

CB Drawer II

376-121

(P) 324⁶²
17985

Reprinted from THE NINETEENTH CENTURY, January 1918.]

3111599278

LET WOMEN SAY!

AN APPEAL TO THE HOUSE OF LORDS

THIS is first and foremost an appeal to the House of Lords to deal courageously with the Woman suffrage clauses in the Electoral Reform Bill, and in the second place an appeal to Conservatives, Conservative men and women, of all classes, and, if one may put it so, of all parties, to strengthen their hands in doing so.

For in using the word Conservative I desire to use it in a sense as nearly non-party as possible. Both the great parties in this country are in my belief necessary and indispensable, since they represent permanent tendencies in the national life. Without Conservatism in the true sense, the 'Bolshevik' becomes our master; without Liberalism in the true sense, the forces of authority and government become a despotism, and mankind sets up a Kaiser—or a Collectivist republic.

We, in this country, through the Electoral Reform Bill are about—if it passes unaltered—to cripple disastrously the indispensable Conservative forces in this country. But to the reconstruction after the War, to the well-being even of the Labour Party itself, a due balance of power will be essential. The immense admission of new male voters to the register is itself a great step further in democratisation, which I, for one, have no fear of whatever. It comes as a climax of a long transforming process, which began in 1832. It has taken 85 years to achieve the full enfranchisement of the men of this country. Has it been at all too long? Has not the whole process been a gradual and natural one, providing, broadly speaking, for the political education of the old voters before the new are taken in? I believe that few political students would deny that this slow development of the male electorate has been on the whole greatly to England's advantage.

But now, at a time when not one single woman possesses the Parliamentary vote, it is proposed to confer it at one stride on *six millions* of women. At a time, also, of supposed truce between parties and political interests; when it is a matter of simple good faith between the Government and the nation that no controversial legislation should be attempted during the War, and when

the Home Rule Act has been hung up for this very reason—together with a dozen other vitally important matters.

This then is the moment when the chance majority of three or four votes in the Speaker's Conference, combined with energetic party wire-pulling behind the scenes, and with a wave of sentimentalism in the House of Commons, which women in general, and the Suffragist leaders in particular, are the first to ridicule and disavow, has brought upon the nation, at one stroke, the most controversial, the most revolutionary of all possible changes—viz. the admission of six million women to the franchise of the British Imperial Parliament.

Let me substantiate the word 'revolutionary.' We are about to do—unless the Lords intervene—what no first-class European Power dreams of doing—neither France nor Italy, our Allies, neither Germany nor Austria, our enemies. Russia indeed has granted universal suffrage to men and women alike. The spectacle of Russia at the present moment must surely make the keenest democrat a little uneasy as to some of his or her favourite doctrines. We may learn at any rate, writ large, as we watch the Russian situation, what the vote of large masses of men and women, on whom the burden of political responsibility is suddenly thrown, can achieve in the way of destruction. Can anyone say that the experience is one to make the prospect of wholesale political change in any old and long-settled country more attractive or less anxious? Magnificent, on the whole, as the support given by the British working-class to the great causes represented by the War has been, are there not dangers, many and serious, ahead?—to none more threatening than to the more educated and more experienced strata of the workmen, and those dependent upon them. They stand to lose quite as much as the richer classes by anything that brings about any undue extension of what one may call without offence the 'Bolshevik' power in the State—the power, that is, of the less educated, and more excitable, the less skilled, and less responsible elements in our population.

At the same time we have this to consider. The less educated and the less skilled of our male proletariat have for the last three years given their blood and life without stint in England's struggle for existence. Whatever the risks may be of such national disturbance as may accompany the full admission to political citizenship of these as yet unenfranchised sections of her male population, Britain knows very well that she must face them and face them gladly. Men who on a thousand stricken fields have met death and mutilation, and almost intolerable hardship, for months and years together, have indeed earned their vote! Men who are called on to die for England are good enough to vote for her.

'Welcome'—says the country, to these new man and boy citizens who long before the Munitions Act was passed—and since—have gone into the very jaws of death to save her; and she says it with a full heart.

Moreover during these three years, the majority of these new voters, and thousands of the old, have been passing through the fierce discipline of war, which has made of them—as we know very well, who have watched the lads of our villages depart, and re-appear on their brief 'leaves'—new men, with a new self-consciousness and a new outlook upon life. Not brutalised by what they have seen and borne!—but sobered, trained, developed, with eyes opened to the greatness and variety of the world.

Well, the male supporters of Woman Suffrage, beginning with the Prime Minister, have been saying in the House of Commons—'Perfectly true, as to men. But—as to desert—women are in the same case. Look at what they have done for the War. They are making munitions, they are doing skilled engineering work, they are driving motor-cars, and staffing public offices—they too have earned the vote, and we will give it them, first as a reward, and then as an industrial protection after the War.'

Yes—they have done everything, but that *one thing* which we who have opposed the Parliamentary Suffrage for women *in this country*, have always maintained that, much as they might desire it—and who doubts the high heart of women!—it was impossible for women to do. The invasion of this country, or the victory of her enemies in the field, has only been prevented by the offering of life itself, by the blood and muscle, the physical endurance and suffering, which has alone, in the case of men, stood between Great Britain and destruction. The physical force argument—that physical force is the ultimate sanction of the Parliamentary vote—stands stronger to-day than ever.

Yet we are now proposing to give to women the vote which, if not to-day, then to-morrow, will enable them to decide, as a majority of the electorate, if men shall fight or not fight; and, whether the excitability of women is turned towards war, as in the Berlin of 1914, or towards peace, as in the Russia of the present year, will enable the organisers of the women's vote, aided by a male minority, to impose their decision upon a male majority.

And this is being done in the absence on military service of three millions of men, and of more than a fifth of the House of Commons!

'But the women voters will not be a majority,' says Mr. Walter Long. 'We have taken good care of that. Of course it would be a disastrous thing if there were a majority of women voters in Great Britain. But look at the age limit. That protects us.'

Can any reasonable man suppose for a moment that this slight barrier can last beyond the next Parliament? Mr. Henderson and his friends, to whose strong political pressure on the Government while Mr. Henderson was in the Cabinet the attitude taken towards the Woman Suffrage clauses—an attitude which ensured their success—is believed to be due, will take good care of that. The women's vote, to them, is merely so much electoral material which they mean to use for the purposes of the Labour Party, and if it does not yet give them all they want, one of the first uses they will make of the largely increased representation to which they are looking forward in the House of Commons will be to lower the age limit. The National Union of Woman Suffrage Societies, also, have officially announced their intention of agitating for the next step. 'Votes for women on the same terms as they have been or may be given to men,' was their object before the War. They will not have attained it, they say, 'even when the Representation of the People Bill has gone through; and they will, of course, continue to work for it.' Meanwhile the Prime Minister and Mrs. Snowden are at one in ridiculing what Mr. Lloyd George clearly regards as a temporary concession to the Conservative elements in the Coalition which supports him.

By the Parliament after next at the latest, we shall be face to face with the further demand, and the Labour Party by the help of the women's vote will be easily able to enforce it.

The majority of women voters over men which would then result is variously estimated. But given the war death-rate of men, in addition to the normal peace majority of women, and adding to it the inevitable withdrawal from an election, at any given time, of male voters who are doing the Empire's business abroad, the majority of women over men, I am told on the best expert authority, could hardly be less than two millions.

II

What have been the motives governing the Ministry and the House of Commons in what they have so far done?

Let us look at the matter fairly—and give every weight to the genuine sympathy and appreciation which was felt by the House of Commons for the work which has been done by women in the War.

But after all the business of the British Parliament and a British Government is *to provide for the safety of the British State*. On an impulse of good feeling, they have no right to give away what is not theirs to give—i.e. the interests of the future.

Meanwhile let anyone go into a great munition factory and try and find out what are the incentives which have brought these rows of bright and active girl-workers crowding to the lathes.

'They like the high wages and the excellent conditions of course,' said the Superintendent of a Government shell-factory to myself—'but there is much more than that in it!' They are working for their brothers and sweethearts, their fathers and husbands. They are working indeed with their hearts—the vast majority of them—for those they love; and all of them—small blame to them!—for the wages which mean a spending power they have never yet possessed.

What women of any nation could do otherwise—what women in the Allied countries are not doing as much? Yet the women of France and Italy, toiling in the fields, at munitions and in public offices, are not putting forward a great political claim, on the ground of their work, in the midst of a hideous war. Nor is it being put forward for them. They know what their men have suffered—how far more than themselves; they know what the effort of the men has been in the War, how infinitely greater than their own. So do our women; and if it had not been to the interest of a political party—who saw their opportunity—that this proposal should be made, this particular reason for it, at any rate, would never have been advanced by women themselves. Mrs. Fawcett has expressly repudiated it; though Suffragists in general have no doubt been glad to take advantage of the national enthusiasm.

But the War will end, we pray, some day, and male enthusiasm, which is rather an insult to women than a compliment, will die down. But the vote—with all its consequences—if the Bill passes in its present form will remain. *All its consequences for women and children*, above all. But to that I will return.

And for a time at least, till that majority of women voters over men, to which Mr. Long tells us he would never have consented, has been realised, only an insignificant fraction of the women who have done the work will under this Bill get the vote. The brave girls in the munition factories, the girls who have gone to France, the girls who are on the land, the Nurses and V.A.D.s, who are doing heroic work for the wounded, are, as a rule, many years under thirty. The change is being made and the vote is being claimed in their name. Supposing the Bill goes through, it will be many years before they get any advantage from it. But among the women who will immediately benefit—if it is a benefit—by their work, will be the women, who, in many cases, have not deserved well of the nation at all, the multitude of rich and middle-class idle women, above thirty, who, as the streets and shops show, still spend their mornings and afternoons in shop-gazing and gossip, and are doing no work for the War at all.

So much for the first plea put forward by those who voted for and supported the suffrage clauses in the House of Commons.

I do not doubt its sincerity on the lips of many good men for a moment. *But the real motive power behind the clauses*, so far as the House of Commons, and political parties are concerned, *has been simply political calculation*. Let my own party—the Conservative Party of Great Britain—take note of it.

Originally, when it was a question of the Conciliation Bill the calculation was all on the side of the Conservatives. As a prominent Unionist leader said to me a little while ago—'My Unionist friends used to say to me—"Why do you oppose it? It is we who shall gain from Woman Suffrage." They speak very differently now!' And indeed I think a considerable uneasiness among Conservative Suffragists, male and female, as to what they have helped to do, is already visible.

For clearly it is the slowly reached, but now fixed conviction of the Labour Party that Woman Suffrage, *in the form they have at last succeeded in giving to it*, is going to carry them into the Socialist promised land, which has been the real power at work in the Parliamentary Transformation Scene.

There have been, of course, many contributory causes; the genuine fear—for one—of generous-minded men, that women, without the vote, will be at a disadvantage, industrially, as compared with men, after the War; plus the unworthy fear of a renewal of Suffragette disturbances, if the question is not settled now.

But if the British State is not to be sacrificed to what I have called an impulse of good feeling, it is still less to be sacrificed to an impulse of fear—or rather the mere impatient wish to get rid of a nuisance.

III

And all this time nobody has thought of asking, with any thoroughness or system, *what women themselves desire*. The membership of the Suffrage Societies before the War was somewhere about 100,000. The imposing advertisement put out by them last July may be doubly discounted, (1) by the fact that the long array of Trade Unions and Trade Societies mean simply what has been already stated in this article—i.e. that Labour, and some of the most extreme sections of Labour, stand to gain largely from the women's vote, *as now proposed*, and still more, as the woman's vote will be, supposing the Bill becomes law, a very few years hence. And (2) by the equally true fact that the manifold women's societies named in the list are to a certain extent 'women in buckram'—that is, as everyone who has ever had much to do with social work knows, the same women, active, clever, and fanatically Suffragist, belong to a good many of them, and naturally wield a great influence. They vote as delegates on Suffrage

resolutions which in many cases have nothing to do with the purposes for which they were commissioned, and the real opinion of the various societies for social work, which they represent, supposing their members were adequately polled, must always remain extremely doubtful. This certainly was the case with the National Union of Women Workers, at the time when I belonged to it, before the War.

But now—*now!*—we have at last the means of ascertaining with some adequacy and exhaustiveness the real opinion of women. A fortnight ago an amendment, conceding the Municipal franchise to the wives of the present municipal electors, as well, of course, as to the present women ratepayers, passed the House of Commons *nemine contradicente*. The Bill, as the Speaker's Conference left it, contained the astonishing absurdity that while six million women were admitted by it to the Parliamentary franchise, no extension whatever was made of the women's Local Government franchise, which stood at about a million and a quarter. In other words, the wife of a workman, with very deficient education, with no time to read newspapers or go to public meetings, was to vote upon the details of a European peace, or the maintenance or dismissal of a British Government, of which she might not even know the names, or measures of revolutionary change affecting our fundamental institutions; but she was to have no voice in the administration of the schools to which her children went, or of the Evening Classes which were to fit them for the higher forms of work; in the housing and sanitation of the districts in which her employment and her husband's compelled her to live. She was to be left still without direct influence, in short, on all the manifold subjects bearing on her daily and practical life, which are dealt with by the enormously important Local Government vote; while she was to be given a free hand as a voter in the great Imperial questions, which, in nine cases out of ten, given the conditions of a working woman's life, it would be simply impossible for her to understand. Suffragists and Anti-Suffragists combined in the House of Commons to draw the attention of Sir George Cave to this extraordinary feature of the Bill. An amendment was brought in on Report, and passed without a division. Indeed it is well known that the most convinced Anti-Suffragists have incessantly worked and spoken, before the War, for the extension of the Women's Local Government vote. It has long been my own personal conviction that if the development of the public power of women had been steadily pursued along Local Government lines, instead of through the Parliamentary suffrage, infinitely greater results would have been obtained for the life and well-being of women than could ever be gained by the Suffrage movement.

The influence of John Stuart Mill, of Mr. and Mrs. Fawcett, and a very able group of Cambridge women, in the early days of the Women's Education movement, directed that movement towards the delusive aim of a sham equality with men, which in the course of years, as we see plainly from later developments, has become one of rivalry with men, tending in the case of many women to a position of active sex hostility. Whereas what the State really needed, in the field of public work and progress, was the complementary action, through different institutions, of men and women.

The unanimous vote of the House of Commons, a few weeks ago, together with the steps taken in recent years, and heartily supported by anti-suffragists, for increasing the number of, and removing restrictions on the election of women candidates to local bodies, brings into view two possible consequences among others.

First—nothing would be easier, with so large a constituency of women voters in the background, and with the increased number of women representatives on Local Government bodies, which is sure to result from the increased number of women voters, than to secure some Statutory body, chosen from these representatives, and brought into close connexion with Government and the House of Commons. Such a body, if it came into existence during the coming year, would probably have much more direct effect upon questions affecting women's labour after the War, than the use of the Parliamentary vote, entangled as it must be with a mass of Imperial questions and interests, would ever enable women to obtain.

This, however, I only throw out by the way.

The vitally important consequence which immediately affects the Bill before Parliament is that we have now got, through the large and unexpected extension of the Local Government vote, *a wide and democratic body of women*, whose registration will be put in hand at once, and from whom a really valuable Referendum vote can be taken.

I submit that this introduces a wholly new feature into the case.

One of the chief objections put forward on the Suffragist side to the adoption of a Referendum on the subject of Woman Suffrage used always to be that no adequate or recognised body of women existed from whom a Referendum could be taken.

That objection is now removed. The new Women Municipal Voters will provide such a body.

And hundreds of thousands of women throughout the country will be heartily grateful to the House of Lords if they will use their revising power to insist that these Women Suffrage clauses, fraught as they must be with immense and incalculable results for

the British State, shall not be passed into law before the opinion of women, at least, has been asked upon them.

The women of this country have indeed every right to be consulted before this thing is done. It is a step unique in our history; and the nature of the British Constitution, together with the circumstances of our Imperial power, makes it a peculiarly anxious one. Women throughout Great Britain are very anxious about the future; and especially while this vast struggle continues, are they troubled about the political and military safety of their country. The assimilation of three to four million new male voters by our loosely balanced Constitution, which has none of the checks and safeguards of the Constitution of the United States, and under which matters of the most vital moment to the State may be decided by a few hundred thousand votes, will of itself certainly strain our political machinery, and in ways which we cannot yet foresee.

Are we at the same moment to add to the risks entailed by the sudden admission of millions of mostly very young men to Imperial responsibility and power, the further risk of six million women voters, among whom nobody will deny that the average of political knowledge and experience is and must be—because of the conditions of their sex—much lower than the average among men? Do British women really desire to take the first step, which given the population conditions of Great Britain, and the aims of the extreme Labour Party, as lately defined by Mr. Henderson, must ultimately lead to a government determined by women—under Socialist guidance?

Let me appeal finally, as I began, to the true Conservatism of the nation, which exists in all parties, and is indeed our great protection against the risks of advancing democracy.

Sir Henry Maine insisted that 'Democracy is the most difficult of all Governments.' At a moment when the difficulties of democracy are thrown into ghastly prominence by the course of events in Russia, are we going deliberately to increase our own difficulties and risks in this country?

Well—*let women say!* That is my plea. For it is women's concern. It is mere bare justice to refer the question to them *before it is decided.*

That brings us to the Referendum.

I do not propose to discuss the Referendum in detail. The pros and cons of its use were much before the country in 1910 and 1911; and Lord Balfour of Burleigh's 'Reference to the People' Bill showed how it might be applied here. And politicians of all parties have frequently recognised, even when generally they disapproved of the Referendum, that Women's Suffrage was one of those rare and exceptional subjects to which it might safely be applied.

In this case I believe and hope that the whole course of controversy will tend to bring the Referendum to the front. The line taken by the Opposition in the House of Lords cannot indeed be exactly predicted. But in the end it looks as though the serious struggle will come on the question of a Referendum. The rules of the House of Lords will admit no doubt of the insertion of a Referendum clause in the Bill itself. But the rules of the House of Commons, under the Speaker's recent decision, will not allow the Commons to accept it, even if they wished, when the Bill returns to the Commons. At this point to have a Referendum Bill ready for immediate and simultaneous passing through both Houses would seem to be the policy most likely, *if the House of Lords stand firm*, to secure the actual reference of this great question to the people—*above all to women*.

For the Women's Referendum is in fact all that matters. If they really wish for the vote, no subsequent Referendum to men will deny it them. Nor would any of us who, in the interests of our sex, have opposed Woman Suffrage, continue to fight any further. But there is in fact no evidence as yet, worth the name, that more than a very active but comparatively small minority do wish for it.

IV

Assuming however that a majority exists in the House of Lords who are opposed to the grant of the Parliamentary franchise to women on its merits, or that a majority exists who would favour on its merits a submission of this issue to a Referendum, it remains to be considered whether action of this kind would be desirable in the interests of the House of Lords, and whether it could be carried through without damage to the cause of stability and order, and without adding fuel to revolutionary fires. Is the fact that this change was carried by a very large majority in the House of Commons a conclusive reason against any action in the contrary direction by the House of Lords?

In the view of the extreme sections of the Labour Party, as Mr. Henderson has lately explained, the acceptance of Woman Suffrage paves the way for 'revolution.' Its rejection by the House of Lords, or preferably its submission to the country by Referendum, on the initiative of that chamber, involves therefore an exercise of power which is not merely legitimate according to Unionist views of the Constitution, but is far smaller than the power conceded by the authors of the Parliament Act. That statute allows the House of Lords to delay for three years a measure which has already been submitted to the country at a General Election, and which is sent up by a House of Commons fresh from contact with the people. In this case the proposed

action refers to the people a measure which has never been submitted to them, and which is sent up by a House of Commons which has three times prolonged its own life, is seven years old, and is less representative than any House of Commons since the seventeenth century.

It must however be recognised that action by the House of Lords will no doubt lead to an agitation in the country by the Labour Party and the Suffragists. Why should this be feared? They are responsible for raising the controversy: they themselves made the proposal for 'stealthy, unconsidered, precipitate change,' the very thing against which Mr. Asquith, as he said when he introduced the Parliament Bill, desired to provide a constitutional check. It should however be borne in mind that their agitation will be most effective against a mere blank negative on the part of the House of Lords; and will be largely disarmed if that House provides definite statutory means for the free decision of the issue by the people themselves.

The Peers have it in their power, if they stand firm, to insist on a Referendum. The Bill is required as an indispensable preliminary to the next General Election. The Government and the House of Commons will be under the strongest inducement to accept any reasonable changes made by the House of Lords, since the alternative is the loss of the Bill. I submit that the consultation of the country—but especially of women themselves—through a Referendum, is a reasonable change.

V

Perhaps in presenting this appeal on behalf as I believe of many thousands of my fellow country-women, I may be allowed a last personal word. Ever since the seventies and eighties of the nineteenth century when I first began seriously to think over this question of Woman Suffrage, I have been absolutely convinced that Woman Suffrage was the wrong and not the right way to secure the welfare and progress of women, and that while a real equality of power in the State, dependent on a balancing of functions and of rights, might be obtained for women, through education, local government, industrial and social organisation, and the constantly increasing co-operation of women of all classes with Parliament and the Government, through these same great agencies,—nothing could be achieved, through Woman Suffrage, that could not be better attained in other ways; while it seemed to me certain that Woman Suffrage would tend to make women the mere political tools of men, and thereby to endanger the stability and safety of the British State.

Thirty years and more have elapsed, and I am quite clear that time has only strengthened the reasons expressed in the Manifesto

of 1889, published in these pages, of which, if I remember right, I wrote the greater part. Let me sum up in the shortest possible way what it seems to me these thirty years have proved :

(a) That women may just as safely as men leave their interests in the care of a man-elected Parliament of Great Britain. If their interests have sometimes been ignored amid the pressure of party politics, so have those of men. But, on the whole, the words of Mr. Asquith are still abundantly justified—'I challenge comparison of our Statute Book with any code of legislation in any part of the world in regard to the degree of protection and care which it gives, not only to the property of women and to the status of married women, but to the position of women workers.'

(b) That not votes but economic conditions and collective bargaining govern wages. The leaflets now being put out by the N.U.W.S.S., in which almost every class of wage-earning woman is promised increase of wages through the vote, seem to me one of those offences against truth and knowledge, on the part of those who know better, which are hard to forgive.

(c) That real improvement of the moral life and sex relations can only be achieved through religion, through education, and the growth of public conscience; and that as a matter of fact all the legislation of recent years on these subjects has reflected the advancing ethical conscience of both men and women. Much, I can well believe, is still to do, but it will be better done if women remain an independent and spiritual influence outside politics, than if they are themselves a haggling and bargaining force within it. Their increasing and legitimate power in such matters, closely connected as it is with their increasing education and training, is a solid proof of this.

(d) That the life of women being inevitably, by reason of their child-bearing function, turned inward towards the home, and that of man turned outwards towards the maintenance and government of the State, anything which involves the direct interference of women with the special function of men must in the long run be disastrous.

(e) That the majority of women over men in these islands is at the present moment so large, and will be so greatly increased by the War, that neither men nor women ought to venture any step leading to an electoral preponderance of women in a State with the Imperial responsibilities and the vast risks—as this War has shown them to be—of England.

(f) That the loosely knit Constitution of this country, where, up till now, little more than a few hundred thousand votes may decide an election, makes the addition of the greater ignorance of women to the ignorance or carelessness of certain sections of the male electorate, a far greater danger than it would be under the

Constitution of the United States, or in one of our Colonies, where men largely outnumber women, and the complicated problems of Imperial Government do not arise.

(g) That after thirty years of Woman Suffrage in the United States, the results are either negligible or disastrous. The Suffrage States cannot show any advantage over the non-Suffrage States. Colorado is much worse governed than Massachusetts, and no real connexion has been made out between drink, or any form of vice and corruption, and the denial of the Suffrage. Divorce is more rife in the Suffrage States than in the non-Suffrage. The wages in Colorado are 47 per cent. of the wages of men, whereas in Massachusetts they are 62 per cent. Out of 16 Prohibition States, 12 have adopted it with only men voting, and only four with the aid of women. And so on. The facts are by now so striking that the Woman Suffrage speakers are abandoning the 'results' argument and falling back upon that of 'natural right.'

(h) Lastly the history of the Women's Social and Political Union, and of the agitation conducted by them before the War, confirms all that older controversialists have said or prophesied as to the greater excitability and lawlessness of women when submitted to the strain of politics, than of men.

Such it seems to me are the hard facts which the past thirty years have brought to light. Another 'hard fact' for myself, no doubt, is that my view about the Suffrage has divided me in opinion, though not in feeling and affection, from many friends with whom I have worked in social or educational questions. Upon them and upon those advocates of the Suffrage generally, whose sincere and passionate belief in their cause I deeply respect, I would urge with all the earnestness of which I am capable, that should the House of Lords ultimately stand firm on the Referendum, they should join with us in endeavouring to ascertain the real opinion of women. If they are right, and women do overwhelmingly desire the Parliamentary vote, as shown by a Referendum decision, then the Suffrage will come with a general acquiescence and desire to make it work that nothing else could give. If not, do women wish to coerce women in the name of liberty?

So we come to the final plea—

Let women say! We appeal with all our hearts to the justice and determination of the House of Lords to seize this opportunity which the action of the Commons on the Local Government Vote has so happily offered.

MARY A. WARD.

PRINTED BY
SCOTTISWOODE, BALLANTYNE AND CO. LTD.
LONDON, COLCHESTER AND ETON.

0837842

The Cavendish Bentinck Library.

at

WOMEN'S SERVICE LIBRARY
FAWCETT HOUSE,
27, WILFRED STREET,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1.

W.I.