The text of the Appeal is as follows:—

AN APPEAL FROM WOMEN

Of all Parties and all Classes.

To the Members of the House of Commons.

Gentlemen,

Many of the women who sign this appeal differ in opinion on other political questions, but all are of one mind that the continued denial of the franchise to women while it is at the same time being gradually extended amongst men is at once unjust and inexpedient.

In our homes it fosters the impression that women's opinion on questions of public interest is of no value to the nation, while the fact of women having no votes lessens the representative character of the House of Commons.

In the factory and workshop it places power to restrict women's work in the hands of men who are working along side of women whom they too often treat as rivals rather than as fellow-workers.

In Parliament it prevents men from realizing how one-sided are many of the laws affecting women.

We therefore earnestly beg you to support any well-considered measure for the extension of the Parliamentary franchise to women.

All who have not yet signed should apply AT ONCE for forms for Signature.

SPEECHES

AT A

GREAT MEETING IN SUPPORT OF THE POLITICAL ENFRANCHISEMENT OF WOMEN

HELD AT

QUEEN'S HALL, LANGHAM PLACE

LONDON

ON JUNE 29TH, 1899

Published by the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies

Head Offices—

20, Great College Street, Westminster;

39, Victoria Street, S.W.;

5, John Dalton Street, Manchester.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

SPEECHES

At a Great Meeting in Support of the Political Enfranchisement of Women.

Held at Queen's Hall, Langham Place, on June 29th, 1899.

THIS was a meeting arranged to welcome the delegates from abroad attending the International Congress of Women, then holding its quinquennial session in London. Mrs. Fawcett, LL.D., presided, amongst those present on the platform were Mrs. Benson; the Countess of Aberdeen; Lady Henry Somerset; Miss Susan B. Anthony (U.S.A.); Mr. Faithful Begg, M.P.; Hon. Mrs. Arthur Lyttelton; Hon. W. P. Reeves (Agent-General for New Zealand); Mrs. Wynford Philipps; Frau Stritt; Mr. J. T. Firbank, M.P.; Sir Willian Wedderburn, Bt., M.P.; Sir Wilfred Lawson, Bt., M.P.; Mr. Walter Hazell, M.P.; Mr. W. Johnston, M.P.; Mr. Charles McLaren, M.P.; Mr. John Wilson, M.P. (Govan); Lady Laura Ridding; Dr. Beddoe, F.R.S.; and Mrs. Beddoe; Mrs. Carmichael Stopes; Mrs. Eva McLaren; Lady Helen Munro Ferguson; Miss Emily Davies; Miss Ellaby, M.D.; Hon. Mrs. Bertram Russell; Mr. and Mrs. Russell Cooke; Lady Grove; Miss Honner Morton; Mr. and Mrs. Fisher Unwin; Lady Marjorie Gordon; Mr. Dhadabai Naoroji; Mr. Mark Oldroyd, M.P.; and Mrs. Oldroyd; Lieut. Col. J. W. Lawrie, M.P., and Mrs. Laurie; Sir John Leng M.P.; and Lady Leng; Mr. and Mrs. Haslam (Dublin); Miss Blackburn; Mrs. J. C. Croly (U.S.A.); Miss Bunney (Secretary Women's Liberal Federation); Mrs. Charles Baxter; Miss Palliser; Miss Roper; (Secretaries to the National Union of Women Suffrage Societies).

The following Delegates of the International Congress also supported the Chairman on the platform: Mrs. May Wright Sewell (U.S.A.); Baroness Alexandra Gripenberg (Finland); Madame von F. de Mountford (Palestine); Mrs. Willoughby Cummings (Canada); Mrs. Frank Gibbs (Canada); Mlle. Monod (France); Mrs. Gawler (South Australia); Mrs. Armitage (New South Wales); Dr. Cecilia Grierson, M.D.

(Argentine Republic); Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Stetson (U.S.A.); Dr. Aletta Jacobs, Mr. C. V. Gerritsen, Miss M. G. Kramers, Mrs. Klerck van Hogendorp, Mrs. Rutgers-Hoitsema (Holland); Miss Ellen Sandelin, M.D. (Sweden); Frau Cauer, Frau Dr. Selenka, Anita Augspurg, Fräulein Pappritz and Fräulein Dr. Schirmacher (Germany); Mdlle Vidart (Switzerland); Fröken Gina Krog (Norway).

Mrs. Fawcett, LL.D., opened the proceedings by expressing the great pleasure it was to her, on behalf of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies, to welcome there that night, so many of the delegates attending the great International Congress of Women from all parts of the world. She regretted to have to announce two disappointments; Mr. Leonard Courtney, their staunch friend, was unfortunately detained in the House of Commons by pressing political work, and Dr. Cockburn, who had had charge of the Women's Franchise Bill, when it became law in South Australia, was unhappily prevented from attending owing to domestic bereavement. Mrs. Fawcett then went on to say: We are now at a moment of very exceptional interest. Within the last few days in London, there have been events of particular importance as regards the Women's Movement. I refer more especially to the Jubilee of Bedford College and to two great International Congresses which have been held in London, one of which is still in Session and many members of which we very heartily welcome among us to-night. Another interesting event, but one of a less satisfactory kind, is that which took place on Monday last, when the right of women to be elected as Councillors and Aldermen in the new London Bill was contemptuously rejected by the House of Lords. I think we may learn something from all these events. From the Educational Jubilee, we may learn courage and hope; who among those gallant pioneers who worked for the Educational Movement fifty years ago could have foreseen the great triumph of their cause? What prospect did there then seem of opening University Education to women in England and in nearly every country in Europe? To speak of our own country only, out of twelve Universities, nine are entirely open to women, and of the other three, two have opened their educational facilities and highest examinations to women. The fountains of knowledge are no longer sealed to those of both sexes who wish to drink of them. The work of opening the avenues of the higher education to women has been completely done; that should give us hope and should make us go on in the work on which we are engaged with unfaltering courage and determination. If we look for a moment at those two great International Congresses, I think that they, too, have their lesson for us. They show the enormous vitality and the strength of this

Women's Movement in which we are engaged. Probably every country in Europe, besides the United States, Australia and our other Colonies have sent representatives to these Congresses, giving an idea of the world-wide nature of this movement which has gradually changed the ideals of women and the general conception of woman's place in society. Now, if we look for a moment at the least satisfactory of the three events I have mentioned—I mean the rejection of Clause 2 of the London Government Bill by the House of Lords—I think we may learn something from that also. Unfortunately, the spectacle of the House of Lords pursuing the "Gentle art of making Enemies," is not altogether unknown in English politics. The House of Lords has given us proof of the extent of the disapproval with which they regard the work of women on elected bodies in devoting themselves to alleviating the misery and distress of the lowest and most miserable portion of the population. But if we look at this question, I think we shall find some consolatory aspects connected with it, to which I shall briefly direct your attention. First of all, I think this action of the House of Lords will have some effect in gaining us converts to the cause of Women's Suffrage. There are many fair-minded friends—men and women—who will say that if such treatment is to be accorded to women who have done good work in the past—that they are to be rejected with contumely from being allowed to continue that good work in the future—that is additional proof that the only safeguard against this kind of thing is the possession of the Parliamentary Franchise. In words, which during the last few weeks have been very frequently found in the press—though not in reference to our question—these events have proved that "the possession of the franchise is of the first importance," and when once it is carried, other grievances will redress themselves automatically without any further struggle. There is another source of consolation also to which I want briefly to refer. I feel, as would be acknowledged too by the majority in the House of Lords themselves—that the moral and intellectual weight of the House of Lords was with those who supported Clause 2. I refer particularly to the noble speech of Lord Salisbury, which in some degree compensates us for the disappointment we feel at the result of the Division. I feel that the speech Lord Salisbury made on our behalf on Monday night will go far in the future to place him in the same category as that in which a former great Prime Minister, Pitt, now stands in the estimation of his successors, from the fact that years and years before those causes were supported by any political party, he stood out before his King and country as the advocate of the abolition of the Slave Trade and of Catholic disabilities. I think Lord

Salisbury will occupy a similar rank in the estimation of the future by the fine stand he made for us on this question. There is one more point I should like to urge upon you, especially upon the attention of our foreign friends present to-night, and that is that the point argued in the House of Lords last Monday was not the question of Women's Franchise ; the question of women voting in the London local elections was not raised in any way. Even those who must sit in darkness and in the valley of the shadow of death as regards this question never had the temerity to raise a voice against the right of women to vote in these local elections. That battle has been won and won thoroughly all over the British Islands. What was done on Monday was the denial of the right of women to sit on Municipal Councils. The right of women to sit on these bodies is a very different matter—or rather I should say, the right of the London ratepayer to be represented by that person whom he feels is best fitted to serve him.

We often hear a great deal about the thin end of the wedge This seems to me a most unfortunate simile. We know what a wedge is—it is a foreign body of inanimate matter driven by force into an inert mass—generally also of inanimate matter, with the object of splitting or dividing it. Our movement does not represent anything of that sort. It represents an organic living force with all the strength behind it which vitality and vitality alone can give. We do not seek to drive into Society something foreign to its own nature. We claim to be a part of the Society in which we live, a living outgrowth of its energy ; and we find a proof of this in the fact that this outgrowth is to be found in every country of progressive Western civilization. If we look at Russia, Scandinavia, Holland, Belgium, France, Germany, or even Spain and Italy, and last, but not least, at the great English-speaking nations—the United States, the United Kingdom and her Colonies—we see in everyone of them that this Movement is a movement of living growth and vitality. It is this which causes us to feel that it is a power which will continue to grow in the future. I wish it had been possible at this meeting to call on representatives of all these nations to tell us of the progress of this Movement in their own countries. For obvious reasons, that was not possible, and therefore we have made this meeting a congratulatory one—a meeting of welcome to the foreign Delegates who are attending the International Congress. We shall ask a few of them to tell us what means they have found the most effective in carrying out the work in their own countries and bringing it to a successful issue.

Mr. Faithfull Begg, M.P., said: No one is more entitled to the place of honour on this occasion than Mr. Courtney, and I

exceedingly regret that his unfortunate absence should cause this duty to devolve upon me. The resolution I have the honour to move is as follows :

"That this meeting of Women's Suffragists of Great Britain and Ireland, offers a hearty welcome to delegates from all parts of the world, now attending the International Congress of Women, who have, in many instances successfully striven to promote the great movement for the recognition of the citizenship of women by opening to them the political franchise. We thank them for the grand lead they have given us, and we, in our turn, desire to give a good lead to those nations and colonies less advanced than ourselves. We feel that it lies with the United Kingdom and her Colonies, and the United States of America to carry forward and complete the principle of representing institutions, and to demonstrate to the world that the representation of the people, means representation of the whole people, and is manifestly incomplete as long as a whole sex is excluded."

As Mrs. Fawcett has said, in her opening remarks, we have succeeded, within recent years, in gaining a remarkable triumph, and I am very hopeful that, as time goes on, we shall be able to carry still further the object we all have so much at heart. Our Chairman referred to the consolatory aspects of the question at present. Perhaps it would not be out of place if I explained in a few words why I entirely agree with her that there are consolatory aspects, and that we have no reason to feel cast down. We all take the keenest interest in the question that has been discussed within the last few days. But I should like to point out that even in this there is a consolatory aspect, because, to my own knowledge, many persons interested in Women's Suffrage, and perfectly willing to grant votes to women, are not willing to go further ; and we must not be too hard on our friends who are willing to go with us on the question of the Suffrage because they are not willing to go a little further with regard to the London Government Bill. I should like to draw your attention, and particularly that of our foreign friends, to the reasons why there is much that is consolatory and much that is encouraging. It is true that for many years this question has been advocated, and success has not yet followed the efforts of friends of the cause. But, after all, the time that has elapsed since the reactionary period began is not a long time in the history of political movement. In 1832, a great blow was struck at Women's Franchise by the Reform Bill, and later, in 1835 and 1836, the Municipal Franchises were taken away. It is equally true that for many years it was impossible to restore these privileges. But in 1869 the Municipal Franchise was successfully restored, although the great prophet of the movement, John Stuart Mill, was unsuccessful in carrying his amendment. It may be said that in that year the low-water mark of the movement was

reached, and ever since that time there have been growing indications that we were on the upward grade, and progressing to a more rational and reasonable state of affairs. I need not refer to the passage in 1870 of the Married Women's Property Act. 1886 was the first occasion on which a Second Reading of a Women's Suffrage Bill was secured in the House. In 1888, women secured the right to vote for County Councils, and in 1894 to vote for Parish and District Councils, and in other parts of the Empire—in 1893 in New Zealand, and 1894 in South Australia—there was a recognition of the undoubted right of women to take part in Parliamentary elections. In 1897 we were once more successful in the House of Commons in passing a Second Reading of the Women's Franchise Bill by the very substantial majority of 71. I have thus rapidly traced the course of a reaction which has been both slow and tiresome, but it has been a reaction, the course of which can be clearly traced in the history of the country. You have also many proofs that the influence and intelligence of women have been appreciated in the country. In later years they have been frequently appointed upon Royal Commissions and Enquiries, and recently, by popular election, they have been returned as Poor Law Guardians and upon School Boards. But this not all. Have they not justified the confidence that has been placed in them? Have they not proved by their acts that they are competent as citizens to deliberate upon and decide the great questions that come before the country from time to time? Have they not graduated with success and distinction in our Universities? Last of all: I would remind you that this great Empire has been ruled over for over sixty years by a woman (cheers), and surely if the affairs of an Empire like that of Great Britain can be governed by a woman, her sisters ought to be entitled to a vote in connection with the Parliamentary Franchise. I will conclude by asking you to approve the resolution which I have proposed. The movement is progressive. Why should the movement stop? Logic is with us: those against us are the cynics and the sham friends of the cause. What state was ever saved by cynics? There is no question that the movement must go forward and must succeed. Mrs. Fawcett alluded to the great question agitating the world at this moment. What is the injustice which is disturbing the whole population of South Africa? Is it not the denial of the Franchise to the law abiding and tax-paying citizen? We have half a million of women Outlanders in England who are denied the Franchise. I say it is for them and those in favour of their claims to go on patiently and unremittingly pressing the demand that their claims should be granted, and I have no doubt whatever of ultimate success.

Mrs. Wynford Philipps, in seconding the resolution, said: It is nearly half a century since a famous woman, the wife of John Stuart Mill, published a little pamphlet declaring that women should be politically free, nearly fifty years since the first Women's Suffrage Congress was held in America. Now, on the threshold of the twentieth century, we rejoice to welcome here to-night the veteran leader from America, Miss Susan B. Anthony—(applause)—and the delegates from those generous young countries that have dared to do what we have dreamed of, and have justified in the New World the faith of the most enlightened thinkers in the Old. The International Congress gives a living answer to many pampered old prejudices and favourite old fears about what women will do when they come together for public-spirited purposes. I only wish people would cultivate their hopes half as carefully as they coddle and cuddle their fears! The Congress proves that women can take an interest in home affairs and in national and international affairs at the same time. Most arguments against Women's Suffrage need not be met; they need only be stated, for, like the Kilkenny cats, they devour one another. It is said that woman is too superior—that she is too inferior; that she is too angelic—that she is too earthly; that she is too Conservative and retrograde—that she is too Radical and go-ahead! Mr. Beresford Hope, in opposing the Woman Suffrage Bill in 1870, said the male intellect was logical and judicial, the female was instinctive and emotional, and that the instinctive and emotional had its own duties—to influence, to moderate, to suffer, but not to govern! Mr. Lang, in 1867, on the other hand, said he opposed the Suffrage on the ground that the instincts of all men were against it, and he had much greater confidence in instinct than in logic. From which we observe that instinct in man is a reason why he should govern, even to the extent of keeping women out of governing power, whilst in woman, it is a reason why she must not be permitted to govern, though she may very properly be permitted to suffer. Nowhere is this attitude amongst the lords of creation seen so clearly as when they are also created Lords—in the House of Lords only this week there has been set the harsh barrier of serried prejudices against the logical, natural, wise and righteous demands of women that they should have some share of government in this great city. It is said the vote would cause woman to leave her special sphere, the home—but does it cause man to leave his special sphere, his profession, workshop, business? What it would do is to bring into the home wider interests, deeper sympathies, and teach woman the needs of those less happily havened than herself in this great empire on which the sun never sets, but in the

shadow of which are many shipwrecked lives and many desolated homes. Woman is said to be "the angel of the hearth," then let her not sit so long with drooped and folded wings; let her spread the strong pinions of her extended sympathies and bear upward into better conditions the heavy burden of human want and human woe. It is said, too, that if women had a vote that men and women would disagree, and there would be serious domestic and social discord; but remember that men have never yet been found to agree on any single point whatsoever, and women have never yet been found to agree on any single point of any kind. Is it likely that at this late day they will at last learn to agree, only in order that they may disagree with one another? My earnest appeal to you women delegates from so many lands is to let no petty, personal, ephemeral consideration stand between you and the demand for this great reform. I beg you to persist in it, remembering that it is the only sure foundation of all you care for: the power to do right more efficiently, to obtain right more rapidly, to retain right more certainly, and without it, the structure of women's new and noble liberties is necessarily insecure and incomplete. The vote is sometimes spoken of as if it were a little thing, but it is not a little thing. Wrapped up in the heart and soul of the English-speaking people is the firm conviction that the vote is a great thing, the sign of worth and dignity—the possession of which puts a hall-mark of excellence upon a man. Five million women have had to enter the labour market, and there, suffering under many a disadvantage, woman is tried in the fire of life, and has she not proved herself of sterling metal? If that be so, then stamp *her* with the hall-mark! Rightly understood and rightly used, the political voice is the conscience of the nation, that still, small, but most potent voice, that may inspire the body politic with the living spirit of the people. Therefore claim the vote for women, that the structure of government may be breathed into by the animating spirit not only of the manhood, but the womanhood of the nation.

The Hon. Mrs. Arthur Lyttelton, speaking in support of the resolution, said: I stand before you here very apologetically instead of Dr. Cockburn, the great champion of women in South Australia. I can in no way fill his place, for he could have told you of the success of Women's Suffrage in that country, and one ounce of proof is worth a great deal of prophesied success. I have been asked why we devote so much time and energy to this propaganda instead of devoting ourselves to the more obvious good causes that lie before us. My answer is that not only does Women's Suffrage lie at the back of all these philanthropic movements and that none of them will succeed without it; but that there are in the lives of States as in the lives of

individuals, psychological moments, times when certain things ought to be done; and if they are not done, then the State or individual suffer for it. To my mind we are fast reaching one of these moments in the present condition of women in our country. Owing to the advance of civilisation, we have attained a very different position from that which we held fifty years ago. The increased safety of our streets, the use of steam, the general progress of civilisation, even the bicycle, has helped to change the position of women enormously in the last fifty years. Their freedom is now an established fact; but freedom without responsibility is a very dangerous thing, and this is fast becoming the condition of women in many parts of the world. I don't know if you have ever come across a certain poem of Keats called "Woman":

> "Oh, who can e'er forget so fair a being?
> Who can forget her half retiring sweets?
> God! she is like a milk-white lamb that bleats
> For man's protection."

When I heard that many of the Peers who voted against the Clause allowing women to serve on the new Councils, did so because the women they knew urged them to vote against it, I felt that those women wished to be considered as "milk-white lambs bleating for man's protection." The great difficulty in our way is that there is no one at this moment whose direct interest it is to press forward Women's Suffrage. Everyone—I speak more especially of the governing bodies of the male sex—is more afraid of what women will do than hopeful of what they will gain from the women's vote. Thus, if this great movement is to succeed, it must be through enthusiasm only, and it is therefore incumbent upon all who believe in it to work with their whole heart and soul and strength. We have, as I cannot but think, a very great amount of strong opposition yet to face, and it will be very hard work to overcome it. The adjustment of the relations of the sexes, like those of the classes, will take a long time to accomplish. When once Women's Suffrage is obtained we shall hear much less of the perhaps well-founded charge that we think too much of women's questions, and that we exalt ourselves at the expense of men. We do so because persons who are oppressed are always self-asserting, and the way to prevent this self-assertion is to put them on a level with men. We ought to be inspired by the presence here of friends from all parts of the world to work with more vigour and more enthusiasm. The century is waning to its close, but I hope the childhood of the next century will see Women's Suffrage an accomplished fact, and that with it there will come a higher, stronger, nobler, and, I confidently believe, a more Christian view of the relations between men and women.

The resolution was then put and carried by acclamation.

Miss Susan B. Anthony (U.S.A.), who was received with prolonged applause, the audience all rising, in responding to the resolution said: Mrs. President, Officers and Members of the Suffrage Societies of Great Britain and Ireland and of all the world over, I wish I might be worthy of the honour which Mrs. Philipps gave me of being one of those who, more than fifty years ago, assembled in the little town of Seneca Falls, New York, and made the declaration that the right to vote is the under-lying right, the one which protects all other rights. But I was not there. Lucretia Mott was there, and Martha C. Wright, whose daughter sits beside me, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton—all signers of the call for that first Convention. I hear all these women and the men also, asking, "Why is it that when this first proclamation for the ballot was made in the United States more than half a century ago, other countries are getting ahead of us?" Well, I can assure you there are many reasons. It is not from any lack of hard work and persistent effort on the part of the handful of women who have stood at the front of this movement in our country; but the complications are very unlike those in your own country. Suppose that here in England, after all your labours and after your magnificent champions—from John Stuart Mill and Jacob Bright down to Mr. Begg—had worked in your Parliament for years, had urged the enactment of a law, and succeeded in getting it through the House of Lords, that the question then had to be voted on by every elector in the mines, the factories and the rural districts of every county of England, how much would you expect to get all at once? And that is the difficulty with us.

Our revolutionary Fathers proclaimed equal political rights. At first they made practical application to a very few men only, and during the more than a hundred years' battle in our country, those great principles have been gradually extended to one class after another. In the beginning only Church members voted, then only rich men, then only white men, then only men; that is, we had an aristocracy of the Church, then an aristocracy of men of wealth, then an aristocracy of white men, and at last we now have an aristocracy of *men*. We are simply demanding to-day the application of our fundamental principle of political equality to the other half of our citizens. We are asking for nothing new, but simply for the practical application of the old doctrine that was declared by Hancock and Adams and all the old revolutionists, who rebelled against King George because he insisted on taxing them without giving them the right of representation. We are insisting to-day that the men of the United States shall no longer continue to violate their principles—to

tax women and deny them representation. We have what you might call forty-five Englands; that is, we have forty-five States, and each State Legislature must first pass a resolution submitting the question to be voted upon by the men of that State. We have succeeded in gaining the Franchise in four States of the Union by this slow process.

Another hindrance I want to mention to you: every single year, over a quarter of a million of foreign born men are landed on our shores, fresh from the monarchies of the Old World, who know nothing at all of the Declaration of Independence, of the principles of free and equal government, and we have, as General Grant once said, a "big job on our hands," we have to educate a quarter of a million of men every year into the principles of our American Institutions. And I want to say to you, my good friends, that in everyone of the fifteen States in the Union in which the question has been voted upon, if only the native born men had had the franchise, the women in every one of them would have had the ballot to-day. I am not sorry that those men who do not understand our Institutions have the right to vote, for they never would understand them if they had not that right. So we must wait with patience this slow process of education. And we have been very patient; in our half century of agitation and education we have gained Woman's Suffrage in four States! And besides that, women have Municipal Suffrage in one State, a vote on matters of taxation in several others, and School Suffrage, to a greater or less extent, in twenty-three States. In over one-half of the States of our Union, women are voting to-day. In Louisiana, one of the old Slave States, on the sixth day of this month, women taxpayers in the city of New Orleans, for the first time in history cast their ballots on the question of taxing the people of that city for the purpose of building sewers and improving sanitary conditions. The men were so considerate of the women when they made that constitutional provision, that they arranged for them to vote by proxy if they were too modest to go to the ballot box. When some of the women attempted to get a proxy they learned that, by the law of Louisiana, a married woman's name on a certificate would not stand, and therefore they were compelled to go to the ballot-box.

The distance we have gone in the last fifty years is beyond computation. Before I sit down I will tell one little incident illustrating the condition of things when we started. I had been a teacher in the State of New York for fifteen years—from the age of fifteen to thirty. A State Teachers' Convention was held in my city of Rochester. Over a thousand women had gathered in that Convention and perhaps two hundred men. Up to that time no woman's voice had ever been

heard in one of these Conventions; only men had reported the result of their experience, because it was considered improper for a woman to speak in public. Those men appointed a committee to prepare resolutions, and one of these declared that teachers were not respected as were ministers, lawyers and doctors. In discussing that resolution one man declared that the profession of teacher was higher than that of a doctor, of more use to the community; another, that it was higher than that of the lawyer, and a third even affirmed that it was of more service to the world to train the young than it was to try to reform them after they had been brought up in a crooked way. "And yet," said these men, "Ministers, lawyers and doctors are treated with the greatest respect, invited into the best families, often elected to high offices, whereas schoolmasters are treated slightingly, and are often called Miss Nancies and old grandmothers!" I listened with a great deal of interest, and at length—having been born and reared a Quaker, and always taught that God inspired a woman to speech just as well as a man—I rose in my seat and said, "Mr. President!" The President was a Professor of Mathematics at West Point, a pompous man, wearing a blue coat, brass buttons and buff vest. He stepped to the front of the platform and, inserting his thumbs in his armholes said, "What will the lady have?" The idea never entered that man's cranium that a woman could rise in her seat and address the chair just like a man! And I said, "Mr. President and gentlemen, I would like to say a word on the question under discussion." "Then," said Professor Davies, "What is the pleasure of the Convention?" And he looked down to this little handful of men on the front seats, never casting a furtive glance to the thousand women crowding that hall. One man moved that the lady should be heard, and another seconded, and they discussed the question for half an hour! At last, by a very small majority, it was decided that the lady should be heard, and I managed to say: "Mr. President and gentlemen, I have listened to your discussion with a great deal of interest, but it seems to me that none of you quite comprehend the cause of the disrespect of which you complain. Do you not see that so long as Society says a woman hasn't brains enough to be either a minister, a lawyer, or a doctor, but has ample brains to be a teacher, that every man of you who teaches school practically acknowledges that he hasn't any more brains than a woman?" and sat down. As I passed out of that hall at the close of the Session I heard many a woman whispering to another, "Who is that creature?" "Where did she come from?" "I was never so ashamed in my life, I wished the floor had opened and swallowed me up!" They were honest, they really believed

it was degrading to a woman to speak. The next morning Professor Davies, in calling the Convention to order, assumed his pompous position and said: "I have been asked why it is that women are not put upon the committees, why they are not invited to prepare reports, and so on." And then he continued: "Look at this magnificent hall, at the beauty of the entablature, the symmetry of the shaft, and the strength of the pedestal. Could I be instrumental in dragging from its proud elevation that beautiful entablature and rolling it in the dirt and dust that surround the pedestal? No, Heaven forbid!" And he was quite sincere, and really believed that if a woman stood in an audience and spoke she would be degraded to the level of a man. Exactly so now, men are afraid that if women vote, if they hold office, if they sit in Congressional and Parliamentary halls, they will degrade themselves to the level of men!!

The Hon. W. P. Reeves said: Unlike previous speakers I make no pretentions to eloquence. You do not expect me to deal with the past or with the future, to tell you the long story of oppression and injustice in the past or to soar upwards into the glorious hopes and possibilities of the future. You want me to tell you about the common-place, work-a-day present. Yet there is some satisfaction in dealing with an actual fact, and I have come here to speak about the work of Women's Suffrage in two British Colonies. Is England proud of her Colonies? When it comes to telling foreign nations of the grandeur and growth of the British Empire I hear Englishmen say that our Colonies are very fine things indeed—vigorous, robust, progressive, and even great; but when it comes to taking a hint or two on domestic reform from those colonies, of profiting by example—then, one hears that they are small, young, a long way off, and peopled by an inexperienced race. Well, they are some distance away, and they are young countries. But it does not follow that everyone in a young country rejoices in the first bloom of youth. The British Colonies are peopled by men and women who are uncommonly like the people of the mother country; they are of the same race, profess the same religion, read the same books—to some extent even the same newspapers—wear the same dress, are governed in many respects by the same laws, even share the same prejudices and obey some of the same social conventions: and they are uncommonly proud of it. True, the white people of New Zealand number but three-quarters of a million, and the people of South Australia about half that number. Yet I cannot help thinking that as they are distinguished by industry, sobriety, obedience to the law and a general wholesome condition physically and morally, that it may not be beneath the dignity even of the people of this great

metropolis, to study their experience and institutions. Female Suffrage has been the law in New Zealand for between five and six years. Now when a child is five and a half years old no doubt it is rather soon to predict what sort of a man or woman that child will become, but I think you may predict, if it is robust and well-grown, that it has a good chance of living a healthy, good and strong life. Female Suffrage is a very healthy youngster indeed; it has come to stay in New Zealand and South Australia, and so well and comfortably does it work in both Colonies that the only complaint raised against it is it has not produced the revolutionary results its opponents predicted. They expected a tornado; they only met a gentle breeze; and they have the bad grace to complain of it. I do not mean to say that it necessarily follows that when Female Suffrage becomes law in this country—as I hope and believe it will before very long—that exactly the same complaint will be made after five years; but exactly the same sort of evil predictions as I have heard here, were launched at the head of the movement at the Antipodes before it became law. We heard exactly the same tales about neglected children, abandoned husbands, vile cooking, untidy houses and a general falling off of feminine grace, sweetness and charm. None of these evil effects have come about; social life in New Zealand is very much the same as it was before, and if at election time a man finds that the lady next to whom he sits at dinner is able to talk in a practical way about the political questions of the day—that certainly does not make dinner time duller or less interesting. What has been most striking and noteworthy of all has been the cool rational good sense with which woman has applied herself in our part of the world to discharging her duties as a citizen. This she does very much as rational men do, and on many subjects takes the same sort of view. A previous speaker remarked that one objection advanced in this country against Women's Suffrage is that women's intellect is instinctive and emotional. I daresay that in her relations with man, woman displays an amount of sympathy and self-sacrifice that makes her seem—to man—a very instinctive, emotional and irrational creature; no doubt she treats him a great deal better than he deserves. But it has occurred to me sometimes, whether man in his relations with woman—especially younger men in their relations with younger women—may not sometimes seem to a woman to be a little instinctive and emotional also? I can well imagine that the younger of my sex do not always seem to be the most severely logical of human creatures in their relations with the younger of the opposite sex. But it is an actual fact that in the Australian Colonies woman has taken her part as a citizen on common sense and business lines. After five

years of the Suffrage I can truthfully say that New Zealand is more prosperous now than she has been at any time during the last twenty years. You may take my word for it that the five and a half years of Women's Suffrage in New Zealand has only strengthened the conviction with which the majority of that colony passed the law which initiated it. And as it came suddenly, almost as an agreeable surprise, to those who had hoped for it over a long series of years, so I venture to believe that it will come suddenly and unexpectedly some day in England; and though I daresay some of the enthusiastic supporters of the movement may have to confess, after five years' experience, that it has not brought about the millenium, still its opponents will have to confess that the heavens have not fallen and that the empire still stands where it stood.

Frau Marie Stritt (Germany) followed. She said: As the only speaker here to-night representing one of the less-advanced nations—for, as you doubtless know, German women have not as yet arrived at the point of demanding political rights, at least, the demand has not been officially put on their programme—you may think it a presumption on my part and humiliating for me to speak to the resolution. But I feel by no means humiliated, for I hope not only to lay clearly before you the reasons why we are apparently so far behind in the Suffrage question, but also to prove to you that German women have clearly recognised the nature and aims of the movement for the emancipation of women, and that we are in harmony with our sisters all over the world in the conviction that we shall and can attain our full human rights only through our full civil and political rights, and by taking part in the legislation of our country. Constitutional and Parliamentary reforms are, comparatively speaking, new and strange conceptions on the horizon of the Germans. The German citizen's right to vote, to take his share in the government of the country, is to-day still looked upon as a valuable acquisition rather than as a national right, and is, to a certain extent, only considered as a reward for his general military duty.

This aspect has of course asserted its influence also on the German Women's Movement; its first bodies considered the Suffrage not so much the foundation, as the sheltering roof of the house of the future to whose building they contributed the stones. They were of opinion that women should first make themselves fit for the Suffrage by better education, by all professions being open to them, but that means of fitness, as the English and American pioneers always thought, and as the younger German leaders agree, can only be gained by the Suffrage. That Suffrage belongs rightly to the tax-paying woman citizen just as surely as it belongs to the tax-paying man; without that right women

must at best content themselves with only fragments of their full human rights. An exclusively male legislation cannot do justice to the other half of society. When the first Women's Suffrage Bill was brought before Parliament, Louisa Otto—whom we call the mother of the German movement—and others, openly dwelled upon the necessity of the Suffrage, but recommended that those claims should no longer be brought, or even mentioned for the present. They were afraid on the one hand of rousing the worst feelings of the German men, accustomed for long years to absolute lordship, on the other of intimidating the German women, accustomed for long years to humility and suppression. These tactics have been followed for nearly thirty years, but things have changed, and we have at last learned that too much prudence may tend to imprudence, and that to avoid misunderstanding, things should now be called by their right names. But the generally unfavourable and negative results in our Reichstag regarding questions such as the opening of Colleges, Universities, and liberal professions to women, labour legislation for women, etc., constantly give us fresh proof of how badly the interests of our sex are watched over by men, and that women can only be effectually represented by women themselves. So to-day, we openly say this in our women's journals and pamphlets, at every Convention, even at those of the National Council which can only deal with subjects on which all the members heartily agree. In short, we propogate the principles of Women's Suffrage at every opportunity, but only, I am bound to say, as an ideal claim.

The reason why no Women's Suffrage Society exists in Germany, why no Women's Suffrage Bill has been presented in Parliament does not lie either in the want of knowledge or foresight of the leading persons, or in cowardly fear of public opinion, it lies in external circumstances. There still exists in most German States a special law forbidding school-boys, ministers and women to take part in any political society or political meeting. That is to say, no woman may become a member of any political society and the presence of a woman in the meeting of a political party can cause its dissolution by the ever-present police-agent. Thus, you see, an insuperable obstacle still stands between us and throwing down of this barrier to the freedom of our sex. Our National Council, which at the present time represents the woman question in Germany, at its last Convention in Hamburg, unanimously resolved to take its stand for the Suffrage. I hope that at the next International Congress, we may be able to announce a hopeful commencement of the action taken by German women as the inevitable struggle for their right of self-government. Till then we cannot do better than rejoice heartily in the great results

our happier sisters are obtaining in the Suffrage movement. No one takes such a heartfelt interest in your struggles and victories as we German women do. Our movement is an International one, our question, a question of humanity, so we greet every fresh vote for the Suffrage Bill in the English Parliament as a vote given in our favour. We see in every new star on the banner of the American women a star of hope which has risen for us too, which shines also upon our future and the future of our children.

Lady Henry Somerset said: It was not a woman who was pleading against her wrongs or claiming her rights, but one of the broadest-minded and best-balanced intellects of this generation, who said that "the demand that woman should have the vote was the first organised protest against the injustice which has brooded over the character and destiny of one half of the human race. No where else," said Wendell Phillips, "under any circumstances has a demand ever yet been made for the liberties of one whole half of our race."

We have only to trace the history of all enlightened government to see the evolution by which it has come slowly from a past of tyranny and a reign of force, and has little by little expanded under the light of religion and civilisation, and each reform as it came forward, has been combatted by the inherent selfishness of those who desired to maintain existing conditions against justice and right. First, the freedom of all classes had to be established; then the freedom to obtain the necessaries of life; then the freedom of expression of thought and opinion; then the freedom of religious conviction—inch by inch this liberty has been fought for, by those who have been in every succeeding generation the pioneers of wider thought. In every struggle the social fabric of the past has been against the progressive movement of the future.

It is, therefore, no wonder that a reform that strikes a vital blow at the whole social fabric of every nation is slow in coming—so slow, that to some it seems an almost hopeless delay: but although every year brings to some of us the thought that we are individually, perhaps less likely ourselves, to see the righting of this wrong and the triumph of justice, I am not sorry that time intervenes; for time means much to woman at this present crisis; time means education, a juster understanding of the real principles that underlie the demand, a truer conviction of the necessity of reform.

The day has almost gone when it is necessary to make any statement as to the justice of the principle that women, as tax-paying members of civil society, are entitled to the same privileges as tax-paying men. Granted for a moment that woman is intellectually inferior, that it is impossible for women

to look upon great questions with the same balance as men, that it would be impossible for any woman to attain the intellectual heights to which men have climbed—I am not at all disturbed by these arguments. The humblest and the feeblest man has civil rights which are denied to women. There is no competitive examination among men for the vote, for this would infallibly eliminate a large proportion of voters whose intellect (although male) is at best mediocre. I understand that a man votes because of the eternal justice of the principle that taxation and representation must be co-extensive; that burdens and privileges must go together. It is the basis, I believe, of the government of all free countries.

Woman may be essentially different in intellect from man; but at any rate none on reflection can deny that the average woman ranks with the average man: that if a man's privileges are not accorded to him by any measure of intellect, while our civilisation allows a woman to hold property, to be the guardian of her children, it seems almost within the range of possibility that she would be likely to be able to vote as well as a man on whom is thrown the same responsibility.

But there is one point that proves conclusively the fact that where responsibility is given to woman she has not failed. Consider the Queens that have been great in history, women who rank amongst the greatest monarchs the world has known. They were not picked women, not women chosen because they were intellectually supremely greater than most of their sex, but women to whom the accident of birth brought the responsibility. Can you deny the statesmanship of women, with such examples as Queen Elizabeth, Queen Anne, Maria Theresa, Catharine II. or Margaret of Austria? And gathered as we are to-day in the mother-land, have we not a supreme instance of this in Queen Victoria? It is necessary, therefore, to admit that when responsibility has been thrown upon woman she has proved the equal of man.

Again we are told that the responsibilities and cares of woman bind her so completely that is impossible that her mind should be at liberty to consider and weigh the different questions which should affect her views in political life. Allowing that the woman's responsibilities are heavy, and granted that her work must absorb nearly all her time, even then to my mind the objection has no weight. How about the responsibilities of men in professional life? The doctor who has a hundred lives hanging in the balance, and whose thought is day and night engaged in their physical cure; the head of a college on whom rests the care of hundreds of young men: the general who has to plan his campaign: the merchant whose mind is absorbed with schemes of speculation. They have still sufficient leisure left to consider political questions and to vote.

And then there is another argument perhaps more specious, and that is that woman may safely trust all her interests to the watchful care of man. No one is more fully aware of what women owe to men than I. No one deprecates more the tendency to range the interests of women's questions as against the interests of men. The whole status of woman would have but little interest to me if it were not to my mind a part of the great human question in which is involved the happiness and welfare of mankind. The question is not only, Is it best for women, but, Is it best for men: and my feeling strongly is that while I believe men have legislated in many instances fairly on questions pertaining to women, it is absolutely impossible for them to understand the intricacies of a woman's position as woman can herself.

Why is it that women inspectors have been an infinite boon to the factory? Why is it that women Guardians have been a blessing to the workhouse, that their presence on Vestries has been of value? Because there are details and aspects of every question better understood by women, and this is not narrowed down to municipal life alone, but on the great social questions womens view's would be in many instances likely to be more correct, more practical, than the views of men. Moreover, all who feel strongly upon social legislation realise that woman's vote is essential to the welfare of the State, just because these are the questious that would keenly interest the woman voter.

But then men turn to what they believe form the interest of the largest proportion of women. They say, "Look at the fashion papers, look at the literature that woman reads, and tell me that the average woman is fitted to be a voter." I do not wish to compare the frivolities of women with the frivolities of men (sometimes we would wish that the follies of men could be called by a name as innocent as that), but I merely wish to emphasise the fact that responsibility is the greatest instrument for education. We have all seen it again and again. We have seen an empty-minded man or woman hold out hands to accept some serious responsibility and from that hour become changed. The frivolity is gone, the responsibility has moulded the character, and the very questions that seemed to be uninteresting and unimportant have become vital.

And if this is so, by what right is woman to be denied the education of responsibility? It may be true that man is ready to represent her politically, but he bears none of the burdens that are attached to her citizenship. When a woman is left with her young family, no man comes forward to pay her taxes. When a woman is sentenced by the law, she bears her own punishment; no man bears it vicariously. The women of Germany and of Italy labour on the highway and the harvest

field; in France you see them tilling the soil. I have not noticed that men think it necessary to relieve them of the burden of labour. They are very willing that woman should take her place in sharing the world's toil.

The charge of the children is considered to be woman's peculiar domain, and those who oppose our movement lay more emphasis on this than on any other aspect of the question. "What can a woman want more," they say, "than to fulfil her mission in educating and caring for children?" But I maintain here again that woman's interest in this her special domain has not been protected. A woman's child is only her own so long as that child is born under shameful conditions (and then the child, so wrongly called illegitimate—for there is no illegitimacy save in the relations of the father and the mother—belongs to the woman); but if for any reason it is impossible that the woman should remain with the father when he is her husband, if his drunkenness or brutality makes it obvious that he is unfitted for parental duty, the child, until she can prove her case, belongs according to the State solely to the father. A little while ago, a father had the power to will away the child from its mother, and although the laws have been greatly remedied in this respect, they still remain in a most unsatisfactory condition. A woman goes into a court of law handicapped, not because she has not an equal case to prove, but because she has to start with the assumption that the children are not hers but belong to her husband, and therefore, to obtain their custody, she has a double burden of proof to produce. Many other points might be cited in which it is obvious that in those very departments which are woman's chief sphere, her interests have not been guarded.

What are the questions that are involved in the government of any nation? Our relations with foreign countries, our finance, the religious, educational, and moral questions that affect the social life, the sanitary state of our cities, streets, and houses. I do not think that anyone can be complacent with the conditions that we have arrived at even during the reign of the progressive ideas of this last century, or seriously satisfied with the vice and misery that surrounds thousands of our population, with the swarming multitudes of children growing up in densest ignorance, with the worn and weary men and women whose life is sweated in underground cellars, with the hopeless starving multitude who are many of them driven by their conditions into lives of vice and sin, with the harrowing, heart-breaking social problems that meet us at every turn. These rise up before us to tell us that the government of the past has not been an unmitigated success: and it may be that when the intellect of woman, differing as it may from that of

man, is brought to bear upon some of these questions, the best interests of the masses will be involved in their political emancipation. No one who has watched the marvellous ingenuity of the woman to whom the earnings of, say, 15*s*. a week are entrusted, to be expended on a family of eight or nine, all of whom have to be fed, clothed, and provided for in every particular—can have failed to observe that woman is an adept at solving some of the most difficult financial problems; and this responsibility is placed upon her in almost every home among the working classes.

Another objection that is constantly advanced is that the political differences that might exist between married people would render the exercise of her political responsibility dangerous to domestic happiness. But I would urge, Is there not at the present moment often conscientious difference of opinion between married people on highest points of duty? Women are allowed independent religious opinions; they may change their religion after marriage, and there is no question upon which more bitterness can arise than differences of religious views. But I do not think it has ever been urged that for this reason a married woman should have no religious individuality, but rather I believe that with a better education and a juster view of their relations, there will be more mutual toleration as individual responsibility increases, between the man and woman who each recognises the other's opinions, intellectual attainments, and duties.

But whatever may be the arguments that can be advanced against the proposition to give woman her political freedom, I believe that we must ask ourselves on this as on all other questions, if there is a principle of right or wrong involved, if there is not a sense of justice that should turn the scale: and if it is true that the education, the responsibility, the readjustment of property law, and a thousand other questions, must force us to the conclusion that the time has come when such freedom must be given to women, and such responsibility entrusted to them. Then I believe it is for all to side with the right, to trust God, and we shall see in the end that such trust will prove to be expedient.

It has been well-said that "our sense of justice will dictate that the being who is to suffer under laws shall first personally assent to them," that the being whose industry Government is to burden, should have a voice in fixing the character and the amount of that burden; and I believe that when responsibility is accepted, not from human hands but from that Infinite Wisdom which establishes the rules of right, those who most dread the effect of woman's political emancipation will realise that far from deteriorating her character, it will have unfolded

her moral nature, and that as she studies the great human questions with which she is called to deal, she will become more prudent, more sagacious, under the stimulus and check of responsibility.

But there is another reason why I feel that the vote given to women will be of inestimable benefit, and that is because I think it ought to tend to create a greater accord between the moral standards of men and women; for if woman is to mould a new life, it must be that instead of increased responsibility dividing the ways, it should bring them nearer together; for every cause, no matter what it is, that separates man and woman, every interest that divides them does not make for the best good of any nation. Has not this curse been most deeply demonstrated where men have been divided from the community for military purposes? Around the soldier's camp there has always been the greatest amount of evil and temptation, and the best hope that has come to the last years of this dying century is the message of peace that seems to us as a herald of a better day. Nothing will do more to break down the power of war than the influence of woman, who necessarily must be opposed to all that endangers the lives of those she loves; and I believe that when the age comes, in which a woman can say, "I am part of the State, I am a part of the industrial evolution, I am a part of everything that a man values, I think his thoughts with him, I can follow him in lines of philosophy or philanthropy or history or science," then will come that better union which alone can bring mutual happiness and self-respect. The Arabs used to say of a good man that "he is a brother of girls," and I would never speak upon the question of woman's responsibilities or woman's rights without recognising how much man has done to open the great doors of the future to the ideals to which we are looking.

But it is impossible for me to close these words without admitting that I do not wonder that sometimes there is hesitation in the minds of the best, as to the expediency of pressing forward. If I believed that the admittance of women to wider responsibility was likely to endanger the most sacred ties of life, instead of promoting a truer understanding of their value, I too should hesitate; for I believe that no one can with impunity lay a finger on the ark of the solemn mysteries of life, which are ordained by God Himself; and when I hear proposals that these sacred ties should be bartered for financial remuneration, and schemes by which mothers are to be merely recognised agents for replenishing a country's population, then I feel that woman herself has built up the highest barrier to her own interest.

I do not say I believe that there cannot be a wider and a

better understanding of the mutual responsibilities of marriage, and the mutual duties involved in the tie, that the best chances of happiness must be the cultivation of the best in each, so that each may help in the development of the other; but I maintain the profoundest conviction that the ideal of marriage must be preserved, that it must be guarded as a sacred institution, grounded on the truth of the divine nature that is in every human being as the absolute principle upon which the whole ethical character of family life rests. "Marriage," says Hegel, "is essentially a spiritual relation," and if we are going to attempt to treat it as a mere contract, as something that relates only to the interest of property or to the furtherance of individual opportunity, the result will be the utter destruction of social life and disaster to the community. I am well aware that on the individual may sometimes heavily fall the penalty of these principles, but none the less, they are ordained by God Himself, and on them He has founded the whole up-building of our family life.

I recognise in standing here to-day, that I have round me some of the keenest intellects, the best-balanced brains, and the hardest workers among women from all lands. I understand, in part, the immense amount of work for humanity that has been accomplished by them; but yet I should be false to all that I hold dearest, to the principles that are nearest to my heart, if I did not say quite plainly that from my soul I deplore that women are often silent now to-day, from a mistaken liberality, which is, I feel, but faithlessness to the cause of Christ; for I realise, perhaps more deeply than ever, that woman's strongest influence lies in the fact that she must be loyal to the Christianity which has been from its outset a "woman movement," and here quite briefly I would like to ask you to look back a moment and consider whether it is not Christ who uprooted the social system of paganism, and whether He did not recognise man and woman on equal terms?

Plutarch represented advanced thought among the Greeks; but as to the rights of a wife, he said, "A wife shall have no friends but those of her husband, and as the gods are the first of friends, she should have no gods but those whom her husband adored." And it was an old Stoic who laid down the proposition that woman "in every kind of affairs and obligations, whether in behalf of men or women, is prohibited from having any concern." It was upon this social foundation that the reform was begun by the Lord, and it is owing to His teaching that Society now recognises the right of a wife, repudiates free marriages terminating at will (which were common among the Romans). For however much the Church may have been held back by the trammels of superstition, wherever the Gospel has been purest, wherever Christ's golden rule has been best

understood, the progress of religious sentiment has continually tended towards the assertion of the independence of woman. Lecky, in speaking of Christianity has well said, that "in no other important movement of thought was female influence so powerful or so acknowledged."

There comes to me a deeper sense of responsibility as I realise that I stand here to-day in the place of one who did the widest and greatest work for woman's welfare in this generation. I do not even except the veteran whom we honour here to-night, Susan B. Anthony, for Frances Willard brought to the heart and conscience of woman as none other has, her deep responsibility to the world around her, and the intimate relations between the home and that larger home circle which we call Government. Her voice is silent here to-day, for she has been called to wider spheres of work. And there comes to me also the responsibility of knowing that the messages I can give to such gatherings as these will grow fewer. Thank God there are others to take our places abler and better; but with the years also, there comes to me I think a deeper understanding of woman's high and holy calling. I realise how the solemn vicissitudes of her life have helped to confirm her faith in the beautiful realities of the Unseen: how in the hours of pain and danger, when her steps lie along the borderland of this closely-curtained world, the gift she brings is the more sacred because it comes to her when the veil was thin between her and eternity: that the little life that lay in her arms has done more than all theories and arguments to keep hearts loving and unworldly, true to the interest of the race; that in these deepest and most sacred experiences lie the safeguard of our social life. I do not dread the future, for that anchor holds. As Christian women, we need not fear, but go forward with loyal trust to claim all the responsibility that God has for us. The happy, protected lives will give of the abundance of their joyful knowledge to enrich the world; the sad and lonely will use their sorrowful experience to bless others, and so shall be themselves enriched.

And to me this question of women's privileges and rights and responsibilities is part of a better understanding of the law of love each to each, given to the world by His lips Whose Gospel has lifted us up into these heavenly places, Who was a Brother to the Marys, and Who in His hour of mortal agony did not forget His mother, for it is a Hand pierced by the sorrows and sins of the world that points the way.

Sir William Wedderburn, Bt., M.P., moved a vote of thanks to Mrs. Fawcett for presiding, which was seconded by Sir Wilfred Lawson, Bt., M.P. Mrs. Fawcett briefly responded, and the meeting closed by singing a verse of "God Save the Queen."

LONDON
WOMEN'S PRINTING SOCIETY, LIMITED.
Whitcomb Street W.C.