, on "The Enlightened Parent." We have seldom enjoyed in a short space such a subtle combination of sympathy with the statement of unpalatable truths. After an inquiry into the modern methods of bringing up children, in which justice is done to the necessary revolt against the old régime, the rise of "psychology" in child-culture and of the system of "natural liberty," the result of these in anarchy and despotism on the part of the child and "nerves" in the parent, the writer comes to the conclusion that the root of the error in modern methods lies in the attempt to ignore and annihilate the difference between two generations, to bridge over the inevitable gap, and to exert a "moral influence" from the older generation to the younger, such as is only likely to be efficacious and beneficent in the case of contemporaries. To quote the words of the writer:—

"Surely it would be better not to try an experiment in false equality foredoomed to failure."

And again:—

"The present situation is one of utter instability and fumbling compromises. Much of the trouble is due to the conspiracy of solemn sentimentalism into which educationists, eugenicists, and humanitarians have entered to persuade us that self-sacrifice is the true function of the parent, whose thoughts and aspirations should be concentrated wholly on the good of the next generation. There is something rather preposterous in this conception of an infinitude of effort directed to an abstract improvement of the race, no part of which is to be harvested in the enjoyment of the current generation. May it not be proper to remind ourselves that the twentieth century is not wholly 'for the child,' and that parents also, being God's creatures, have rights as well as duties? Past defects in the nurture and education of children are ill compensated by present excesses."

It is comforting to hear a voice crying in the wilderness in support of the rights of parents, and it inspires the hope that the excesses in question may have reached their furthest limit in the present day, and that more rational methods are developing in dealing with the rights of the child.

A Pioneer.

We publish on page 705 an account of Dr. Sophia Jex-Blake's career. She was one of those greatest pioneers in the advance of women's education to whom the debt of gratitude owed by the present generation can never be too warmly or too frequently acknowledged.

Another Woman Insurance Commissioner.

It is with pleasure that we note the appointment last week of another woman as an Insurance Commissioner in the person of Mrs. Creighton. It would be difficult to make a better choice of a representative of women's interests to add to the women already appointed.

Our Portrait.

We publish this week the portrait of a most distinguished member of the National Union, Miss Clementina Black. She has served for many years on the Committee of the London Society, and during that time has rendered invaluable services to the Cause. Her literary work and her connection with the Women's Industrial Council have made her name well known to all who are interested in women's conditions in the industrial world.

ALL BUSINESS COMMUNICATIONS should be addressed to The Manager, 2, Robert Street, Adelphi, W.C.

ADVERTISEMENTS should reach the Office by first post on Tuesday.

POSTAL SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

British Isles: 6s. 6d., Abroad: 8s. 8d. per annum.

Copies of back numbers 1d. (post free), or 2d. when more than three months old. A few copies of Vol. I. to be had at 3d. each, post free.

LITERARY CONTRIBUTIONS should be addressed to the Editor, 2, Robert Street, Adelphi, W.C., accompanied by a stamped envelope addressed if it is desired that they should be returned. The Editor accepts no responsibility, however, for matter which is offered unsolicited.

CORRESPONDENTS ARE REQUESTED TO NOTE that this paper goes to press on Tuesday. The latest news, notices, and reports should, therefore, reach the Editor by first post on Monday. The Editor reminds correspondents, however, that the work is made much easier if news is sent in as long beforehand as possible. Monday is only mentioned as the last day possible, not as the one upon which all news should arrive.

NOTICE.—This paper should be obtainable at newsagents and book-stalls by mid-day on Thursday. If people have any difficulty in getting it locally they should write to the Manager, 2, Robert Street, Adelphi, W.C., giving the name and address of the newsagent or bookstall from which they wish to be supplied.

Contents.

| | | | |
|--|-----|-----------------------------------|-----|
| Portrait: Miss Clementina Black... | 697 | Treasurer's Notes | 704 |
| Notes and Comments | 697 | By-Election | 704 |
| The Will of the People | 699 | London Society | 704 |
| The Question of the Referendum | 700 | Federation Notes | 705 |
| Hopelessly Divided | 701 | The late Dr. Jex-Blake | 705 |
| The Suffrage Movement in America | 701 | Women's Suffrage and the Referen- | 706 |
| The Dressmaker | 702 | dam | 706 |
| The National Union of Women's | | The Miracle | 706 |
| Suffrage Societies | 702 | Our Friends Abroad | 708 |
| From Headquarters | 703 | Foreign News | 708 |
| Press Department | 703 | An Anti-Suffrage Meeting | 709 |
| Literature Department | 704 | Letters to the Editor | 710 |
| Forthcoming Meetings | 710 | | |

The Will of the People.

A strange and rather artificial excitement has been created in a section of the Press by the sudden realisation of the fact (already well known to everyone) that members of the Cabinet held different views on the question of Women's Suffrage. No cry of horror was uttered by the Liberal papers when it was first made public, some years ago, that Ministers differed as to the principle, nor when it was announced, some weeks back, that they were prepared to express their principles in speech and action. In his answer to the suffragist deputation on November 17th, the Prime Minister suggested a solution for the difficulty presented by this division of the Cabinet. He said that as he himself and some of his colleagues were opposed to Women's Suffrage he could not include it in the Reform Bill, but that as the majority of the Cabinet were in favour of it he would allow full scope for an amendment including women, and that if such an amendment passed the House of Commons the Government would regard it as an integral part of the Bill by which they must stand or fall. He expressed himself ready to bow to "the considered will of the House of Commons," and to allow entire freedom of action to those of his colleagues who differed from him. Immediately afterwards it was announced that Mr. Lloyd George and Sir Edward Grey would profit by this freedom to lead a suffrage campaign, and that one of them would probably introduce the amendment by which the will of the House of Commons was to be tested. Still no cry of distress was raised. It is only within the last week or two that part of the Press has been struck with the seriousness of the situation, and has declared with anguished gravity that there is no way out but the Referendum.

The change is so sudden, and follows so closely on patent signs of the growth of the feeling in favour of Women's Suffrage throughout the country, that one cannot help wondering whether the danger from which a "way out" is sought is not the almost certain passage into law of a measure of Women's Suffrage. In whatever spirit the cry for a Referendum has been taken up by our professed friends, the *Westminster Gazette* and the *Daily Chronicle*, there can be no doubt that its origin was definitely hostile, and that it is, indeed, the last weapon of the Anti-Suffragists driven to desperation by the evident progress of the Women's Suffrage movement. This fact was made quite plain by the Anti-Suffrage deputation to Mr. Asquith on December 14th. The unwillingness of the Anti-Suffragists to disclose their last resource was shown by the delicate manner in which the speakers hovered round the dangerous word, until at last Mr. Asquith uttered it for them. He uttered it only to make plain the constitutional impossibility of what they asked. They had nothing else to suggest, and he

had nothing else to suggest except that the prolonged discussion provided for by the Parliament Bill would be fatal to any measure really opposed to the will of the people. This suggestion was not discouraging to Suffragists. We are not at all afraid of the will of the people, and only demand that that will should be expressed in the ordinary constitutional way. We have the Government pledge that a successful Women's Suffrage amendment will become an integral part of the Bill, and so long as our part of the Bill is only subjected to the fair, constitutional tests, by which the rest of the measure is tried, we have no fears about the result. The Anti-Suffragists evidently agree with us as to the probability of our success, for, in spite of Mr. Asquith's advice, they continue to ask that a special and unconstitutional test should be applied to the subject of Women's Suffrage. We are not surprised when such a strongly Anti-Suffrage and Conservative organ as the *Morning Post* urges the adoption of a political method which would probably prove more fatal to the Government which applied it than to the measure to which it was applied, but we confess to some amazement when Liberal newspapers like the *Westminster Gazette* and the *Daily Chronicle* fall into the trap. It is true that they do not agree with the *Morning Post*, for while that organ answers Mr. Asquith's pertinent question, to whom the Referendum should be made, by the bold statement that it should be made to the present electorate, the *Daily Chronicle* professes itself unable to decide this point, and says that it would be a matter easily settled when the principle of a Referendum had once been accepted. But is a Liberal Government likely to accept the principle of a Referendum? Could it do so without an Act of Parliament, for which it certainly has no mandate? And having done so, could it possibly limit the application of the principle to one single measure, and refuse it for everything else? The British Constitution, as it exists at present, does not provide for the use of a Referendum. Our laws have been made, and our Constitution has been made by Parliament and the Crown, the will of the people has been ascertained through the representatives of the people in Parliament. It is true that our Constitution can be altered by Act of Parliament, as was recently done by the Parliament Bill; but it must be understood that the introduction of a Referendum would be an alteration of the Constitution, and one for which the Government certainly have not received the sanction of the electorate. This would not matter, says the *Westminster Gazette*:—

"The electors, it is true, might say 'We like this plan of being asked our opinion on a particular question, and hope we shall always be asked on questions of importance and difficulty.' But, on the other hand they might say, 'We do hope that we are not going to have any more Referendums—we don't want this sort of upset in addition to General Elections every two or three years.'"

Quite so—they might, and would the Government have the slightest right to inflict it on them? "*Fiat experimentum in corpore vile*" seems to be the *Westminster's* proposal. But let the *Westminster* remember that the subjects of the experiment would be not only women, who are painfully used to having their affairs experimented on by men, but the present electorate, which is somewhat less patient.

And supposing the electorate liked the experiment and made the first remark suggested by the *Westminster*, would it stop there? The *Times* provides an answer to this question. Let any Liberal who thinks with the *Westminster* that the use of the referendum would be a means of passing women's suffrage "without hurt to Liberalism" take warning from its frank declaration of its motives. It says:—

"What will be the outcome of all this it is impossible to foresee, but, meanwhile we note two things with satisfaction—the progress of the Referendum policy, and the active opposition to Woman Suffrage, which is receiving a great stimulus. With regard to the first, those who have once advocated the Referendum, even if for their own ends and on a particular occasion only, can never again offer a general and unconditional opposition to it."

Of course they cannot; you cannot accept a principle for one thing and then refuse it for another; this is an instance in which the application of a special and exceptional law to women might ultimately prove very dangerous to the party which applied it. The excuse for using such a law in this instance is that Women's Suffrage is an exceptional measure and cuts across parties. But if woman's suffrage is exceptional among the great measures now before the country, it is only so because it concerns the disenfranchised. Many other great measures have split parties: Home Rule versus Unionism, and Free Trade versus Protection certainly did so. But in these instances the parties were quickly re-formed on the lines of the particular divergence of opinion in question. This has not happened with Women's Suffrage, because the advocates of the

measure had not direct representation in Parliament, and it was therefore impossible for them to form a strong party in Parliament to stand first and foremost for their reform.

But we will not quarrel with the suggestion that Women's Suffrage is an exceptional measure. It is exceptionally great, and has exceptionally large support in the House of Commons, and it has for many years been treated by those in power with exceptional neglect. It is, then, in some senses an exceptional measure, and an exceptional solution for it was provided in the Conciliation Bill. If the Government had given full time for all the stages of that Bill before announcing Manhood Suffrage, if they had given us on that occasion the free and fair opportunity which is all we demand, we believe that a Women's Suffrage measure would by this time be through the House of Commons. The Government refused us that exceptional solution; they now offer us another solution which is less exceptional; we are determined to make the best use we can of it. We hope that those who profess to be our friends will not make our task more difficult by seeking to load it with extraordinary difficulties. We refuse a referendum, not because we think that the will of the people is against us (we are convinced by every sign that can be given to the disenfranchised that their will is upon our side), but because the referendum is a constitutional experiment, a political method which has several times been used on the side of tyranny and obstruction in foreign countries, and has never been used in England at all. It is offered by our opponents, not instead of, but in addition to, the ordinary constitutional procedure, with the certainty that its use would cause confusion and delay. Women are very tired of exceptional methods, and they are still more tired of the fact that the exception when it is made is always to their disadvantage. With a little exceptional time and opportunity for a non-party measure we could have got the Conciliation Bill through last year. The Conciliation Bill is still before the country, but if no exceptional efforts are to be made for it by the Liberal party, they must at least give us the ordinary fair play for which we ask with regard to the Reform Bill. We believe that the great majority of them are determined to do so. Their determination is expressed by the *Manchester Guardian* and by the *Daily News*. The former suggests that the difficulty of the Liberal ministers who are opposed to Women's Suffrage might be solved if they would agree, like the Prime Minister, to accept the verdict of the House of Commons as a whole.

"The authority of the House for the Bill is good enough, and in obeying the instructions of the House of Commons the Cabinet will be doing what it should do regularly."

The *Daily News* points out that whatever force there might have been in the suggestion of the referendum six years ago has now disappeared for two good reasons:—

"In the first place the Liberal Party has condemned the Referendum; in the second place a majority of members and the Prime Minister, in the name of the Government, have given certain pledges which are binding upon men of honour. . . ."

"There is a majority of members who have pledged themselves not once but several times to vote for a Woman's Suffrage Bill. Mr. Asquith, again, has pledged himself to give time for the Conciliation Bill and to allow a Woman's Suffrage amendment to be moved to his own Manhood Suffrage Bill, which if carried is to become an integral part of the Bill. These are pledges given in the full light of day, and no sophistry can suggest that they would be fulfilled by substituting for them the offer of a Referendum. That would be as naked a breach of honour—unless those to whom the pledges were given accepted the substitute—as could those to whom the pledges were given. There may be some persons who imagine that in politics honour must give way to expediency. For our part we think that the last thing which the Government should or even dare do is to forfeit their title to the respect of men who hold that a word should be a bond."

We are glad to see this pledge recognised and accepted by these two great Liberal organs, as it has been recognised and accepted by Mr. Asquith. In spite of what our opponents say, our question has been before the electors at two General Elections. It has been brought before them by all the means that are open to the voteless. They have replied by sending back to Parliament a body of men pledged to support us. The representation of the people is at present very incomplete; it is our task to make it more complete. In doing so we only ask that the will of that portion of the people which is at present represented should be ascertained in the ordinary way, and not in a special and very unsatisfactory way invented on purpose for us. We ask now, as we have so often asked before, for equal justice. We want nothing else. When will politicians realise that women are not clamouring for special treatment, but only for the freedom men have found good for themselves: the constitutional rights of self-government, which have been worked out and proved through the centuries, since the desire for liberty first awoke in men of the English race.

The Question of The Referendum.

LETTER FROM MRS. HENRY FAWCETT, LL.D.

(The following letter appeared in the "Times" of January 15th. We reprint it for the benefit of those of our readers who do not see the "Times.")

SIR,—There has recently been an outburst in the London Press, both Liberal and Conservative, attributing to the Government an extraordinary position of embarrassment and difficulty owing to the well-known differences of opinion which exist in the Cabinet on the subject of Women's Suffrage. These difficulties are supposed to date from about the middle of December. May I be allowed—paraphrasing the expression "The beauty is in the eye of the beholder"—to say that the difficulties are in the minds and the pens of the ready writers who tell us every morning what we are to think about the political issues of the day?

For there is nothing new in the situation. There has been development, but no essential change since 1908. In May, 1908, Mr. Asquith, having then recently become Prime Minister, received a deputation of Liberal members of Parliament favourable to Women's Suffrage. He then stated that it was the purpose of his Government to introduce a wide measure of electoral reform, and he promised, notwithstanding his own well-known opinions, that if a Women's Suffrage amendment to this Bill were moved, it should not be resisted by the Government, "for the simple and sufficient reason that probably two-thirds of his colleagues in the Ministry were in favour of it. If it were approved by the House it could not be any part of the duty of the Government to oppose such an amendment, and the matter would be left to the decision of the House." That was Mr. Asquith's position three and a half years ago. It is his position now. This promise was repeated by Mr. Lloyd George in December, 1908, and by Mr. Asquith himself again in December, 1909, when opening his party campaign for the General Election of January, 1910. The whole of the present situation, which many of your contemporaries believe to be so new and so extraordinary, is really involved in these reiterated promises.

But more than this can be said. There is nothing unparalleled in members of the Government opposing one another on Women's Suffrage. In July, 1910, when two days of Government time were granted for the second reading of the Conciliation Bill of that year, we had the spectacle of members of the Government speaking against one another; not, indeed, on platforms, but on the floor of the House of Commons. Is it necessary to recall that Mr. Asquith spoke against and Mr. (now Lord) Haldane in favour of the Bill; while on the opposite side of the House Mr. Balfour spoke for suffrage and Mr. Austen Chamberlain against it?

In the same year, in November, Mr. Asquith gave the further promise immediately before the General Election of the following month that his Government would, if returned to power, give facilities in the new House of Commons for all the stages of the Conciliation Bill if so framed as to admit of free amendment. Mr. Asquith recently (November 17th) reiterated that promise, and has added to it a repetition of his earlier promise that a Women's Suffrage amendment to the coming Reform Bill shall not be officially opposed by the Government, and if adopted by the House shall be considered as part and parcel of the Government Bill, to be defended by the Government in all its stages with the whole force at its disposal.

The friends of Women's Suffrage recognise in this situation their great opportunity and the enemies of Women's Suffrage their great danger. The enemies, looking round for a new weapon, seize upon the idea of a Referendum. Those who wish to oppose any political change are, I observe, always inclined to rely upon the efficacy of a Referendum for putting a stop to it. Conservative and Liberal anti-suffragists are now crying aloud for a Referendum, notwithstanding that nearly all the Liberals have, as you say, exhausted the vocabulary of humour and scorn in pouring contempt upon it. "An expensive means of delaying justice, but just the thing for shelving female suffrage" is a not unfair paraphrase of their recent and present homilies on the subject.

In his remarks to the anti-suffrage deputation in December last, the Prime Minister, after calling the Referendum "that most undesirable innovation," pointed out some of the practical difficulties and inconveniences attached to its application to the question at issue. First, if the question, he said, were referred solely to the present male electorate, and women were left out, this course would be "resented as in the highest degree misleading and unsatisfactory." On the other hand, if the opinion and vote of women were asked, this would be "assuming that

a certain number of women were qualified to express an opinion" on a political question of first-rate importance. But this, though he did not say so, is what the suffragists are constantly urging.

If Mr. Asquith pointed out some of the practical difficulties in the application of the Referendum to Women's Suffrage, others can easily be added. The Referendum forms no part of the law of this country; before it can be applied to any subject it must become law, and machinery to carry it into effect must be provided. You, Sir, in your article of to-day have pointed out another difficulty. You cannot have a Referendum to use against one question alone. When once the weapon has been forged and placed in the national armoury, it certainly would be used for other purposes. It has already been proposed for Tariff Reform; perhaps in the not very distant future it might be applied, with startling results, to a No Rent movement, or to Nationalisation of the Land, or to a repudiation of the National Debt. Cleon or Jack Cade could make most effective speeches in favour of any of these proposals, and they would be settled by a single vote 'Yes' or 'No' from the whole electorate. Let those who are now so gaily calling for a Referendum consider its possible application to any of the great economic questions which divide the Have Nots from the Haves, and remember that the Have Nots are probably from 10 to 15 times more numerous than the Haves.

But it is necessary to appeal to the cruder kinds of self-interest. Representative institutions, as existing in this country, whatever their obvious drawbacks, do at any rate secure that the more instructed political minds shall weigh more than the less instructed. This is only equivalent to saying that the average member of Parliament has more political knowledge and has more power of weighing the consequences of political action than the average elector. But the Referendum is a means of making the least instructed and the least sagacious weigh as much as the most instructed and the most sagacious, thus accentuating some of the worst practical dangers of democracy.

Let the House of Commons grapple boldly with the present situation as regards the political position of women. It is unusual to have so weighty a question severed from party politics. But the enfranchisement of women has never from the outset been a party question. Every Conservative Prime Minister since, and including, Lord Beaconsfield, has been a supporter of it, while the great weight of members in its favour has been found on the Liberal and Labour benches. There is no exact parallel that I can recall for its present position. But there is some resemblance to it in what happened in 1867. Mr. Disraeli's Reform Bill of that year could never have been carried had it not been for the support of the band of Liberals who received the nickname of the Tea Room Party. If the Conservative suffragists will form a Tea Room Party in 1912 a Women's Suffrage amendment to the Reform Bill is safe.

Those who have been crying for deliverance from the tyranny of party now have an opportunity of putting their sincerity to the test. Let them welcome the opportunity of settling a political question of first-rate importance on non-party lines.

Your obedient servant,
MILlicent GARRETT FAWCETT,

January 13th.

"Hopelessly Divided."

The subjection of political journalists to phrases is one of the most curious and melancholy weaknesses of that intelligent profession. No doubt it is partly the fault of the public, that eternal sophist, always on the look out for some easy formula that may seem at once to express and to justify its prejudices; but the supply exceeds the demand. Some day—after women have got the vote—there may be time for the compilation of a Dictionary of Political Phrases, in which the history of each ephemeral war-cry might be given, and the actual meaning of the words contrasted with the state of mind that they produced or encouraged. It would be an instructive work, and might conduce to general humility. In our own movement we have unusual opportunities for observing phrases at work, because we have both the politician proper and the Anti-Suffragist pelting us, so that there is hardly a piece of foolishness in the language that has not come our way one time or another, and expected to be taken for argument. For the moment, however, the anti-suffragist, as such, is less interesting than the politician; we know what the anti-suffragist is at, but we are still learning the politician's vocabulary, and we want very much to see what the politician is going to be up to next. The

difficulty is that the politician has been thrown by the present position of the Suffrage movement into a state of extreme anguish owing to the prospect of having to make up his mind for himself instead of just going with his party; and, in consequence, the things that he says are expressive rather of his pain than of his judgment. No one can question the genuineness of the torment that drives the *Westminster Gazette*, with the ink scarcely dry on its belated confession that women must be in the Reform Bill, to cry aloud for a Referendum. It takes an experienced journalist to realise that his pangs call for nothing less than an apostasy to relieve them; but the *Chronicle* was quick to see that it was in the same case, and scarcely made a wry face at the prescription. It is difficult to believe that either will really swallow it; when it comes to the point both will probably bear their sufferings, and forget what they said in their haste, even if they do not forget what the *Manchester Guardian* said about them.

Oddly enough, the sufferings of the *Morning Post* are even more acute; the Ministry, it finds, are "hopelessly divided," and its horror of a situation that can be so described quite overpowers its proper feeling that no situation can be too bad for a Liberal Ministry. If the heathen are in temporary possession of the temple, the least they can do is to abstain from unhappy divisions. Even the prospect of sharing the plunder while pitying the man is not enough to console a politician for the ruin of the rules of the game. "Hopelessly divided"—it is a pathetic, almost a sympathetic phrase. Never was the feeling for adverbs, one of the finest of journalistic feelings, more happily exemplified. "Divided" by itself is good, with a suggestion of a difference that breaks up solidity and makes Two of One; but the adverb is a touch of genius, all the sentiment of "Tears, idle tears" concentrated in a word. "Quite divided," "completely divided," "finally divided," "clearly divided"—any one of these would answer to the fact; but they would leave the reader cold; we might ask ourselves whether there was anything so very terrible about a division of opinion upon one important subject among many, whether the agreement to agree which is the basis of party government might not even be refreshed and made a little wholesome by an agreement to differ for once. But "hopelessly" sets us right; it demands that we shall be disconsolate. Like all good journalistic weapons it is double-barrelled; not once but twice are we hit by it, for it tells us not merely that division is there, but that such division is dreadful. The conversion of Mr. Asquith would be a lesser evil; that, at any rate, would leave the party machines undamaged, and relieve many honest fellows from the cruel necessity of considering things on their merits. What the honest fellows cannot endure is the sight of the captain of a team proposing to stand umpire; for that is how it must present itself to those who feel "in their bones," as the anti-suffragists say, that politics are a game and must be played as a game. The spectacle of a man admitting that it may be his business to help those who differ from him to win the day, though there is no party advantage to be gained by it, is to them the most shocking of spectacles. Why he may even damage the party; and though on all other counts the *Morning Post*, at any rate, would rejoice in the complete ruin of Mr. Asquith's party, this unprincipled scrupulousness strikes a blow at all parties, and is not to be tolerated by men of principle.

All this lamentation is instructive, and even makes a legitimate demand upon our sympathy; and yet it is necessary to tell the enraged politician that, painful as his sufferings may be, he has got to make up his mind to suffer. It is not, and it never will be, the mark of one party in the State that it desires to enfranchise women, and of another that it desires to exploit them; and the "hopeless division" of the present Ministry is exactly what we should find in any Ministry that could conceivably offer to govern the country to-day, because—well, because all the common sense of the country will never be found in one political party.

R. F. CHOLMELEY.

The Suffrage Movement in America.

My visit to America was very short—hardly more than six weeks—and it would be an impertinence to write of it at all without warning my readers of the very slender basis of knowledge on which my "impressions" rest. For not only was my stay brief, but my speeches were many and my work hard. It is apparently the general custom in America to have only one speaker; the chairman is admirably brief; and there are (merciful dispensation!) no votes of thanks. The burden of the meeting, therefore, rests on the shoulders of one speaker, and she is given ample time to develop her theme at length,

and answer all the questions. The plan, though it taxes the speaker, seems to me a good one, but I could have wished it sometimes modified in my own case, since it inevitably resulted in my hearing no other voice than that with which I am already too familiar—my own. Only on two occasions had I the pleasure of hearing American Suffrage speakers, and on both those occasions, by misfortune, I had to leave before the end of the meeting. And most of the time that I was not on a platform I was in a train.

Yet I learnt something; and from American Suffragists I gathered that, in their own opinion, the movement is more advanced here than it is yet with them—at least in the East; and this in spite of the fact that six of the Western states have actually granted the full franchise to women. It is necessary to speak of the "full franchise" because an attempt has been made over here to minimise the importance of recent victories in Washington and California by representing the vote there as on a par with the municipal vote in England. Such an attempt can only be made in the grossest ignorance. The state franchise in America carries with it the municipal vote, the vote for the State Legislature, and the Federal Legislature, and the President of the United States. I will not complicate my article by an account of the American system of elections—sometimes direct and sometimes indirect. My point is that, in every case, the female franchise is exactly the same as the male. If this be "merely local government," then we English are asking no more—indeed not so much, since we do not ask to elect the king!

The extension of the franchise to women in the West goes far to contradict what I have said as to the position of the Suffrage movement in the East. Even if it is not so widespread or (in some states) so highly organised as in England, it may yet outstrip us in the race; for it has no longer to combat the terror of the unknown. The vague prophecies of disaster, which form almost the whole stock-in-trade of the Anti-Suffrage speaker here, lose their force when women vote and no disaster follows. California follows Washington quickly, because in Washington justice has been done, and the heavens have not fallen. Startling, indeed, but irrefutable proof that they need not fall, even if women voted in New York. So, though one's wish to every state is "May you be next!" the general consensus of opinion is that "it will come from the West."

To the West, to my keen regret, I could not go, Chicago being my furthest point. But everyone was speaking, of course, of the Californian victory, and everyone agreed that it had been largely won by the help of those who came in from Washington, to testify to the beneficial working of Women's Suffrage there. Against such arguments the lurid prophecies of Anti-Suffrage Jonahs were harmless as blank cartridge.

Women have not been "in politics" in America nearly so much as they have here. It is perhaps almost as much an advantage as a disadvantage. It means less experience in political organisation, but it means less difficulty in getting rid of the bondage of party feeling, and a greater readiness to put Women's Suffrage before all other considerations. Moreover, though women have taken little part in party politics, they have frequently, and with conspicuous success, taken a share in the business of working for "good government" in the cities, *i.e.*, an honest as against a corrupt administration. They scored a splendid victory in Philadelphia this autumn, when in that corruptly-administered city a "good government" mayor was elected, largely through the efforts of the women. They were publicly thanked by the successful candidate for their ungrudging and efficient work for him.

Within the Suffrage movement itself, it is as hard for an outsider to grasp the aims and relations of the different leagues as (no doubt) it is for strangers here. There are many different societies, all, or nearly all, affiliated to the National American Woman Suffrage Association, whose President is Dr. Anna Shaw. One which surprised me greatly was the "College Equal Suffrage League," founded with the special object of bringing university women into the movement. Here they have been "in" so long that one can hardly realise a state of affairs in which such a league could be necessary. It has, however, done splendid work in America.

The most important development in Suffrage work of recent years is undoubtedly the rise of the "Woman Suffrage Party." To English ears this title at once suggests an organised party in Congress, but the Woman Suffrage Party is something wholly different. Its members are men and women of any shade of political opinion, who sign a membership form stating their belief in Women's Suffrage and willingness to join the "party." They pay no subscription, and are urged to join one of the other leagues or societies, which do demand subscriptions, if possible.

One asks at once: "How is it possible to organise or keep in touch with non-paying members?" In the answer to this question lies the real importance of the new society.

The Woman Suffrage Party is organised on the same lines as the men's political parties: that is, it is divided into wards and precincts, and (further) into smaller districts of so many "blocks" of houses. Captains have charge of each of these divisions or districts, with officers under them to organise the sub-divisions, in such wise that there is an active representative of the Woman Suffrage Party in charge of every group of houses. She keeps in touch with those inhabitants who belong to the party, and gets more to join. The thing is organised by personal work from top to bottom. It is magnificent.

English Suffragists will not be surprised to learn that the brain from which this statesmanlike scheme originated is Mrs. Chapman Catt. She founded the Woman Suffrage Party in New York, where it has had an extraordinary success, and already numbers between forty and fifty thousand members. Its president now is Mrs. Penfield; it has an organ of its own, *The Woman Voter*; and its activity in organising meetings and interviewing members of the Legislature is very great. It has spread to the other States. I met some of the noblest of its adherents in Chicago, one of whom (Mrs. Frances Squire Potter) has lectured in England, and will, I greatly hope, come here again. Mrs. Catt herself, of course, is absent from America on international business.

It is believed that the Woman Suffrage Party will not only help to win the vote, but will educate the voter; hence its organisation on the lines of the men's political divisions, the "wards" and "precincts." Women of the "Party" will understand the machinery (I use the word in its English, not its American sense) of government, and take their places in it without difficulty when the time comes. They will, moreover, have a programme to work for, ready-made. Though the "Party" is a Suffrage society, it takes a definite line also with regard to better conditions for women's work, and other problems of the day. This is all without prejudice to its primary object—the vote. If one may make a comparison, it perhaps more resembles the National Professional and Industrial Women's Suffrage Society than any other here, at least with regard to its general policy and line of action, though it is obviously quite different in constitution; while in the education in democracy which it gives to its members, I was proud to see a resemblance to our own N.U.W.S.S.

This is a very brief and "sketchy" account, indeed, of a great subject. English Suffragists will hardly need to be reminded how great, since it is the American Suffrage movement which has given us our first victory, in Wyoming, and our last, in California; the most important book in Suffrage literature since, "The Subjection of Women"—"Women and Economics," and our International President, Mrs. Chapman Catt. A. MAUDE ROYDEN.

The Dressmaker.

A little shadow of a being drifted into our house and out of it again three or four times a month like a wraith. She came to sew for us, and she was very pale and shy and small. She always dressed in black, as if she were permanently in mourning for the death of her kith and kin, almost all of whom had left this world. Her face was tiny; and scored, not with the bold lines of a life fully lived, but with the network of little crossed wrinkles that are caused by incessant anxiety. Her shoulders were much bent, her chest hollowed, and her thin body moved always quickly and nervously; she laughed in a timorous way, frequently, as if she were fearful of giving offence by lack of appreciation of her employers' jokes. She often laughed when no joke was intended. Her eyes had faded to a china blue, and her mouth was thin as if the lips had grown to the shape required for keeping the needful pins within them. Her hands, with fingers bent into the sewing form, were even more wrinkled than her face; and the skin round the nails was broken with housework. She was very communicative about her history, and glad to find someone who would listen with sympathy, for the telling of her story seemed to lighten its load. Her life had been very uneventful. There had been no "romance" in it, and its periods were marked by the successive deaths of her parents and sisters. It had been a life full of the continual visitation of death, and empty of the inspiration of birth, for neither her sisters nor brother had married, or done great things. Each one had been made first cadaverous, and worn, and unlovely by their common enemy—consumption—which then took them into the great silence. It had been a life of decay and ending, but the little dressmaker continued it with courage and

perseverance. Her family had always been "respectable," and when the rest of them were alive they had seen better times; but as their numbers had been lessened there had grown in her heart a great fear. And now that she was alone, and her earnings—because she had so little strength—were very small, the great fear became a nightmare brooding over her and governing her life. The great fear was her dread of the "Union." That she must keep out of the workhouse and not touch the small sum laid aside for "burial money" was her painful, ever-present thought.

She spoke often of a distant cousin who was her hope and comfort; she thought that when she could earn no more he would keep her from the last disgrace. He was a successful doctor with a large practice in London, and he sent her five pounds every Christmas as a present. "He's a real relation," she would say of him, "and the only real one I have; the others care nothing for me." By "the others" she meant his wife and family, and his brother and wife and family. "But they might not be cousins for all the notice they take of me," she used to say.

One day she came in great distress. Something about her dress gave it a greater air of mourning than usual. Her eyes were red with crying and her low voice caught with half-sobs. She came with the news that her one "real relation" was no more. "And now, how do I know I shan't end in the workhouse?" she cried. "Eh! how I'm hoping that the funeral won't be in London. It didn't ought to be, for he was born here; and, if it is, I couldn't go so far. . . . Oh! how I'm hoping I'm asked. But, if I'm not asked, I shall go anyway; and most, I hope I'm asked to hear the will." Her anxiety to attend the funeral was obviously prompted more by the desire to hear at the earliest opportunity what help in her unending struggle she would have from her dead cousin than by the wish—though that was very strong—to do him a last reverence. Her necessities were driving her. "If he's not left me anything," she continued, in her dreary, unmodulated voice, "I don't know how I shall get on without his five pound coming regular, for I always paid the rent with it. I can make for the food and that, but I can't make for the rent; it's too much. If I'm not asked to the will-reading I shan't know, perhaps, for weeks whether he's left me anything or not; and it will be just like them not to ask me! I don't expect them to ask me. . . . Do you know what makes me think they won't? Well, I'll tell you. I've only been in their company once—but it was enough. I went to a wedding of one of their daughters. It was he that asked me." (She always referred to the cousin who acted in a cousinly manner in reverential tones as "he.") "But I wished I had never gone, for they took no notice of me, and pretended not to see that I was there; and at the reception afterwards I could not find my lace among the wedding presents. I could

have cried—I could, really—for it was a good bit, too, that my grandmother used to wear, and that had been given to my mother and given to me. It was a lace collar, you know, and it would have made a beautiful transparent yoke to a blouse; and I wanted to give them a present, and I thought it was just the thing. But I couldn't find it anywhere, and, I suppose, they hid it—showin' they didn't know what good lace was!" These last words she added with a burst of the artist's contempt for the ignorant depreciator that was like a flash of the undeveloped being in her. "Then, in another room, set out on a table, there were all the things to eat—cakes and things, very fancy—and we sat round the wall, and the other daughters were all bustling about attending to the other guests, that were fine, you know. But they never saw me; and there was I, ready to drop because I had come a long way and had to have my dinner early to get off in time. But they never took no notice o' me; and, see, I never had even a morsel o' the wedding-cake; and I was that disappointed I was coming away without saying 'Good-bye' to anyone. But He met me in the hall, and said, 'Where are you going, Lizzie?' and he said, 'Nay! You're never going without any tea!' and he took me into a little side-room and I had my tea there; but I didn't want it. I felt as if I could have flung it in their faces—not his, you know, but the others. . . . You know, they think of nothing but appearances, and they'd never give away a penny piece if they could have their way. It's He who gives it, and they're always trying to stop him; they care for nothing but show. They don't care what becomes o' me."

Thus the worn voice—not bitterly, and very little complainingly, but rather as if it were merely stating facts—called up a vision of weeks of preparation for this wedding, of eager anticipation of it, of little contrivances to make a festive appearance, and generally to show that the humble dressmaker knew the duties of the wedding-guest as well as any other member of the wedding party. This had been one of the events of the dressmaker's life, and it had taught her what to expect from those relations who were not "real relations" at this other great event—her benefactor's death.

A few weeks later the little dressmaker looked so resigned and cheerful that it seemed things must have turned out exactly as she had hoped, but they had not. "Eh, no!" she said, her face clouding over at the memory of her trouble; "I got nothing. They put him away very fashionably in London, so I saw nothing of it; and I heard only a week ago. I never got a penny piece. They've been too much for him; they've been a-worryin' and a-persuadin' of him to leave it all to them, as he said they did, and he's given in to them. He was very good—but weak, you know," she finished, drearily; "and I don't know how I'm going to make my rent."

A. M. ALLEN.

NATIONAL UNION OF WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE SOCIETIES.

OBJECT: To obtain the Parliamentary franchise for women on the same terms as it is or may be granted to men.

METHODS: (a) The promotion of the claim of women to the Parliamentary vote by united action in Parliament and by all constitutional methods of agitation in this country. (b) The organisation of Women's Suffrage Societies on a non-party basis.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|
| <i>Hon. Secretaries:</i> | <i>President:</i> | <i>Secretary:</i> | <i>Hon. Treasurer:</i> |
| MISS K. D. COURTNEY. | MRS. HENRY FAWCETT, LL.D. | MISS GERALDINE COOKE. | MRS. AUERBACH. |
| MISS EDITH PALLISER (Parliamentary). | | <i>Hon. Secretary to Press Committee:</i> | MISS EMILY M. LEAF. |
| <i>Telegrams:</i> | "Voiceless, London." | <i>Hon. Sec. to Literature Committee:</i> | MISS I. B. O'MALLEY. Telephone: 1960 Victoria. |
| | | <i>Offices:</i> | Parliament Chambers, Great Smith Street, Westminster, London, S.W. |

From Headquarters.

The attempt which is being made by several of the daily papers to discuss the question of a Referendum in relation to Women's Suffrage is being dealt with in other parts of this paper. We wish, however, to remind members of the National Union that, in view of the pledges which have been received from Mr. Asquith, the discussion is wholly futile. Mr. Asquith promised that if a Women's Suffrage amendment to the Reform Bill were carried in the House of Commons, it would become an integral part of the Bill, and as such would be defended in all its stages. Nothing was said about a Referendum, and indeed nothing could have been said, to any purpose. The Referendum is not part of the British Constitution, and to make it so an Act of Parliament would be required, for which the present Government could scarcely claim a mandate. It seems improbable that the programme for next session, already weighted with Home Rule, Welsh Disestablishment, and the Reform Bill, will include so drastic a measure as a change in the Constitution. The question whether or not a Referendum will ever become part of our methods of Government does not now concern us, it can be discussed on its own merits at the proper time. For the present we are concerned with obtaining the passing of a measure of Women's Suffrage through the House of Commons in the ordinary way, and are likely to have obtained it long before the Referendum is part of our Constitution. In the meantime those who talk of submitting the question of Women's Suffrage to a Referendum talk of submitting it to a thing which does not exist, and they may rest assured that the Women's

Suffrage Societies will absolutely decline to allow their measure to be dealt with in an unconstitutional way.

K. D. COURTNEY.

The arrangements for the Albert Hall meeting on Friday, February 23rd, are proceeding rapidly, and it seems probable that the hall will be full to overflowing. Applications for seats should be sent immediately to Miss Strachey, 58, Victoria Street, S.W.

Press Department.

"REFERENCE TO OUR FILES."

January 15th, 1912.

The *Westminster Gazette*, which, in its own words, has "become the target of indignant reproaches and remonstrances," finds something humorous in the fact that the "solitary defender of its advocacy of the Referendum is a lady who is a keen and determined opponent of the Suffrage Movement"; we heartily agree, but neither the deplorably weak defence, nor the triumphant assertion of the *Westminster* that its files show that it had "actually before given Woman's Suffrage as an example of a suitable case for the Referendum," are likely to alter the opinion of Suffragists that it is a preposterous suggestion. It is not remarkable that the Referendum should have been mentioned previously, as Mr. Winston Churchill has already alluded to it. It is instructive, however, to note his reason for not applying it to such questions as those specially affecting "minorities which have a special point of view in which they are passionately interested, which might be brushed aside

The Labour Party, Independent Labour Party, and the Fabian Society.

Demonstration ADULT SUFFRAGE

TO DEMAND ADULT SUFFRAGE WILL BE HELD AT Royal Albert Hall, LONDON,

(MANAGER—HILTON CARTER). Under the auspices of the Three Organisations,

ON Tuesday, 13th Feb., 1912.

SPEAKERS—

WILL CROOKS, M.P. J. KEIR HARDIE, M.P. ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P. PHILIP SNOWDEN, M.P.

MARGARET BONDFIELD MISS MARY R. MACARTHUR MISS MILLICENT MURBY WM. C. ANDERSON (Chairman of the Independent Labour Party).

Doors open at 7.0 p.m. Chair to be taken at 8.0 p.m. prompt by

J. RAMSAY MacDONALD, M.P. (Chairman of the Parliamentary Labour Party).

SUPPORTED BY

GEORGE N. BARNES, M.P., WILLIAM BRACE, M.P., J. R. CLYNES, M.P., CHARLES DUNCAN, M.P., F. W. GOLDSTONE, M.P., J. O'GRADY, M.P., JOHN HODGE, M.P., WALTER HUDSON, M.P., J. PARKER, M.P., J. POINTER, M.P., T. RICHARDS, M.P., T. RICHARDSON, M.P., ALBERT SMITH, M.P., J. E. SUTTON, M.P., JOHN W. TAYLOR, M.P., J. H. THOMAS, M.P., STEPHEN WALSH, M.P., GEO. J. WARDLE, M.P., W. TYSON WILSON, M.P., and others.

Reserved and Numbered Seats in Boxes, 5s., 2s. 6d., 2s. Arena, 1s. Stalls, 2s. and 1s. Reserved Seats, Balcony, 6d. Tickets Free to Gallery (Promenade) on application.

Tickets to be obtained by Members only from the Offices of the Independent Labour Party, St. Bride's House, Salisbury Square, E.C.; The Fabian Society, 5, Clement's Inn, Strand; The Labour Party, 28, Victoria Street, S.W.; and all Branches of the three Organisations. All tickets must be purchased before night of meeting.

Our Friends Abroad.

Members of the National Union will remember that our Treasurer (Mrs. Auerbach) has been obliged to go to South Africa for a few months.

I have not been completely idle, and have all but succeeded in getting the question of Women's Suffrage discussed by every passenger on board. The captain very soon told me I could have the saloon for a suffrage meeting on every evening that I liked.

A ship affords a magnificent opportunity for propaganda. I wish we could keep organisers going to and fro on all the ocean liners!

I am completing this letter on shore just to let you know that I was greeted on arrival by a letter from Mrs. Solby, the Cape Town treasurer, telling me that she was getting up a meeting for me to address on Tuesday next.

Madame Schmahl, the eminent French Suffragist, who was one of our foreign visitors for the procession last summer, writes in a letter to Mrs. Fawcett:—

"I have followed with the deepest interest the divers phases through which the Suffrage movement has passed lately in England, and you have my warmest sympathy in this particularly difficult period."

In a letter also addressed to Mrs. Fawcett, Madame Bonnersés, President of the Suffrage Section of the Conseil national des femmes françaises, congratulates Mrs. Fawcett and the National Union on "l'éclatant succès parlementaire que vous venez d'obtenir."

Mrs. Fawcett has also received an interesting letter from Mrs. Chapman Catt (president of the International Woman Suffrage Alliance), who is making a voyage round the world in the interests of women's suffrage.

mind of that impression. We are two very strenuous, hard-working individuals, with scarcely time to sleep, and certainly none in which to sew our hooks on.

Foreign News.

Germany. Though the part played by German women in elections is as yet an inconsiderable one, they too are beginning to make their influence felt, and their help is being sought by the candidates of different parties.

This year the German Suffrage society celebrates the first decade of its existence, and a leading article in the "Zeitung für Frauenstimmrecht" is devoted to a retrospect.

In the intervening eight years events have moved fast. In 1908 the Association laws were reformed, and no external hindrances now stood in the path of progress.

Women Workers at Reading Biscuit Factory.

A magnificent demonstration was held in the Town Hall, Reading, last Thursday evening, when about 2,000 were present, to protest against

the action of Messrs. Huntley and Palmers' in dismissing a number of women and men who had joined their respective Trade Unions.

Women in Industry

Readers of THE COMMON CAUSE desiring information as to the conditions under which women work, should read the columns of

THE LABOUR LEADER

in which Factory and Public Health Law is explained by an expert.

ORDER FROM YOUR NEWSAGENT

EVERY FRIDAY. . . [ONE PENNY].

THE INTERNATIONAL SUFFRAGE SHOP. Fixtures! Sunday at Homes, 8.30 P.M. Will start on JANUARY 21st, with Lantern Lecture, Mr. J. J. Mallon on "Men's Wages & Women's."

THE PLAY PICTORIAL

An Artistic Souvenir of Popular Plays.

January Issue: FANNY'S FIRST PLAY.

Of all Booksellers, or direct from 6, ADAM STREET, STRAND, W.C.

"Thinking Women Read The Standard"

IN a few weeks this phrase has become a truism. Why? Order The Standard for a week, or a day, and you will see. It is because, since October 3, The Standard's daily news pages have included one headed:

"WOMAN'S PLATFORM"

which every Thinking Woman in the land, and very many thinking men, want to see and to study every day. "WOMAN'S PLATFORM" has ended what was called the "Press Boycott" of the serious interests of thinking women—not their ribbons and ornaments, but their thoughts, aims, claims, views, hopes, deeds, and—Work.

"WOMAN'S PLATFORM" in The Standard has already become the Thinking Woman's own medium in the Daily Press of Great Britain. All thinking women, modern women, are keenly interested in "WOMAN'S PLATFORM." They know that it is their own; they themselves determine how much it can serve their own interests by:—

- 1. Following "WOMAN'S PLATFORM" closely and day by day in The Standard, and using it freely in women's interests, as opportunity offers. 2. Inducing the largest possible number of the general public—men and women—to do the same thing, thus extending the scope of its services to women.

The Standard, 104, SHOE LANE, LONDON, E.C.

MARY BURY.

London Society for Women's Suffrage.
GREAT SURREY DEMONSTRATION.
PROCESSION (^{Wet or}_{Fine}) THROUGH RICHMOND,

SATURDAY AFTERNOON, JAN. 27th,
 TO CLAIM
Women's Suffrage in 1912.
MASS MEETING in RICHMOND THEATRE.

Chairman:
THE MAYOR OF RICHMOND.

Speakers:
THE LADY FRANCES BALFOUR,
MRS. HENRY FAWCETT, LL.D.
MR. PHILIP SNOWDEN,
HON. SIR JOHN COCKBURN, K.C.M.G.

Arena reserved Free for Processionists. Tickets (numbered and reserved)
 2s. 6d., (reserved) 1s. and 6d., and all information from Miss Mildred
 Watson (Organising Secretary), 156, Westbourne Terrace, W., and Mrs.
 Bailey, (Hon. Sec. Richmond Branch L.S.W.S.), 16, Marlborough Road,
 Richmond.

ASSEMBLE RICHMOND GREEN 1.30 p.m. Men and Women
 urged to join.

DRAMATIC ENTERTAINMENT

consisting of two plays:
"THE LADY GERALDINE'S SPEECH" (Beatrice Harraden),
 and
"THE LADIES' BATTLE" (MM. Scribe and Legoure),
 will be given in aid of the Eccles Society, on Tuesday, Jan. 23rd, at 7.30 p.m.
TOWN HALL, ECCLES.
 Tickets 2/6, 1/., and 6d.

Slightly Soiled.

12 Copies only of Volume II.

Bound in the colours, Red,
 White, and Green.

Price reduced to **5s.** each.

Office of "THE COMMON CAUSE,"
 2, ROBERT STREET, ADELPHI, W.C.

Deansgate Temperance Hotel,
Manchester. LARGEST AND BEST IN THE TOWN.

Most centrally situated.
 Manchester and Salford Cars to all parts pass close to the Hotel.
 PASSENGER LIFT. TWO NIGHT PORTERS.
 Re-decorated and re-furnished.
 National Telephone 5538 & 5539 City, Manchester.
STANLEY D. GORDON, Manager.

NEAR THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

KINGSLEY HOTEL

HART STREET, BLOOMSBURY SQUARE,
LONDON.

Well-appointed and commodious TEMPERANCE HOTEL, offering
 all the conveniences and advantages of the larger modern Licensed
 Hotels at moderate charges

Telegraphic Address:—"BOOKCRAFT, LONDON."

Printed by ODHAMS LIMITED, 93-4, Long Acre, London, W.C., for the Proprietors, The Common Cause Publishing Co., Ltd., and Published at 2, Robert Street,
 Adelphi, W.C. Manchester: John Heywood; Abel Heywood and Son; W. H. Smith and Son. Newcastle-on-Tyne: W. H. Smith and Son.
 Edinburgh and Glasgow: J. Menzies and Co. Dublin and Belfast: Eason and Son.

Manchester & District
FEDERATION.

A GREAT
WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE
BAZAAR

WILL BE HELD IN THE
Midland Hall, Manchester,
 ON
February 8th, 9th and 10th, 1912.

TO BE OPENED
 On the FIRST DAY at 12.30 by the RT. HON.
The VISCOUNTESS CASTLEREAGH.

CHAIRMAN:
 Councillor **MARGARET ASHTON, M.A.**

ON THE SECOND DAY AT 12.30 BY
The LADY FRANCES BALFOUR.

CHAIRMAN:
Sir GEORGE KEMP, M.P.

ON THE THIRD DAY AT 12 NOON BY
LORD EMMOTT,

CHAIRMAN:
Sir WILLIAM BAILEY, F.R.G.S.

HERR DRESSHER'S
VIENNESE ORCHESTRA.

EXCELLENT ENTERTAINMENTS.
 Catering by the Midland Hotels, Limited.

PRICES OF ADMISSION.

Opening until 4.30, Thursday and Friday, 2s. 6d.
 Until 2 on Saturday, 2s. 6d., afterwards 1s.
 Season Tickets, 3s. 6d. Children half-price.

BAZAAR to be open until 10 p.m. each day.

Any offers of help will be gratefully received by the Hon.
 Secretary, the Lady Beatrice Kemp, 85, Deansgate Arcade,
 Manchester.

Lounges and Spacious Dining, Drawing,
 Writing, Reading, Billiard, and
 Smoking Rooms.
 Bathrooms on every Floor.
 Perfect Sanitation. Passenger Lifts.
 Floors Fireproof Throughout.
 Night Porters. Telephone.

BEDROOM, ATTENDANCE, AND TABLE
 D'HOTE BREAKFAST, SINGLE,
 from 5/8 to 7/8.

TABLE D'HOTE DINNER, six courses, 3/-

Full Tariff and Testimonials on application