

National Society for Women's Suffrage.

OCCASIONAL PAPER,

*Issued by the Central Committee, 10, Great College Street,
Westminster.*

CONTENTS.

- Notes of the Session.
- Debate in the House of Commons on Sir Henry James' Amendment.
- Division List.
- Conversazione.
- Opinions of the Press.
- Future Efforts.

JUNE 1st, 1891.

London:
 JOHN BALE & SONS,
 WOMEN'S PRINTING OFFICE, 87-89, GT. TITCHFIELD STREET,
 OXFORD STREET, W.
 1891

NOTES OF THE SESSION.

The Central Committee consider that it may be useful and desirable to present to their friends and subscribers a brief narrative of the events of the past few weeks, especially the circumstances which led up to the loss of the day for the second reading of the Parliamentary Franchise Extension to Women Bill.

It was generally understood that Mr. Woodall had obtained a first place for the Parliamentary Franchise Extension to Women Bill on May 13th. Fears were, however, entertained that this date might be absorbed by the Whitsuntide holidays. Mr. Haldane subsequently obtained a place for a resolution on the question on April 24th. It thus appeared that a debate either on Bill or resolution was ensured during the Session.

A vote on a resolution is, however, no more than the expression of an abstract opinion; the Central Committee, therefore, had, early in the Session, resolved to leave no effort untried to secure a division on the Bill rather than a resolution, and to this end a memorial, with many influential signatures appended, had been prepared, and a request made to the First Lord of the Treasury to receive this at the hands of a small deputation of ladies. Mr. W. H. Smith named April 20th as the date on which to receive the deputation, which was introduced by Viscount Wolmer, M.P., and consisted of Louisa Lady Goldsmid, Mrs. Fawcett, Miss Emily Davies, and Miss Helen Blackburn.

Mr. W. H. SMITH, in acknowledging the memorial presented by the deputation, gave the assurance that the House would not adjourn until after May 13th, and that, unforeseen contingencies apart, the Government

had no intention of taking the day for Government business.

The Parliamentary Committee met later in the same day, when the result of the deputation was communicated to them. The following members were present: Mr. Ainslie, Col. Cotton-Jodrell, Baron Dimsdale, Mr. Penrose Fitzgerald, Mr. Sydney Gedge, Mr. Haldane, Capt. Edwards Heathcote, Mr. Johnstone, Sir Rainald Knightley, Mr. Lafone, Mr. McLaren, Mr. Round, Sir Richard Temple, Sir Edward Watkin, Mr. Alfred Webb, Viscount Wolmer, Mr. Woodall.

On hearing the tenour of Mr. Smith's reply, it was agreed to proceed with the Bill, and Mr. Haldane accordingly withdrew his resolution.

The various Women's Suffrage Committees at once commenced preparations for vigorous work in view of a division on May 13th. The opponents were equally on the alert; notice to move that the Bill be read that day six months appeared on the papers of the House from no less than four different members, viz., Mr. Radcliffe Cooke (Newington, West), Mr. de Lisle (Leicestershire, Mid.), Mr. Samuel Smith (Flint.), Mr. Asquith (Fife, East), and schemes were laid for its destruction.

On April 30th, Mr. Smith moved that certain specified days should be appropriated to Government business. Mr. Gladstone immediately rose to lead the Opposition, but instead of objecting, as is usually the case, to the time of private members being appropriated, he insisted that Mr. Smith should be 'perfectly uniform in the application of his rule,' and include all Wednesdays before Whitsuntide. Mr. Gladstone's proposal afforded a manifest opening for shelving the Bill for the Enfranchisement of Women, which the opponents of the measure were quick to perceive. A debate of nearly an hour followed, of which a full report is given in these pages. Mr. Smith declared himself unable to take the day for Government business after the expectations which had been aroused. Mr. Stuart and Mr. Bryce thereupon pressed the claim of Wednesday the

8th to be equally exempted for the Access to Mountains Bill. Mr. Labouchere scouted the idea of giving a day to "female franchise, or some folly of that sort." Mr. Courtney defended Mr. Smith's proposal. Finally Sir Henry James moved an amendment to take all days to Whitsuntide. This was opposed by Lord Wolmer, supported by Sir Wm. Harcourt, and finally carried by a division of 218 to 159; and thus the Government, for probably the first time in Parliamentary history, had a day forced upon them.

The division list, which is given on another page, is worthy of careful study. By that list we find that there voted

	Majority.	Minority.
Conservatives,	79	128
Liberal Unionists,	25	13
Gladstonian Liberals,	90	27
Nationalists,	25	2
	<hr/> 218	<hr/> 159

and more than this, we find that fourteen known opponents, including several members of the Government, voted in the minority to give a fair opportunity of discussion of the question, while eighty-six who were supposed to be friends voted in the majority, viz., twenty-six Conservatives, one Liberal Unionist, forty Gladstonian Liberals, thirteen Nationalists.

Further, the absence of many steady friends is also to be noted, due to the snatch nature of the vote, and showing that the division, however instructive, is not decisive of the genuine opinion of the House of Commons.

There is at least one member whose courageous consistency should be fully recognised. When Mr. Haldane placed his resolution on the paper, Mr. de Lisle gave notice to move as an amendment to leave out all after "that" and insert "the exclusion of women from voting in elections of Members of Parliament is beneficial to the peace and prosperity of the

State, being in accord with the fundamental principle of the good government of mankind; and that the laws now in force regulating the election of town and county councils and other local representative bodies require examination in order to determine whether the legal qualifications of women are in accord with the natural."

Mr. Samuel Smith and Mr. Radcliffe Cooke also gave notices of amendments.

PARLIAMENTARY INTELLIGENCE.

House of Commons, Thursday, April 30th.

THE BUSINESS OF THE SESSION.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I wish to put a question to the leader of the House, the answer to which may in a certain sense, I think, possibly tend to shorten the conversation upon the motion which the right hon. gentleman is about to make. First of all, is it his intention to ask for the particular preference he desires to have on behalf of the Irish Land Bill exclusively; and, secondly, is it his intention to apply the power which he seeks to obtain without making any exception in favour of any particular measure, so that it shall be perfectly equal in its application?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: I appreciate the spirit in which the right hon. gentleman has put the question. The preference which we ask for has reference to the Irish Land Bill at the present time. We conceive that that Bill should be pressed forward with all reasonable speed. It has unfortunately lagged greatly in Committee during the last few days. I suppose the question of the right hon. gentleman is directed specially to the Wednesdays. So far as other days of the week are concerned, we do not propose to make any exception whatever. The Government do not think it would be possible to make an exception in favour of one motion or proposal without making an exception in favour of others, so far as Wednesdays are concerned. One difficulty in which we are placed is that an hon. gentleman opposite had a motion on the paper for last Friday, and removed it under the impression that I had given a pledge that the 13th of May should be reserved for its consideration. I did not give that pledge. I did not give that pledge unreservedly; I merely stated that, so far as the Government were concerned, they would not propose that there should be an adjournment for Whitsuntide before that Wednesday; and if no unforeseen event occurred they would not propose to take that day. However, it has been translated into a pledge, and therefore I am afraid I should

not be able to take that day for Government business. After Whitsuntide there are Bills of private members which would be in progress, and under Standing Order No. 12 those Bills would be entitled to precedence before any other orders. But it would be a strong measure on my part to deprive those Bills of the position they have obtained until absolute necessity compels me to do so. It would be held to be exercising the rights of the majority rather severely upon hon. gentlemen who had charge of other Bills, and therefore it is not the intention of the Government to take the first three or four Wednesdays after Whitsuntide so far as Bills in progress are concerned. Therefore it comes to this. The proposition of the Government is that the time of the House shall be given on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays, without reservation, for the Land Purchase Bill. Next Wednesday shall be given for that purpose, but the first three or four Wednesdays after Whitsuntide will not be given until fair progress has been made with the Bills which are in Committee.

Mr. J. STUART asked whether it was open to the right hon. gentleman to reconsider the decision to take next Wednesday, when a most important Bill was down.

Mr. BRYCE inquired whether, seeing the right hon. gentleman took a night in February last, on which he had a motion down with reference to the access to mountains in Scotland, he did not intend to make an exception now in favour of that motion, which was down for May 8.

Mr. W. H. SMITH: It would, I think, be more convenient that I should enter into these questions, in regard to which I have had more notices than one, when I make the motion for precedence. I express my regret if by any motion of mine I have deprived the right hon. gentleman of any opportunity of bringing forward his motion.

The SPEAKER then, upon formal notice from the First Lord of the Treasury, proceeded to read the motion on the paper, but, in response to Opposition cries of "Move,"

Mr. W. H. SMITH again rose and moved, "That, whenever the Purchase of Land and Congested Districts (Ireland) Bill is appointed for Tuesday or Friday the House do meet at 3 o'clock, and that the proceedings on that Bill have precedence over all orders of the day and notices of motion; and that the said Bill have precedence on Wednesday, if it be appointed for that day." He then proceeded to describe the obstruction to which the Irish Land Purchase Bill had been subject.

Mr. GLADSTONE, after commenting on the general business affected by the motion, added: There is only one other point on which I wish to say a word, and that is with regard to the reference which the right hon. gentleman made to me in connection with next Wednesday. He said that if I expressed a certain opinion with regard to next Wednesday he would not be disposed to take it. I am disposed to speak in the opposite sense. If the right hon. gentleman thinks it necessary to interfere with the course of business in the House and with the rights of private members, particularly in circumstances so remarkable as these, when he has taken

the night of the motion of my hon. friend the member for Aberdeen, in which so much interest is taken in Scotland, in my opinion his only safety is to insist on that on which he has often insisted on previous occasions, and to be perfectly uniform in the application of his rule. I do not look to the contents of the Bills, or to anything that may be called a matter of immediate urgency which I might conceive would be a possible subject for exception, but, taking these measures as measures, they are all well entitled to discussion, and I think the motion of my hon. friend the member for Aberdeen is better entitled than any other motion, on account of what has formerly happened. I may press on her Majesty's Government that they should not make two bites at a cherry, but should make a fair and uniform practice, and therefore avoid all occasion for giving ground for special complaint on the part of those who may be interested in any particular measure.

Mr. W. H. SMITH: Am I to understand that the right hon. gentleman is inviting me to take all Wednesdays after Whitsuntide?

Mr. GLADSTONE: I thought that we were discussing absolutely the question of all days until Whitsuntide, and then after that of the days on which the Land Purchase Bill was down.

Mr. LABOUCHERE, who was received with ironical cheers, said that as the right hon. gentleman was in a somewhat prophetic mood as to what was going to take place in the present year, he was sorry that he had not said when there was going to be a dissolution. With regard to the motion of the right hon. gentleman, it seemed to him that he was always expected to play lamb to the right hon. gentleman's wolf. The right hon. gentleman turned on him as if he were the *fons et origo* of all obstruction in the House. In one sense he was—in the right sense of the word obstruction. The Conservative party and Ministers had extraordinary notions as to the duties of that House. He further objected to the proposal of the Government to take the time of private members, because it introduced a new element into the demands on the public time. By means of it Ministers were able to say in effect what Bills they approved or disapproved. They would take one Wednesday when Bills which they disapproved were to be brought on, but not the next, because then a Bill favoured by their supporters was to be brought on—a Bill about female franchise or some folly of that sort. In those matters let them at least be fair. What was sauce for the gander was sauce for the goose also. Let the Government take all the Wednesdays or none.

Mr. BRYCE moved an amendment to except Friday, the 8th of May, from the operation of the resolution. He said he could understand the action of the right hon. gentleman if it had been uniform, but to select days in a particular way and practically in favour of particular Bills was scarcely fair to the House. He should not have moved his amendment if the right hon. gentleman had taken all the time of private members, and if he had not intimated that the Government would not take Wednesday, the 13th; but under the circumstances he felt bound in duty to his constituents and to the people of Scotland to take the course he had done.

Mr. COURTNEY said the hon. member for Aberdeen had candidly confessed that his principal motive of action was to except Wednesday, the 13th of May, not that he loved the Access to Mountains Bill so much as he hated the Women's Franchise Bill.

Mr. BRYCE said that what he stated was that he desired absolute equality in the matter.

Mr. COURTNEY said the hon. member distinctly stated that he should not have moved his amendment if the right hon. gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury had not intimated that he would not take Wednesday, the 13th. Therefore, he had not unfairly interpreted what the hon. member said. Now, as to the question that was to come on on the 13th of May. Last Friday week the first notice of amendment on going into Committee of Supply stood in the name of the hon. member for Haddington relative to the political disabilities of women. That could not have been brought on if the Bill of the 13th of May still stood on the paper, and it was a question with those members interested in the subject whether that motion should be proceeded with or whether the chance of the 13th of May should be retained. A deputation went to the right hon. gentleman to ascertain the intentions of the Government with respect to that day, and the right hon. gentleman had frankly repeated what he said to the deputation—that it was not intended to adjourn the House before the 13th of May, and that in the absence of unforeseen circumstances the Government had no intention to take that day. Well, had anything unforeseen happened?

Mr. LABOUCHERE.—Yes, surely. The First Lord of the Treasury bases his claim to the days of private members on the fact that the unforeseen has happened—that the Land Purchase Bill is obstructed.

Mr. COURTNEY said that had not happened since the time referred to, and was not unforeseen. On all grounds it was impossible for the right hon. gentleman to depart now from the engagement he had made. The engagement of the right hon. gentleman was known to every member of the House; it was known to the hon. member for Northampton. Before sitting down he would like to say that his right hon. friend was a little obscure with respect to the Wednesdays subsequent to Whitsuntide. With regard to Bills which had been considered before Whitsuntide, which had passed a second reading, and which were set down for progress after Whitsuntide, if the opportunity of further progress was taken away they would put a stop to all legislation by private members and would make such legislation before Whitsuntide a farce. He entirely agreed with the right hon. gentleman as to the necessity of reserving those Wednesdays for such Bills. He protested against the contention of the hon. member for Northampton and the hon. member for Aberdeen that Wednesday, the 13th, should be taken.

The SPEAKER reminded the House that the amendment before it was a limited one.

Sir H. JAMES appealed to the member for Aberdeen to withdraw his amendment, and he would then ask leave to amend the motion so that it should read after the word "Bill," in the last line but one, "shall also have precedence on Wednesdays until said Bill has passed through Committee of the House."

Mr. BRYCE said that on that understanding he was willing to withdraw his amendment.

Sir H. JAMES said that if there were any ambiguity in the views of the hon. member for Aberdeen, there was no ambiguity in those of the right hon. gentleman the Chairman of Committees. Whatever might be the inconvenience to members of that House, and however desirable it might be that their time should be occupied by useful legislation, all that, according to the right hon. gentleman, ought to give way to what would be an abstract discussion on the right of female suffrage. The effect of the amendment which he begged leave to move was that until the Irish Land Bill passed through Committee all the Wednesdays should be taken up by that Bill. In that case they might hope that the Bill would be through Committee before the Whitsuntide recess, and if it were fewer Wednesdays would be taken by the Government after Whitsuntide. Anything which should interfere with the progress of that Bill through Committee would be detrimental to the public interest. What did the right hon. gentleman the Chairman of Committees ask? He asked that the Bill should be suspended, and that precedence should be given to the second reading of the Bill for conferring the suffrage upon women. Did the right hon. gentleman hope that there was any possibility of that Bill passing through the House? The House had still to deal with the Bill for marriage of a diseased wife's sister, with the Rating of Machinery Bill, with the Bill which would give a close time for hares. All those Bills had vested interests, and ought to be dealt with practically by the House. If they now said that they would not take away the Wednesday in question, but would give it for the pleasure of hearing the eloquence of his right hon. friend they must take more days after Whitsuntide, and all for an abstract proposition which they had already discussed eight or ten times in that House. There was only one argument which had been used in favour of that course—namely, that the right hon. gentleman had given a pledge. But this was a question for the House itself. They had to consider how they should best do what was useful for carrying on the public business. They should not be able to leave that House in the month of July if these days were not taken, and the Session would have to be further prolonged. The right hon. gentleman the leader of the House did not anticipate when he gave what had been called a pledge that eleven days would have been taken up with three clauses of the Irish Land Bill. He begged to move the amendment.

Viscount WOLMER said that the First Lord of the Treasury stated that he did not intend to move the adjournment of the House before the 13th of May, and that he would not take that day for the business of the Government unless some "wholly unforeseen emergency" had arisen. He would like to ask if any wholly unforeseen emergency had since arisen.

Sir W. HARCOURT said he did not know what the leader of the House would do. The right hon. gentleman was asking the House to make a sacrifice of its time for the purpose of carrying the Irish Land Bill through Committee. With regard to the pledge which had been referred to, the right hon. gentleman said that he had not

given a pledge, and it was a curious thing that a man should be bound, not by what he acknowledged to be a pledge, but by what other people understood to be a pledge. He thought that the proposal of the right hon. member for Bury was one which they ought to accept. The arrangement that all Wednesdays should be taken need hardly be broken into for the grand field day of the right hon. member for Liskeard and the noble lord the member for the Petersfield Division, whom in other circumstances they would be even more pleased to hear on the subject of female suffrage than they would be to hear the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. COURTNEY.—Why?

Sir W. HARCOURT.—He is younger.

Mr. W. H. SMITH trusted that the House would not consider it necessary to prolong the debate. The question before them was a very narrow one. It was whether the understanding that had been come to with reference to May 13th should or should not be observed. For himself he felt bound not to depart from that understanding, but it was for the House to decide what course should be taken.

Mr. WOODALL thanked the First Lord of the Treasury for the loyalty with which he had adhered to the understanding with reference to May 13th. He suggested that, as there were now only two Wednesdays before Whitsuntide, it would be just and equitable to exclude them from the operation of the resolution.

Mr. W. H. SMITH said that, in answer to a question addressed to him by the right hon. member for Mid Lothian, he had expressed willingness to forego Wednesdays altogether, but since his doing so the Wednesdays had been pressed upon the Government, and those who were responsible for the conduct of public business could hardly refrain from accepting facilities of that kind when they were offered.

Mr. HALDANE complained that if May 13th were taken by the Government it would be unfair treatment, for he had abstained last Friday from moving his resolution on female suffrage on the understanding that the Bill dealing with the subject would come up for discussion on Wednesday, the 13th.

Mr. J. ROWLANDS protested against the proposal to take May 6th, for which day the Town Holdings Bill stood at present as the first order.

The House then divided on Sir H. James's amendment, when there voted—

For the amendment	218
Against	159
Majority	—59

There was much cheering when the Clerk placed the voting paper in Sir Henry James's hand and the figures were announced.

A consequential amendment to strike out the words at the end of the motion, "if it be appointed on that day," was accepted by Mr. W. H. Smith and agreed to.

THE DIVISION LIST.

Thursday, 30th April, 1891.

Numb. 162.—Business of the House (Proceedings on the Purchase of Land and Congested Districts (Ireland) Bill.—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, whenever the Purchase of Land and Congested Districts (Ireland) Bill is appointed for Tuesday or Friday, the House do meet at Three o'clock, and that the proceedings on that Bill have precedence over all Orders of the Day and Notices of Motion; and that the said Bill have precedence on Wednesday if it be appointed for that day;"—(*Mr. William Henry Smith*):—

Amendment proposed, in line 5, after the word "Wednesday," to insert the words "until it shall have passed through Committee:"—(*Sir Henry James*):—

Question put, "That those words be there inserted:"—The House divided; Ayes 218, Noes 159.

AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Glamorgan).	Campbell, Sir Arch. (Renfrewsh.).
Abraham, William (Limerick).	Campbell, Sir Geo. (Kirkcaldy).
Asher, Alexander.	Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hn. H.
Austin, John.	Carew, James Laurence.
Bailey, Sir Joseph R.	Cavan, Earl of.
Baird, John George Alexander.	Colman, Jeremiah James.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. J. Blair (Clackm.).	Crawford, Donald.
Balfour, J. Spencer (Burnley).	Cremer, William Randal.
Ballantine, Wm. Henry Walter.	Crilly, Daniel.
Barclay, James William.	Davenport, W. Bromley.
Baring, Viscount.	Davey, Sir Horace.
Barnes, Alfred.	Dawnay, Col. Hon. L. P.
Barran, John.	Deasy, John.
Baumann, Arthur Antony.	De Lisle, Edwin.
Beckett, Ernest William.	Dickson, Thomas A. (Dublin).
Bickford-Smith, William.	Dillwyn, Lewis Llewelyn.
Bigwood, James.	Donkin, Richard Sim.
Blane, Alexander.	Duff, Robert William.
Blundell, Col. Hen. Blundell H.	Duncan, James Archibald.
Bolitho, Thomas Bedford.	Elcho, Lord.
Bolton, Jos. Cheney (Stirlingsh.).	Elliot, Hn. Art. R. D. (Roxburghs.).
Bowles, Capt. Henry Ferryman.	Elliot, Geo. Wm. (Yorks, N.R.).
Bright, John A. (Birmingham).	Esslemont, Peter.
Bristowe, Thomas Lynn.	Evans, Francis H. (Southampton).
Brown, Alex. H. (Salop).	Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan).
Bruce, Gainsford (Finsbury).	Evershed, Sydney.
Brunner, John Tomlinson.	Ewing, Sir Archibald Orr.
Bryce, James.	Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith).
Burdett-Coutts, W.	Finch, George H.
Burghley, Lord.	Fisher, William Hayes.
Buxton, Sydney Charles.	Fitzgerald, J. Gubbins (Longford).
Caldwell, J.	Fitzwilliam, Hon. W. H. W.

Fletcher, Sir Henry.	Lloyd-George, David.
Flynn, James Christopher.	Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine.
Foljambe, Cecil G. S.	Long, Walter Hume.
Fowler, Rt. Hn. H. H. (Wolverh'n).	Lyell, Leonard.
Fry, Theodore (Darlington).	Macartney, W. G. Ellison.
Fulton, James Forrest.	MacInnes, Miles.
Furness, Christopher.	Maclean, James Mackenzie.
Gardner, Herbert.	M'Calmont, Capt. James.
Gathorne-Hardy, Hn. J. S. (Kent).	M'Cartan, Michael.
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E.	M'Carthy, Justin (Londonderry).
Gladstone, Herbert J. (Leeds).	M'Ewan, William.
Goldsmid, Sir Julian.	Maguire, James Rochfort.
Gower, Geo. Granville Leveson.	Mahony, Pierce.
Hall, Sir Charles (Cambridgesh.).	Malcolm, Col. John Wingfield.
Halsey, Thomas Frederick.	Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe.
Hanbury, Robert William.	Marjoribanks, Rt. Hon. Edward.
Hanbury-Tracy, Hon. F. S. A.	Maskelyne, M. H. Story.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William.	Mildmay, Francis Bingham.
Hardcastle, Edward (Salford).	Milvain, Thomas.
Hardcastle, Frank (Lanc. S.E.).	More, Robert Jasper.
Havelock-Allan, Sir Henry M.	Morgan, Rt. Hn. G. O. (Denbighs.).
Heath, Arthur Raymond.	Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen).
Heneage, Rt. Hon. Edward.	Morgan, W. Pritchard (Merthyr).
Hinckes, Harry Tichborne.	Morley, Arnold (Nottingham).
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampstead).	Morley, Rt. Hon. J. (Newcastle).
Howard, Joseph.	Morrison, Walter.
Howell, George.	Morton, Alpheus Cleophas.
Hunter, Wm. Alex. (Aberdeen).	Mowbray, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Oxford U.).
Illingworth, Alfred.	Mowbray, R. G. C. (Lanc. S.E.).
Isaacs, Lewis Henry.	Muncaster, Lord.
Jarvis, Alexander Weston.	Neville, Ralph.
Joicey, James.	Newark, Viscount.
Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt. Hn. Sir U.	O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary).
Keay, John Seymour.	O'Connor, Arthur (Donegal).
Kennaway, Sir John Henry.	O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool).
Kimber, Henry.	Oldroyd, Mark.
King, Henry Seymour (Hull).	O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens.
Knatchbull-Hugessen, E. (Roch.).	Paget, Sir Richard Horner.
Knatchbull-Hugessen, H. (Kent).	Palmer, Sir Charles Mark.
Knox, Edmund Francis Vesey.	Parker, Hon. Francis (Oxfordsh.).
Labouchere, Henry.	Paulton, James Mellor.
Lafone, Alfred.	Pease, Alfred E. (York).
Lane, William John.	Pease, Henry Fell (Yorks. N.R.).
Laurie, Col. Robert Peter.	Picton, James Allanson.
Lawrence, Sir Trevor (Surrey).	Playfair, Rt. Hon. Sir Lyon.
Lawrence, W. F. (Liverpool).	Powell, Francis Sharp.
Lea, Thomas (Londonderry).	Priestley, Briggs.
Lees, Elliott.	Reed, Sir Edw. James (Cardiff).
Lefevre, Rt. Hon. George Shaw.	Reid, Robt. Threshie (Dumfries).
Leighton, Stanley.	Rendel, Stuart.
Leng, John.	Ridley, Sir Matthew White.
Lewis, Thomas P. (Anglesey).	Roberts, John (Flint Burghs).

Robertson, Edmund (Dundee).
 Robinson, Thomas (Gloucester).
 Roe, Thomas.
 Rothschild, Baron F. James de.
 Rowlands, James (Finsbury).
 Russell, Sir George (Berkshire).
 Samuelson, Sir B. (Oxford, N.).
 Sexton, Thomas.
 Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew).
 Sheehan, Jeremiah Daniel.
 Sidebottom, T. Harrop (Stalybr.).
 Sidebottom, William (Derbysh.).
 Sinclair, William Pirrie.
 Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.).
 Spencer, Hn. C. R. (Northampton).
 Stack, John.
 Stewart, Halley (Lincolnshire).
 Stokes, Sir George Gabriel.
 Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath).
 Sullivan, T. D. (Dublin).
 Sutherland, A. (Sutherlandsh.).
 Tanner, Charles Kearns.
 Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr).
 Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray.
 Trevelyan, Rt. Hn. Sir Geo. Otto.
 Tellers for the Ayes, Sir Henry James and Colonel Saunderson.

NOES.

Ainslie, William George.
 Allison, Robert Andrew.
 Allsopp, Hon. Geo. (Worcester).
 Allsopp, Hon. Percy (Taunton).
 Anstruther, H. T. (St. Andrews).
 Anstruther, Col. Lloyd (Suffolk).
 Ashmead-Bartlett, Ellis.
 Baden-Powell, Sir Geo. Smyth.
 Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r).
 Balfour, Gerald William (Leeds).
 Bartley, George C. T.
 Bazley-White, J.
 Beach, W. W. Bramston (Hants.).
 Beaufoy, Mark Hanbury.
 Bentinck, Lord H. C. (Norfolk).
 Bethell, Commander.
 Biddulph, Michael.
 Birkbeck, Sir Edward.
 Birrell, Augustine.
 Boord, Thomas William.
 Bridgeman, Col. Hon. Francis C.
 Brodrick, Hon. St. John.
 Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn.
 Burt, Thomas.
 Cameron, Charles (Glasgow).
 Campbell, James A. (Glas. Univ.).
 Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry.
 Charrington, Spencer.
 Clark, Dr. G. B. (Caithness-sh.).
 Clarke, Sir Edward (Plymouth).
 Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready.
 Compton, Francis (New Forest).
 Corbett, John (Worcestershire).
 Cornwallis, F. S. Wykeham.
 Cotton-Jodrell, Col. Edw. T. D.
 Courtney, Rt. Hon. Leonard H.
 Cubitt, Rt. Hon. George.
 Cust, Henry John Cokayne.
 Dalrymple, Sir Charles.
 De Worms, Rt. Hon. Baron Henry.
 Dixon, George (Birmingham).
 Dixon-Hartland, Fred. Dixon.
 Dugdale, John Stratford.
 Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart.
 Egerton, Hon. Tatton.
 Elliot, Sir George (Monmouth).

Ellis, Sir J. Whittaker (Surrey).
 Farquharson, Dr. R. (Aberd'sh.).
 Feilden, Lieut.-Gen. (Lanc. N.).
 Fellowes, Ailwyn Edward.
 Fenwick, Charles.
 Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manch'r).
 Forwood, Arthur Bower.
 Fowler, Sir Robert N. (London).
 Fraser, Gen. Charles Craufurd.
 Gedge, Sydney.
 Giles, Alfred.
 Godson, Augustus Frederick.
 Goldsworthy, Major-General.
 Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon.
 Goschen, Rt. Hon. Geo. Joachim.
 Grimston, Viscount.
 Grove, Sir Thomas Fraser.
 Gunter, Colonel.
 Gurdon, Robert Thornhagh.
 Haldane, Richard Burdon.
 Harland, Sir Edward James.
 Heathcote, Captain Edwards.
 Herbert, Hon. Sidney.
 Hill, Rt. Hn. Lord Arthur (Down).
 Hill, Col. Edwd. Stock (Bristol).
 Hoare, Samuel (Norwich).
 Holloway, George.
 Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry.
 Howorth, Henry Hoyle.
 Hozier, James Henry Cecil.
 Hughes, Colonel Edwin.
 Hunt, Frederick Seager.
 Hunter, Sir Guyer (Hackney).
 Isaacson, Frederick Wootton.
 Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. Lawies.
 Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick.
 Johnston, William.
 Kenyon, Hon. George Thomas.
 Knightley, Sir Rainald.
 Leahy, James (Kildare).
 Lechmere, Sir Edmund A. H.
 Legh, Thos. Wodehouse (Lanc.).
 Lennox, Lord Walter C. Gordon.
 Lewisham, Viscount.
 Llewellyn, Evan Henry.
 Lockwood, Frank.
 Low, Malcolm.
 Lowther, Hn. Wm. (Westm'land).
 Lymington, Viscount.
 Mackintosh, Charles Frazer.
 Maclure, John William.
 M'Donald, Dr. Roderick.
 M'Lagan, Peter.
 M'Laren, Walter S. B.
 Madden, Dodgson Hamilton.
 Marriott, Rt. Hon. Sir W. T.
 Matthews, Rt. Hon. Henry.
 Maxwell, Sir Herbert E.
 Montagu, Samuel.
 Morgan (Octavius V. Battersea).
 Morrell, George Herbert.
 Mount, William George.
 Mulholland, Henry Lyle.
 Murdoch, Charles Townshend.
 Nolan, Colonel (Galway, N.).
 Norris, Edward Samuel.
 Northcote, Hon. Sir H. Stafford.
 Norton, Robert.
 Pearson, Sir Charles John.
 Pelly, Sir Lewis.
 Philipps, John Wynford.
 Pickersgill, Edward Hare.
 Plowden, Sir William Chichele.
 Plunket, Rt. Hon. David R.
 Pomfret, William Pomfret.
 Price, Captain (Devonport).
 Rankin, James.
 Reed, Henry Byron (Bradford).
 Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson.
 Robertson, Rt. Hon. J. P. B. (Bute).
 Robinson, Brooke (Dudley).
 Round, James.
 Rountree, Joshua.
 Russell, T. W. (Tyrone).
 Selwyn, Capt. Charles William.
 Smith, Abel (Herts).
 Smith, Rt. Hn. Wm. H. (Strand).
 Stanhope, Rt. Hn. E. (Lincolnsh.).
 Summers, William.
 Sykes, Christopher.
 Talbot, John Gilbert.
 Taylor, Francis.
 Temple, Sir Richard.
 Theobald, James.
 Thorburn, Walter.
 Tyler, Sir Henry Whatley.
 Vernon, Hon. Greville Richard.
 Vincent, Chas. Edw. Howard.
 Walsh, Hn. Arthur Henry John.
 Webster, Sir R. E. (Isle of Wight).
 West, W. Cornwallis.
 Weston, Sir Joseph Dodge.
 Weymouth, Viscount.

Williams Arthur (Glamorgan). Woodall, William.
 Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.). Wortley, Charles Beilby Stuart.
 Winn, Hon. Rowland. Wright, Caleb (Lanc. S. W.)
 Wolmer, Viscount. Wright, H. Smith (Nottingham).
 Wood, Nicholas.

Tellers for the Noes, Mr. Akers-Douglas and Sir William Walrond.

CONVERSAZIONE.

In view of the expected debate on May 13th, a conversazione was arranged to take place in the galleries of the Royal Institution of Painters in Water Colours, Piccadilly, on the evening of Monday, 11th. Invitations were issued to supporters of Mr. Woodall's Bill, in the names of the following ladies, who kindly consented to form a Reception Committee:—The Lady Frances Balfour, Mrs. Leonard Courtney, Miss Courtenay, Mrs. Fawcett, Louisa Lady Goldsmid, Miss Davenport-Hill, Lady Lethbridge, Lady Matheson, Mrs. Penrose FitzGerald, the Countess of Portsmouth, Mrs. Temple, Mrs. Westlake, the Lady Maude Wolmer. Amongst the earliest arrivals were, the Lady Frances Balfour, Dr. Storey (of Roseneath), Louisa Lady Goldsmid, Mrs. Fawcett, Miss Davies, Mrs. Garrett Anderson, Mr. Anderson, the Misses Anderson, Mrs. Leonard Courtney, Miss Courtney, Lord and Lady George Campbell, Lady Matheson, Major and Mrs. Houston, Mr. and Mrs. Hallett, Rev. Donald Fraser, Miss Garrett, Miss Gurney, Mr. McLaren, M.P., Mr. Woodall, M.P., Mr. and Mrs. Moberley Bell, Mrs. Sheldon Amos, Mr. and Miss Amos, Miss Dorothea Roberts, Mrs. Shaen, Mrs. Rowland Williams, Mr. and Mrs. Stopes, Colonel Wintle, Mrs. Miller Morrison, Mr. B. Blackburn, Mrs. Rowe Bennett, Miss Catherine Drew, Mr. Atkins, Mrs. H. W. Lawrence, and Mrs. Coffey, Mrs. Bateson, Mrs. Bathurst, Mrs. and Miss Henn Collins, Mrs. Culme Seymour, Captain James, Mr. Clutton, Miss Edith Phillott, Miss McKerlie, Miss A. E. Bell, Miss Gertrude Andrews, Mr. Tod, Misses Hill, Mrs. Earnshaw, Miss Ellaby, M.D., Miss Spring Rice, Misses Butcher, Mr. and Mrs. Shore Smith, Miss Hubbard, Mrs. Wynford Philipps, Miss Cicely Philipps, Miss L. M. Wilkinson, Miss F. R. Wilkinson, Miss Greenhill, Lady Weston, Miss Zimmerman, Mr. and the Lady Ida Lowe, Mrs. Gerald Wellesley, Mr. and Mrs. Hugh Watt, Miss Vernon, Mrs. and Miss Sterling, Mr. Stone and Miss Stone, Mr. and Mrs. Stanger, Mrs. S. W. Rea, Miss Eccles, Mr. and Mrs. E. R. Pease, Major and Mrs. Jordan, Mrs. W. Debenham, Miss M. H. Hart, Mrs. Kyllmann, Misses Vernon Harcourt, Miss Robson, Mrs. Alexander Ross, Mrs. Mylne, Miss Walker, M.D., Mr. and Miss Dryhurst, Mr. F. E. Garrett, &c., &c.

Letters regretting unavoidable absence were received from the Countess of Portsmouth, Mrs. Temple, Mr. Rankin, M.P., Sir Albert Rollit, M.P., &c. Lady Maude Wolmer was prevented by

illness from being present, also Miss Tod, Mr. T. W. Russell, M.P., Misses Davenport-Hill, and several others.

The Committee had, in the first instance, contemplated a gathering mainly social in character, but after the change wrought in the political position by the division on Sir Henry James' amendment on April 30th, it was determined to introduce a more political element, and speeches were accordingly arranged to be given between ten and eleven o'clock in the Eastern Gallery, by Mrs. Garrett Anderson, M.D., the Lady Frances Balfour, Mrs. Ashworth Hallett, Rev. Donald Fraser, D.D., Mr. McLaren, M.P., and Mr. Woodall, M.P.

Mr. McLAREN was voted to the chair, and after reviewing the circumstances by which the Bill had been set aside, he went on to say it was of course open to the House of Commons to discuss, or decline to discuss, any measure that might come before it, but no measure had been treated with such injustice as this one—despite all the efforts their friends could put forth. Two years before, when a debate was expected, they had been cheated out of their day by a conspiracy between the Radicals, Mr. Labouchere being chief intriguer, and the Conservatives' Whips. This year it had not been possible for the intriguers to enter into negotiations with the Government, because Mr. W. H. Smith had given an assurance to the deputation of ladies who had waited on him, that the day for second reading should not be absorbed. They had been obliged, therefore, to adopt more open proceedings, and attention had thus been drawn to the manner in which the Women's Suffrage party had been cheated.

Many members though in favour of the measure, had not the courage to oppose its being set aside. They tried to get all they could from women and would give nothing in return. If women would take a bold stand, and make it clear to candidates and members that they would not receive their help unless they pledged themselves to support Women's Suffrage they would, in a year or two, have the fulfilment of their hopes. But so long as it was treated only in an academic way, they would be cheated in the future as they had been in the past. He trusted that all women interested in this subject would do their best so to organise in the constituencies as to press this matter forward at every election.

The LADY FRANCES BALFOUR being then called upon to speak, said she did not know why she should be asked to speak first, unless it were because she was the youngest of the recruits. In a lively manner she described the fears that were felt when it was known that the Government intended to take private members days, how Mr. W. H. Smith stated that he had given something in the nature of a pledge that the 13th should not be taken, and now after all the day for the Suffrage Bill was lost. When they considered the position the question occupied now and compared it with that it occupied fifteen years ago, they had no cause for anything but cheerfulness. They had only to go straight forward, for they had come to be regarded seriously: they had only to go on trying to strengthen members of Parliament, and in a short time they would gain all they wanted.

Mr. WOODALL, M.P., after some preliminary comments on the

fate of the Bill, went on to say that now they must dismiss all illusions. They had been accustomed to think of Women's Suffrage as having been voted for on its own merits. They had seen women taking their part so well in Municipal elections, School Board and Poor Law Guardian work, that if by a stroke of the pen their work and influence could be eliminated it would be to annul a great power from among the motive forces which are now being brought to bear on the administrative work of the day and on social problems. They had taken it for granted that the battle was over when they might count on a majority in the present Parliament. Thus a fallacious opinion had grown up that the academic feeling in favour of their claim was strong enough to assure them a vote of the majority of the House. It was only of recent years that all political parties had come to acknowledge the importance of the co-operation of women, yet all had misgivings, lest they should spoil their calculations by the introduction of this new element. They needed to impress members with the conviction that women are in earnest; that they desire the vote for the uses they can put it to. They must make earnest effort. He believed there was a general feeling even amongst opponents that their ultimate triumph was certain.

Mrs. GARRETT ANDERSON, who was very cordially received, said she wished to express how very important she thought the present crisis to be. They must throw their hearts into this work if they meant to bring it to a successful issue. People were not yet sufficiently convinced that women do care for this thing. A great deal of activity ought to be their's before the next general election, and she would be glad to see a large sum raised, for propagandism is expensive. When they heard a person like Mr. Labouchere say that the suffrage is no more likely to be given to women than to rabbits, that ought to be brought up against him on every occasion. It was a scandal for a man who called himself a man to say such a thing.

Mrs. ASHWORTH HALLETT said that it was in 1870 that the Women's Suffrage Bill was first introduced into Parliament, and there were some present that evening who had never ceased to work for the question during that long period of years. In the early days of the movement they had endured the scoff and sneers of opponents with becoming meekness. They were supported by the belief that they had got hold of a truth which, in the progress of events, would have to be acknowledged. They had seen political power gradually extended to thousands of "capable" illiterate men. Statesmen had now to reckon with a vast unwieldy electorate swayed by emotion and sentiment, and in their difficulties they were entreating women to lend their aid to lead and guide this incalculable host. Women having no voice in forming the laws were asked to help to form the ideas of the new law makers. No longer were politics outside women's sphere. If women, to quote Mr. Gladstone, have "a real part to play in Party politics," then it was clear that the bottom had been knocked out of all the arguments, ancient and modern, against giving them responsible political power. The women who are asking for the franchise are the only voters representing property who are left outside the

Constitution. They are already included in the local electoral roll, and when added to the Parliamentary register they would bring some balance of intelligence to set against the ignorance that abounded. She believed that the votes of women would be on the side of strong Government, on the side of law and order, of religion and morality. They asked for the franchise for women because they believed it would add a new power and virtue to the State, and that in the future, as in the past, every act which helped to raise the status of women would add to the well-being of the world.

The Rev. DONALD FRASER was next asked to address the audience, and began by saying that this was his maiden speech on the subject, though he had been a convinced adherent for over twenty years. His profession had taken him from political discussions, yet in his quiet room he had often felt indignant that a question of such importance should be balked year by year by provoking delays, nor did he think it creditable to men that it had to be pressed so much. He had no fear that its supporters would lose heart or hope, for as it has been said, "our desires are increased by our difficulties."

It is the voice of the dunce that says "women do not understand public affairs," the dunce is afraid of the woman who has enlarged her mind by these questions. The real objection is that men think women very dangerous persons. They are so easily humbugged, men say, and so fond of hobbies. But that is about the most incorrect fallacy they can utter. Women are not so sentimental as men, for they are much more practical, and in so far as they have been intrusted with the public affairs of the country it is not they who have set up fads and hobbies. This question was not one that should be only pushed by women; men should push it also. Women, when they have the power of the vote, would see through a good many men who are cajoling the masses. They would put their bodkins into a good many windbags. It would not be possible to subtract from the number of voters, but it would be possible to make a wise and reasonable addition, one that would bring intelligence and a new point of view into the whole sphere of politics, and would help the moral amelioration of the people.

Mrs. FAWCETT then proposed a vote of thanks to the Chairman, and the company, which had collected during the speeches in the Eastern Gallery, dispersed through the various rooms, taking leave towards midnight.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

Times.

"The Woman's Franchise Bill belongs to a class of measures which are a scandal to representative institutions—measures which, by the insistence of a noisy and importunate minority acting upon the cowardice and flabbiness of candidates for seats in the House of Commons, gradually secure the perfunctory support of numbers who

are thoroughly opposed to them, and sometimes become law in defiance of the true opinion of the House and the country. Men in quest of seats are addicted to the immoral practice of promising their support to measures which they know to be bad, and of soothing their conscience with the argument that the measures are too bad ever to pass. There is no measure too bad or too ridiculous to be passed by an Assembly in which this form of dishonesty is prevalent. A moment arrives when the number of those who are bound by these dissolute pledges becomes so great that the obstacle in which they put their trust, even while doing all that lay in their own power to overthrow it, is finally swept away. This is bad enough even in matters of minor importance. But in this country we have no written Constitution and no organic statutes of any kind. Nothing is safe from a chance vote of the House of Commons, and, unless that House is inspired by a high sense of public duty, the tactics we have described may be as easily used to effect the most profound as the most superficial changes. The admission of women to equal political power with men is a wild experiment from which the most advanced democracies in all ages have shrunk. Yet to that experiment we are so nearly committed, in the teeth of reason, experience, and the sober conviction of an overwhelming majority, that the House of Commons is glad to snatch at the somewhat ignominious expedient of preventing the question from being put to the vote."

Globe.

"Women's Franchise is not a burning question, but it is of very much more importance, in respect both of justice and of expediency, than many which emulate temporary volcanoes; and to treat it as an intrusion upon the serious business of the country is to virtually admit ignorance of its whole character and bearing. Moreover, a considerable number of pledges have been given that it shall be fairly considered; and we do not take for granted that election pledges are made only to be broken, or else given under the tacit condition that the measure in respect of which they are given shall have no chance of becoming law. Mr. W. H. Smith only gave evidence of his care for the reputation of the House, as well as of his right estimate of a great question when he insisted upon giving advocates of women's suffrage their single opportunity during the present session. For once, the temper of the House of Commons appears to be sufficiently cool and unpreoccupied to consider it on its merits; and—though such appearances are deceptive—it is regrettable that the opportunity should have been refused."

Pall Mall Gazette.

"The great movement which is teaching women to think, and enabling them to act, for themselves, which is encouraging them to possess character and individuality, and to put those qualities into careers, will but receive a slender tributary when a Woman's Suffrage Bill is read for the third time and has sustained but little check from yesterday's jockeying.

"Meanwhile, there is one practical good which should arise from

yesterday's double shuffle. It ought to teach the Liberal lady politicians that they are being humbugged; that from the Liberal Party, as a party, they, as women, have nothing to look for."

Western Morning News.

"Women already vote for Municipal Councils, for Boards of Guardians, and for School Boards. Nobody has suggested that they have unsexed themselves. But when it is proposed that the Parliamentary privilege shall be extended to them, then the bulk of the Liberal Party will not so much as discuss the matter. So much the worse for the Liberal Party. If the Conservatives are to have on their side all that is most intelligent and aspiring amongst educated English women, we may depend upon it that the Conservative Party will soon be moved by yet stronger and stronger desires for social improvement, and that in the end it will become popular by good deeds which can never be extinguished. Services like those performed by the main body of the Conservatives last night towards women will be paid, not so much by women's support, as by women's influence. We wish we could claim more Liberal Unionists, but we have some of the best of them."

Punch.

"*Thursday.*—A pretty little game on to-night. OLD MORALITY moved his Resolution taking power to appropriate Tuesdays and Fridays evening sittings, and all Wednesdays for Irish Land Bill. In ordinary circumstances there would have been stormy protest led from Front Opposition Bench against this inroad on time of private Members. Other fish to fry to-night. Wednesday week assigned for Second Reading of Woman's Suffrage Bill; if Government take that day for Irish Land Bill, obviously can't be utilised for furtherance of Woman's Rights. This is an awkward question for some Members; don't like it, but daren't vote against it. Here's opportunity of getting rid of it by side-wind. Not necessary in arranging proceedings to mention Suffrage Bill, or even Wednesday, 13th of May. It was principle for which Members struggled; the 'principle of uniformity,' as Mr. G. beautifully put it. 'Let us,' he said, though perhaps not quite in this phrase, 'go the whole hog or none; take all the Wednesdays, or leave them.'

"Pretty to see OLD MORALITY protesting against this unprecedented access of generosity. The very picture, as McEWAN said, of a good man struggling with the adversity of overwhelming good fortune. Was prepared to take a Wednesday here and there; but, really, too much to appropriate every one. 'Not at all—not at all,' said Mr. G.

"But it was only under compulsion of a Division that he consented to accept the endowment. In meanwhile, the Woman's Suffrage debate on Wednesday week snuffed out, and final opportunity of Session lost.

"'I'm inclined,' said WM. WOODALL, 'as a rule, to take kindly views of my fellow men, to put the best construction upon their actions; but, upon my word, I'm not satisfied in my own mind that

we advocates of Woman's Rights have not been made the victims of deep and dastardly design.'

"'Order! Order!' said COURTNEY; 'no more am I.'
 "'Business done.—Woman's Rights men dished."

Truth.

"Had the House of Commons had an opportunity to vote upon the proposal, the ladies would have discovered that the Legislature is as likely to give them votes as to give votes to rabbits, for it would have been defeated by a very large majority."

Methodist Times.

"The way in which the House of Commons sneaked out of the necessity of recording its opinion for or against the Female Franchise Bill was not creditable to the male sex. If Members of Parliament do not believe in extending the vote to women, let them at least have the courage to say so, and then we shall know where we are. It is to be feared that some advocates of the Female Suffrage have imperilled their cause by making extreme demands. Not satisfied with giving votes to such women as are ratepayers, they wish to confer the vote upon every woman at once, which would effect at a stroke such a complete revolution in the distribution of political power that even the friends of the gradual recognition of Female Suffrage might hesitate to concede it. The frequently expressed argument that the vote should be resisted on the ground that all women are Conservatives is too contemptible for discussion. If women are entitled to the suffrage the way they are likely to vote has nothing to do with it. As to the argument that they are likely to be influenced by the parsons, it comes with ill grace from men who have been often influenced by the publicans, and of the two we prefer the parsons. We quite admit that the question is a grave one, but it ought to be discussed on its merits and not meanly dismissed by a side wind."

Speaker.

"Certain forms of female suffrage are already in force in this country, and practical politicians have had an opportunity of seeing for themselves how they answer. It is true that the extension of the franchise to women which has already taken place is in itself unobjectionable. But the equity of the change which gave certain women a vote in municipal affairs is independent of the manner in which they have used that vote. Unfortunately experience has taught all who are concerned in municipal elections that the working of the female franchise has not been satisfactory. Whether rightly or wrongly, the fact remains that the great majority of female voters have the strangest dislike for independence. There are, of course, striking exceptions to the rule; but these exceptions only seem to make the rule more conspicuous. The majority of the ladies who now enjoy a vote in municipal affairs vote as they are told. That is to say, they place themselves in the hands of some trusted friend, and their ballot-paper is marked as that friend advises. By-and-by this may all be changed; the idea of the independence of

woman, which now possesses so strongly the minds of a few, may permeate the whole mass of the female sex. But clearly that is not the case at present, and will hardly be the case for a generation to come. What happens now is that certain favoured persons—clergymen being conspicuous among their number—though they are not allowed a plurality of wives, are permitted to enjoy a plurality of votes; and in more cases than we care to dwell upon, the votes of women in municipal contests have been cast against useful and necessary measures of reform, merely for the sake of pleasing their spiritual or medical advisers."

NOTE.—The following letters furnish an appropriate commentary on the above passage.

The first is from Miss Sanders, Cardiff.

"My father (Mr. Alderman Sanders, of Cardiff) wishes me to say that he thinks few men have a wider or more continued experience of municipal contests than he has had, which experience extends over more than thirty years. It may be perfectly true that some women vote as they are told, but not the majority. It is equally true that many men vote as they are told, but on the whole he is convinced that the majority of women voters use their suffrage with a higher and nobler purpose than do the majority of the other sex."

The next letter is from Mr. S. Hayward, Bath, who writes:—"An experience of thirty years in municipal elections in Bath (where the women voters comprise 1,700 out of 7,000) enables me confidently to contradict the assertion of the writer in the *Speaker*, 'that the great majority of female voters have the strongest dislike for independence.' The municipal elections here have generally been fought on political grounds (I think unfortunately), and hence both male and female voters have been influenced in various ways; but I have found that the women voters have generally attached more importance than the men to the personal moral character and social usefulness of a candidate; and certainly have shown more independence than the majority of the lower class of male voters."

FUTURE EFFORTS.

The Executive Committee have received many suggestions as to the best methods of concentrating the strength of the movement which has for quarter of a century being steadily increasing in force.

The effort to obtain a fair hearing for the question has now received the aid of the Government. This combined with the approach of a General Election makes the present a time peculiarly calling for energetic action.

In regard to the necessary sinews of war, the Com-

mittee have received the following letter from a lady, whose name if she would permit its publication, would carry weight. They commend it to the attention of their supporters:—

“I advise raising a good sum to spend in working up the country during the next three years. I will contribute £100 a year for three years on condition that £900 a year more is promised.

“I think £1,000 a year is not in the least too much to spend just now.

“Would it be worth while to have a Self-denial Suffrage Week, say in November or December, of each year, in which friends all over the country shall deny themselves all luxuries and put the proceeds into our fund? . . . We must find ways of making it recognised that we care **VERY MUCH** on the subject.”

The aid of women is constantly invoked in election contests, and it is surely reasonable to ask those who desire such help to take part in obtaining for women the right to exercise quietly by their votes the political power which they are urged by all parties in turn to exert in their favour by canvassing or other more conspicuous methods.

Women are called on now more imperatively than they have ever been called on before to make their views known to the men who are likely to have the power of carrying them out, and by this means lend the most effective form of co-operation to the efforts of their friends in the House of Commons as well as to the efforts of the Committee, who will do their utmost to secure the introduction of a Bill next session.

NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE

CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

Office—10, GREAT COLLEGE STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

REPORT

OF THE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

PRESENTED AT THE

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

HELD IN THE

WESTMINSTER TOWN HALL

JULY 14th, 1891.

London:

WOMEN'S PRINTING SOCIETY, LIMITED,
21B, GREAT COLLEGE STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

Lord Wolmer having introduced the deputation, Mrs. Fawcett briefly brought forward certain points for consideration. Mr. Smith stated in reply that he had every reason to believe that May 13th would be available for the Bill. He added that that day would certainly not be included in the Whitsuntide holidays, that there was no intention of taking the day for Government business, and that every effort would be made to keep the day open for the Bill.

Meantime Mr. Haldane had secured a first place for a Resolution on April 24th. The Parliamentary Committee on hearing the result of the deputation resolved to proceed with the Bill. Mr. Haldane accordingly withdrew his Resolution.*

Your Committee and the other affiliated Committees at once entered on preparations for the expected division. Mr. Radcliffe Cooke and Mr. Samuel Smith had already given notice of opposition. Mr. De Lisle and Mr. Asquith now also gave notice to move that the Bill be read that day six months. On April 30th, Mr. W. H. Smith moved—"That, whenever the Purchase of Land and Congested Districts (Ireland) Bill is appointed for Tuesday or Friday, the House do meet at 3 o'clock, and that the proceedings on that Bill have precedence over all orders of

* The text of Mr. Haldane's Resolution was as follows;—"That the exclusion of women, otherwise legally qualified, from voting in elections of Members of Parliament is injurious to those excluded, contrary to the principle of just representation, and to that of the laws now in force regulating the election of town and county councils and other local representative bodies."

To this the following notices of amendments were given:—Mr. Samuel Smith,—As an Amendment to Mr. Haldane's Motion, leave out all after "That," and insert "this House views with apprehension so grave a change in our political system as would be involved in the admission of women to the Parliamentary Franchise, and declines to entertain the proposal."

Mr. Radcliffe Cooke,—As an Amendment to Mr. Haldane's Motion, leave out all after "the" and insert "alteration of the Laws which exclude women from voting in elections of Members of Parliament would not be expedient until some public demand should arise for the change, and until (in the event of such a demand arising) the change could be effected without injustice to male voters."

Mr. De Lisle,—As an Amendment to Mr. Haldane's resolution, leave out all after "that" and insert "the exclusion of women from voting in elections of Members of Parliament is beneficial to the peace and prosperity of the State, being in accord with the fundamental principle of the good government of mankind; and that the laws now in force regulating the election of town and county councils and other local representative bodies require examination in order to determine whether the legal qualifications of women are in accord with the natural."

the day and notices of motion; and that the said Bill have precedence on Wednesday, if it be appointed for that day."

A debate then ensued of a very unusual character led by Mr. Gladstone, who advised that all Wednesdays be taken by the Government; Mr. Bryce and Mr. Labouchere also spoke in the same sense and Sir Henry James proposed to amend the motion so that it should read after the word "Bill," in the last line but one, "shall also have precedence on Wednesdays until said Bill has passed through Committee of the House."

On a division being taken the votes were—for the amendment 218, against 159, majority 59. Mr. Akers Douglas and Col. Walrond, the Government Tellers, were tellers for the minority; neither the debate nor the division lists turned on the merits of the Bill.* The following tabular statement will indicate the mixed character of the voting on this occasion:—

	NOES.					AYES.				
	Con.	L.U.	G.L.	N.	Tot.	Con.	L.U.	G.L.	N.	Tot.
Known friends	15	4	8	0	27	3	0	1	1	5
Supposed favourable	60	4	17	2	83	27	7	41	13	88
Opinions unknown or doubtful	30	4	1	0	35	29	14	31	11	85
Understood to be opposed	12	1	1	0	14	19	4	17	0	40
TOTALS.	117	13	27	2	159	78	25	90	25	218

Some known opponents voted with the minority to support Mr. W. H. Smith; some who had been counted on as friends voted with the majority in order to further the Irish Land Bill. Be the motives what they might, and they were no doubt various, the effect remains the same.

On April 13th, a public meeting was held in the Westminster

* A full report of the debate and division list was given in an Occasional paper issued by your Committee on June 1st.

Town Hall, in support of the Parliamentary Franchise Extension to Women Bill. In the unavoidable absence of Mr. Penrose FitzGerald, M.P., the chair was taken by Sir Richard Temple, Bart., M.P. The meeting was addressed by Mrs. Ashford, Mr. Henry Kimber, M.P., the Rev. Harry Jones and Mrs. Fawcett; the following resolution was passed:—

"That in view of the many social questions involving home and domestic interests which will claim the attention of the Legislature in the near future, the inexpediency and injustice of excluding women from all representation has become more serious than at any previous period.

"This Meeting therefore respectfully urges on the Members of Her Majesty's Government, and on Members of the House of Commons, the importance of no longer deferring such extension of the Franchise as shall enable duly qualified women to be placed on the Register before the next General Election."

In view of the expected debate on May 13th, your Committee arranged a conversazione in the galleries of the Royal Institution of Painters in Water Colours, Piccadilly, for the evening of Monday, 11th. Invitations were issued in the names of the following ladies, who kindly consented to form a Reception Committee:—The Lady Frances Balfour, Mrs. Leonard Courtney, Miss Courtenay, Mrs. Fawcett, Louisa Lady Goldsmid, Miss Davenport-Hill, Lady Lethbridge, Lady Matheson, Mrs. Penrose Fitz-Gerald, the Countess of Portsmouth, Mrs. Temple, Mrs. Westlake, the Lady Maud Wolmer. Between ten and eleven o'clock a large assembly which had gathered in the Eastern Gallery were addressed by Mrs. Garrett Anderson, M.D., the Lady Frances Balfour, Mrs. Ashworth Hallett, Rev. Donald Fraser, D.D., Mr. McLaren, M.P., and Mr. Woodall, M.P.

Your Committee desire to express their cordial thanks to Mrs. Napier Higgins for a numerous attended drawing-room meeting held at her residence, Percy Cross House, Fulham, in November; Mr. Napier Higgins, Q.C., presided. They would also thank Miss Reid and Miss Guinness for a discussion meeting held in their studio, Augustine Road, Brook Green, and Mrs. Ormsby Sherrard for a meeting held by her kind invitation at 3, Berkeley Square. They are much indebted to Mrs. Louis Blacker, for a well attended meeting

held by her kind invitation at 13, Queensborough Terrace, Col. Birch in the chair, and to Miss Greenhill for inviting a meeting, on May 9th, at her studio, Abdale Road, Shepherd's Bush; Mr. Sharp in the chair; also to Mrs. Shaen, Mrs. Oliver, Miss Abney Walker, Miss Lord and Miss Petrie, for kind help in addressing these meetings.

Two Petitions of a somewhat special character were presented in the House of Commons through the instrumentality of the friends and members of this Society; one signed by 774 professional women including the Heads of Girton and Newnham Colleges, Cambridge; Somerville Hall, Oxford; College Hall, London; Aberdare Hall, Cardiff; and many Head mistresses of schools, together with a large number of artists, authors, journalists, &c. This petition was presented by Sir John Lubbock. The other was signed by 472 women engaged in social work of various kinds, and was presented by the Right Hon. C. T. Ritchie, M.P.

In December last your Committee offered two prizes in connection with the Educational Council of the southern section of the Co-operative Union for the best essay on "The bearing of Co-operative Experience on the Question of Women's Suffrage." The first prize was awarded to Mr. F. Rockell, whose essay your Committee propose to publish. The second prize was not awarded.

A letter, calling attention to the importance of the Suffrage for Women, which was extensively circulated amongst ladies engaged in political work, was signed by:—Clara, Lady Rayleigh-Miss Balfour (Chief Secretary's Lodge), the Hon. Lady Grey, Egerton, Lady Knightley, Mrs. Cotton-Jodrell, Mrs. Atlay, (The Palace, Hereford), Mrs. Culme-Seymour, Mrs. C. H. Hodgson, (74, Belgrave Road, London), Mrs. Vansittart, Mrs. Dent (Sudeley Castle), the Hon. Mrs. Paley, Lady Rayleigh, and Mrs. Penrose-FitzGerald.

The year that has just closed will be marked in the history of the Suffrage movement for the death of Miss Lydia E. Becker, which took place at Geneva on July 18th, only three days after the last Annual Meeting. Her clear and vigorous mind held a firm grasp of the political bearings of the question,

and as a pioneer in the early and difficult years of the agitation and leader in its councils, the memory of her master mind will ever be associated with its history.

A still earlier advocate of measures for improving the condition of women, Barbara Leigh Smith, Madame Bodichon, breathed her last at Scalands Gate, Sussex, on June 11th. A pamphlet, published by her in 1855, entitled "A Brief Summary of the most important laws of England concerning Women," may be considered to have opened the way for the Married Women's Property Acts. She took an active part in promoting the petition for Women's Suffrage, presented by Mr. J. S. Mill in 1866, and a Paper by her on "Reasons for and against Women's Suffrage" was read at the Social Science Congress in Manchester in the same year. Later she largely shared in founding the college for women now known as Girton College, Cambridge. Though ill-health had compelled her withdrawal for many years from active life, she lived to see her most ardent aspirations more or less fully realized in the passing of the Married Women's Property Acts, the growth of the Women's Suffrage movement, and the success of Girton College.

Your Committee have to record the loss, at the close of last year, of Mr. Coleridge J. Kennard, who had been an earnest supporter of their cause, both in and out of Parliament; of Lord Deramore, who as Sir Thomas Bateson, M.P. for Devizes, voted steadily for the enfranchisement of women; and of Mr. Bradlaugh, M.P., who had proved himself a most consistent and disinterested supporter of Women's Suffrage.

In the past few weeks your Society has lost an old and valued member in Sir Robert N. Fowler, M.P.; he had voted in favour as Member for Penryn in 1871, and his name was on the back of the Bill when it passed second reading in 1886. Another of the most valued members of the Society has passed away in Mr. Thomas Hare, who was for many years a member of the Executive Committee, and who throughout his long life had always been a staunch friend of the cause of women.

The death of Sir J. A. Macdonald removes a powerful supporter from the ranks of our colonial statesmen, and in the general

regret for his loss, your Committee gratefully remember that he introduced provisions for the enfranchisement of women in the Canadian Electoral Bill of 1885.

Your Committee have received an offer of £100 a year for three years, provided that another £900 be raised annually. They earnestly appeal to the friends of the movement to enable them to profit by this offer. They would also invite application for lecturers and for literature from associations desirous of information on the subject.

Amidst the many reforms which press for consideration at the present day, your Committee entreat their friends never to lose sight of this question, and to embrace every opportunity of urging on members of Parliament and Candidates for election, that sex cannot be treated as a bar to enfranchisement without risk of injury to all legislation affecting the moral and social condition of the country.

In conclusion your Committee are resolved to leave no effort untried to procure the passing of a measure of enfranchisement during the life of the present Parliament—or failing this to be fully prepared to meet the General Election.

NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE,
CENTRAL COMMITTEE, 10, GREAT COLLEGE STREET, WESTMINSTER.

Receipts and Payments for the year ending June 30th, 1891.

RECEIPTS.		PAYMENTS.	
	£ s. d.		£ s. d.
By Balance	1 16 0	By Rent	40 0 0
" Donations	224 9 0	" Office Expenses	57 4 0
" Subscriptions	174 12 6	" Salaries	128 15 4
" Sale of Publications	2 0 0	" Meetings and Advertisements	73 5 4
		" Stationery	14 7 0
		" Printing and Publications	65 7 8
		" "Women's Suffrage Journal"	4 19 7
		" Postage	43 10 5
		" Secretary's Travelling Expenses	3 18 1
		" Newspapers and Parliamentary Papers	11 16 6
		" Prize Essay	2 2 0
		Balance in Bank	393 5 11
			9 11 7
	<u>£402 17 6</u>		<u>£402 17 6</u>

Examined, compared with the books and vouchers, and found correct,

M. HARRIS SMITH, *Accountant*,

13, Victoria Street, Westminster, S.W., and

NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

General Annual Meeting of the Central Committee.

Westminster Town Hall, July 14th, 1891.

SIR ALBERT ROLLIT, M.P., in the Chair.

The SECRETARY presented the Report and Financial Statement.

RESOLUTION I :

That this Meeting adopt the Report and Financial Statement and direct that they be printed for circulation.

Moved by Miss TOD.

Seconded by BARON DIMSDALE, M.P.

RESOLUTION II :

That in view of the approaching General Election this Meeting is of opinion that a Bill should be introduced next Session to extend the Parliamentary Franchise to women who already possess the local franchises.

Moved by COL. JODRELL, M.P.

Seconded by MRS. FAWCETT.

RESOLUTION III :

That the Executive Committee for the ensuing year consist of the following persons, with power to add to their number, and of delegates of Associated Societies :—

Professor Adamson, Miss Gertrude Andrews, Mrs. Ashford, Miss Baker, Miss Helen Blackburn, Miss Jessie Boucherett, Miss Frances Power Cobbe, Colonel Cotton-Jodrell, M.P., Miss Courtenay The Right Hon. Leonard Courtney, M.P., Miss F. Davenport-Hill, Miss Emily Davies, Captain Edwards-Heathcote, M.P., Mrs. Henry Fawcett, Louisa Lady Goldsmid, Mrs. Hallett, Mrs. Haslam, Miss Lucy Johnson, Mrs. E. J. Mylne, Miss Mordan, Clara Lady Rayleigh, T. W. Russell, Esq., M.P., Mrs. Stephen Spring-Rice, Mrs. Sterling, Miss Tod, and Miss Vernon.

Moved by MRS. SHAEN.

Seconded by REV. J. C. KIRBY (S. Australian W. S. Committee).

RESOLUTION IV :

That the best thanks of this Meeting be given to Sir Albert. Rollit for presiding on the present occasion.

Moved by Miss EMILY DAVIES.

Seconded by MRS. PENROSE FITZGERALD.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS.

	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
	Dons.	Subs.
Adams, Mrs.	-	1 0 0
Addison, Mrs.	-	0 2 6
Adair, Mrs. H.	-	0 5 0
Allen, Miss	-	1 0 0
Anderson, Mrs. Hall	-	1 1 0
Anderson, Miss	-	0 2 6
Atkins, Edward, Esq.	-	0 5 0
Atkinson, Mrs. Beavington	-	0 5 0
Aylmer, Miss	-	1 1 0
Babb, Miss	-	2 2 0
Babb, J. Staines, Esq.,	-	1 1 0
Baker, Miss	-	0 2 6
Bailey, Miss	-	0 10 0
Baxter, Mrs. Fleming	-	1 0 0
Baxter, Miss	-	0 5 0
Beechcroft, Miss	-	0 2 6
Biggs, Miss Ashurst	-	1 1 0
Biggs, Miss Maude	-	1 0 0
Bishop, Mrs. (Dolycarrig)	-	0 2 6
Blacker, Mrs. Louis	-	0 10 0
Blackmore, Miss	0 10 0	0 10 0
Borchardt, Miss	-	0 5 0
Bostock, Miss	-	0 3 6
Boucherett, Miss Jessie	-	1 0 0
Brandreth. H. S., Esq.	50 0 0	-
Bridges, Mrs.	1 0 0	1 0 0
Brodhurst, Mrs.	-	1 0 0
Brown, Miss E. L.	-	0 10 0
Brumgate, Miss	-	0 2 6
Buchan, Dowager Countess	-	0 2 6
Buckland, Miss	2 0 0	2 2 0
Burne, Miss	-	0 2 6
" Collected by Mrs. Burne	-	0 5 0
Thomas Burne, Esq.	0 2 6	-
Miss S. M. Gardiner	0 2 6	-
Miss de Natorp	0 5 0	-
Smaller Sums	0 3 0	-
Burt, Miss N. S.	-	0 2 6
Bush, Misses	-	2 2 0
Calthorpe, Miss	-	0 5 0
Camperdown, the Earl of	-	5 0 0
Channing-Pearce, Mrs.	-	0 5 0
Charlesworth, Mrs.	-	0 5 0
Clarke, Mrs. Benjamin	-	1 0 0
Cheeseman, Mrs.	-	0 2 6
Chickall, Miss	-	0 2 6
Clutton, R. G., Esq.	-	5 5 0
Cobbe, Miss F. Power	-	5 0 0
Chickall, Miss	-	0 2 6
Colborne, Hon. Mrs.	-	0 10 0
Cotton, Mrs.	-	1 1 0
Cowell, Mrs. H.	-	1 0 0
Courtney, Rt. Hon. Leonard, M.P.	-	1 0 0
Courtenay, Miss	-	1 0 0
Coxhead, Miss	10 0 0	0 10 0

	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
	Dons.	Subs.
Crook, Mrs.	-	1 1 0
Crowe, Miss	-	1 0 0
Crump, Miss	-	0 10 0
Culme-Seymour, Mrs.	-	5 0 0
Curry, Miss F. W.	5 0 0	1 0 0
Darwin, Mrs. Francis	-	0 5 0
Davenport-Hill, Miss	-	1 0 0
Davenport-Hill, Miss F. }	10 0 0	1 1 0
" " (second donation)	1 0 0	1 1 0
Davies, Miss Emily	-	1 1 0
Davies, Mrs.	-	0 5 0
Davis, Miss M. H.	-	0 2 6
Debenham, Mrs. Wm.	-	0 10 0
Dimsdale, Baron, M.P.	-	3 3 0
Donkin, Miss	-	0 5 0
Dougal, Miss L.	-	0 2 6
Dublin Committee	-	1 0 0
Duer, Misses	-	0 10 0
Dunn, Miss	-	1 1 0
Eaton, Mrs. Lauder	-	0 5 0
Eccles, Miss	10 0 0	5 0 0
Edge, Miss	-	0 2 6
Edmunds, Miss	-	1 0 0
Ely, Miss Emily	-	0 5 0
Evans, Miss	-	0 10 0
Eve, Mrs.	-	0 10 0
Ewart, Miss	0 10 0	-
Fawcett, Mrs. Henry	2 0 0	-
Fawcett, Miss	10 0 0	5 0 0
Field, Mrs. Eastwick	-	1 0 0
Ford, Miss E. H.	-	0 5 0
Ford, Miss I. O.	5 0 0	3 0 0
Ford, Rawlinson, Esq.	-	5 0 0
Ford, Mrs. Rawlinson	-	1 1 0
Friend, A (Windsor)	0 10 0	1 1 0
Friends, Several, per Miss Lucy Johnson	-	0 10 0
Garrett, Miss Agnes	5 0 0	-
Goff, Miss	-	2 2 0
Goldsmid, Louisa, Lady	-	0 2 6
" " (second donation)	5 0 0	2 2 0
Gordon, Miss	-	0 5 0
Green, Miss E. H.	-	1 0 0
Grey, Mrs. Wm.	-	2 2 0
Grove, Miss	-	0 10 0
Gurney Miss M.	-	1 0 0
Gurney, Miss A.	-	0 10 0
Gwynne, Miss	-	0 10 0
Hallett, T. G. P., Esq., and Mrs. Hallett	5 0 0	-
Hamilton, Miss	-	0 5 0
Hamley, Miss	-	0 2 6
Hallwright, Mrs.	-	0 5 0
Harberton, Viscountess	-	1 0 0
Hardie, Miss	-	0 2 6
Hare, Thomas, Esq., (the late)	-	1 1 0
Harrison, Mrs.	-	1 0 0
Hart, Miss M. H.	-	0 5 0

	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
	Dons.	Subs.
Harvey, Miss	-	0 2 6
Heath, Mrs. Bayly	-	1 1 0
Heberden, Mrs.	-	0 2 6
Higgins, Mrs. Napier	-	2 0 0
Higginson, Mrs.	-	1 0 0
Hill, Miss Emily	-	0 2 6
Hill, Miss Georgiana	-	0 2 6
Hill, Frederick, Esq.	-	1 0 0
Hodgson, Mrs. C. H.	3 3 0	-
" " (second donation)	5 0 0	-
" " (third donation)	3 3 0	-
Holland, Mrs. Charles	10 0 0	2 2 0
Holland, Miss Mabel	-	2 0 0
Howse, Mrs.	-	0 10 0
Hubbard, Mrs.	-	0 5 0
J.L.A.	1 0 0	-
Jex-Blake, Dr. Sophia	-	1 0 0
Jodrell, Col. Cotton, M.P.	3 0 0	-
Johnson, Miss Agnes	-	1 1 0
Johnson, Miss Lucy	-	1 1 0
Jones, Miss Constance	-	1 1 0
Jones, Miss H. M.	-	0 5 0
Kensington, Miss	-	0 5 0
Lafone, Alfred, Esq., M.P.	-	2 2 0
Lawrence, Miss D.	-	1 1 0
Lawrence, Miss M.	-	1 1 0
Lawrence, Miss	-	1 1 0
"Left Hand"	2 0 0	-
Lewin, Miss	-	0 4 0
Light, Miss	-	1 1 0
Link, F., Esq.	0 5 0	-
Lister, Miss Emma	-	0 5 0
Lloyd, Miss	0 10 0	-
Ludlow, Miss	1 0 0	-
Lyttelton, Hon. and Rev. Edward	-	1 1 0
Lyttelton, Hon. Mrs. Edward	-	1 1 0
<i>Per Luton Committee :-</i>		
Mrs. Alford	-	0 3 0
Mrs. Baily	-	0 1 6
Miss Bigg	-	2 2 0
Mrs. Boutwood	-	0 2 6
Mrs. Hall	-	0 2 6
Mrs. F. B. Webb	-	0 2 6
John Webdale, Esq.	-	0 5 0
Mrs. Webster	-	0 5 0
Mrs. Wootton	-	0 2 6
Mrs. Henry Wright	-	0 5 0
The Committee	-	0 2 6
McKerlie, Miss Helen	-	0 5 0
Mackovski, Stainslaus	-	1 1 0
Manning, Miss E. A.	-	1 1 0
Marshall, Dr. Mary	-	1 1 0
Marshall, John, Esq.	-	1 1 0
Marshall, Mrs. John	-	1 1 0
" " per Miss von Herder	-	0 5 0
" " " Miss Beever	-	0 2 6

	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
	Dons.	Subs.
Marshall, Mrs. Stephen	-	2 0 0
Martineau, Miss L. E.	-	1 0 0
Meinertzhagen, Miss	-	0 5 0
Mitchell, Mrs. J. F.	1 1 0	-
Moore, Miss Ogle	-	0 2 6
Mordan, Miss	-	5 0 0
Mordan, Augustus, Esq.	-	1 0 0
Morris, Mr. George	0 7 6	-
Mosley, Miss M.	-	0 2 6
" " Collected by		
Miss E. S. Clarke	-	0 2 6
Mrs. Curling Hope	-	0 2 6
Miss E. G. Pierpoint	-	0 2 6
Mrs. Maguire	0 2 6	-
Muller, Mrs.	-	1 1 0
Mylne, Mrs. E. J.	-	0 10 0
Newman, Prof. F. W.	-	1 0 0
Norris, Miss	0 3 0	-
Notcutt, Miss	-	0 5 0
O'Connor, Miss	-	0 5 0
Oliver, Mrs.	-	1 1 0
Paley, Hon. Mrs.	-	2 0 0
Paine, Mrs. Lewis (two years)	-	0 10 0
Pereira, Hon. Mrs.	-	2 2 0
Phillott, Mrs.	-	0 5 0
Phillott, Miss Constance	-	0 5 0
Phillott, Miss Edith	-	0 5 0
Pochin, H. D., Esq.	5 0 0	-
Pochin, Mrs.	5 0 0	-
Ponsonby, Hon. Mrs.	-	0 5 0
Porter, Miss	-	0 5 0
Poyser, Mrs.	-	0 2 6
Pym, Mrs. Guy	1 1 0	-
Rayleigh, Clara, Lady	-	1 0 0
Reeves, Miss	-	0 10 0
Reid, Miss	-	0 2 6
Roberts, Sir Owen and Lady	-	2 2 0
Robertson, Miss	-	1 0 0
Robson, Miss H.	0 10 0	-
Rolleston, Miss	-	0 1 0
Russell, T. W., Esq., M.P., and Mrs.	-	0 10 0
Ruth, Miss (2 years)	-	2 0 0
Salès, Mrs.	-	1 0 0
Sanderson, J. S., Esq.	-	1 1 0
Scholefield, Mrs.	-	1 1 0
Seakins, Mrs.	-	0 5 0
Shaen, Mrs.	-	1 1 0
Shaen, Miss	-	1 1 0
Shedden, Mrs. E. C.	-	0 2 6
Shedden, Mrs. R.	-	0 2 6
Shurmer, Miss Ada	-	0 5 0
Sidgwick, Prof. and Mrs. Henry	-	2 2 0
Sieveking, Miss E. W.	-	0 2 6
Singleton, Mrs.	-	0 2 6
Smith, Mrs. Murray	5 0 0	-
Smith, Mrs. F. P.	-	0 5 0

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
	Dons.			Subs.		
Smith, Miss M. Harris	0	10	6	0	10	6
Smith, Mrs. Macleod	2	0	0			
Snoad, Mrs. Frank, Collected by						
Miss E. M. Phillips	0	2	6			
Mrs. De Rheims	0	2	6			
Small sums	0	2	0			
Spring-Rice, Mrs. S.				1	1	0
Collected by	0	7	6			
Spring-Rice, Miss A.	0	2	6			
Spring-Rice, Hon. Mrs. F., Collected by	0	6	0			
Stansfield, Miss	1	0	0			
Sterling, Mrs.	1	0	0	2	0	0
Sterling, Miss	1	0	0	2	0	0
Stopes, Mrs.				0	5	0
Strange, Miss L. G.				1	1	0
Streatfield, Mrs.				2	2	0
Tabor, Miss M. C.				0	5	0
Tacey, Miss				1	0	0
Tacey, Miss Alice	4	0	0	1	0	0
Tacey, Miss Anne				1	0	0
Tatlock, Miss				1	0	0
Taylor, Mrs. Thomas				1	0	0
Thomas, Mrs. Charles				1	1	0
Thomas, Mrs. Elizabeth	10	0	0			
Thorne, Mrs.				0	5	0
Toynbee, Miss				0	5	0
Tubbs, Mrs.				1	0	0
Turner, Mrs. J. W.				0	5	0
Twining, Miss Louisa				1	0	0
Venning, Miss Rosamond						
Wainwright, Miss	1	0	0	0	5	0
Walker, Miss Abney				1	0	0
Walker, Edward, Esq.				1	0	0
Walker, Miss Ethel				0	2	6
Walker, Mrs. Ingram				0	10	0
Ward, Miss F. B.				0	2	6
Waterman, Miss	5	0	0			
Wedgwood, Miss Julia				0	10	0
Wellesley, Mrs. Gerald				1	0	0
Welsh, Miss				1	0	0
Westlake, John, Esq., Q.C.				0	10	0
Westlake, Mrs.				0	10	0
Wilkinson, Miss F. R.				1	1	0
Wilkinson, Miss L. M.				1	1	0
Wodehouse, Mrs. E. H.	0	10	0			
Wolmer, The Lady Maud				1	1	0
Wordale, Rev. J.	2	0	0			
Zimmermann, Miss Agnes				1	1	0
Various small sums				0	5	0

RECEIVED SINCE BOOKS MADE UP.

Mrs. Jeffcock	0	5	0
Mrs. Frank Hill	1	1	0
Mr. Michael Cook	0	5	0
Miss Lucy Bird	0	10	0
Mrs. Tapson	2	2	0

GENERAL COMMITTEE.

Agg. Gardner, J. T., Esq., M.P.	Johnston, Wm., Esq., M.P.
Collings, Jesse, Esq., M.P.	Kenyon, Hon. Geo., M.P.
Cotton-Jodrell, Col., M.P.	Lafone, Alfred, Esq., M.P.
Courtney, the Rt. Hon. Leonard, M.P.	Laurie, Col., M.P.
	Lethbridge, Sir Roper, M.P.
Dimsdale, Baron, M.P.	Maclure, J. W., Esq., M.P.
Dunsany, Lord, M.P.	Manfield, M.P., Esq., M.P.
Edwards-Heathcote, Capt., M.P.	McLagan, Peter, Esq., M.P.
FitzGerald, R. U. Penrose, Esq., M.P.	McLaren, Walter, Esq., M.P.
	Puleston, Sir J. H., M.P.
Fitzwygram, Lt-Gen. Sir F., M.P.	Rollit, Sir A. K., M.P.
Fowler, Sir R. N., Bt., M.P.	Round, James, Esq., M.P.
Fry, Lewis, Esq., M.P.	Russell, T. W., Esq., M.P.
Hanbury-Tracy, Hon. F. S., M.P.	Temple, Sir Richard, Bt., M.P.
Hughes, Edwin, Esq., M.P.	Wright, H. Smith, Esq., M.P.

Abbott, Rev. Edwin A., D.D.	Cobbe, Miss F. Power
Adamson, Professor	Colborne, The Hon. Mrs.
Andrews, Miss Gertrude	Colville, Col.
Anderson, Mrs. Garrett, M.D.	Cooper, Miss Laura
Anstruther, Louisa Lady	Cotton-Jodrell, Mrs.
Ashford, Mrs. (Birmingham)	Courtauld, Geo., Esq.
Atkinson, Miss (Manchester)	Courtenay, Miss
Babb, Miss C. E.	Crook, Mrs. (Bolton)
Baker, Miss G.	Cross, Mrs. Joseph (Bolton)
Balfour, Eustace, Esq.	Darwin, Mrs. Francis
Balfour, The Lady Frances	Davenport-Hill, Miss
Barnett, Mrs. S. A.	Davenport-Hill, Miss F.
Beddoe, John, Esq., M.D., F.R.S.	Davies, Rev. Llewelyn
Beddoe, Mrs. (Clifton)	Davies, Miss Emily
Bell, Miss Elizabeth	Donkin, Miss
Bell, Miss A. E.	Drew, Miss Catherine
Bigg, Miss Louisa (Luton)	Dunbar, Dr. Eliza W. (Bristol)
Biggs, Miss Ashurst	Dunn, T. W., Esq., M.A. (Bath Coll).
Blackburn, Miss Helen	Eastwick-Field, Mrs.
Bostock, Miss	Eccles, Miss
Boucherett, Miss (Willingham)	Edwards, Miss Amelia B.
Boucherett, Miss Jessie	Egerton, Hon. Lady Grey
Bowring, Lady (Exeter)	Eiloart, Mrs.
Brodie-Hall, Miss L. W. (Eastbourne)	Ellaby, Miss, M.D.
	Ellis, Miss
Buchan, Dowager Countess of	Ewart, Lady
Burrough, Mrs. (Eaton Bishop)	Fawcett, Mrs. Henry
Byers, Mrs. (Belfast)	FitzGerald, Mrs Penrose
Chamberlain, V. I., Esq.	FitzGerald, Miss Geraldine
Chamberlain, Mrs. V. I.	Penrose
Champneys, Basil, Esq.	FitzGerald, Miss (Valencia Island)
Clark, Mrs. Benjamin	FitzGerald, Mrs. Robert (Tralee)
Clough, Miss A. J. (Newnham College)	Fletcher, J. S., Esq.

Ford, Mrs. Rawlinson (Leeds)	Mordan, Miss
Ford, Miss Isabella O.	Mylne, Mrs.
Forsyth, W., Esq., Q.C.	Muller, E. B. Ivan, Esq., Manchester
Forsyth, Miss Ethel	Mylne, Mrs. Eltham
Garrett, Miss Agnes	Newman, Prof. F. W.
Green, Rev. Charles (Beckenham)	Oliver R., Esq.
Grimshaw, Mrs. (Goldington Grange)	Oliver, Mrs.
Gurney, Miss Mary	Parry, Lady Maude
Goldsmid, Louisa, Lady	Percival, Rev. J., D.D. (Rugby)
Hallett, Mrs. Ashworth.	Passmore-Edwards, J., Esq.
Hallett, T. G. P., Esq.	Pereira, The Hon. Mrs.
Hamilton, Mrs. (Bray, Dublin)	Portsmouth, the Countess of
Hamilton, Miss Mary	Prideaux, Miss S.
Hankey, Mrs. H. A.	Pym, Guy, Esq.
Harberton, Viscount.	Rayleigh, Clara, Lady
Harberton, Viscountess	Reeves, Miss
Harcourt, A. Vernon, Esq. (Oxon)	Reeves, Miss (Tramore)
Hare, Miss Mary H.	Ridley, Miss
Haslam, Mrs. (Dublin)	Roberts, Sir Owen, F.S.A.
Heath, Mrs. W. Bayly	Roberts, Lady
Herringham, Mrs. Wilmot	Roberts, Miss Dorothea
Higgins, Mrs. Napier	Robertson, Miss
Hill, Frederic, Esq.	Russell, Mrs. T. W.
Hill, Mrs. Frank	Sanderson, J. S., Esq., (Chislehurst)
Hodgson, Mrs. C. H.	Sawyer, Lady
Holland, Mrs. Charles	Scholefield, Mrs.
Hunter, R., Esq.	Severne, Mrs. (Shrewsbury)
Hunter, Mrs. R.	Shaen, Mrs.
James, Captain	Sidgwick, Prof. Henry, D.Litt.
Jex Blake, Dr. Sophia	Sidgwick, Mrs. Henry
Johnson, Miss Lucy	Spring Rice, Mrs. Stephen
Jones, Rev. Harry.	Still, Major-Gen. (Clifton)
Jones, Miss H. M. (Notting Hill High School)	Sturge, Miss Emily (Bristol)
Kensington, Miss	Sturge, Miss M. C.
Kinnear, J. Boyd, Esq.	Sterling, Mrs.
Kinnear, Mrs. J. Boyd	Stone, Miss
Knightley, Lady	Swanwick, Miss Anna
Lambert, Rev. Brooke	Tabor, Miss M. C.
Lecky, Mrs. W. E. H.	Taylor, Mrs. (Chipchase Castle)
Lethbridge, Lady	Taylor, Mrs. Thos.
Lister, Miss Emma (Hampstead)	Taylor, Miss Janet
Lynd, The Rev. R. I., D. D. (Moderator, Irish Presb. Church)	Thomas, Mrs. Charles (Bristol)
McLaren, Mrs. Eva	Thorne, Mrs. (Lewes)
Manning, Miss E. Adelaide	Tod, Miss (Belfast)
Marshall, Mrs. Mary, M.D.	Toynbee, Miss
Marshall, Mrs. Emma	Turner, Mrs. Hugh Thackeray
Marshall, Mrs. John (Derwent Island)	Twining, Miss Louisa
Marshall, Mrs. Stephen (Amble-side)	Vernon, Miss
Meath, The Countess of	Vincent, Maria, Lady
Mele Barese, Princess	Ward, Mrs. E. M.
	Wedgwood, Miss Julia
	Welsh, Miss (Girton College)
	Wilkinson, Miss
	Wilkinson, Miss L. M.
	Wilks, Mark, Esq.

NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

The object of the Society is to obtain the Parliamentary Franchise for Women on the same conditions as it is, or may be granted to men.

The Society seeks to achieve this object—

1. By acting as a centre for the collection and diffusion of information with regard to the progress of the movement in all parts of the country.
2. By holding Public Meetings in support of the repeal of the Electoral Disabilities of women.
3. By the publication of Pamphlets, Leaflets, and other Literature bearing upon the question.

RULES.

PASSED AT THE GENERAL MEETING OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE AND SUBSCRIBERS TO ITS FUNDS, HELD JULY 17TH, 1872.

1. The Central Committee shall consist of the present members and such others as the Executive Committee may, from time to time, elect.
2. The Executive Committee shall consist of members of the Central Committee, to be elected at the Annual General Meeting, and of single delegates, the same being members of Local Committees, appointed by Local Associations to represent them; the Executive Committee having power to add to the Central Committee, and to its own number, and to appoint the Officers.
3. A subscription of any amount constitutes membership of the National Society.
4. A General Meeting of the Central Committee shall be held once a year to appoint the Executive Committee, to receive the Annual Report and the Financial Statement and to transact any other business which may arise.
5. The Executive Committee shall, at its first meeting, appoint the Officers.
6. A Special General Meeting may be called by the Executive Committee at any time; or, at the written request of not less than twenty-five members of the Central Committee the Secretary or Secretaries shall call a Special General Meeting to discuss such matters only as are mentioned in the notice of such meeting.
7. Eight days' public notice shall be given of all General Meetings.
8. The above rules shall not be altered except at a General Meeting after fourteen days' notice of the proposed alteration given to the Executive Committee.

PUBLICATIONS ISSUED BY THE CENTRAL
COMMITTEE.

MEMORIAL to the Marquis of Salisbury and the Rt. Hon. W. H. Smith. Price 1d.

OCCASIONAL PAPER issued June 1st, 1891.

Contents—Notes of the Session, Debate in the House of Commons on Sir Henry James' Amendment, Division List, Opinions of the Press, &c. Price 1d.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY REPRESENTATIVE ELECTORAL BODIES. Leaflet 1s. 6d. per 100

DECLARATION IN FAVOUR OF WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE, being a complete list of the signatures received at 10, Great College Street, Westminster. Price 2d.

OPINIONS OF CONSERVATIVE LEADERS. Leaflet 1s. 6d. per 100.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE. Reasons for supporting the Extension of the Franchise. 1s. per 100.

12
NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S
SUFFRAGE.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

OCCASIONAL PAPER,

*Issued by the Central Committee, 10, Great College Street,
Westminster.*

CONTENTS. PAGE

CURRENT NOTES	3
PARLIAMENTARY INTELLIGENCE (Text of the Bill)	6
STATISTICS OF WOMEN VOTERS	7
RECENT MEETINGS	7
WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE IN NEW ZEALAND AND SOUTH AUSTRALIA	14

25th March, 1892.

London:
PRINTED BY VACHER & SONS, WESTMINSTER.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Professor ADAMSON.
Miss GERTRUDE ANDREWS.
Mrs. ASHFORD.
Miss BAKER.
The LADY FRANCES BALFOUR.
Miss HELEN BLACKBURN.
Miss JESSIE BOUCHERETT.
Miss FRANCES POWER COBBE.
Colonel COTTON-JODRELL, M.P.
Miss COURTENAY.
The Right Hon. LEONARD
COURTNEY, M.P.
Miss EMILY DAVIES.
Captain EDWARDS-HEATHCOTE,
M.P.

Mrs. HENRY FAWCETT.
LOUISA LADY GOLDSMID.
Mrs. ASHWORTH HALLETT.
Mrs. HASLAM.
Miss LUCY JOHNSON.
Miss MORDAN.
Mrs. E. J. MYLNE.
CLARA LADY RAYLEIGH.
T. W. RUSSELL, Esq., M.P.
Mrs. STEPHEN SPRING-RICE.
Mrs. STERLING.
Miss M. C. STURGE.
Miss TOD.
Miss VERNON.

And Delegates of Associated Societies.

Hon. Treasurer—Miss VERNON.

Hon. Secretary—Mrs. FAWCETT.

Secretary—Miss BLACKBURN.

Bankers—LONDON AND COUNTY BANK—HOLBORN BRANCH, NEW
OXFORD STREET.

Office—10, GREAT COLLEGE STREET, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

OCCASIONAL PAPER,

25th March, 1892.

CURRENT NOTES.

WITH the introduction of a new Bill (the text of which has just been printed), the Executive Committee desire to place a brief statement of the present position and prospects of the Women's Suffrage question before their members and friends.

THE announcement appeared early in January, that Sir Algernon Borthwick, Bart., M.P., had consented to bring in a Bill this Session for the extension of the Parliamentary franchise to women. The effect of the Bill would be to enfranchise those women who already vote in County Council, School Board, Town Council, and Board of Guardians elections.

This announcement caused a great increase of hope that some definite step might be achieved in the Session of 1892.

ON the first day of the Session the Parliamentary Committee, consisting of Members of Parliament supporters of Women's Suffrage, held a meeting in one of the Committee rooms of the House of Commons, to consider the best steps for promoting the Bill for the Enfranchisement of Women. The Members present were:—Mr. Woodall (in the chair), Sir Algernon Borthwick, Baron Dimsdale, Mr. Lewis

Fry, Mr. Penrose FitzGerald, Mr. Haldane, Mr. W. Johnston, Mr. M'Laren, Mr. Byron Reed, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Ernest Spencer, Mr. A. Williams, Viscount Wolmer.

It was resolved to support Sir Algernon Borthwick in introducing his Bill, and agreed that a number of Members should ballot for a day for the second reading.

IN the subsequent ballot, the best place was drawn by Sir Albert Rollit, who stood eleventh on the list. Sir Albert Rollit has secured Wednesday, April 27th, for the second reading of the Bill, which stands first on the orders of the day, and is backed by Sir Algernon Borthwick, Viscount Wolmer, Mr. Walter M'Laren, Mr. Penrose FitzGerald, Mr. T. D. Sullivan, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Burt, and Mr. Ernest Spencer.

Mr. WALTER M'LAREN obtained the next place, and has also set down a Bill for second reading on May 18th, which is backed by Sir Algernon Borthwick, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Mr. T. D. Sullivan, Sir Edward Watkin, Baron Dimsdale, Dr. Cameron, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Lewis Fry, Mr. Webb, Mr. Byron Reed, and Mr. Maclure.

THERE are thus two Bills before the House; one introduced by a Conservative, the other by a Liberal, and each backed by Members of all parties. The text of Sir Albert Rollit's Bill will be found below.

At a Special Meeting of the Executive Committee, held at 10, Great College Street, Westminster, on

February 11th, it was resolved:—"That this Committee rejoices to hear that a favourable day has been secured for the second reading of the Bill for extending the Parliamentary Franchise to Women. They will do their utmost to further the Bill introduced under the auspices of Sir Albert Rollit and Sir Algernon Borthwick, and they cordially thank all those Members who took part in the ballot."

THE effect of the Bill thus brought forward by Sir Albert Rollit will be to place on the Parliamentary register all those women who now vote in the various local elections. It will thus enfranchise those women who are already accustomed to voting, and whose numbers can be accurately ascertained.

THE Committee desire to remind their members and friends that the most valuable help that can be rendered to the movement between the present time and the date for the second reading, is to bring the question before the consideration of Members, either by means of letters or petitions, or by questions at meetings, or in conversation. They also would urge the value of keeping the subject before the attention of candidates, especially those candidates who seek for the help of women in canvassing and other political work preparatory to the General Election, yet would ignore their claim to the instrument by which the most effective political aid can be given, the quiet and silent instrument of the vote.

TEXT OF THE WOMEN'S FRANCHISE BILL.

[55 VICT.] *Parliamentary Franchise (Extension to Women).*

A
BILL

TO

A.D. 1892. Extend the Parliamentary Franchise to Women.

BE it enacted by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

1. This Act may be cited as the Parliamentary Franchise (Women) Act, 1892.

2. Every woman who—

(1) In Great Britain is registered or entitled to be registered as an elector for any town council or county council; or

(2) In Ireland is a ratepayer entitled to vote at an election for guardians of the poor;

shall be entitled to be registered as a parliamentary elector, and when registered to vote at any parliamentary election for the county, borough, or division wherein the qualifying property is situate.

(Prepared and brought in by Sir Albert Rollit, Sir A. Borthwick, Viscount Wolmer, Mr. W. McLaren, Mr. Penrose Fitzgerald, Mr. T. D. Sullivan, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Burt and Mr. Ernest Spencer.)

Notice of opposition, that the Bill be read this day six months, has been given by Mr. Samuel Smith, by Mr. John Kelly, and by Mr. Radcliffe Cooke.

Short title.

Extension of parliamentary franchise.

STATISTICS OF WOMEN VOTERS.

The following table shews the number of women on the registers for the election of Town and County Councillors:—

	Town.	County.
England)	243,448	412,340
Wales)		
Scotland . . .	54,678	61,445
Total	<u>298,126</u>	<u>503,199</u>

The above voters consist of occupiers in either borough or county divisions, who are entered on the rate books as having paid their rates, and who have occupied a house, shop, warehouse or other tenement in the parish for twelve months previous to July 15th, 1891.

Note.—Occupiers of flats and joint occupiers are included in the above, also occupiers of part of a house, when occupied separately for carrying on any trade, profession or business.

For instance, a house might be occupied by a shopkeeper on the ground floor, a milliner on the first floor, and a photographer on the upper floors, each carrying on a quite separate business, and if the landlord were not resident on the premises each could be registered as a voter.

Owners or tenants of land of a clear yearly value of £10. Joint owners can vote when the value is sufficient, if divided, to give £10 to each. For instance, three sisters owning land or houses of the rental of £30 can each be registered as a voter.

There are no returns available by which to calculate the number of women ratepayers in Ireland. It is however probable that it would be somewhat less than in Scotland.

 RECENT MEETINGS.

Several meetings have taken place since the opening of Parliament, the most important being those held in Birmingham, in Prince's Hall, Piccadilly, and in Bristol.

BIRMINGHAM.

A meeting was held in the Masonic Hall, New Street, on

February 23rd, under the auspices of the Birmingham Society for Women's Suffrage, in support of the Women's Suffrage Bill now before Parliament. Mrs. Ashford presided; and among those present were Lady Sawyer, Lady Foster, Mrs. R. W. Dale, Mrs. A. C. Osler, Mrs. J. K. Reid, Mrs. Arthur Dixon, Mrs. W. H. Ryland, Mrs. Sonnenschein, Mrs. Barrow, Mrs. C. E. Mathews, Mrs. Fellowes, Mrs. Farrow, Mrs. Fred. Impey, Mrs. E. L. Tyndall, Mrs. G. C. Elkington, Mrs. C. D. Sturge, Mrs. C. Dixon, &c. Apologies for absence were announced from the Marchioness of Hertford, the Dowager Countess of Aylesford, the Countess of Aylesford, Lady Knightley, Mrs. C. Mallet, Mrs. H. G. Reid, Mrs. H. Chamberlain, Dr. and Mrs. Crosskey, &c. The President, at the commencement of the proceedings, proposed a vote of condolence with the Prince and Princess of Wales, the Queen, and the Royal Family in the loss they had sustained by the death of the Duke of Clarence. Lady Foster seconded the resolution which was carried in silence.—The President said that every lady present had been invited to attend that meeting, because it was known that she took an interest in the social problems of the day. A large majority of them, no doubt, had worked in some of the various elections in the city and neighbourhood, sometimes side by side, and sometimes on opposite sides. At the conclusion of her speech she proposed, "That this meeting heartily approves and supports the Women's Suffrage Bill introduced into the House of Commons by Sir A. Rollit, for the second reading of which he has secured the first place on April 27th, and calls upon those present to unite in urging on their various political associations the desirability of supporting this measure of justice to women." Mrs. C. E. Mathews seconded the resolution, which was supported by Mrs. Sheldon Amos and Mrs. Fawcett, who remarked that it was very natural that those who had been called upon in some measure to take up active political work should feel keenly the absurdity of their present position, and they also felt keenly the absurdity of the position of the men who asked them to do various kinds of hard and rough work connected with the conduct of an election, yet said in effect were not fit to quietly enter a polling booth and vote. All sides invited them to work for them, speak for them, do hard rough work for them, and help to find the money to conduct the political fights, but neither party as a party had yet thought fit to take up the question of the enfranchisement of women. The result was that platform-women had their full share, perhaps, of political power; but the quiet and typical domestic women, to whom an appearance on the platform was distasteful, and who felt that they could not take up active political life, were entirely excluded from any influence in political affairs. Lady Sawyer and Mrs. A. Osler supported the resolution, which was carried.

LONDON.

A large meeting in support of the extension of the Parliamentary franchise to women was held in Prince's Hall, Piccadilly, on February 26th, under the auspices of the Central National Society for Women's Suffrage, 29, Parliament Street. A full report of this meeting appeared in the *Women's Herald*. The following is the speech of the Right Hon. Leonard Courtney, M.P., who presided.

Mr. Courtney said the friends of Women's Suffrage stood that day in a position upon which they might congratulate themselves (cheers). They had a good position from the Parliamentary point of view. They had been for several sessions now somewhat unlucky. The wisdom of Parliament was not always shown in its own procedure, and it was certainly a remarkable fact that the question what subjects it should take up and discuss, and what persons it should hear, should, for half of its sittings—those specially which are given over for the benefit of private members—be determined by pure chance. Luck and not selection rule the House. There might be some subject that a very large section, even a majority of the House of Commons, would wish to discuss; but if the persons who have put their names in the lucky box for the discussion of that question, do not get their names drawn in the first select few, all chance of discussion is gone. But now the wheel of fortune seemed to have turned, and two good places had been secured by two good friends of the cause, Mr. Walter McLaren (cheers) whom we saw there that night, and Sir Albert Rollit (cheers) whom he had the pleasure of seeing in the House of Commons just before he left, and who charged him to convey his regret that he was not able to come here. He did not think the malice of enemies could well take away both those days, and he thought the difficulty of taking away both would probably prevent all intrigues to take away either. It was, no doubt, true, that in one sense the Parliamentary future is doubtful. The lives of its members were numbered. The "blind Fury with the abhorred shears" might at any moment intervene and cut through the thin span of life. But even, he ventured to believe, the possibility of a Dissolution might be lost sight of when they looked to the days they had secured. The probability was great that they would be able to bring on the question; that they would get a good vote of the House of Commons upon it, and he was not without hopes that action would be carried farther, and that before that event happens, something may be done to secure to women votes in the approaching crisis. (Cheers.)

Though they had been thus unfortunate in trying the chances of Parliament during the last two or three years, there were compensating circumstances which cannot be overlooked. Those years had not been unfruitful. They had been remarkable

in a very extraordinary degree by the increase of the political activity of women. (Cheers.) Even before the present Parliament began, women had votes in the election of Town Councillors. They had votes in the election of School Boards; they had votes in the election of Boards of Guardians, and they might even sit upon School Boards and Boards of Guardians. Well, it was a pretty strong thing to say that women were qualified to vote in all these elections, but were not qualified to vote for Members of Parliament. It was an obvious remark that Members of Parliament had some interest in the last vote, and perhaps the gaiety of heart with which they enfranchised women in respect of other elections deserted them a little when their own particular prospects were involved. (Laughter, and hear, hear.) He never could see any reasonable defence of the anomaly; but so it stood at the commencement of this Parliament. They had added to that line of argument by giving women votes for County Councils, and in the Bill now before Parliament, giving County Councils to Ireland, the same principle was involved. But they had done much more. There was now no section of political life which had not enlisted the active co-operation of women. All had asked for their work; all had asked for their help; all had enlisted their zeal. The Primrose League was the first in the field, and dated before the present Parliament. But they had now Women's Liberal Associations and Women's Liberal Unionist Associations (cheers), and whenever there was an election, entreaties came faster and faster to the organisers of those associations to "Send the ladies down" to the district or districts where the elections are taking place, to aid in educating the voters and in bringing them to the poll. Now what does this amount to? It might not have been done with the hearty good will of every politician of every party, but it amounted to a confession by the leaders of each political party, that women are able at least to form an opinion upon political questions. They are able to do more. So excellent is their judgment that they may be trusted to guide others in the formation of their opinions (cheers), and they had now the singular spectacle, on the part of some politicians, of asserting that women may be trusted to instruct others how to vote; but they are not to be trusted to instruct themselves. Now, had they ever heard of such a contradiction as that? Generally those who teach are most expert in practising what they teach. Could they imagine a person teaching swimming who did not know how to swim, or teaching the rudiments of horsemanship who was entirely ignorant of riding? But here are the women sought for, and women's meetings held, and women appealed to, to "come here," and "send there;" "give us your literature," "give us your arguments," "give us your canvassers." But there the matter stopped. They could not add "give us your votes."

He believed it would be impossible to withstand the argument afforded by the experience of recent years, and now that all parties were indebted to the political co-operation of women, there was no ground for denying them participation in electoral rights. (Hear, hear.) There was only one suggestion, he thought, which could be raised; and that suggestion was sometimes, but rarely, avowed. Generally, it was almost indignantly disavowed. There was a feeling, no doubt, on the part of some persons, that if women had votes, those votes would be exercised against the party to which they belong. Well, if there were persons who held this opinion—and he knew, privately, at least, that there were a few—it was held privately by most, because it was an opinion people were ashamed to confess. (Hear, hear.) That women capable of voting, qualified to vote, having all the interests involved in a political crisis at heart, and being concerned in all questions of national welfare, should be denied their vote because it was thought the opinion of the majority of them might be adverse to this or that political party, was a doctrine too shameful to be openly avowed, and he hoped too cynical to be secretly acted upon. (Loud cheers.) But to reason with such persons on their own ground, he ventured to express the opinion that they were entirely deluded in their opinions. There was no reason for supposing, as between political parties, that the action of women would prevail more in favour of one than the other. They had seen something of it in municipal elections. They had seen more of it in School Board elections. In the questions which are dearest to women, he believed it was impossible for the keenest of party managers to say on which side the majority of women's votes are cast in the matter of those elections, and he did not believe that any person could speak with any confidence of the future as to the way women would vote with the majority,—Conservatives, or Liberals, or Nationalists, or Liberal Unionists, or in any other connection. Women were divided in their political opinions as men are. The one thing in which he thought they would be united, and with which they had in the past united, was something quite independent of party; a determination on their part to secure men of probity, of integrity, and of honour (cheers), to whatever political party they might belong. It was in the influence of the character of Parliamentary candidates and of Parliamentary representatives, that he believed the influence of women would tell; and he hailed, and was sure they would all hail, that influence if it was so exercised. (Cheers.) The reflex action upon women themselves he would not enter upon. It was a matter which to him had always been the prime motive for advocating this enfranchisement of women. To give them the vote would do something to enlarge the range of their sympathies, to raise the level of their character, and they, in their turn, would do much to elevate and purify political life. (Cheers.)

BRISTOL.

The annual meeting of the Bristol and West of England Society for Women's Suffrage was held at the offices of the society, 69, Park street, on February 27th. There was a good attendance. The chair was taken by Mrs. Beddoe, who, in opening the meeting, said it seemed that the crisis for which they had been working and waiting was now close at hand; it behoved them more than ever to put their shoulders to the wheel, and do their utmost to bring to the goal this measure which could no longer, at all events, be reproached as being a novelty (applause). In the ancient town to which she had now the honour of belonging, much interest was taken in the subject, as indeed there ought to be, for in the olden days it was not distrustful of women and of what are called their rights. History told them that for 500 years the affairs of Bradford-on-Avon were managed, and evidently very satisfactorily managed, by the Abbesses of Shaftesbury (hear hear.) Such a condition of things might well give courage to those timid politicians to whom the bare idea that at some unknown and remote period a woman might perchance sit in Parliament was such a bogie that they gave this as a reason for not doing the thing that was right and just; and within the last few days two debates had taken place in Parliament on matters of special interest to women. In one of these, a member, an opponent of women's suffrage, though a man they much respected, had carefully prepared statistics showing the attendance, in Liverpool and elsewhere, in Welsh Episcopal churches, also in Welsh Nonconformist churches. Now it would be different to what is usually the case if a majority of their worshippers were not women; yet Mr. Samuel Smith is one of those who would have them believe that politics do not concern women. Then, referring to Mr. Provand's Shop Hours Regulation Bill, she remarked that: If every place of business had to be closed at an appointed hour, it might be necessary to return to the Curfew Bell. But the question that concerned them was the proposal to legislate for the labour of adult women without giving women any voice in the matter. Some years ago she had had a good deal to do with the opening of a dwelling for day workers. Women and girls of all branches of industry in that had interviewed her, but the one stipulation that all made was that there should be no interference between them and their employers. They said "you ladies mean kindly, but we best understand our own affairs."

After the annual report had been read by the Secretary, Miss Blackburn, and adopted, Mrs. Harle moved, and the Rev. A. C. Macpherson seconded:—"That this meeting has heard with great satisfaction that Sir Albert Rollit has secured the 27th April for the second reading of the Women's Suffrage Bill, and earnestly trusts that the Bill may receive the support of the Government."

This was supported by Mrs. Ashworth Hallett, who said that the Prime Minister and Mr. Balfour were both in favour of this measure. She reminded the meeting that the Conservative Associations throughout the country, as represented by the delegates at the great Conference at Birmingham, were practically unanimous in favour of the change. Mrs. Hallett went on to refer to Mr. Provand's Bill for shortening the hours of labour of adult women in shops. Mr. Provand, in moving the second reading of his Bill, said it was "simply to bring women within the provisions of the Act," and the *Daily News*, in its comments, expressed satisfaction that as only women were included "the vexed question of regulating men's labour was not raised." Following in the same line the *Pall Mall* remarked that "all that this Bill discussed is a provision bringing adult women within the scope of the law." To read these statements people might suppose that to interfere with the bread-earning power of women was a matter of no consequence at all, and that to lessen their chances of employment was not a "vexed question" at all. Everyone who had considered the subject knew that the first result of such interference would be to drive women out of shops, replacing them by men, in London probably by foreigners. During the debate, members of Parliament said that they thought it absurd to defer such interference until women were enfranchised, seeing that such interference was for the benefit of women. But this was the whole vexed question. They had to determine whether such interference was or was not for the "benefit of women," and she (Mrs. Hallett) contended that until women were constituents of members of Parliament, it was impossible to secure serious and earnest investigation of subjects relating to their interests. They owed a debt of gratitude to the Home Secretary, Lord Cranborne, and Mr. Balfour, for their valuable speeches on this question, which speeches assured them that although the Bill had been permitted to pass a second reading, the clauses relating to adult women would have to be expunged. She concluded by urging that the friends of the Women's Suffrage Bill should exert themselves to secure the support of members of Parliament when the division took place on April 27th.

Brief mention may also be made of other meetings, including one at Broadway Hall, Hammersmith, the Rev. Prebendary Snowden in the chair; and in the Town Hall, Bradford-on-Avon, Canon the Hon. Sidney Meade in the chair. These were both addressed by Mrs. Fawcett, as also one at Southend-on-Sea, Major Rasch, M.P., in the chair.

A numerously attended drawing room meeting was held, by kind invitation of Captain and Mrs. James, at Lexham Gardens; and meetings of a similar character have been held in Porchester Terrace and at Wandsworth, by invitation of Miss Bell and Mrs. Shillington.

COLONIAL INTELLIGENCE.

NEW ZEALAND.

On August 24th Sir John Hall moved the second reading of his Women's Suffrage Bill, which provides that "In all purposes connected with and having reference to the right of voting in the election of the House of Representatives laws and Acts providing for the representation of the people importing the masculine gender shall include women." He concluded a forcible speech by saying that the principle had been affirmed in that House in 1880. It was again affirmed during the Premiership of Sir Robert Stout, on the motion of Sir Julius Vogel. In 1890 again there had been a large majority. On many occasions the principle had been affirmed, but they had been doomed to disappointment when it came to the practical application. He believed they were now near the end of their disappointment.

Mr. Pinkerton seconded the motion, which was opposed by Mr. Fish at great length, and a prolonged debate ensued, at the close of which the second reading was carried by 32 to 8—majority in favour 25. There were 12 pairs.

The Bill then went into Committee on September 3rd, when Mr. Cairncross moved the addition of the following clause:—"Every woman registered as an elector shall be qualified to be elected a member of the House of Representatives for any electoreal district." This was carried by 30 to 24. The division was a curious one, seven of the eight members who had formed the minority against the second reading voting in favour of the new clause, and fifteen of those who had voted for the second reading voting against the addition. This is of itself sufficient to shew that the new clause was added with sinister intent; but if there were any doubt on the subject that is removed by the admission of Mr. Cairncross himself, in the subsequent proceedings of the Committee, that, "Although he had proposed the new clause which had just been inserted in the Bill, he intended, should there be a division, to go into the lobby against the third reading of the measure. He might be told this was an inconsistent vote. Probably it was; but he admitted his intention was to render the Bill still more distasteful to the country than it already was." The Bill was then read a third time without a division.

On September 9th it was introduced in the Legislative Council by Mr. Fulton, and after an adjourned debate on the following day was thrown out—the "ayes" being 15, "noes" 17; majority against, 2. It is noticeable that the two Maori members of the Legislative Council both voted against the Bill.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

The Hon. J. Warren, on July 22nd, moved the second reading of the Constitution Act Amendment Bill, for placing women in the same position as men in the matter of voting for the Legislative Council. He pointed out that the Bill had passed in the Assembly in 1890, and also in the Council, and would have become law had it not been that some of the members of the Legislative Council were unavoidably absent on account of illness and other causes. He believed a large majority of the Council were in favour of the measure, which would place women possessed of property exactly on the same footing as men with a similar qualification.

The debate on the Bill was adjourned to 29th July, and again to August 5th, 12th and 26th, when the second reading was carried by 14 to 3. On September 2nd it went into Committee, when the Hon. W. Haslam moved to omit clauses 3, 4 and 5, and insert "In the Constitution Act and Electoral Act, 1879, and all other Acts amending the same respectively, the word *man* shall be taken to include *woman*, provided no woman shall be qualified or entitled to be elected as a member of either House of Parliament."

This was carried by 12 to 8, two of the Noes of the previous division voting with the Ayes, and four of the previous Ayes (including the introducer of the Bill, the Hon. J. Warren) with the Noes.

The third reading was passed on September 16th, by 10 to 9, when the President declared that inasmuch as there was not an absolute majority of the Council, the Bill did not pass.

A REPLY

TO

THE LETTER OF MR. SAMUEL SMITH, M.P.

ON

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

BY

MRS. FAWCETT.

Reprinted, with additions, from the MORNING POST and other Papers.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR
WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE, 10, GREAT COLLEGE STREET, WESTMINSTER.

1892.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH, M.P., ON WOMEN'S
SUFFRAGE.

Mr. Samuel Smith, M.P. for Flintshire, has given notice of his intention to move the rejection of Sir Albert Rollit's Women's Suffrage Bill, which is down for second reading on April 27th. It seems, therefore, not inopportune to consider some of the objections urged by Mr. Smith against women's suffrage, which were printed and widely circulated among members of parliament and the public during last session.

It is obvious at the first glance that Mr. Samuel Smith's criticisms do not apply to either of the Bills introduced by Sir Albert Rollit or Mr. McLaren, but to an entirely different measure which exists only in the clouds. Mr. Smith's objections apply to a Bill which would have the effect of enfranchising eleven millions of women; he recurs to the figures again and again: 11,000,000 women, he says, would be enfranchised, and we regret to notice that his experience of women leads him to believe that they would be animated by a practically unanimous desire to destroy the commerce, the credit, the empire and the greatness of England. Against this horde of 11,000,000 malignant women, he says that the fortress of the constitution would only be defended by 10,000,000 men; and the inevitable consequence, in his opinion, would be that "the splendid fabric of centuries will totter to its fall". Trust women with the franchise, he says, in effect, and their first act will be one of matricide.

"This blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this England,
This land of such dear souls, this dear, dear land,
Dear for her reputation through the world"

is according to Mr. Samuel Smith worthily served by her sons, but would be hated and betrayed by her daughters. He says that our success as a nation is due to the "inherited instinct for government which centuries of freedom have developed"; but he appears to believe that this "inherited instinct" is strictly tied up in tail male. He does not, however, explain why he thinks women would be insensible to the claims of patriotism, for he claims for women superiority in matters where heart and the power of affection enter, and also says that "woman has a finer and more highly strung

constitution than man". Now patriotism is very much a matter of the heart, and of susceptibility to the emotion of gratitude and the sense of indebtedness to what others have wrought for us. It is therefore to be expected that if women are really more developed on the side of the affections, and if they really have finer and more highly strung constitutions, they would be more susceptible to love of country, and more keenly sensitive in regard to those actions which might prove either injurious or beneficial to national interests.

The curious mixture in Mr. S. Smith's mind of sentimental homage and practical contempt for, and distrust of, women, must not, however, lead us aside from combating the fundamental error upon which the whole structure of his argument is founded. He assumes throughout that universal womanhood suffrage is what is aimed at; and that every political disability of women will be swept away. Having made this fundamental (and false) assumption, he is able to conjure up at will his horrific pictures of the 11,000,000 women destroying the constitution; wives being brought up to vote against their husbands; wives and mothers neglecting their babies and their husbands' suppers to attend clubs and political meetings; the physical health of unborn generations being destroyed by "febrile excitement" on politics on the part of mothers, and all the rest of it. It could hardly be believed, if it were not a patent fact, that all these things are said in criticism of a practical proposal which, if carried out, would enfranchise not 11,000,000 but less than 1,000,000 women, heads of households, ratepayers and property owners, who have already exercised, during some twenty-two years, all the various local franchises without producing any symptom, however infinitesimal, of the evils Mr. Smith so confidently predicts. It is true that Mr. Smith says that if once Parliament enfranchises women householders, it must necessarily go on to universal womanhood suffrage. But that is not for Mr. Smith nor any of us to decide; the decision as to how far exactly future Parliaments will go in the direction of female enfranchisement is one for those Parliaments, or rather for the nation as then constituted, to determine. All that can be with certainty predicted is perhaps that Parliaments in the future, like Parliaments in the past, will be more influenced by practical considerations than by any desire to attain exact logical consistency. That is really the strength of the women's suffrage question at the present moment; we are not asking Parliament to give legislative expression to any theory or doctrine of equality between the sexes, but we ask Parliament to weigh the practical expediency of giving Parliamentary representation to a certain class of women who,

as heads of households and ratepayers, have already had experience of voting in other elections, where much good and no harm whatever has resulted from including them in the lists of persons entitled to vote.

Mr. Smith confesses at the commencement of his letter that he was once in favour of extending the parliamentary suffrage to women householders, but that his opinion has changed for two reasons:—the first is that "the injustices from which women formerly suffered have been remedied", and the second is that if there is women's suffrage at all, it must be universal womanhood suffrage.

I have already attempted to show that the English Parliament can stop just when it chooses to stop, or rather, just when the constituencies choose to stop, in the process of enfranchisement. The principle of popular election has existed in England for some six hundred years without as yet landing us in universal suffrage. Parliament does not, as a matter of fact, labour under the necessity of riding to death any principle which it sees fit to adopt. When Catholic emancipation was carried, certain exceptions were made. Three of the highest offices of State were reserved and cannot be held by Catholics. To some minds this may be illogical; but it commends itself to the judgment of the majority of Englishmen as a reasonable precaution, and the reservation will be maintained, logic or no logic, as long as the political safety of England appears to require it. In the same spirit, it may be confidently anticipated, Parliament will act in regard to the political emancipation of women; it will enfranchise the nine hundred thousand women householders and property owners without being bound therefore to go on and enfranchise the whole adult female population of England. In a country where for so many hundred years women have been allowed to reign but not to vote, no mere logical exigency will control the freedom of Parliament. It is true that most of the advocates of women's suffrage hope and believe that additional experience of it may encourage future Parliaments to go further in the direction of enfranchisement than this Parliament is asked to go; but this hope and expectation is a very different thing from an assertion that future Parliaments will be bound to go on to universal womanhood suffrage, no matter what experience may teach us as to the effects of a more limited measure.

There is a very curious inconsistency in Mr. S. Smith's position in regard to manhood suffrage. He says that he is opposed to it; that he wishes to prevent it; that he believes household suffrage to be a sounder basis for Government than manhood suffrage. Holding these views, it might be ex-

pected, especially from one who thinks legislation is controlled by logical necessity, that he would endeavour to strengthen household suffrage by making it a reality, and including as householders, whether men or women. If he did this and helped to secure the enfranchisement of women householders, he would then be in a position logically to use all those arguments based on the numerical majority of women in this country, which he now attempts to apply, although they are totally irrelevant, to the practical question raised by the Bills before the House.

Let us now glance at the other reason which Mr. Smith gives for changing his views on the question of women's suffrage. "Women," he says, used to be "subject to some injustices, which men seemed unwilling to remedy"; but these injustices he apprehends, have been remedied one after another, therefore he thinks there is no reason to give women the protection of representation. Mr. Smith's calm assumption that the legal injustices under which women labour have all been removed, is an instance of the fortitude with which one of the kindest of men is prepared to endure the misfortunes of others. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that there is scarcely an instance in which the supposed interests of men and women come into conflict in which the state of the law is not flagrantly unjust to women. The law in regard to the relation of parents to their children appears to have been framed in practical infidelity to the Divine law which gives to every child two parents, a father and a mother. The man-made law regards this as more than enough, and it therefore endeavours, in a bungling way, to deprive each child of one of its natural protectors. Where the birth of a child is legitimate, that is where it brings nothing but happiness and credit with it, the sole parent, the sole fountain of authority in the eye of the law, is the father; but where the child is illegitimate, where the birth means disgrace and shame, the sole parent recognised by the law, except under special conditions which it is easy for the father to evade, is the mother. The inequality of the divorce law is well known and need not be expatiated on. The law in regard to the protection of children and women from criminal immorality is studded with provisions which seem framed with the express purpose of protecting the criminal and making his detection and punishment far more difficult than they ought to be. The law for the protection of property (*e.g.*, the protection of infants from money-lenders), is tenfold more stringent and more vigilantly executed than the law for the protection of the persons of young girls and women from the pursuit of vicious men. The law at present deals most inadequately with persons who

trade in vice. Parents who bring up their children to send them on the streets in order to live on the proceeds of their infamy, are well known in every town and in many villages. Little or no effectual attempt is made by our law-makers to restrain them. Husbands send their wives on the streets by actual personal violence or by threats of it, and are hardly touched by the law unless they happen to complicate their villainy by mixing it with blackmailing of their male victims. Every man is a possible victim of blackmailing, and everything that law can do to stop it has, very properly, been done. What we wish to see is equal vigilance for the repression of offences of which every woman is a possible victim. The law in all cases deprives a divorced wife from access to her children, but a divorced husband is not invariably treated in the same way; the heir to a ducal house was taken away a few years back from his innocent mother and made over to the charge of his guilty father, although it must have been obvious that the best hopes of moulding the child's character for good were thereby seriously endangered.

Many cases might be mentioned in which English law is unjust to women or grossly inefficient. A leading member of the late government at Melbourne, writing the other day about his probable return to this country, concludes his letter by saying, "I shall try to keep my Victorian domicile for the sake of my daughters. I hope if they marry they will have good husbands, but if one of them is unlucky I should not like her to be under the tender mercies of the English law." And yet Mr. Smith flatters himself that all the injustices which he appears to have been aware of a short time ago have been removed, or are rapidly being removed by the action of Parliament.

With regard to avenues of remunerative employment, every woman of the professional classes who has to get her own living knows that every profession that can be closed to women is closed. The medical profession has been at last opened after years of conflict; but the opportunities for professional study in it are very much more restricted and hampered than they are in the case of men. The older universities admit women to their examinations, but rigidly exclude them from any kind of membership. The Vice-Chancellor's certificate that women have passed tripos or other honour examinations gives them no status whatever in the university. Of course no university prizes or positions are open to them; they are permitted to use the museums and libraries of the universities only on sufferance, and they are liable at any moment to be turned out of them.

The way in which women of the industrial class are re-

stricted in their choice of employments by the rules and political power of trades' unions is well known. Hardly a session passes without new legislative restrictions on the labour of women. The efforts of trades' unions are constantly being directed against women's labour:—"Female labour is not at present a crying evil in our trade: it would be worse than folly to allow it to become so", is a passage from the report of one of the London Bookbinders' Unions of 1891. This union succeeded in turning women out of the employment of gilding and marbling the edges of books in which they had been employed for many years. Among the working class the opinion is almost universal that it is justifiable to forbid by law or forcibly prevent the labour of women wherever their labour comes into competition with that of men. A witness before the Labour Commission was describing a strike that had taken place against employing women in one of the Army Clothing factories in Ireland. Mr. Courtney asked the question: "Have not the women the privilege of living?" to which the witness replied, "They have the privilege of living as long as they do not interfere with the men".

What this witness was guileless enough to put into words is the spirit that animates nearly the whole of men's trades' unions. They exert themselves to keep women out of all except the most unskilled and worst paid trades: they combine to prevent the natural growth of industrial efficiency among women: and in so far as they are able to do this, they swell that great army of "fallen women" whose ranks are so much recruited by industrial inefficiency and want of steady employment. The Rev. G. P. Merrick, late chaplain of Millbank, in an address recently published (Ward, Lock & Co.) made an analysis of the life-history of 16,022 "fallen women" who had passed under his care; he speaks of "want of industrial efficiency" as being very prominent among the causes of a vicious life among women. He also says, "I am continually coming across cases where the street is resorted to only during the time when more reputable work fails. . . . When their trade revives they gladly forsake the streets." Those engaged in rescue work constantly refer to the necessity for an increase of female industrial employment, and to the difficulties presented by the low wages of women in ordinary industry.

It cannot for a moment be doubted that the possession of Parliamentary representation would immensely strengthen the position of women industrially. We have only to look at what the possession of the Parliamentary franchise has already done for the agricultural labourer, to be sure that if women had votes, all parties would be eager to prove their

zeal in remedying any legal, educational or industrial incapacity from which they may suffer.

Mr. Smith in one passage of his letter appeals to the religious argument and to the authority of St. Paul. In this matter we appeal from Paul to a greater than Paul, to Christ. No words ever fell from His lips which were inconsistent with that elevation of womanhood which is so marked a feature of practical Christianity. That women were among the last at the cross, that they were the first at the tomb, that when all forsook Him and fled, they remained faithful; that our Saviour honoured them by specially addressing to them several of His most important conversations; that He proclaimed, what the world has not yet accepted, that there is but one moral law for the man and the woman; all these things afford indications that work for the uplifting of the lives of women from a position of subordination is in accordance with the spirit of His teaching. With regard to St. Paul, we may remember this:—that if we take his teaching about women with its context, it is obvious that he was expressing to the best of his capacity his judgment about the circumstances of his own time; and he particularly and definitely asserts in more than one place that this is so. "I have no commandment of the Lord, yet I give my judgment." Much therefore, of St. Paul's teaching about the position of women and other social matters is not accepted by any Christian Church as a practical guide for conduct at the present time. St. Paul taught and believed that celibacy was a higher state than marriage, both for men and women; but I do not think that even in the Roman Catholic Church celibacy is recommended, except for the priesthood and for sisterhoods. St. Paul thought it unseemly for a woman to pray with her head uncovered; but I have never heard of any one regarding this as having any application at the present time, and the most devout Christian women attend and conduct family worship bareheaded, just as they braid their hair, wear gold, pearls and costly array on fitting occasions without any inward accusations of conscience in the matter. If we are now to be tied by the exact letter of St. Paul's opinions on the social questions of his own time, we may expect Mr. Smith and those members of Parliament who agree with him to move, when the education estimates come on, to reduce the vote by the amount of the salaries of the women teachers, for St. Paul said, "I suffer not a woman to teach". It is no exaggeration to say that one who did so would be considered very near the confines which separate sanity from insanity. Then why in other social matters, must we not merely accept St. Paul's words in their simple

natural meaning as expressing his best judgment in the special circumstances of his own time, but twist them into something quite different, *viz.*, into an argument for voting against the second reading of Sir Albert Rollit's Bill for enabling women ratepayers to vote for members of Parliament?

I have already encroached too much on the limits of your space, but Mr. S. Smith makes such an astounding statement about women's suffrage in Wyoming and in the British Colonies, that I must trespass a little further on the patience of your readers. He says, "the idea" of women's suffrage "is scouted in these countries". A women's suffrage Bill was carried last autumn in New Zealand by large majorities in the Chamber of Representatives, and was only lost in the Upper House by the narrow majority of two. It is not a little instructive that two Maories voted in this majority and therefore it may be said that they turned the scale against women's enfranchisement. Those long resident in the colony inform me that in their opinion women's suffrage is absolutely certain to become law there within a very few years. Women's suffrage has been supported by a majority several times in the South Australian legislature, but the majorities have not been sufficiently large, as an absolute majority of the whole House is required there for any law amending the constitution. In 1890, the women's suffrage measure only failed at the third reading by one vote of this sufficient majority. In Victoria and New South Wales the promoters of women's suffrage have more than once come very near success. It is supported in New South Wales by Sir Henry Parkes, probably the most influential of our colonial statesmen. He embodied women's suffrage as an integral part of his scheme for the confederation of the Australian colonies. And yet Mr. Samuel Smith boldly asserts that the idea of women's suffrage is "scouted" in the Australian colonies. One is tempted to imagine that, like Mr. Brooke in "Middlemarch", his pen runs away with him sometimes. Now for the scouting of women's suffrage in Wyoming:—Mr. Smith quotes Mr. Bryce as having said in his book on the American Commonwealth that it was adopted there by accident, and is looked upon as a practical joke by the rest of the country. It is true that people who have had no practical experience of women's suffrage are apt to regard it as a joke and to produce ancient Joe Millerisms in reference to it, such as that if women's suffrage were restricted to women over forty, not a single woman would be found to claim it; but these very humorous comments do not generally survive practical experience of women's suffrage. The people of Wyoming, having seen it at

work for twenty-five years, take it quite seriously, and recently confirmed it (though they were told that their adhesion to it would imperil the success of their claim to be admitted as a State of the Union,) by a majority of 8 to 1.

Mr. Smith has lately taken a prominent part in favour of Church Disestablishment. I do not do him the injustice of supposing that in opposing women's suffrage he is influenced by the impression that the majority of women would be against him on this question. As Mr. Courtney said the other day, such a reason for opposing a measure of enfranchisement is too shameful to be avowed, and, he hoped, too cynical to be secretly acted upon. The importance of the question of Church Disestablishment gives a fresh weight to the claim of women to enfranchisement. Whether we are for establishment or for disestablishment, surely this is a question in which women are as vitally interested as men, and have at least as great a claim to be heard. In his last speech to his constituents, my husband, himself a supporter of disestablishment, placed this issue plainly before them. "If the Church is to be disestablished", he said, "the wishes of women on such a question are entitled to the fullest consideration". Mr. Gladstone has said that to withhold the franchise from any section of the community on the ground that their political views may not be in accordance with our own is a "sin against first principles". I therefore earnestly hope no one will be guilty of this sin on the 27th April, but that all who believe that a case for the enfranchisement of women householders has been made out, will vote for Sir Albert Rollit's Bill.

MILLCENT GARRETT FAWCETT.

14

NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

OCCASIONAL PAPER,

*Issued by the Central Committee, 10, Great College Street,
Westminster.*

CONTENTS.	PAGE
CURRENT NOTES	3
DEBATE IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS:—	
Speeches by Sir Albert K. Rollit, Mr. Samuel Smith, Col. Barttelot, Mr. Woodall, Prof. Bryce, Mr. Wyndham, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Courtney, Sir Henry James and Mr. A. J. Balfour	7
DIVISION LIST AND ANALYSIS	69
TABLE OF FORMER DEBATES	70
CONVERSAZIONE	72

May, 1892.

Price Threepence.

London:
PRINTED BY VACHER & SONS, WESTMINSTER.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Professor ADAMSON.
Miss GERTRUDE ANDREWS.
Mrs. ASHFORD.
Miss BAKER.
The LADY FRANCES BALFOUR.
Miss HELEN BLACKBURN.
Miss JESSIE BOUCHERETT.
Miss FRANCES POWER COBBE.
Colonel COTTON-JODRELL, M.P.
Miss COURTENAY.
The Right Hon. LEONARD
COURTNEY, M.P.
Miss EMILY DAVIES.
Captain EDWARDS-HEATHCOTE,
M.P.

Mrs. HENRY FAWCETT.
LOUISA LADY GOLDSMID.
Mrs. ASHWORTH HALLETT.
Mrs. HASLAM.
Miss LUCY JOHNSON.
Miss MORDAN.
Mrs. E. J. MYLNE.
CLARA LADY RAYLEIGH.
T. W. RUSSELL, Esq., M.P.
Mrs. STEPHEN SPRING-RICE.
Mrs. STERLING.
Miss M. C. STURGE.
Miss TOD.
Miss VERNON.

And Delegates of Associated Societies.

Hon. Treasurer—Miss VERNON.

Hon. Secretary—Mrs. FAWCETT.

Secretary—Miss BLACKBURN.

Bankers—LONDON AND COUNTY BANK—HOLBORN BRANCH, NEW
OXFORD STREET.

Office—10, GREAT COLLEGE STREET, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

NOTES.

AFTER an interval of six years there has once more been a debate and division in the House of Commons, on the merits of Women's Suffrage. The advocates of the question have therefore the advantage of now knowing certainly whom they can reckon upon as friends, and whom they must class as opponents.

THE opposition was on this occasion strenuous beyond all precedent. A whip was sent out by Mr. Labouchere, signed by ten Members on the Ministerialist side of the House and ten on the Opposition side, with names so widely divergent as those of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Carew, Lord Randolph Churchill, Sir W. Vernon Harcourt, Mr. Chamberlain, and Mr. Labouchere. Moreover Mr. Gladstone threw the full force of his resistance against the measure by a letter addressed to Mr. Samuel Smith, and diligently circulated in the form of a pamphlet a few days before the debate.

UNDER these circumstances the supporters of the movement felt they went in with the chances doubly arrayed against them, Mr. Gladstone's *dictum* being in itself sufficient to decide any half-hearted supporters on the Opposition benches.

The narrow majority of 23, by which the motion was lost, came as a dismay to the opponents—who had

counted, some on 60, some on 100,—and with a corresponding gratification to the supporters of the Bill.

SIR ALBERT ROLLIT introduced the Bill with a singularly powerful statement of the question as a whole, and a practical presentment of the special points which distinguished the present from previous Bills. The rejection was moved by Mr. Samuel Smith in a long vaticinatory speech, and seconded by Colonel Barttelot in a speech infused with the sentimental temperature of a much earlier season. Mr. Woodall briefly and appreciatively seconded the Bill.

Prof. Bryce continued the debate, and strove to show the whole idea to be futile and void of any practical good.

Mr. Wyndham followed in favour of the Bill, and contended that in order to minimize the effect of the women's vote it was necessary greatly to exaggerate the capacity of the ordinary male voter.

Mr. Asquith brought some freshness into the well-worn physical force argument, and dilated on the anomalies which the proposed measure would leave in our representative system.

Mr. Courtney continued on the lines of the Bill, throwing the onus of their own arguments for extending the franchise to men on the opponents of the present measure. Sir Henry James again took up his old style of argument, his being in truth the only speech which recalled the lower tone of the debates of the early years of the agitation.

The division hour was now close at hand; however, the Right Hon. A. J. Balfour found time, with a few masterly strokes, to depict the utter inconsistency of those who seek and receive the help of women in political work and refuse them responsibility. He concluded with the important political declaration, that when any further alteration of the franchise was brought up, "they would have to face and deal with the problem of women's suffrage, and deal with it in a complete fashion."

OF the comments, which have appeared in unusual numbers, in the daily and weekly Press, few have been absolutely hostile, and very many have been decidedly favourable. Among the latter may be enumerated *The Morning Post*, *Globe*, *Pall Mall Gazette*, *St. James's Gazette*, *Birmingham Gazette*, *Bradford Observer*, *Liverpool Mercury*, *Manchester Examiner*, *Manchester Courier*, *Nottingham Guardian*, *Nottingham Post*, *Western Morning News*, *South Wales Daily News*, *Scotsman*, *Scottish Leader*, *Aberdeen Free Press*, *Tablet*, *Independent*, *National Reformer*, *Workmen's Times*, *Christian Million*, *London Figaro*, *Sala's Journal*, &c., &c.

THE evening before the debate a conversazione of those interested in the Women's Suffrage Bill was held at the Galleries of the Royal Institute of Painters in Water Colours, Piccadilly.

The following ladies formed the Committee of Reception:—

The Lady Frances Balfour, Mrs. Leonard Courtney, Miss Courtenay, Mrs. Culme Seymour, Miss Davenport-Hill, Mrs. Fawcett,

Lady Matheson, Mrs. Penrose Fitzgerald, The Lady Rayleigh, Mrs. Henry Sidgwick, Mrs. Temple, Mrs. Westlake and The Lady Maude Wolmer.

THE new law in Guernsey, giving women the right to vote in parochial assemblies, was put in force for the first time on March 23rd, when a meeting of the rate-payers of St. Peter-Port was held in the Ozanne Hall and several ladies voted on the various questions under discussion. The Rector, the Rev. G. E. Lee, occupied the chair, and remarked with congratulation that he now for the first time addressed the meeting as *Messieurs et Mesdames*.

AN important step has been made forward by the State of New York, where a Bill "to prevent discrimination on account of sex at elections" passed the House of Assembly, by a vote of 69 to 34, on April 15th. The Bill provided that every citizen, irrespective of sex, should be entitled to vote for every officer to be elected in the State; but owing to the adjournment of the Senate, which had been fixed for the following week, the Bill has not been able to proceed to its further stages.

THE movement is also making way in the Dominion of Canada, where, on May 4th, the Premier, the Hon. J. J. Abbott, received a deputation of ladies at Ottawa, in favour of extending the Parliamentary suffrage to women. The Premier assured his hearers that it would not be long before women were accorded the full rights of citizenship in Canada, although he could not promise Government legislation on the subject this session.

PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE EXTENSION
(WOMEN) BILL.—No. 36.)*

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Sir ALBERT KAYE ROLLIT (Islington, S.): The subject of the Bill of which I now move the second reading is no new one to the House of Commons. For upwards of a quarter of a century it has been debated upon Bills and resolutions. This gives the House the advantage of familiarity with the question; but it has some disadvantage for myself, since it forces upon me a too conscious contrast with those more able men who have on previous occasions introduced this matter to the House of Commons, the benefit of whose assistance I am glad, in many cases, to have to-day. All I can hope to do is to contribute some municipal experience, which, however, may be useful, since the Bill is based on municipal precedents and example, which have been too much ignored in previous debates. (Hear, hear.) One new aspect is, indeed, given to the question by the Open Letter which has been addressed to the hon. member opposite (Mr. S. Smith) by the right hon. gentleman the member for Midlothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone). I realise that such a communication is naturally very forcible, and I shall of course treat it with respect; but if I may make one criticism upon it, it is that I think it does not discuss the proposal from the standpoint from which it is now made, but seems to be based rather upon communications of a similar character addressed to the newspapers, and also, I think, to a constituent, by the hon. member for Flint (Mr. S. Smith), and to be a reflection of his opinions rather than a discussion of the principles of the present proposal. (Hear, hear.) But, at any rate, that Pamphlet has had one benefit. If this subject—which I cannot conceive—has not, as the writer argues, already received sufficient public attention, the letter has itself secured it. (Hear, hear.) There is another, and even a greater advantage attaching to the Pamphlet, in that it invites, and sets the example of, a more serious discussion of the subject, and I trust the tone and language of the letter will not in this respect be lost sight of. (Hear, hear.) I have said the subject is not new to the House of Commons, but I am glad to-day to be free from one reproach which has, on former occasions, been addressed to those who have stood in my present position—namely, that the Bill has been brought before one and the same Parliament session after session. Now, it may be said that the measure has not been before this Parliament at all; and when I recall the fact that in the last Parliament the Bill had the advantage of the advocacy of the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Woodall), and passed the House without a division, I think I am justified in bespeaking for it to-day more

* This report is chiefly taken from the Parliamentary Reports—authorised edition.

statesmanlike consideration. (Hear, hear.) A further change in the position is that the Bill has quite a new form. So much so, that one of my correspondents—who have been numerous and sometimes humorous—(laughter)—has referred to it, in ladylike language, as a “modest Bill.” (Laughter.) I have carefully read the debates and the criticisms passed upon former measures; and, if I may venture to say so, I think those discussions and criticisms have generally been of a too high-pitched and abstract character, and I do not recognise them as applicable to the proposal in its present practical shape. (Hear, hear.) They seem to me—those criticisms—to have exaggerated and distorted both the object of the proposal and the objections to it; and I repeat that even in the case of the recent Letter to which I have referred, the new basis of our proposals seem to have been overlooked, and the same old ground to have been taken once again, viz., that, in the words of the hon. member opposite, this is a proposal “revolutionary in character,” and ‘a reversal of the order of nature,” that it is “such a change as has never been made since the Creation,” and is now “put forward for the first time in the world’s history.” (Laughter.) And all these expressions are actually addressed to the proposal to confer upon duly qualified and capable women citizens a vote in Parliamentary elections which they have long exercised, and exercised with advantage, in relation to municipal government! It is the old case of the roof coming down because a few cobwebs are to be swept away! (Laughter.) Revolutionary! Why, Sir, this proposal is not even an innovation; for, if I remember my history correctly, the franchise, both parliamentary and municipal, was possessed by women in former times on identically the same lines as those I suggest to-day—at any rate it was so exercised by women from time to time in the election of knights of the shire for Yorkshire and elsewhere. (Hear, hear.) If I wanted to found myself on good constitutional and ancient authority, I would remind the House that this was so in the days of the Plantagenets, and certainly of the Tudors, and that ought to be good enough for hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. (Laughter.) Then, on the other hand, to influence hon. gentlemen opposite, I might say that this state of affairs was put an end to by judge-made law; and, having in mind expressions of opinion upon judge-made law during the recent debate upon the Law of Conspiracy, I commend that fact to the consideration of such hon. gentlemen. (Laughter.) It is also a coincidence that may strike both sides of the House that, while this judge-made law emanated from a member for Liskeard (Coke), we shall to-day have the advantage of the aid of another member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) in favour of its restitution. (Hear, hear.) And, if this privilege of voting by women was extinguished because of its disuse, I must remind the House that the cessation was due to the association of the vote with services in kind, and that those services have since been commuted to a money payment, with the result, —which meets the oft-repeated physical force argument,—that qualified

women do just as much for the Army as most men—namely, help to pay for it. (Applause.) But these criticisms, however forcibly they may have applied to former measures, can have no application to this Bill, which aims, as I say, at a practical—and the only present practicable—solution of the question, and which is based distinctly on the natural, and ultimately inevitable, development of our applied principles of representative government. If I may quote the highest political authority for this, I should use the words of Sir Henry Maine, who, in his *Early History of Institutions*, says—

“The civilised societies of the West, in steadily enlarging the personal and proprietary independence of women, and even in granting to them political privileges, are only carrying out still further a law of development which they have been obeying for many centuries.”

May I now remind the House that this is an age of successive and successful franchises,—successive notwithstanding the same arguments as are now used, viz., that the votes are not wanted, that the unenfranchised classes are indirectly represented, and that their enfranchisement will lead us no one knows where,—and successful, especially, in securing attention to, and proper precedence in the consideration of, the interests of the classes on whom the votes have been conferred? (Applause.) And so we hope this extension will secure proper regard for the interests of those who are now unrepresented among the electorate. (Hear, hear.) It was once said by the right hon. gentleman the member for Midlothian, speaking of a large class of men, “They have no votes, and so may be safely neglected.” I heartily accept this expression as applicable to those with which this measure deals. And illustrations of such neglect are not wanting. The middle-class Parliament formed in 1832 did nothing for popular education, or very little; but the election of the Household Suffrage Parliament of 1867 was followed by the passing of the Education Act of 1870 and the Labour Statutes of 1875, which have so materially improved the conditions of life of the labouring classes. So, too, the gift of the County Franchise has been quickly followed by the Allotments Acts and by the Bills which are at the present time before the House for discussion, one of which is to confer upon labourers in the rural districts the advantage of acquiring small holdings. (Hear, hear.) Thus has enfranchisement, whatever else may be said for or against it, been followed by remedial legislation,—yet qualified women have no vote and therefore no such security (hear, hear). Again, enfranchisement has hitherto proceeded on two great main lines:—the possession of qualifying property and contribution to taxation. Time was when taxation without representation was spoken of as tyranny. That was then the tyranny of Kings, but the tyranny is not the less if it is the tyranny of a multitude; it is then but a multiplied tyranny. (Applause.) On the ground of representation with taxation, therefore, these votes are asked for. For the principle upon which the franchise

has been extended is the possession of evidence of citizenship; mere manhood is not sufficient; a man must have, even in the minor cases of the lodger and service votes, a house of some description and contribute, directly or indirectly, to the payment of rates and taxes. (Hear, hear.) Whether a different principle may be adopted in the future we cannot say. The basis of the franchise, now, is the household and some contribution to the national burdens, and, upon that basis, we claim the extension of it to duly qualified women. (Applause.) Manhood suffrage may, or may not, come; that is a matter, after all, only of opinion; speculations based upon it are irrelevant to the present question; and we must leave their solution to future Parliaments. (Hear, hear.) We must not, as I think the hon. member for Flint (Mr. S. Smith) suggests, treat future Parliaments as automatic machines to carry out the behests of the Parliament of to-day. We must have sufficient faith in future Parliaments to know that they will act rightly and with the advantage of a knowledge of the circumstances and conditions of their time; that they will do what is just and expedient, as we do what is just and expedient to-day. We cannot bind future Parliaments; we cannot prophesy what they may do; we must do our duty by giving the franchise where it is right and due, and we must rely on future Parliaments doing their duty in protecting that privilege, and in the maintenance of good government, not carrying the principle to illogical and improper conclusions. (Hear, hear.) We must not, therefore, on the faith of any such speculative assumptions, refuse to fulfil the franchise of citizenship by admitting to it qualified and capable women citizens; we must not decline to do right because others may seek to do wrong; we must do our duty in the conviction that our successors will do theirs and no more than theirs (cheers); and indeed, judging from the present state of local electoral law, the fear is, not that Parliaments will push matters to too logical conclusions, but that they may be only too well trusted to retain any number of illogicalities and anomalies. (Laughter.) Yet, we are told that this proposal to confer the franchise on qualified women is, to use the word of my hon. friend, "revolutionary." We are asked when and where was such a change ever made; and the practice in former debates has been to quote instances where such a franchise has been conferred. It has been asserted that there has been a partial exercise of such a suffrage in Italy, and reference has also been made to Denmark, and to the existence of the female franchise in the territory of Wyoming and other places. I will not dwell on these instances, though I may mention that Wyoming is now a State, that the user of the female franchise has the approval of high official authority, and that the right to vote there carries with it the right to hold any public office in the United States. But I pass to an illustration nearer home. I have a letter from a member of The States of Guernsey, and my correspondent mentions

that a Bill has recently passed the island Parliament, and is now law, giving a vote to women householders—who pay rates and taxes as householders—on the very lines of this Bill. Women, my correspondent adds, are not eligible for any office, nor can they be members of the States. There you have the principles, in both respects, upon which this Bill is based; but the right to vote carries with it no right to hold office or to sit in Parliament. (Hear, hear.) The measure, I am informed, works very well in Guernsey. I might also refer to the case of the Isle of Man, where female freeholders have a similar franchise. The Colonial Confederation Scheme of Sir Harry Parkes contemplated such an extension of the suffrage, and some colonies, including South Australia, have nearly passed such a measure. It is suggested to me, for instance, that in New Zealand the proposal was only defeated by the votes of two Maoris. I mention this because my hon. friend opposite has imaginatively pictured the battle of our eleven millions of women against our ten millions of men, and the defeat of the latter; and if that be possible, one may also imagine Macaulay's New Zealander contemplating from London Bridge not the last man—but the last woman. (Loud laughter.) I do not rely, however, on these instances or on these illustrations as arguments; we have for our safe guidance ample practical experience in the United Kingdom, in our own municipal and county council elections; and, seeing the development of our constitution, I would ask where should we look for such a completed franchise if not to our own country, the home of representative institutions, from which, as such, this franchise is asked for qualified women,—so much, and no more, and for such and such only? (Loud cheers.) Next, much has been said of the manner in which this proposal has been advocated, and I am not concerned to defend all those methods. But the arguments of our opponents are too often contradictions in terms. (Hear, hear.) If women press for this extension, then "they are agitators, and their demand should not be complied with;" if they do not agitate, then "they are indifferent to the subject." If many petitions are presented, then "they are got up by organisation;" if the petitions are few, then "you see women do not want this extension." If the platform is occupied, then "there is reason to fear the invasion of Parliament by the advocates of female suffrage;" if the platform is not resorted to, then "there is no popular feeling in favour of the proposal." (Laughter and cheers.) The allegation that it is not wanted has invariably been urged against the extension of the franchise to any class. It is based on the fallacy of universality. It is not true to say that women do not want the franchise, though some may be indifferent or opposed to it. The only true proposition is, as in most other cases, that many do and some don't wish for votes, and the exercise of the franchise will be optional—there is no obligation to use the vote or to follow the example set by those who think it gives the proper protection of their own interests,

and those who do desire it ought not to be debarred from it for the sake of those who need not exercise it. (Hear, hear.) With regard to the methods by which the present proposal has been advocated, all I can say is I have taken no part in any agitation. I have attended no meetings on the subject; happily, not one of those held last night, the proceedings of which I thoroughly disapprove (Hear, hear.) Very many petitions have been presented—some, no doubt, open to the criticisms which can always be directed against this form of expression of opinion. These petitions have emanated frequently from bodies of people, and are signed officially by presidents and others, who represent very large constituencies. They have been signed by those who belong to all classes, and very many of whom are obviously in humble positions. (Hear, hear.) Resolutions have, at one time or another, been passed by the great political organisations of both parties, at Leeds, at Birmingham, and elsewhere; and though it may be said that women should not take part in political campaigns, they have been urged to do so by the leaders of both parties; their assistance has been welcome, and most of us, unlike some others, are grateful for it. (Cheers.) Petitions have been presented from some 160 branches of the Women's Liberal Federation, some of them this morning. The attitude of the press towards the proposal has in London been critical but just, and not unfavourable in many cases; the provincial press has been eminently favourable, especially in Scotland, and I do not hesitate to say that from the provincial press we get a good index of the public opinion of the country and of its probable development. (Hear, hear.) This, therefore, is a constitutional concession constitutionally asked. (Hear, hear.) And, though I have incidentally referred to parties, let me say, as emphatically as possible, that this is in no sense a party matter, as the names attached to the Bill conclusively show. The tendency of the influence of women voters will, it is to be hoped, be to modify party feeling, which, however necessary under our existing system, is, in my opinion, too often a disfigurement of our national life; and I hope for the time when it will be more generally felt that he does best for his party who does his best for the State. (Oh.) On the other hand, woman's interests must not be sacrificed to party exigency; and I trust that they may be the hope of each party, the prey of neither, and the sport of none. (Cheers.) I gladly leave this part of my remarks for the moment in order to tell the House how the Bill carries out the principles under which it is introduced, for it appears there is much misapprehension in some minds as to what the Bill does and as to what it does not do—It enacts that—

“Every woman who in Great Britain is registered or entitled to be registered as an elector for a town council or county council, or who in Ireland is a ratepayer entitled to vote in the election of guardians of the poor, shall be entitled to be registered as a Parliamentary elector, and when registered to vote at any Parliamentary election for the county, borough, or division wherein the qualifying property is situate.”

These words “qualifying property” follow the Municipal Corporations Act of 1882, and this is the basis of the existing female franchise. What, then, will be the effect of accepting this? And what will be the results—not by mere prophecy, but by necessary inference? In England and Scotland, under the municipal corporations and county councils electors Acts, every inhabitant occupier—that is, every householder who for twelve months has been rated and has paid rates—is qualified for, and entitled to, the franchise; and the effect will be to give just the same, no less and no more, to a woman who is similarly qualified, subject to two exceptions which I will deal with in a moment. In Ireland, where there is not yet a Local Government Act, but where we hope that, under the auspices of one party or the other, there soon will be, it will then be easy to apply the same principle for conferring the franchise on women, and I think the Local Government Bill for Ireland contains that provision. Meanwhile, the closest analogous Statute which includes women voters, viz., the Poor Law Act for Ireland (1 and 2 Vic., c. 56), has been taken as giving the nearest approach to the franchise to be conferred on women in this country, and it will thus be given to all those who are duly qualified as ratepayers, or (if no rate has been laid) as county cesspayers, to vote for the election of guardians of the poor. The Bill, if passed, would thus add about a million to the electorate, as against some 300,000 to 400,000 under previous Bills—a million of women who have had a long experience in the exercise of the franchise. (Hear, hear.) And if it be said by my hon. friend opposite that this will be a large number as opposed to men who are similarly qualified, let me tell the House that they will only be a seventh or an eighth of the constituencies, subject, moreover, to a large deduction for those who are said not to wish for the franchise and who presumably will not vote. In the event, therefore, of such a pitched battle as he anticipates the forces will be pretty unequally matched, with all the advantage to mankind of some millions and also of his leadership on that side. (Laughter.) A million will be added and no more. And now what will the Bill not do, for I have heard attributed to it a great deal which is not within its purview. It will not “disfranchise” a single person—it is an enabling, not a disabling Bill; it accepts the existing Parliamentary lines, the lines of experience and usage under the municipal, educational, and other franchise Acts. It leaves the franchise law exactly as it is, and follows those parliamentary lines under which the woman suffrage has hitherto been wisely and safely exercised. (Hear, hear.) At present married women are not registered as voters for municipal elections, nor can they vote for school boards. If, therefore, it be said there is an inconsistency and an anomaly in that this Bill does not confer the vote upon married women, it is an anomaly which is the creation of Parliament itself. If it be said, as it has been said by the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Gladstone), that this proposal

is "halting and inconsistent," then I reply that the halting and inconsistency are the halting and inconsistency of Parliament and of the Governments of the right hon. gentleman which conferred the municipal franchise in 1869 and 1882, thus creating and training a special class, and qualifying its members for further similar privileges, any undue excess of which may well be left to future Parliaments, which will be governed, like ourselves, by practical considerations. (Hear, hear.) May I also point out that the criticisms upon the non-inclusion of married women are generally put in a somewhat illogical way? It is said, first, that the principle of including women in the franchise is objectionable; but, again, it is said, "If you include married women a great objection to the measure will be removed." In fact, the argument is, first, that we should not include any women; and, secondly, that we should include more than we do. (Laughter.) This is too often the reasoning not of sincere friends, but of enemies—sowing tares and tempting us to go further in the hope that we may fare worse. (Laughter.) There is no inconsistency on our part; we accept the position as Parliament has made it, and we are quite willing, if Parliament thinks fit hereafter to consider the assimilation of the municipal and Parliamentary franchise, to leave that open for future legislation. (Hear, hear.) By an historical accident the municipal and Parliamentary registers slightly differ in some few respects. Among these, the municipal register does not include married women or lodgers, and the municipal register is taken as the basis of this Bill, because of the experience of its working, which offers a strong argument in our support, for we can say that those who have had the municipal franchise have exercised it with such advantage that they are entitled also to the parliamentary suffrage. (Hear, hear.) We accept the present law and existing experience as a basis, and it has at least this advantage, in that it enables us to avoid the rocks on which previous measures have struck, to escape such differences as those as to the duplication of votes, or differences and discord in the home, the creation of faggot votes, and the like, by accepting the law just as it is, and by not touching such matters of controversy. (Cheers.) In Scotland, again, the law gives the vote to married women who are living, as the expression is, "not in family with their husbands," and we take the law of Scotland as we find it and as indicating what is in accordance with the general opinion and experience of Scotland; and a similar observation may be made in regard to the enfranchisement of the female trader, whether living with her husband or not, under the custom of the City of London. As I have said, the underlying principle of the Bill is that it accepts and utilises the law as it stands, whether by statute or custom, for a still further development of the franchise. That being so, we are able to say the Bill goes past the differences which have hitherto divided the House, and we escape criticisms which are not applicable to the present measure, however they may have applied to

previous proposals. (Cheers.) We also claim that we proceed on the old constitutional principle of advancing step by step, so often resorted to in the legislation of this country, and which, if it has produced some anomalies, is at least a safe system. (Hear, hear.) What Parliament may hereafter do is a wholly different matter; but if we look at the manifold complexities and illogicalities in Acts conferring local franchises, it cannot fairly be said that the apparent anomaly here presents an obstacle to this measure. Similarly, in relation to women lodgers the Bill follows the lines of experience and of least resistance; it does what is at present practicable and possible; and though, as in the case of married women, we concede that much, very much, may be said on each side, as also that many arguments which have been used are based on mere assumptions, still the facts remain and justify us that the municipal and other registers on which we are proceeding do not include married women or lodgers, that the Bill enfranchises large numbers of women, that it gives additional security for the consideration of the interests of all women, from the woman's own point of view, and that other points may well await what would undoubtedly be a public advantage—namely, the unification of the municipal and Parliamentary registers. (Cheers.) In former debates local experience of a parochial character was chiefly resorted to in support of the claims of women, such as the right to vote for overseers, and better, the right to vote for local boards, and still better, the right to vote for school boards and to serve on school boards. I mention the boards of guardians and school boards to point out that when Parliament intended to confer the right to sit and serve, as well as to vote in elections, Parliament has had the courage to give that sanction by Statute. (Hear, hear.) But recourse to parochial elections is now comparatively unnecessary. The Statute of 1869, passed under the Government of the right hon. gentleman (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), gave the right to women to vote at municipal elections, or I should rather say, that right was then revived, for it had previously existed, and was ignored by the Municipal Corporations Act of 1835. In previous debates it has been said that this right of women to vote at municipal elections was given by accident—"by a slip"—"when the House was asleep at three o'clock in the morning," and, said a former member for Huddersfield, "You will not catch us napping a second time." (Laughter.) This means, if anything, that the opponents of the Parliamentary suffrage for women would, if they had the opportunity, oppose municipal suffrage for women, and would on the same grounds—grounds of prophecy which have been falsified by experience—deprive the country of the advantage which that Act of 1869 is generally admitted to have conceded. This shews that they are not very prescient guides. (Hear, hear.) The provision was, in fact, discussed in the Lords in 1869, and had the able advocacy of Lord Cairns, and, I think, the Home Secretary. Lord Aberdare spoke for it even in the Commons, and it was advisedly accepted. The Municipal Corporations

Act of 1882, having incorporated the same provision, adopted and conceded the principle, while practice has approved it, and if there is to be any debate now it can only be as to the application of the principle—not to the principle itself—of the right of women to vote. (Hear, hear.) Experience, now for a quarter of a century, completely supports the way in which that franchise has been exercised, and municipal elections have been generally conducted in a manner highly creditable to all concerned, including women. Indeed, any misbehaviour has been, so far as the cases disclose, only on the part of the men. (Laughter.) If there had been any objection, either on principle or in practice, to women's votes in municipalities certainly my connection, as president, with the Municipal Corporations Association would have brought such arguments to my knowledge. (Hear, hear.) But experience rebuts nearly every one of the speculations of my hon. friend opposite. The proportion of women voters in municipal elections is from 15 to 17 per cent., made up of women of all classes, and two-thirds or three-fourths of whom are women occupying houses rated below £20. Let me refer to a letter I have received from the neighbourhood of Huddersfield. My correspondent says:—

“Many women in this neighbourhood would be enfranchised by such an Act as you propose, and especially widows of respectable working men, who have made such provision for them that they continue to rent the houses they occupied during their husbands' lifetime.” (Hear, hear.)

This is important testimony to the fact that this proposal will not enfranchise an exclusive class; that it will include a large body of working women, and I have many other similar letters. (Hear, hear.) Then, much has been said as to the desire or otherwise of women to exercise this franchise, and the answer is, from practice and statistics, that women do exercise the suffrage now at municipal elections in about the same proportion as men, and that the exercise of the vote by women is increasing, especially in Scotland, which is strongly in favour of the present proposal. (Hear, hear.) Moreover, women do not vote in that solid mass which has been suggested, but, on the contrary, the votes are very materially divided. The recent county council elections, for instance, show that such is the case. And the reason is that women are associated with all the relations of life, and that with this extension there would be no transfer of voting power from one class to another, such as has accompanied previous enlargements of the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Then there is the argument from disorder and from the supposed difficulty in women recording their votes at Parliamentary elections. But where can be the difficulty in women, once in some four or five years, doing that which, in municipal elections, they do annually, viz., placing a voting paper in the ballot box? Municipal elections have, in fact, been conducted very much on political lines; political considerations enter largely into them; and if there is question of disorder, I should look for that disorder in those small boroughs

where strong party and personal feeling frequently run high, and yet where women are able to record their franchise without any difficulty whatever, and add an element of courtesy to such contests. (Hear, hear.) But the fact is that, so far from having an unfeminine tendency, this Bill will enable the quiet and unassuming women to vote, as distinguished from the more active aspirants to the platform, the former, but not the latter, being now excluded from all political influence. (Hear, hear.) I refer to the exercise of the municipal franchise for one purpose more, and only for one purpose—that is to say, that the municipal vote has not been followed by any general or practical demand for seats in town councils or claims to public office. (Hear, hear.) I should be far from endorsing any such claims, and have declined to present them to this House. There is a distinct and legally recognised difference between the right to vote and the right to sit in a deliberative assembly; the disqualification for the latter has been decided to exist as to women, and it has long subsisted in the case of the clergy and the Civil Service, so I deny the inference that because the right to vote is accorded it must be followed by the right to sit or to hold office. (Cheers.) With regard to the right to vote, I may point out to the House that it is one that has been exercised under the conditions I have mentioned without difficulty; and I do not know that there has been any real complaint as to the manner in which the constitutional privilege of the municipal franchise has been exercised by women. I believe the late Mr. Beresford Hope and the former member for Huddersfield said, now many years ago, “it has not been a success,” and one of them added that it had been “a mistake.” But I quote the right hon. gentleman the member for Midlothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), who has said “they have exercised the franchise without detriment and with great advantage.” (Cheers.) And yet the same right hon. gentleman has just published that this municipal experience is, after all, but a “plausible shadow”! It is coupled by him subordinately with the right to enter the Universities, with the right to intellectual culture; and yet the fact is ignored that women have taken an active and useful and unpretentious part in the public affairs of the country and in the localities, and have earned the appreciative expressions of the right hon. gentleman himself. (Hear, hear.) Shadows! It is the criticism which is shadowy, and under the light of experience it is shown to have no substance. (Cheers.) There is just one other subject to which I should like to refer, and that is this: that there has been in fact an actual neglect of the just requirements of women in dealing with the subjects in which they are interested. (Hear, hear.) I notice that one statesman (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) has said, and I think he has said with great truth, that—

“Men have often been the most unfaithful guardians of women's rights to social and moral equality.”

But it is contended that these grievances have been remedied, and no

doubt a great deal has been done for the protection of women and so for the benefit of the nation; for instance, in regard to the conditions of their labour in mines and at the loom. (Cheers.) Nevertheless, a former able advocate of women's suffrage, the right hon. gentleman the member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler), said at Wolverhampton only the other night what is certainly true, that—

“The need for reform is as great to-day as ever, and every day develops new claims.”

And I should like to call attention to one or two matters in which this concession on the part of Parliament is eminently necessary for the benefit and improvement of the position of women. In relation to their Property, the right to which is absolute even in such a country as Russia, much has been done; but it took a quarter of a century's fighting to do it, and there are anomalies which still remain to be removed. (Hear, hear.) No doubt Parliament has been rather generous; in some respects even too gallant, for it has given women their property and left men their debts. (Loud laughter.) Perhaps more prudent administration in this House—perhaps the expression of the wishes of women from their own point of view—may lead us to be a little more cautious in relation to legislation of that description. (Hear, hear.) In regard to the Guardianship of children and the protection of The Home something has been done; but the Bill in relation to the former was greatly modified in its passage through the House, and there is still room for much improvement. (Hear, hear.) In Education men have taken most and the best of the endowments, and have left little for women. There, again, there have been improvements, but there is still much to do in opening the older Universities, in establishing new ones—as in London—in the work of University extension, in supplying the dearth of teachers—for if we want our education to be great we must make our educators great—(hear, hear), and in technical and industrial training for the army of women who have to earn their own livings and fight their own battle in life. (Cheers.) Yet women, despite difficulty and disability, have shown themselves highly capable in all the records of human thought and achievement. The percentage of rejections at the first examination of the University of London, which is close and severe, shews that women fulfil the test quite as well as men competitors; and therefore I need no longer, seeing what has been accomplished, point to those great exceptional cases, which have been sneered at, but which have been the triumphs of the few for the benefit of the many, and which have opened the door for the vast numbers that have followed in their wake. (Loud cheers.) Then the Laws of Divorce, which were discussed here only last night, are still unequal, and women's views could be expressed upon them with advantage. (Hear, hear.) There is, too, the perennial question of the Deceased Wife's Sister, and, intermingled with her, the deceased husband's brother. We hear much of the one, but little of the other. (Laughter.)

Breach of Promise of Marriage has been proposed to be abolished, but women's petitions have been presented against it. Surely one of their direct representatives might be allowed to express his views upon that subject. (Hear, hear.) In relation to the great question of the Land, the House, perhaps, hardly realises how many cultivators are in the unfortunate position of having lost their husbands, and are yet carrying on their farms, employing numbers of labourers who have votes, while they, though more qualified in every respect, have none, simply and only because they are women! Few know how many women are farmers and graziers—some 20,000—and few, perhaps, realise that the agricultural interest loses through this cause something like 140,000 votes. (Hear, hear.) On questions affecting The Home, from which springs the nation; on questions as to the Sanitation of the house and workshop; the improvement of the social condition of the people in relation to Vaccination, and Sanitary matters; as to the administration of the Poor Laws, the Housing of the poor, and as to Pensions in old age; as to the *Status* of women in relation to industry and trade; as to the Hours of work in factories and shops; as to the legislation which must follow the result of the Royal Commissions on Labour, and on Sweating, in which women are very deeply interested; and as to the Payment of Members of Parliament, to which they will have to contribute, but upon which they are not to be heard; on all these and many other questions, women have not, but ought to have, a voice through their representatives in Parliament. (Loud cheers.) Surely these are considerations which should appeal strongly to this House and induce it to accord the vote which we ask it to confer upon women. (Hear, hear.) It may be said, finally, as has been said by my hon. friend opposite, that this vote is beyond the sphere of women's intelligence and beyond the range of her knowledge of Imperial, as distinguished from municipal, politics. I reply that there is really no inherent distinction and no true difference as between the two cases; and the sphere of each is becoming yearly more intermixed, owing to extensions of local government, to devolution, and to transfers of powers, which is the tendency of the age. (Hear, hear.) The frequent resort, too, to the permissive principle in Acts of Parliament and so to local option, constantly gives to localities the quasi-right of legislation; and, indeed, it may almost be said now, as was said by Cicero, that administration is quite as important and quite as difficult as legislation. So important as this is the duty which you have entrusted to women! yet you refuse them, when equally qualified, scarcely a higher function. (Hear, hear.) And so, also, the objection on the score of range of knowledge is no less a fallacy. In former debates it was usual to meet it by saying that women are not less informed than the agricultural labourer, or the illiterate voter, for whom you have taken such pains that he may record his valuable vote. (Laughter.) But, in truth, we need not go so far afield as that agriculturist. It is sufficient to ask

who in this House is qualified to undergo any such test as that upon which it is sought to exclude women from the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Who of us is, or ever can be, versed in the whole range of modern politics? However we may flatter ourselves, most of such matters are really determined by the few experts on each, experts which the House delights to listen to, and, upon some such social subjects as I have specified women are the experts of experts. (Loud cheers.) And if they help us in these, or some of them, we can well spare them from "scientific frontiers" and the Eastern Question, and from juries and the army, and the police force—which one honourable member cited as a disqualification. (Laughter.) It is not necessary that women should know—it is not possible that they—or we—or anyone—can know the whole range of politics at the present time. What we ask is only that they should be permitted to choose some representative, who would be able to consider these matters, and record their views on their behalf. Yet my hon. friend opposite seriously proposes to apply to women a fancy franchise test which is even higher than any applied to mankind. He says, "What do they know about Fair Trade?" Of course they are "fair" traders if they are in trade at all. (Laughter.) He asks, "What do they know about proportional representation?" Why, who knows anything about proportional representation?—except the right hon. member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney). (Loud laughter.) He says "they will be socialistic and vote for eight-hours' Bills." Well many men are doing the same, though women have probably the longer hours of the two, and are yet comparatively silent. (Hear, hear.) How, he asks, can women understand the mysteries of bi-metallism? Why, that is a subject no man can understand. (Loud laughter.) That is the sort of test the hon. member for Flintshire (Mr. S. Smith) proposes by his letters to apply to women! I think that is carrying the argument much too far and reduces it to an absurdity. (Hear, hear.) What women can, and do, understand better than men can understand for them is their own interests, which is the chief justification of a wide suffrage. (Cheers.) There are also some subjects to the solution of which they can contribute, perhaps, more than any others—namely, a practical view of those social questions, mostly the subjects of the day, in which their experience would be most useful, while, without it, Parliament is not fully competent to solve such problems. (Hear, hear.) I am sure I have trespassed far too long upon the attention of the House in endeavouring to show what I feel, viz., that this is a very proper and safe development of the principle of the franchise, based on safe experience, and itself a corollary of our household suffrage, which, in order best to meet a demand for manhood suffrage, we ought to strengthen by inclusion rather than weaken by exclusiveness. (Cheers.) And I ask this on behalf of qualified women, for reasons which may be stated finally in a very few words. They are: That it will be an advantage to Women, to

Parliament, and to the State—to women themselves by securing the expression of their views from their own standpoint, and through those who may be entrusted with the safeguarding of their interests, for political influence is the only guarantee of legislative justice. (Cheers.) It will, we are convinced, also improve the social and economical position of women, and so in the end lessen undue and unfair competition with men. (Hear, hear.) It will raise, as we believe, the general moral and intellectual tone of society, and even conduce to a more advanced position than that which women, by their own efforts, have already occupied. We believe, too, that it will be of advantage to Parliament, because it is undesirable that this House, which loses by disabilities, and which should always be adapted to new social and industrial conditions, should fail in the expression of the views of any large portion of the community, or in the representation of the thought and industry of any part of the population. (Cheers.) And lastly, we acknowledge that, after all, the object of legislation should be—as we believe would be the achievement of this Bill—good government. We believe that if we give the vote to women it will contribute to that good government; and, at least, that it will save them from misgovernment. (Hear, hear.) And, in that belief, and agreeing, as we do, with Lord Beaconsfield, that "the exclusion of the votes of women has been injurious to the best interests of the country," we offer the remedy of this Bill,—which, though it may not do all that is desired by some, will certainly accomplish much for many,—and confidently ask Parliament to sanction that which we believe to be justified by considerations of justice, experience, and expediency. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. S. SMITH (Flintshire): In rising to move the rejection of this Bill, I wish to pay my tribute of respect to my hon. colleague. I have listened with great interest to his speech, and I think I may say with truth that I never heard the case of women put forward in a more fair and reasonable manner. I wish also to say that I entertain a very deep respect for the purity of the motives of those who are the leaders in this movement. I believe they have a deep and earnest desire to raise the position of women, and that they believe the franchise to be the most potent instrument for so doing. This movement represents a great amount of genuine philanthropy, and has secured the support of many of the best men and women of the country. It deserves to be treated with great respect, not only from the purity of their motives, but for the great ability of its advocates; and I hope that I shall use no arguments against it which are not both honest and respectful to my opponents. I conceive that no issue of equal importance has been submitted to Parliament in our time. This measure, if passed, will carry consequences far-reaching and momentous—consequences which none here can adequately realise. I readily admit there is weight in the arguments in favour of the measure; but I hope to convince the House that there is still

greater weight in the arguments against it. I will make the admission that the Bill now before us gives the irreducible minimum of women's demands; it professes only to give the Parliamentary franchise to those women who already possess it for municipal and county councils. It excludes lodgers and the service franchise. The hon. gentleman says that it will enfranchise one million voters. I thought, from such investigation as I have been able to make, that the number it would enfranchise would lie between 800,000 and 900,000.

Sir A. ROLLIT: That is, strictly, more accurate.

Mr. S. SMITH: I am glad of that explanation. It professes to give the Parliamentary franchise to 800,000 or 900,000 female householders in the United Kingdom, who are nearly all spinsters or widows; and I will allow that, if this concession would finally settle the question, there is much to be said for it. No doubt it seems rather illogical to give the franchise for local government and not for Imperial purposes, but I remind those who think this to be conclusive, that the admission of women to local franchises was very much the result of an accident. It was never properly discussed in this House, and no one foresaw at the time how it would be used as a lever to obtain Parliamentary franchise. Had this been foreseen, I doubt whether this women's local franchise would have been given, or this agitation have attained its present proportions. There is, however, an enormous difference between the two franchises. The local franchise is a very limited one, and for objects strictly defined by Act of Parliament; then, the local franchise may be altered or cancelled as Parliament thinks right. Besides, local bodies possess merely administrative and no law-making powers, but the Imperial Parliament possesses absolute authority over the lives and property of all within the realm, and indirectly governs 300 millions of people outside the United Kingdom. No legislative body that I know of possesses such unlimited powers as the British Parliament. The Legislature in the United States is bound and limited by the written Constitution; and if it act *ultra vires* can be called to account by the Supreme Court, and its decisions nullified. All the Legislatures in the British Colonies are more or less restrained by statutory obligations, but the British Parliament is as absolute as the Czar of all the Russias, and nothing but the practical good sense of the people prevents it becoming an instrument of tyranny. But the electors are the makers of Parliament; therefore, in the last resort they wield this tremendous power, and no nation was ever so dependent upon a practised and trained electorate. The case for Parliamentary franchise is, therefore, altogether different from that of a local one, and must be justified by far more weighty arguments. The attention of the House should be called to the fact that the previous female franchise Bills introduced were altogether different to this one; they claimed that—

“For all purposes of, and incidental to, the voting for members to serve in Parliament, women shall have the same rights as men, and all

enactments relating to or concerned in such elections shall be construed accordingly.”

Another Bill goes even further. It claims that—

“No person shall be disqualified from being elected to, or from filling or holding, any office or position merely by reason that such person is a woman, or being a woman, is under coverture.”

That is to say, women are to be eligible to sit in Parliament, to hold office under the Crown as Ministers of State, to become judges, bishops, or even Commanders of the Forces. Now, I want to know whether the advocates of female suffrage, in this House or out of it, have abandoned these claims in favour of the more moderate proposals of the Bill now before us? I believe that, with one voice, all the leaders of this agitation will claim absolute equality as between men and women; this is the goal at which they are aiming, and nothing less will satisfy them. Most of those who will vote for this Bill intend at the first opportunity to widen it so as to equalise the franchise as between men and women; and should Parliament pass this Bill, what will be our position at the first general election at which women vote? The country will be overrun with female orators inciting women to remove the stigma placed on their sex; the 800,000 or 900,000 female electors will be urged to vote only for those candidates who will promise to put men and women on an equal footing; they will be told that we make marriage a disqualification, and so insult all married women; and it will be found that hardly a candidate will refuse the pledge, for in almost every constituency the large female vote will turn the scale. There is not one trained politician in this House who does not know that the grant of the franchise claimed by this Bill will necessitate in the following Parliament the further grant of absolute political equality as between men and women. That must mean before very long universal suffrage of both men and women. Those who read the signs of the times know well that manhood suffrage must arrive here as it has done everywhere else. I do not wish to see it. I believe that most members here do not wish to see it; yet it will come by the force of the *Zeitgeist*—that spirit of the age which carries all before it; and as sure as it comes will womanhood suffrage come along with it; and the world will see the first instance in history of a great empire ruled by women, for, as everyone knows, women largely preponderate in number. It may be estimated that when allowance is made for the far larger number of men who are from home—as soldiers, sailors, and in other capacities—the available woman vote under universal suffrage will exceed that of men by about one million, or ten per cent. No one who has watched this agitation can doubt that women will then claim and enforce their right to sit in Parliament, and we shall then see not only the Mrs. Fawcetts and the Miss Cobdens of the future, but the Mrs. Besants and the Miss Helen Taylors sitting on these benches. I cannot comprehend the mental altitude of those who say we should only look at

the first step we take, and shut our eyes to its inevitable consequences; as well might a man drive a coach down a steep incline with a precipice at the bottom, and say that he had no business to consider the precipice. I insist that the House should view this question as a whole, and not be deceived into swallowing in separate doses what it would reject if given as a single draught. Consider the vastness of the change that is proposed. Our electorate at present consists of about six millions of men, nearly all householders and heads of families; it will ultimately become, if this Bill passes into law, twenty millions of persons, of which increased numbers between nine and ten millions will be men and between ten and eleven millions women. What will be the qualifications of this large mass? When were such responsible duties entrusted to such an incompetent body? Never since the world began. Many of the men are ignorant enough, and the risks run from nine or ten millions of male electors would not be small; but if you add ten or eleven millions of women, it would be overwhelming. Men, as a rule, gain a rough experience of the world; they mix in workshops and clubs, and discuss the politics of the day, and in a rough sort of way make up their minds on the current topics. Nearly all of them read newspapers and attend public meetings, but how few women have either the taste or opportunity of doing this? How few women take an interest in politics, or read speeches, or attend meetings? It is doubtful whether out of the ten or eleven millions of adult women even one million ever read a political speech, or care the least about politics. What are the vast majority of these women? Several millions of them are wives and mothers; the great majority of them are wives of working men, struggling with families of small children from early morning till late at night, utterly unable to study the complicated questions which come before Parliament. What they do read is mostly the religious serial, or the cheap novel, and it is impossible for them to frequent clubs and public meetings without ruin to their children. Of the women who are not married the vast majority are domestic servants, shop girls, factory girls, sempstresses, barmaids, &c., and I ask this House what knowledge of politics do they possess? If a census could be taken of their reading, I verily believe that not one in ten would be found ever to read a speech or care a rush about politics. The clever political women who really study politics are a mere handful, perhaps not one per cent. of the whole women of this country, and for their sakes we are asked to revolutionise our Government. In arguing this question we have to deal with women in the mass as with men in the mass. It is no valid argument to say that it is a shame to deny the franchise to a clever intelligent lady, and give it to her coachman or her butler. That is not the question before us. The real question is whether women as a whole are as fit to exercise the franchise as men as a whole, and I deny that they are, or can ever be. But we are told that political education follows the gift of the franchise, and that just as the agri-

cultural labourer is learning politics because he now can vote, so his wife and daughters will equally learn as soon as they get the vote. I hold that this is one of those half truths more dangerous than whole errors. Men, as a class, naturally take to politics when they get a chance; but women will not, because the bent of their minds is different. They live—that is, the great bulk of them do—by the heart more than the head, and the enfranchised servant girl will continue to prefer the novelette to the *Times* or the *Daily News*. There are certain professions and occupations that women can never fill so well as men. They never will make soldiers, or sailors, or policemen, or judges, or clergymen, though there are occasionally women who can do all those things; and they will never become politicians, because their minds recoil from it. I claim in support of my views the great father of modern Radicalism, Jeremy Bentham. That illustrious philosopher, whose writings have coloured the entire legislation of this century, decides against giving the franchise to women. The House would probably like to hear his acute estimate of the relative capacity of the sexes; a more just estimate could not be given of their respective characteristics—

“The sensibility of women seems to be greater than that of men. Their health is more delicate. They are generally inferior in strength of body, knowledge, the intellectual faculties, and firmness of soul. Their moral and religious sensibility is more lively; sympathies and antipathies have a greater empire over them. The religion of a woman more easily deviates towards superstition—that is, towards minute observances. Her affections for her own children are stronger during their whole life, and especially during their early youth. Women are more compassionate for the sufferings of those they see; and the very pains they take to relieve them form a new bond of attachment. But their benevolence is locked up in a narrower circle, and is less governed by the principle of utility. It is rare that they embrace in their affections the well-being of their country much less that of mankind; and the interest which they take in a party depends almost always upon some private sympathy. There enters into all their attachments and antipathies more of caprice and imagination; while men have more regard to personal interests or public utility. Their habitual amusements are more quiet and sedentary. On the whole, woman is better fitted for the family, and man for matters out of doors. The domestic economy is best placed in the hands of the women; the principal management of affairs in those of the men.”

What is this but an expansion of Milton's well-known lines—

“For contemplation he and valour form'd;
For softness she, and sweet attractive grace;
He for God only, she for God in him”?

Our opponents do us the great injustice of thinking that we underrate women's powers, and disparage their character. So far from that I freely admit that women possess a finer organisation than men—they are more affectionate and unselfish, and generally speaking, more moral and religious; but I hold that if we wish to preserve these beautiful traits of character, we must not unsex them.

We must not force them into an unnatural competition with men, and endanger the real virtues they possess in pursuit of Utopias. Let me remind the House that this agitation in its essence contemplates not merely political equality, but absolute equality between the sexes in all the relations of life. Some of the leaders of this movement take strong objections to the existing marriage law and the relation of the sexes as laid down in Scripture and upheld by all branches of the Church. Mrs. Fawcett, in a manifesto she has recently issued, repudiates the authority of St. Paul on this question. She says—

“Much, therefore, of St. Paul’s teaching about the position of women and other social matters is not accepted by any Christian Church as a practical guide for conduct at the present time.”

Many of the leaders of this movement resent the marriage service of the Church of England where the woman responds in the affirmative to the following question:—

“Wilt thou have this man to be thy wedded husband, to live together after God’s ordinance in the holy estate of matrimony? Wilt thou obey him, and serve him, love, honour, and keep him in sickness and in health; and, forsaking all other, keep thee only unto him, so long as ye both shall live?”

This form of service is based upon the most express statements of Holy Scripture. From beginning to end the Bible teaches in the most explicit form the subordination of woman to man, specially in the marriage state.

“The husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is the Head of the Church.”

is the uniform language of Scripture, repeated in one form or another hundreds of times. Could a greater calamity befall the human race than to undermine this sacred institution? I much doubt that with female franchise will arise an agitation for substituting perfect equality as between husband and wife, and, should that be successful, a time of social chaos would ensue. Since the time of John Stuart Mill, who repudiated the marriage law of the New Testament, an agitation has arisen for what is called the emancipation of women. I look with dread upon this movement. It is at bottom directed against those organic laws for the guidance of the sexes which the Creator has laid down. Europe has had one instance of the effects of the emancipation of women from those natural restraints which God and nature have placed upon them. In the most corrupt times of the Roman empire there was a movement for absolute equality between the sexes, and all laws were repealed which recognised any superiority on the part of man. Will the House allow me to quote an extract from the great historian Gibbon, showing the effects of this legislation?

“When the Roman matrons became the equal and voluntary companions of their lords, a new jurisprudence was introduced, that marriage like other partnerships, might be dissolved by the abdication of one of the

associates. In three centuries of prosperity and corruption this principle was enlarged to frequent practice and pernicious abuse. Passion, interest, or caprice suggested daily motives for the dissolution of a marriage; a word, a sign, a message, a letter, the mandate of a freedman declared the separation; the most tender of human connections was degraded to a transient society of profit or pleasure.”

Under this state of things it was not unusual for a wife to have twenty husbands in succession, and a husband as many wives. I must express my deepest conviction that it is perilous in the last degree to tamper with those Divine laws which govern the relations of the sexes. Out of this movement for absolute political equality between men and women may develop at a later date another movement to replace the marriage law of Christianity by one giving absolute equality to the wife; and I much fear that experiments may be tried which will not tend to the welfare of mankind. No one can doubt that John Stuart Mill aimed at something of this kind, and he may be said to be the father of this movement for women’s suffrage. It may be granted that the great majority of those who are moving in this matter have not at present the slightest wish for such changes, but my argument is that they are feeding a movement which contains them in its bosom, and out of which they will ultimately grow. Another argument to be considered is this, and I appeal to hon. gentlemen in this House who are historians. I see the Leader of the House in his place, and as I know he is one who studies human nature very closely, I wish to lay before the right hon. gentleman the circumstance that universal history is opposed to the movement; no free country in the world has ever tried the experiment. I am not one of those who decry the formula *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. They take a tremendous responsibility who deride the universal experience of mankind. The mover of this Bill faintly shadowed some attempt in the historical past in which women were allowed to vote. I have never come across it, and I imagine it never assumed importance. My hon. friend (Sir A. Rollit) has made a great deal of one little experiment tried in that remote territory called Wyoming. As regards Wyoming, I admit the testimony is conflicting, and I quite admit that there are some who give a good account of its operation. But I am going to ask the House to listen to the opinion of the hon. member for Aberdeen. This newly formed State on the outskirts of civilisation does duty at every women’s franchise meeting. It got female franchise by an accident when its population—now 60,000, or about one-thousandth part the population of the United States—was a few thousands, yet none of the other forty-three States in the Union have followed its example, or seem likely to do so. It stands alone. As to its working there my hon. friend (Mr. Bryce), in his standard book on the American Commonwealth, the best and ablest ever written, says—

“As regards Wyoming alone the experiment has been longest at work

both as regards full suffrage and jury service. The balance of such evidence as I could collect seems to be unfavourable."

He quotes from one of his most trustworthy authorities, as follows:—

"After the first excitement is over it is impossible to get respectable women out to vote except every two or three years on some purely emotional question, like prohibition or other temperance legislation. The effect on family life seems to be nil, certainly not bad, but, after a year or two, it is found that the women of the worst classes are those that most regularly go to the polls."

As to the general feeling of the United States on the subject, Mr. Bryce writes—

"There is a widespread apprehension that to bring women into politics might lower their social position, diminish men's deference for them, harden and roughen them, and, as it is expressed, 'brush the bloom off the flowers.' This feeling is at least as strong among women as among men. Of the many American ladies whose opinion I inquired, the enormous majority expressed themselves hostile."

The House will allow that the United States is the most democratic Republic in existence; the one where human rights are most fully acknowledged; yet it is undoubted that its judgment is quite against women's suffrage; and the same is true of all other existing Republics—such, for instance, as France and Switzerland. Yet in all those countries the problems of life are far simpler than with us. They could make experiments with much less danger. No country ever had so complicated a system of government as ours, with such prodigious duties and responsibilities cast upon it; and surely common-sense would indicate that we should not be the first to turn upside down the experience of humanity for thousands of years. If this revolutionary change is to take place, let it be tried by some other countries first, and let us profit by their experience. One strange feature of this movement is that it is most favoured by the Conservative party. (No.) My hon. friend says "No," but I think the voting to-day will show that I am right. The Conservative party once made what was called "a leap in the dark," but that leap is nothing compared to this. One would think that all their traditions were opposed to such leaps in the dark. The motive which probably influences them is the belief that women are more Conservative than men. This may be true as regards the upper classes, and perhaps as regards the majority of the women householders; but let me ask hon. gentlemen opposite if by their means the upper tier of women, if I may use the expression, are enfranchised, and add to the strength of their party, how long would it be till the Liberal party sought a counterpoise by emancipating a lower stratum? My own belief is that neither of our great historical parties will derive strength from the enfranchisement of women. If I might venture a prediction, there are two movements which will be powerfully reinforced by female suffrage, the one is Clericalism and the other

Socialism. In Roman Catholic countries womanhood suffrage would mean the undisputed sway of the priests. In France, Italy, and I think I may say the Catholic part of Ireland, the women would vote as their father confessors directed them, and the Pope's supremacy would be made absolute, not merely in the realm of religion, but in that of politics as well. Is that a result which members of this House, even of the Roman Catholic communion, would regard with satisfaction? In Ireland you would give undisputed control to the priests.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): They have got it now.

Mr. S. SMITH: I would ask the hon. member for Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell), whether three-quarters of Ireland would not be completely under the sway of the Roman Catholic priests?

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: Just as now with the men—absolutely.

Mr. S. SMITH: As to that, I do not agree with my hon. friend at all. In Protestant countries, like Great Britain, clerical influence would be less; still it would be considerable. This cannot recommend female suffrage to the Liberal and Radical sections of the House; but it may not dismay the Conservative party. Let me, however, point out that in England, at least, womanhood suffrage would emancipate masses of women utterly impervious to clerical influences, but very amenable to the politics of John Burns, Ben Tillett, and Mrs. Besant. The programme of the Fabian Society would have immense charms for millions of sempstresses, factory girls, domestic servants, and working men's wives. It is entirely a matter of speculation; but I cannot help thinking that we should see representatives of the strongest opinions sent to this House under such a suffrage. A Socialist party led by Ben Tillett and Mrs. Besant would not add to the dignity of this House, or make the government of our vast Empire an easy matter. In many political questions the truth may be said to lie at the bottom of a well. The superficial fallacy is far more attractive than the sound deductions of experience. Long controversies, like Free Trade, have been settled by hard and close argument protracted for a generation. How do you know that those settlements may not be reversed when submitted again to the verdict of a preponderating female vote, intensely and hopelessly ignorant of the issues involved? No one could be certain that a single result of centuries of experience, whether political, financial, or commercial, could stand the test of so entire a revolution of political power. Everything would be thrown afresh into the melting pot, and no human being could predict what would emerge from the chaldron. But my main objection to this and all similar Bills is my dread of its effects on the home life of the nation. I hope the House will weigh well the pregnant words of the right hon. member for Midlothian—

"I am not without the fear lest, beginning with the State, we should eventually be found to have intruded into what is yet more fundamental

and more sacred, the precinct of the family; and should dislocate or injuriously modify the relations of domestic life."

I believe those words are perfectly true, and they weigh more with me than all other objections combined. A peaceful and pure home life is the true foundation of all national well-being. That happy home life can only be found when wives and mothers make the family the centre of their being. All that tends to draw them from this is pernicious. The outside attractions are already too strong in this restless age. Why add to them enormously by pushing women into the maelstrom of politics? Already there is a dangerous disinclination to marriage among young men. The decline in the marriage rate is an ominous feature of the times. For the decade ending 1860 it was 16.9 per thousand annually, for the decade ending 1890 it was only 14.9, being a decline of twelve and a-half per cent. I much fear that under womanhood suffrage a still further decline will occur. Most men hate a noisy turbulent home life; they do not wish wives that claim equality, and fight for their rights. A silent distaste for marriage might be one of the results of what is falsely called the emancipation of women. I say that it is falsely so called, for it is really a diversion of women from their natural sphere of wifely and motherhood. I believe the ultimate effect of pushing them in the maelstrom of politics will be to produce an increasing silent distaste for married life, with all the enormous evils accompanying it. I must apologise for having detained the House so long, and wish to say, in conclusion, that the vast majority of the women of this country do not want the franchise, or care one pin about it; the active spirits of this movement are a mere handful; and it would be a strange thing, as Mr. Gladstone well shows in his weighty letter on this subject, were we to confer a franchise which most of the recipients did not value. Those women who care for politics are already free to exercise their gifts in every way they choose, except going to the poll. In no country are women accorded greater liberty than here; nowhere do they use the press and the platform more freely. Some of them have splendid gifts; and no one grudges them a sphere for their use; but why should they insist upon forcing the franchise on their unwilling sisters? A clever woman can wield a thousand times more influence by speech and writings than by a vote. Remember, that when once given it will be difficult for any woman to abstain; she will be canvassed incessantly, and get no peace till she pledges herself. And elections will be far more frequent in the future than in the past. In the United States they are, and it will be the same here as democracy progresses. Fancy a wife receiving a crowd of canvassers in her husband's absence, and probably going with her political associates to one meeting, and her husband to another. How long would domestic life stand such a strain? I ask the House to pause before taking this terrible leap in the dark. It is the most revolutionary proposal of our time. If it prove a mistake it

will be irretrievable; once given it cannot be reversed. In my judgment, it will be the commencement of national decline. In any case, it is a desperate experiment. We have too much at stake to make rash experiments. We are trustees for the greatest Empire the world ever saw, and we cannot afford to sap its foundations by reckless innovations. I beg to move the Bill be read this day six months.

Sir W. B. BARTELOT (Sussex, North-West), in seconding the amendment, said: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks upon perhaps the most important question that could possibly be brought before the House of Commons. I give all those who may advocate this measure every credit for the feelings which they may possess, believing, as they do, that they are simply going to do justice to the women of this country. But I must point out, and point out most distinctly, that before even those who are most anxious for the passing of this measure can arrive at a satisfactory conclusion, far more trouble should be taken to find out what the views and opinions of women are with regard to this question. My hon. friend the member for South Islington (Sir A. Rollit) introduced this Bill in a most moderate and fair speech, bringing forward all those arguments which lay within his reach, and stating many things which are no doubt absolutely correct, but at the same time leaving out a great number of things that he should have introduced. I will ask the House whether, supposing this Bill, which is called a moderate measure, is passed into law, they think they are going to stop there; and whether, having started the ball rolling, they will not find it increases its pace; and whether, before very long, we shall not only have all the widows and spinsters with votes, but whether we shall not find married women asking to have votes also, especially those with property? And when we get there, what will be the next thing? We have a right to look ahead, and not be guided by present circumstances alone. Our bounden duty is to see what the eventual consequences of a measure of this kind will be. Manhood suffrage may, and very likely will, be given at some future time, and we shall then find, in the case of this Bill being passed, that womanhood suffrage cannot be neglected. The result would be more women voters than men voters, and I should like to ask the House what the position of this great country would be if placed in that peculiar position? Well, Sir, I for one, feel strongly on this question. I have talked to many ladies about it. I may also say I have taken part in nearly every division upon the question. I am sorry to see that my right hon. and learned friend the member for Bury (Sir H. James) has gone out, because I was going to say that I have never listened to speeches that have impressed me more than the speeches of my right hon. and learned friend. He has clearly pointed out that there is something far beyond what is contained in this small Bill now before us, and the difficulties and responsibilities of citizenship which a woman will acquire if she gets the franchise. What I

should like to ask the House is, How can she perform all the duties and bear all the responsibilities men are called upon to undertake? I will venture to say that such can never be the case. Another thing I should like to point out is that those who feel that woman, having got the franchise, would not advocate coming into this House, are miserably mistaken, and even you, Mr. Speaker, might have an opponent in a lady, supposing women were admitted to this House. And I will venture to say that we should infinitely prefer to have one with your sound judgment and unbiased mind, and one whom we can most thoroughly trust. Although there may be some women masculine in all their ways, yet the majority of women—those loving and sympathetic women whom we all so much respect and admire—we have to protect, and I, for one, will not place upon them a burden they are unfit and unable to bear. I have said that womanhood suffrage will be asked for if manhood suffrage is given. Look at the meeting held last night. A resolution was put forward there calling what is proposed to be granted by the Bill now before the House class legislation, and asking that it should be extended and that every woman should have a vote. Well, so long as I feel I am in the right, and that I am acting in the best interests of the country, I will never pander to these views from whomsoever they may come, and whatever form the Bill introducing them may take. I am afraid I am speaking strongly upon this question, but my excuse is that I feel strongly upon it. I am not going to detain the House at any great length, but I may say that I read with the greatest interest the letter of the right hon. gentleman the member for Midlothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), and I will take the liberty of reading one particular paragraph of that letter, because I think it is one we should bear in mind in considering this great question. The right hon. gentleman says—

“There are very special reasons for circumspection in this particular case. There has never, within my knowledge, been a case in which the franchise has been extended to a large body of persons generally indifferent about receiving it. But here, in addition to a widespread indifference, there is on the part of large numbers of women who have considered the matter for themselves the most positive objection and strong disapprobation. Is it not clear to every unbiased mind that before forcing on them what they conceive to be a fundamental change in their whole social function, that is to say, in their Providential calling, at least it should be ascertained that the womanly mind of the country, at present so largely strange to the subject, is in overwhelming proportion, and with deliberate purpose, set upon securing it?”

I will venture to say that my hon. friend (Mr. S. Smith) who moved the rejection of this Bill was absolutely correct in stating that a large proportion of the women of this country are against receiving the franchise. Well, let us look for a moment at one point which has never been mentioned, but which I hope will be carefully considered. You are going to put women in antagonism with men. That is a very

serious question to be borne in mind. You are going to put them in a relation of life which we have been taught should never exist. They are going to be put in the position of men, and very likely, if the wife is of a different opinion from her husband, the most unpleasant consequences may ensue in that particular family. In this House you shut the ladies up with a grill before them, and do not allow them to look at you if it can be helped, in order that your attention should not be distracted. Do you suppose for a moment that if the ladies got the vote they would not claim to be, in the other gallery, and indeed in every part of the House where strangers are now allowed to sit? These are small considerations for the moment, but they are considerations that deserve serious thought. But, Sir, there is something much more important than this. I should like to ask the House whether they think women would be the most fitting persons to manage this great Empire in times of danger, of anxiety, of panic, and of trouble of all sorts. Well, I will only say that, as far as I can judge, it would be most unwise, and a terrible thing to place them in that position. The real question before us does not require to be elaborated by me. It has been well elaborated by my hon. friend who moved the rejection of this Bill. It will be unfair of me to go too much into this question, as there are many who wish to speak upon it, but there are three considerations which I think I might mention. The first is the social question, and I will venture to say this is the most important matter for every member of this House to consider. Whether it will be for the happiness of women to have all the privileges some are asking for is not for me to say. But this much I will say: What would you think of a woman—and we all know there are women of that class—who would leave their families and all they hold most dear and sacred and go into the public arena, and make speeches, and take part in questions about which, perhaps, they know little or nothing? The second consideration is the Parliamentary question. That I certainly need not go into; but, believe me, they will never be satisfied if they do not have all the privileges we men now enjoy as members of this House. But there is something beyond that, and that is the great constitutional question; and looking at that question as a whole, I say what can be more unwise than to place the future destinies of this country in their hands? The hon. Member (Mr. S. Smith) has said that with womanhood suffrage and manhood suffrage there would be 10,500,000 women with votes, as against only 9,500,000 of men voters. I will ask the House to consider what position this country would be in if at any great crisis, with, perhaps, peace and war trembling in the balance, we had to depend upon the vote of the women of this country. Well, Sir, I will not go any further into this question. I should like, however, to say that, taking women as a whole, we all know and acknowledge the useful work they are doing from one end of England to the other. Talking of that useful work, I am reminded of a story which I think I

may mention, the lady being in favour of the Bill. A very pretty widow lady wrote to a member of this House, and she said—

“I cannot sit down and knit, and I do not like visiting the poor. I must do something, and, I think, therefore, your Bill will be a great help to me; and I should like to enter into that sort of life if this Bill will give me the opportunity.”

That, I believe, is not the view of the large majority of the women of this country. They have other duties to perform, and they know it, and they perform them to the satisfaction of those to whom they are united. All I can say is that if you pass this Bill you will place women in a position for which they are unfitted, and I believe the effect would be most mischievous to women themselves.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word “now,” and at the end of the question to add the words “upon this day six months.”—*(Mr. S. Smith.)*

Question proposed, “That the word ‘now’ stand part of the question.”

Mr. WOODALL (Hanley): Those who, like myself, have had any responsibility for the Parliamentary conduct of this question, must feel that great service has been rendered to it to-day by the very admirable manner in which it has been presented to the House by the hon. member for South Islington (Sir A. Rollit). I offer him that acknowledgment the more readily, because, as he knows perfectly well, I have myself felt that after the disastrous defeat last session, and because of the fact that this moribund Parliament is on the eve of dissolution, the raising of the question at the present moment is so inopportune that I declined to take the responsibility of it. But as the question has been raised I shall have no hesitation in following my hon. friend into the lobby in support of the second reading. We are confronted by an extraordinary combination of forces against this Bill, and I cannot but feel that this is an acknowledgment of the meritorious position which has been reached, and as a testimony for which, perhaps, we ought to be most grateful that we have passed out of the region of abstract discussion, and that the question is now recognised by all parties concerned as a measure of practical politics. We have been reminded to-day of divisions and dissensions in the ranks of the supporters of woman suffrage, and reference has been more than once made to a particular meeting last night. I regret exceedingly that anything should have occurred to give force to the argument of dissension; but if we recollect previous movements for the enfranchisement of the people, I think it will be remembered that they have all been accompanied by trouble of a similar kind. Those of us who can remember the struggles for household suffrage, know how we were then hampered, and our task made infinitely more difficult by the more extreme advocates of universal suffrage. I regard the Bill now before the House as excellently devised; amongst other reasons, from the fact that it is

another step towards a universal register. In the making up of an ordinary register women are left on for local purposes, and subsequently eliminated from the register for Parliamentary purposes; and I say that in that respect, as in many others, my hon. friend has been happy in the form in which he has drafted this Bill. We have listened to an extremely interesting speech from the hon. member for Flintshire (Mr. S. Smith), in the course of which he protested that it was unwise to prophesy; but surely no speech has ever been delivered in this House which was so full of prophecy and of dolorous prediction, and three times he warned us against taking a leap in the dark. As I listened to him it appeared as if he had been living for some time past upon the literature of the discussions on former measures of enfranchisement. The measure conferring the franchise upon the working men in the boroughs was opposed on both sides of the House. It was opposed on one side by the extreme friends of manhood suffrage because it did not go far enough; and by those who feared the measure and disliked it, it was opposed in the same sense in which my hon. friend has spoken to-day as an indication of the danger of the thin edge of the wedge, as a step in the direction of manhood suffrage, from which I think we are as far off to-day as we were then. In the speech of the hon. baronet who preceded me the arguments against this measure were stated with great force; but I am bound to say, with all respect, that none of these arguments are new. We are told, for instance, that many women would protest against a measure which would expose them to some inconvenience. My hon. friend reminded the House that in the discussion with regard to the abolition of slavery it was contended that the negroes themselves did not desire the liberty which it was proposed to give them; and I think I can recollect the fact that when the proposals were made to confer the franchise upon the agricultural labourers we were assured over and over again that the franchise was undesirable and undesired by them. But we say that there are a large number of women who do desire it, who have petitioned for it, and have given every conceivable testimony of the earnestness of their desire; and why should they be denied that which we insist is right, because a certain number of others, to whom the privilege will be given, are indifferent or hostile? The women in whose interests we are speaking to-day might very well plead that they are not excused from any of the obligations of citizenship which they are capable of performing. We are warned not to intrude upon the delicacy and purity and refinement of women's lives. But when these arguments are used, it should be remembered how very large a proportion of women citizens have to struggle for their maintenance, to work for their livelihood, to labour under conditions of extreme hardship; they work even in factories, and they are forming associations and combinations very much as men do for the bettering of their condition and improvement of their remuneration. I was astonished to

hear the terms in which my hon. friend spoke in his reference to Mrs. Fawcett, who combated the assertion that what St. Paul wrote in his own day is of equal force now, and whose chief contention was against the apparent preference of the Apostle for celibacy as more honourable than marriage. I wish it were not inconvenient to submit some of the passages Mrs. Fawcett wrote; but perhaps it is sufficient that attention has been called to one of the most admirable and able arguments ever put forward on this question, and I venture to think that Mrs. Fawcett's contention is much stronger and much more practical than that of my hon. friend. Amongst other things, St. Paul would not suffer women to teach. We have a large army of women workers who are invaluable in our educational work. We find that women are handicapped in every form of industry, in the matter of wages and remuneration. We find their access to the professions impeded by unfair conditions. They have been deprived and defrauded of their fair share of educational privileges and emoluments; and, in truth, what the right hon. gentleman the member for Midlothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) said twenty years ago is nearly as true to-day, that Parliament has dealt with women with less than justice. One of the advantages of the motion now before the House is that it proposes to confer the franchise upon a class of electors who have gone through an apprenticeship. They certainly cannot be considered inexperienced, and yet I may recall the fact to the House that when we extended the franchise to the Irish cottiers and the agricultural labourers we gave the vote to a class who had had no experience at all in local voting. But here, on the other hand, we have the advantage of a trained electorate who have been in the habit for a number of years of going steadily, even annually, to the poll, and who probably know the way of marking their paper as well as any of their male friends. The right hon. gentleman the member for Midlothian, in a speech he made in 1870 or 1871, admitted that if the ballot should be adopted by Parliament it would remove one of the most serious difficulties in the way of women taking part in popular elections. I venture to think that our experience of the Ballot Act is that it has introduced a quieter method of taking votes, and that it has fulfilled the expectations which were formed of it. The irony of the situation is that while so many hon. members hesitate to confer the vote upon women they are willing to have them associated with them in the rough work of political contests, acting on electoral committees, undertaking the work of canvassing, and persuading men how they are to vote, and in the course of which women have displayed the very highest kind of political acumen, almost amounting to that of professional experts. I shall be very sorry to find, in such a division as that we shall take to-day, the members of my own political party less strong in support of this measure than those who sit on the other side of the House. It has always been to the great honour of the Liberal party to have initiated measures of enfranchisement; and recalling as we do the

enormous advances which have been made in that direction, I confess it is a great disappointment that we have not the advantage of the concurrence and vote of the member for Midlothian. Some of my friends seem to be alarmed at the zeal with which certain hon. gentlemen opposite are supporting this particular measure of enfranchisement. I can only say, however, that I cannot reproach hon. gentlemen opposite who may not be in the abstract in favour of the measure for supporting what they think may give them a tactical advantage, any more than I can approve hon. members behind me who believe in the justice of the claim, but hesitate to grant it because it may possibly work against them. We admit that a considerable number of the women who would be enfranchised under this Bill have not yet been trained in practical politics; they are still in that respect only the equals of a very large number of the early voters, and in a large degree also of those who have been most recently enfranchised. I should like to ask those hon. members who say that women do not desire a vote what has been the experience of the use made by women of the vote in municipal affairs? We find that they vote in something like the same proportion as the male voters. Some of my friends fear that the votes of women would be given against them; but cases can be quoted in many parts of the country where the Parliamentary representative, for whom the women do not vote, is Conservative, whilst the local councils are largely Liberal. When one comes to analyse the great programme of Liberal measures on which the Liberal party is now addressing itself to the country, I cannot but feel that many of those measures of social reform, such as the improvement of the dwellings of the poor, temperance reform, education, and the incidence of taxation, are questions which appeal directly to women; and we shall have in them, when the time comes, invaluable allies in forwarding the progress of these measures. We are asking for this Bill for women themselves, not only in order that they may profit by it as the industrial classes and the agricultural labourers have done by the redressing of their grievances through possessing the franchise, but also we claim it for them because it would be an advantage to the whole community and to the best interests of humanity.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I am very reluctant to address the House, but the question is one of so much gravity that I feel bound to state the reasons for the opinions that I hold. Those opinions are far from being hostile to the claims of women to the fullest social equality and the freest entrance into all professions and occupations. Perhaps the House will permit me, in order to justify my own position, to say that it is more than 25 years since I began to work in the cause of women's education. I laboured for some years on behalf of the Married Women's Property Act; I had charge for three years of the Bill which ultimately became an Act for extending the rights of women to the guardianship of their children, and I have always

advocated the claims of women to a much larger share of educational endowment in connection with schools and Universities. I should like to say that I do not at all associate myself with a good many of the arguments which are used against this measure, and I will say that I think the question whether the same number of women attain to as high intellectual excellence as men has nothing to do with the matter. I believe the intellectual capabilities of women are amply sufficient to put them for purposes of elections on a level with men. I am far from denying that there are many women fit for the franchise. Again, I desire altogether to repudiate the notion that this question cannot be viewed apart from party consequences. If women have the franchise it must be given them as a measure of justice, irrespective of whether they will vote for Liberals or Tories. We must deal with this question rather more from the political than from the social point of view. It is the political interests of the country that we have to study. My first objection to the proposal is that women do not want the franchise. I am well aware that there are a good many ladies, active politicians, who do desire it. Some of them desire it because they think it will further political or social objects they have at heart—the cause of temperance for instance. Others go further, and look upon it as a step towards complete equality in all things. One lady went so far in conversation with a friend of mine as to say that what we want is to get rid of the English idea of a home. That is a very extreme expression, and I have no doubt goes far beyond the ideas of the advocates of this measure. But, as far as our own observation goes, I think the women who desire the franchise are a very small minority of the women of the country. We know that petitions have been presented in favour of this measure, but how many women would be entitled to the franchise? We are dealing now with the enfranchisement of all the women of England, which is more than is contemplated by this measure. At present I suppose there are about eleven millions of women of mature age in this country who would be entitled to the franchise if we came down to womanhood suffrage. What proportion of these have petitioned this House? The percentage could hardly be expressed without going into decimal fractions. Let us take our own personal knowledge, because that is, after all, the only test we can apply to the matter. Let any hon. member ask himself, out of those ladies whom he knows, how many are in favour of receiving the franchise, and I do not think he will find the number to be more than one in five; and I appeal in aid of my argument to the very remarkable protest published a few years ago in one of the monthly magazines, in which there appeared a number of names of women eminently intellectual, which, I think, far outweighs the authority, high as it is, of the intellectual women brought to bear on behalf of the proposition. Why did these women object to it? Because they thought it would injure their own position. No proof has been given

that it will either benefit women or benefit the State. It is not for us to prove that the measure would work ill; it is for the supporters of the measure to prove that it would work some good; and that, I contend, they have utterly failed to do. I have listened to the arguments that have been used in support of the measure, and I find no sufficient ground except the appeal to the fact that women have already exercised the franchise on local affairs without injury to the community. But it is not alleged by my hon. friend that they have exercised the franchise either with any benefit to the community or to themselves. What are the grounds upon which the franchise has usually been extended? They are mainly two. One was that the Constitution would be stronger and the Government more stable if we included the largest possible number of citizens within the boundaries of the Constitution. Nobody argues now that our policy will be any more firmly based if women were admitted to the Parliamentary franchise, or that there is any substantial discontent in connection with an existing disability on the part of women. Therefore, we may dismiss that at once. The other argument is that the interests of no class will be properly enforced and secured by legislation unless that class is represented. I take it, on the whole, that this is the strongest fact which is advanced by those who are in favour of the change; but my objection is that it rests upon the fallacy of assuming that women are a class. Women are not a class. Who are the women of this country? They are our mothers, our sisters, and our wives. They are not a class, but are members of the class to which their husbands, brothers, and sons belong, and their interests are the same. I think there has been some confusion in this matter. My hon. friend referred just now to the agricultural labourers; they are a class indeed. They had interests which were not the same, and were generally supposed to be opposed to the interests of the farmers and the interests of the landlords; and no one can doubt that the interests of the agricultural labourers have been more carefully regarded by this Parliament than by any previous Parliament, because the labourers now have votes. But the wives and daughters and sisters of agricultural labourers do not form a distinct class, but are part of the same class. Whatever class you take, you will find that the interests of the women belonging to that class are substantially the same as the interests of the men. There is no such antagonism between men and women in this or any other country as makes women a distinct class. I may be told that there is some unjust legislation applied to women in which, their interests being divergent, the interests of women would be better looked after if they had the franchise. How much unjust legislation is there conceived in the interests of men as against the interests of women? There was a Bill before the House last night for making the English Law of Divorce the same as that of Scotland by establishing equality between the offences of men and women. I

voted for that Bill, and I hope it will be passed. I conceive that some people will represent that as a case where the interests of men are opposed to those of women. I do not think it raises that issue. Questions of divorce are of the utmost possible difficulty, and are questions in which the interests of the whole community are involved, and they must not be considered as questions between men and women, and I do not believe Parliament looked upon them in that light. In Scotland that rule has existed for 300 years, because the people believed it to be the fairest and most just law. Doubtless there is much to be said against the Divorce Law of the United States, but they have equality between men and women; and in no part of the United States, except Wyoming, do women enjoy the franchise. Therefore, it is not necessary for women to have the franchise to enjoy equal laws. There are other cognate questions, but when they are looked into as a whole they will be found to depend not on the antagonism of men and women, but on social questions of great difficulty on which the most ardent friends of women may hold very different opinions. Then there are some restrictions on the labour of women which do not apply to men, and some hon. members complain bitterly on the restrictions imposed by legislation on the labour of women, and that they have no voice in determining these restrictions. But these restrictions are not imposed in the interests of men as against women, but in the interests of women themselves, and the feeling of women is divided upon them. So on the point you are not entitled to say that women are a class who require special representation. It is said that in some industrial matters women are exposed to greater disadvantages than men; they get lower wages in some trades, and the men's trade unions have shown themselves hostile to and have oppressed the women's trade unions. I sincerely regret that, but these are matters which legislation cannot deal with; they depend upon the supply of labour and the amount of competition there is. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if any considerable grievance is left which can be pointed to as a grievance between men and women which the political power of women is required to remedy. Those who rest their case on this point entirely ignore what has been done for women during the last 25 years. We have had the Married Women's Property Act, the Guardianship of Infants Act—not in so complete a form as I should like, being a believer in the absolute equality of the rights of father and mother—yet in a form to remove four-fifths of the grievances under which they suffered. They have a large share of endowments; they have been admitted to the teaching at the Universities; they are making their way in the professions, and their trade unions are making good their position in another direction. When reviewing what has been done in 25 years without the suffrage, I have great confidence that women will get the further privileges and advantages they desire without legislative power, and that the good feeling, justice and sympathy which has helped them before will in the future

have their perfect work. It is said that women would be socially elevated if engaged in political work with men. That is the opinion of my hon. friend, but others hold a different opinion, and neither he nor I can prove it. So far from believing that women will benefit by politics, or politics be benefited by them, I believe politics will do them more harm than good. Political work is exposed to serious temptations, and there are certain things in the constitution of women which make them more liable to succumb to those temptations than men. I do not lay stress on that part of the argument; but if I am asked to state my opinion, I believe that the participation of women in voting, and that which must follow voting—sitting in this House, and the participation in all the active work of governing—will ultimately lead to a revolution in the social relations of the two sexes which will be not only momentous, but, so far as we can see, disastrous. I come now to the last ground on which I object to this Bill. It is a very bold experiment. It is recommended by certain abstract theories, by certain shadowy notions of benefits to be conferred on women politically, morally and socially, by giving them a share in the political work of men. I notice that the common argument used is, Why not? We want something better than a "Why not" in this matter; we want a positive reason. All reforms in the franchise have been introduced to remedy or cure some existing defect in our system, and we have been able to apportion the change we made to the cure we desired to effect. Here we are asked to make this great change on pure abstract theory. There is nothing more pernicious in politics than abstract doctrine, and no worse habit can a country contract than that of yielding to abstract doctrine. Why should we make such an experiment, which can have no other effect than to double our constituencies? This little Bill only proposes to admit about a million women, but we know perfectly well the matter cannot stop there. Many ladies object to the Bill because it refuses the franchise to married women. Why should marriage be made a reason for not granting it? The enfranchisement of all women was supported by strong and even physical arguments at St. James's Hall last night. Shall we not be asked in any future extension of the franchise to men to extend it in like manner to women? We are within measurable distance of manhood suffrage, and I say that for this reason neither party in the State is much concerned to oppose it; nobody can tell which party may be benefited by it, and it is as likely as not to come from the party opposite as from the party to which I belong. I ask the House to assume that we are within measurable distance of manhood suffrage, and I submit that if you concede that you cannot refuse womanhood suffrage also. The distinction between the suffrage of men as men and the suffrage of women as women is a clear and well-marked distinction, and rests on rational grounds. If we once admit the principle of women suffrage at all, we put ourselves on an inclined plane on which there is no stopping until we

are landed in universal suffrage—manhood and womanhood alike. If I were asked whether I think woman suffrage would work well, and whether the eleven million adult women in this country—including, of course, domestic servants, who in some London constituencies would form the majority of the voters—are fitted for the franchise, I should reply to the question with an unqualified negative. I should say that in every class of the community women know less about politics than men do; and whatever class of the community my hon. friend looks to, he will find that the women are immeasurably behind the men in political knowledge and interest. This is no disparagement of women; it results from the circumstances of their lives, in which circumstances the interests of their lives are profoundly bound up. How many of the ladies in our own circles are in the habit of reading the political intelligence in the newspapers, or of going to public meetings? We can in this way see the difference between the political capacity of men in any given class and the present political capacity of women in the same class. I may be told that the franchise will be an education, and that women will rise to the functions given to them. I think that argument has been pushed too far, and I could show instances in which it has completely broken down. Let that education make some progress before we try the experiment. The arguments I have put forward must have some weight, because they are found to prevail in all democratic parts of the world. There are other countries more democratic than ourselves; there is Switzerland, why does she not try it? Why does not democratic France try it? Our Colonies are democratic in the highest degree: why do they not try it? In any of the 44 States of America where there is the most unlimited facility for trying experiments—why has not somebody been trying the experiment? I shall probably be reminded of Wyoming. That is a very interesting little State; it has a population of 60,000 spread over an area nearly double that of England, and the biggest town has only 9,000 inhabitants. Wyoming has adopted woman suffrage, but I do not think that example—which may be compared with Ross and Cromartie—will have much weight with the House. There is another case more in point. The State of Washington had woman suffrage for about four years, but when it enacted its Constitution in 1889 it rejected woman suffrage by 35,000 to 16,000. Washington is a wealthy and flourishing State with a population of 350,000, and I think that example will have more weight on one side than Wyoming will have on the other. I feel some little doubt as to prediction in this matter; I do not associate myself with the predictions of my hon. friend, for the results in changes of this kind are often totally unlike those we expect. I think every member of the House will admit that as experiment may probably result in the addition of eleven millions to the electorate it is a very large experiment, from which great results may be expected, and which nobody can say would not affect the Government of the

Mr. Wyndham's speech on 17th Dec 1891

country. This is an experiment so large and bold that it ought to be tried by some other country first. I am bound to say we have made changes enough of late in the franchise. We enlarged it in 1867, and again in 1885; let us wait a little while before we make another change. There is, I believe, a very large and momentous change, which is dictated to us by the highest considerations of public policy, which we shall have to enter on in the next Parliament, and which will affect the Constitution of the three kingdoms. We have the prospect of a period of passionate controversy over these proposals of change; and I cannot think, with this prospect before us, that this is a very happy time to embark on so bold an experiment. I will appeal even to those who are in favour of the proposal to let us wait until the weather is a little more settled before they ask us to launch out into an unknown sea.

Mr. WYNDHAM (Dover): The hon. gentleman has dissociated himself from the apocalyptic prophecies uttered by those who have preceded him in this debate. He does not join in the sheer terror with which the hon. member for Flintshire (Mr. S. Smith) views the possibility of the destinies of this country being governed by ladies who prefer serial novels to the works of Jeremy Bentham and Gibbon, of Juvenal and John Stuart Mill:—the rather strangely-assorted library which we are led to infer now guides the agricultural labourer in casting his vote. But at the end of his speech he was unable to refrain from adding a third, though a milder one, to the gloomy prognostications to which we have been treated this afternoon. If he does not fear to be governed by women he is desperately afraid of any further move in the direction of reform. We have been much interested in watching the faces of some of his colleagues while he preached the gospel of caution in sentences which, had the word peasant been substituted for the word woman, might well have been delivered in this House in 1832. The hon. gentleman addressed three arguments to the House. The third and last argument, to which I have just referred, was one of caution against any advance until somebody else had had the courage of their convictions. But I will leave that part of his speech. I do not see why on this occasion we should depart from the invariable usage of this House, and endeavour to frighten ourselves with the possible yet remote consequences of an action the immediate results of which we can gauge by reading this Bill. The second argument of the hon. gentleman was that the franchise would rather do harm than good to the women who receive it. That he delivered, I believe, as a pious opinion. Other speakers had told us that, though women may take the active interest they do in politics, for them to have the privilege of bringing their opinions to bear on candidates would in some strange way degrade them and do away with that refinement and purity which we are glad to think they now possess. That is a pious opinion, and a pious opinion it must always remain. Yet this we know, that in other spheres of

life—in hospital wards, for instance—women have shown a higher power than men to transcend the brutalities and degradations of their surroundings. I cannot, therefore, doubt that conferring the franchise on women may tend more to sweeten and elevate the atmosphere of political life than to work any degradation to the women who will wield that power. The first argument of the hon. gentleman, and the one on which I wish more particularly to dwell, is that for this reform no such case of urgency or need has been made out as for every other reform which has preceded it. It is said that the fallacy under which we are labouring is that women are a class. We are told that in past times the franchise has always been extended to a class to add stability to the State, or to defend the recipients from injury, but that since women are not a class they will add no stability to the State, and do not need any special protection. In connection with that I noted one sentence about “the home.” The hon. gentleman said it would imperil home life as understood in England, or quoted and deplored the sentiment of some lady who wished to see that home life materially altered. The hon. gentleman must be aware that a great many women have no home, and can have no home; that the whole status of women—whether we like it or not—is altered; that the daughters, as well as the sons, in many families, have to seek employment and to be independent of the protection of their male relatives, which 60 or 100 years ago was doubtless extended to them in every case. It is for these women we appeal. We believe they constitute a class, in need of protection, and will continue to do so, until the same political privileges are extended to women as men now enjoy. They are, indeed, a class labouring under special disabilities. Because the last Reform Act ostensibly gave a vote to every householder; that was substantially the object of the right hon. gentleman the member for Midlothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), who introduced the Bill. But from these householders a class was excluded, the class of women householders, who were left without a vote. What we wish to do is to complete the right hon. gentleman’s measure; to approach nearer to that ideal which was his ideal, for in the speech in which he introduced the Bill he said—“If we endeavour to attain an ideal franchise we may be led to giving women suffrage or minority representation.” So that the right hon. gentleman, when he contemplated an ideal franchise in 1884, contemplated a franchise providing for women suffrage and also, by the way, for the representation of minorities—why did he not then include women householders, as well as men householders? For a very good reason. He objected to what he called “deck-loading” his Bill. He declared that to admit that reform then would but imperil the measure; but does anybody say now when the ship has been sailing safely for eight years, when the cargo has been securely stowed all that time, there is any danger in our rounding off and completing his scheme of franchise by removing the

disabilities which now lie upon women householders and upon women householders alone? What led the right hon. gentleman to select householders as, broadly speaking, the political unit in this country? He did that because he laid it down that every citizen capable of using the vote for his own benefit and for the benefit of the country was entitled to have the vote; and he said that the class of householders although they might exclude some persons who had that capacity at any rate would include very few who had not that capacity. Therefore, if women householders are to be excluded and other householders are to be maintained, it can only be because they are incapable of exercising the vote for their own benefit, and for the benefit of the country. Why are they incapable? We have had some arguments advanced to prove that because women, at the last resource, are possessed of less physical force than men, therefore they are not entitled to the vote. But physical force is not everything, even in the more ordinary and more obvious pursuits of life; and in such an elaborate and complicated function of society as the exercise of the franchise, physical force is nothing at all. Physical force, unless propelled by the emotions and directed by the mind, achieves nothing in politics; and even supposing the whole fabric of society were to crumble about our ears, physical force amid the wreck of civilization would still be of little avail unless so propelled and so directed. And, therefore, if we do not find that women stand on a lower level in moral and intellectual capacity we are not entitled to reject their claim on the ground that physically they are weaker than men. There is another argument or another assertion of the incapacity of women—namely, that they lack judgment, that they are not such good judges of political questions as men are. Surely, when we use such an argument we exaggerate not only the ability but the demands made upon the ability of our fellow voters in this country. It needs no Solon to vote for one man or the other when only two are presented for choice; but, letting that pass, even if a great quality of judgment were required, and even if women possessed less judgment than men that would not invalidate their claim to the vote, for the argument for every reform has been not so much to increase the power of discernment, and to obtain a more accurate view from one standpoint, as to multiply the points of view. Then, in fine, we have only to consider whether the point of view of these women who are independently earning their livelihood is a point of view which we can afford to ignore. That is the sole question left for us to answer; and in reply to that it has been argued that a great deal of legislation has been passed for their benefit in recent years, and that they are pretty well off as they are. All these arguments were familiar in the mouths of those who were opposed to the extension of the franchise to the agricultural labourers. It was pointed out that the lot of English peasants was cast in happy places; and yet, now we are told that

without allotments, small holdings, and free education, their lives will be no better than those of slaves. I think we must, on both sides, attribute this opening of our eyes in England to the fact that the labourer has been given a vote. Is it then not only possible, but probable, that if the women householders had a vote and obtained a voice for their sisters who are not householders, we should find, forthwith, even in the legislation which we so kindly introduced and passed on their behalf, that we had wounded their feelings, missed their true welfare, and lost by our self-satisfied neglect the guidance which we might have received at their hands? I concede that no doubt the old ideal was a good one in its day. Undoubtedly the position of women in the home was not only tolerable but necessary at a time when the persons and property of women were not safe in England; just as the position of the serf was not only tolerable but perhaps necessary in the days of feudal anarchy when his life could only be protected by service to his lord. But now that is changed in the case of women, as in the case of the peasant. Both having achieved liberty, and foregone protection as the price of subordination, demand the right to protect themselves. I hold it, therefore, certain that just as the abolition of feudalism in the relation of the lord to his vassal led at last, but led inevitably, to the enfranchisement of the labourers of England, so the abolition of feudalism in the relation of man and woman must inevitably lead to the enfranchisement of women in this country.

Mr. ASQUITH (Fife, E.): The House always listens with pleasure and instruction to the hon. member for Dover, and I think I may congratulate him on the present occasion upon having contributed in a very difficult case new arguments to a well-worn discussion. In the first place, the hon. gentleman informs us of what I for one certainly never imagined before, that his new zeal and that of many hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who are going to support this Bill is due to the very disinterested desire to "round off" the system of enfranchisement introduced by the right hon. gentleman the member for Midlothian in 1884. I hope that the hon. gentleman and his friends will not allow their logical enthusiasm for the development of Liberal policy to evaporate at this point, but that when we present to the House some other consequences which, in our opinion, are much more legitimate deductions from the principles of that measure of 1884—for instance, when a measure is introduced providing for "one man one vote" we shall be able to count on the hon. gentleman's support. The other argument which the hon. gentleman used, and which, so far as I know, has not been anticipated, is that there are a very large number of women in this country who are without homes—clerks, servants, and persons of that description—who therefore cannot be regarded as represented by the male relatives under whose protection they live, and for whom, and in whose interest, it is desirable to provide separate representation. But has the hon.

gentleman read the Bill, in support of which the speech which we have just heard has been delivered? If he has, he has no need to be reminded that, so far as the class he has mentioned are concerned, this Bill will not produce the least effect in the world. This Bill excludes from its operation every lodger; and I suppose that persons without homes who are pursuing their occupation, whether as clerks or servants, would certainly in 99 cases out of 100 fall within the category of lodgers. Therefore, whatever force there may be in that argument it is entirely irrelevant to the measure now before the House. I confess I think both the House and the country ought to be congratulated that they have at last got an opportunity for determining with precision, as the division to-day will enable us to do, whether this movement for the so-called enfranchisement of women has advanced or receded within the last ten years. Among all the social and political agitations of our time, it is a movement which has enjoyed, and does enjoy, exceptional advantages. It has been recommended to the country by names of great and just authority. It has been engineered and advertised with a skill and a pertinacity which show, to my mind at any rate, that we have among us at the present day women who, even without the vote, can in that department of political activity teach us many lessons, and whom we can teach very little. And while I do not wish in the least to disparage the genuine enthusiasm which is felt in some quarters for this Bill and for kindred schemes, I am bound to add that, so far as I can form a judgment, it has been very largely accepted not from conviction, but without mature examination or inquiry; in that spirit of flaccid fatalism by which people persuade themselves that a thing must come if only it is shouted for loud enough, if only it drapes and clothes itself in a democratic disguise. I trust that, after this afternoon, we shall examine this question on its merits. I observe in the press and in speeches which have been made by outside supporters of this movement that they are approaching the division to-day with unusual heaviness of heart. They are lamenting, and lamenting somewhat publicly, the backslidings and fallings-away of eminent persons who in bygone times used to vote for their Bill, and even advocated actively their cause. They know their own tactics best; but I confess I should not have thought that that was the best way of recommending their claims to the attention of the House and the country. But I suppose, when you have got no proselytes to boast of, the only thing you can do is to denounce the perverts whom you have lost—I say, when you have no proselytes to boast of. I must admit that I rather agree with my hon. friend the member for Aberdeen, that some of the arguments both for and against this measure were pitched in rather too high a key. So far from thinking that it will lead to the political millennium which has been described in such graceful and elaborate language by the hon. member for Dover, I regard it, for reasons which I shall shortly state to the House, as upon

the whole a mischievous and injurious scheme; but, on the other hand, I cannot associate myself with all the gloomy predictions which we hear from the hon. member for Flintshire and others, who seem to imagine that we are passing a measure which will lead to a complete and speedy disintegration of the social fabric. I believe that for some years its consequences would be slight and almost imperceptible. But we have got to consider and to deal, not with its immediate results, but its ultimate tendency. It is admitted that we have in this matter no relevant experience to guide us. There is no civilised country in the world, living under conditions similar or even approximating to those which prevail in Great Britain, which has ever made the experiment of giving women the vote. As to the case dealt with by my hon. friend the member for Aberdeen, the solitary case of Wyoming in the western part of America, I need not repeat what has been already said by my hon. friend. It will be sufficient to point out that it is impossible to argue seriously from the experience of a rudimentary community, with a sparse population thinly scattered over what they call in America "magnificent distances," to the case of an ancient, complex, and highly organised society such as our own. Nor is more light to be gained from our experience of municipal elections. The women's vote there may have done good or harm. There is no evidence upon which to pronounce an opinion one way or the other; and the reason for that is that the result has been infinitesimal, either for good or for harm. No doubt there is a great and growing interest in these municipal contests; but we should be shutting our eyes to facts not to recognise that they are for the most part determined by local and personal considerations. The position of women voters in such contests is fundamentally different from what it would be if, through their instrumentality, an immense addition were made to the Parliamentary register, and if, when a great election was coming on, where every vote was a matter of almost national importance, this large body of untried and susceptible opinion were to be exposed to the influences, solicitation and pressure which cannot be withdrawn from a Parliamentary election. As we have no experience to guide us one way or the other, this change must be recommended on purely abstract grounds; and I do not think I am doing any injustice to the argument of the promoters of this Bill when I say that the main weight of their case rests on the assumption that in a democratic community such as ours, to exclude from the franchise any class of persons—especially persons who pay rates and possess property—is an indefensible anomaly, and a negation of the principle of popular representation. In other words, this Bill is recommended, as the hon. member for Dover has said, as the logical development and completion of previous extensions of the suffrage. That is a position which, in its length and breadth, I entirely traverse. I assert that, in many essential particulars, the present proposal differs from all other previous enlargements of the franchise. In the first place, there has

been no case hitherto in our constitutional experience where the franchise has been extended to a class without clear proof to demonstration being given that that class was, if not unanimously, at least in immensely preponderating numbers, and by an emphatic and clear voice demanding the boon that was to be offered. Now, what is the case in relation to women? It is true that there are some of the best women who are strongly in favour of women's suffrage. It is also true that there are some—I will not say a majority—of the best women who are strongly opposed to it. But as to the great mass of the sex, the only thing that can be asserted with truth is that they are watching with languid and imperturbable indifference the struggle for their own emancipation. Again, there has been no previous extension of the suffrage except where it has been capable of proof, and where it has been proved, that the class excluded, and whom it was sought to admit, are persons capable of performing, and actually performing, the duties, bearing the burdens, and liable to the calls of active citizenship. That was the case with the £10 occupier, and with the urban and rural householder. They were all men liable to be called upon in the last resort for the defence of their country. They were men to whom, before they got the franchise, most positions of public emolument and trust were already open. They were men for whom the duty and the burden of carrying out, and being actively responsible for, the policy and legislation of the country, existed, and who had no voice in directing or deciding that policy. The hon. gentleman opposite has spoken with contempt of the argument derived from physical force. But in the last resort, not living in an ideal state of things, the sanction of the law is force; and the law which rests on the opinion of a majority of voices, but which cannot summon to its aid, in case of difficulty and danger, the active assistance of the physical force of the country—that is a law which is made to be broken, and for the performance of which there is no practical or adequate security. I say, therefore, that you are asking for the first time for the introduction into the constitution of a new and a privileged class. You are asking the House to give women a vote and the power to count head for head with men in the making of laws, in the determining of policy, in the supervision of national administration; and yet, at the same time, you are not casting upon them—because nature does not allow it—the burden which is cast upon every male citizen. I go now to a further point. I say that there is no case in which the franchise has been enlarged where it has not been shown that there was an actual grievance of which the excluded class had a right to complain. One of the worst effects of a limited suffrage has been its tendency to produce class legislation; and it can be shown to demonstration that every extension of the suffrage has led directly, as an almost immediate consequence, to the remedying of grievances and the redress of injustice, or to the opening out of new opportunities, in respect of the class which was then for the first time

admitted to electoral rights. It was so in 1832, when the £10 occupier was admitted. That led to the opening of the Municipal Corporations and to Free Trade. It was so in 1867, when the urban householder was admitted. That led to the scheme of national education. It has been still more conspicuous in the case of the last enlargement. For there is no doubt that, but for the enfranchisement of the rural labourer, the country would never have heard of allotments or small holdings, or any part of that large and varied programme of social and agrarian reform which is to be spread before the eyes of the country voter at the next general election. I have taken these instances for the purpose of challenging any hon. member who may follow me to show that, in respect of sex, there is, or there has been for the last 30 years, a case of provable injustice in the legislation of the Imperial Parliament. The hon. member for Aberdeen has dealt with the efforts of Parliament to put married and single women on the same footing in relation to contract and property, and to deal fairly between men and women with regard to the care of children. Is there any case now where the law weighs unfairly on women, and to which the attention of Parliament is not just as likely to be invoked successfully under the present suffrage as under a suffrage which would include women? I do not believe that any such case can be cited. It is the framers of this half-hearted and illogical Bill who are going to introduce distinctions between men and women, and between men and women. They are creating distinctions between women and women because, whereas a Parliament of men have removed every distinction and disability with respect to contract and ownership of property as between married and single women, the movers of this Bill ask the House to affirm that a woman is perfectly qualified and competent by intelligence and experience to exercise a vote; but that the moment she approaches the altar she constructs for herself a disability which Parliament ought to recognise as thenceforward disqualifying her for a vote. That is not the only distinction; for while it is sought to enfranchise women for the particular and limited purpose of giving a Parliamentary vote, the movers of this Bill at the same time refuse to take the next step—a step which, if their premises are right, would logically follow—and give them the capacity to sit in Parliament and hold important offices in the State. As the right hon. gentleman the member for Midlothian has pointed out, there is to be a new class of voters, privileged in one sense, as taking no part in the execution of the law, but in another sense disabled, because, while they may vote, they may not sit in the House of Commons or hold any public office. Now, that is a state of anomalies and inequalities which no legislative body, in which male opinion predominates, would ever be guilty of putting on the Statute Book. The question has been asked with considerable force, or at any rate with great superficial plausibility, whether the opponents of the Bill are prepared to assert that there are no women fit for the exercise of the

franchise. They have been asked, by way of illustration, whether they will assert that a woman of genius like "George Eliot" was unfit for the vote which was given to her butler and her footman. But legislation must be framed to deal not with exceptions and portents, but with average cases and normal conditions; and when this question of fitness is raised it is incumbent to realise oneself, and to remind others, that fitness is a relative term. We have not only to ask whether the average woman is fit for the franchise, but, if I may use such an expression, whether the franchise is fit for her. I demur to the doctrine that women are unrepresented, or that they contribute nothing to our political life at the present moment. They contribute through their own appropriate agencies quite as much as men do. They contribute to it imagination, insight, sympathy, a host of moral and intellectual qualities, which are impossible to analyse and difficult to classify, but all of which have this common property—that they operate by personal influence, and not by associated or representative action, and that their natural sphere is not the turmoil and dust of politics, but the circle of social and domestic life. I do not say that if this measure were passed women would cease to exercise that influence; on the contrary, I believe they would still exercise it. But exactly to the extent to which the temptations offered by this measure were operative, in that degree they would tend to draw women from the sphere in which they are really powerful, and transplant them to another, where they would play a subordinate, a secondary, and an inappropriate part. I have heard this measure recommended in the name of democracy. But it is not a democratic measure. The doctrine of democracy demands that we should equalise where inequality exists among things fundamentally alike, but not that we should identify where things are fundamentally unlike. The inequalities which democracy requires that we should fight against and remove are the unearned privileges and the artificial distinction which man has made, and which man can unmake. They are not those indelible differences of faculty and function by which nature herself has given diversity and richness to human society.

Mr. COURTNEY (Cornwall, Bodmin): My hon. and learned friend (Mr. Asquith) has made such a very powerful speech that I feel considerable diffidence in rising to follow him; and especially so, as I am aware there are others who desire to join in the debate. I will, however, briefly deal with one or two arguments he has advanced. My hon. friend has said this will be an occasion for taking the measure of the progress of opinion on the subject dealt with by the Bill, and he seemed already to congratulate himself that the division would show a dwindling force into its support. I do not inquire what result to the Bill the immediate decision may be. Whether it be for or against the second reading I shall receive the result with an equally unmoved temper, because I am persuaded that this measure, small as it is, is a part of the great movement

which, in spite of all the rallying of the opposition, is bound to persevere, bound to go on, and must very soon prevail. The hon. member for Fife (Mr. Asquith), referring to the extremely able speech of the hon. member for Dover (Mr. Wyndham), said that the hon. member advanced a new argument against the Bill. The hon. member for Dover referred to a large section of the women population of this country who, in consequence of the alteration of economic and social conditions, are now themselves forced to earn their own living and are more or less self-dependent, and he argued that was a class whose interests at least deserved consideration, and were liable to be forgotten by this Imperial Parliament so long as women were not represented by this Parliament. "But," says the hon. member for Fife, "this Bill does not enfranchise women of that character." It is, however, a Bill which will undoubtedly enfranchise something like eight or nine hundred thousand women, most of them closely associated with the working women of whom I have spoken, and who will share their hopes, their fortunes, and know the particular wants of women, and the particular wants which require attention. It may be possible that not many of these working women who are self-dependent will get the franchise under this Bill, although I think there are more than the hon. member for Fife suspects; but this Bill if passed will establish the great principle that women not only economically and socially but politically must be regarded as persons who are more or less capable of self-dependence. And the influence which already operates to a large extent will, from the political operation of the vote, still more be strengthened and confirmed, so that woman in the future working out her own position and dependent upon her own exertions would fortify the Legislature and render it more responsible to her wants. It is said that women have no particular claim to protection at the hands of the Legislature. And it is curious to note that the class proposed to be enfranchised has always already received careful and full attention from the Legislature, but when it becomes enfranchised it is found that its members have a considerable right to ask attention which up to that time has been neglected. During the speech of my hon. and learned friend the member for Fife, and his argument about women, and still more during the speech of the hon. member for Flintshire (Mr. S. Smith), who fears the terrors of what will happen if eleven million women are admitted to the franchise, I was reminded of an incident which occurred in this House during the debate on the Household Suffrage Bill. Some member on the Conservative side dilated on the frightful consequences which would come if the working classes were admitted to the franchise *en masse*, and the right hon. member for Midlothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), animated by a just resentment of that kind of argument, said—

"You talk of these persons as if they were wholly removed from us; as if they were persons who would vote against us. Are they not also our own flesh and blood?"

I venture to say of women—"Are they not also our own flesh and blood?" Have not they got some sort of interest in what we do, in the laws we proclaim; are they not interested as men are interested; and from that point of view, are we to assume with the hon. member for Flintshire that the final effect of this movement, if now adopted, will be to enfranchise eleven million enemies? It is said that women have no special merits, no special needs. But I would recommend for consideration the action of women in connection with the representative institutions they could influence. Why, Sir, experience of the action of women as electors in representative assemblies has shown that women are very keenly interested in the character and the conduct of the persons they choose, and they are very keenly interested, too, in the kind of social legislation which affects the happiness of the home, and affects the relations of the wage earner of the home. And who can doubt that if women do get the vote, even under the limited form of this Bill, there will be a considerable addition to the strength of the demand for temperance legislation. As to the needs of women, I have had some small experience as a member of the Labour Commission, which at least shows there are some wants of women which have not been hitherto attended to, and which I think would receive ampler attention, and more immediate attention, if women had an active voice in the Legislature. There is, for example, such a small matter as the inspection of factories. The mass of workers in the textile factories are women, not men; and they are universally agreed in their demand for women inspectors, and yet they do not get women inspectors to help them in any degree. I think if the Home Secretary had women voters at his back he would soon have to come to the House of Commons to ask for an increased inspectorate, and to allow women to inspect the conditions of work in our factories as well as men. Then there is the matter of educational endowment, which has also been referred to, and under which women have not had their fair share. There is also the question of the divorce laws, and the subject of the custody of children still remains in a most incomplete form, inflicting great injury and injustice on the mother. For example, a husband may treat his wife so badly that it is impossible for her to live with him, and yet if the wife separates from the husband the latter has complete control of the children. This Bill is a very narrow and simple Bill. It proposes to declare this—that a woman already entitled to the municipal vote or county council vote should also be entitled to the Parliamentary vote. "Oh," said the hon. and learned member for Fife (Mr. Asquith), "You are creating a new class with exemptions; you do not give the vote to the married women." We, however, take the situation as we find it. We do not cut out the married women at all. To the women who have a vote we give a vote; and if the hon. member for

Fife is so anxious to remove the disability of coverture there is no reason why he should not endeavour to do so. It is not we who have created the disability; we accept the disability simply as it stands, and we propose to extend the Parliamentary franchise in accordance with the conditions regulating the municipal franchise. I have said this is a very small measure in itself, but it is part of a great movement, which may be pregnant with important consequences. If adopted it will initiate this principle—that woman is a citizen as well as man, and that woman, self-dependent, has the same right to be represented in this House as man. And in that respect—aye, small as the matter is—I accept it as one dictated by common-sense and the plain principles of justice, and supported by the experience we have had; and whatever may be the ultimate consequences to which we are moving—I am not bold enough to prophecy—I am satisfied with the movement itself. No doubt we have gone through an age of the emancipation of women. From the time when men, in the plenitude of their strength, put to death the surplus female infants who were not wanted, because they were drags upon their action and limitation to their power, from that time to the present we have made great advances, and no doubt there are greater advances yet to be made. What may be the ultimate position of men and women in the society of two or three centuries hence I do not pretend to know. I am satisfied with this one step. This step is a simple one, and it is a just one. This one step is dictated to us by experience. This one step is recommended by the past. The future may take care of itself. This one step we are emboldened to take, because we see in it a step onward in the progress which has been made in the development of woman as a factor in our social system. I am, therefore, induced to give this Bill my support, and I hope the House will give it their support also when it goes to a division.

Sir H. JAMES (Bury, Lancashire): It is some 21 years ago since I first took part in the discussion of a Bill somewhat similar to the one now before the House. Since then I have so often expressed my views upon the subject, that perhaps those who have followed the discussions on this question will feel I am unduly intruding myself upon their attention. But the sound of my right hon. friend's voice has aroused me. He has recalled some struggles he and I have had on this subject before. Well, Sir, I admit the skill of his rhetoric and his power in debate have not afforded me many opportunities for answering him this evening. Yet, at the same time, there are some topics upon which an answer should be given. Mr. Speaker, my view is that my right hon. friend has misconceived the nature of this Bill. I did not enjoy the opportunity of hearing the hon. gentleman (Sir A. Rollit) who introduced this Bill, explain the strange and fantastic character of it, and the circumstances under which he felt justified in presenting it to this House. I have always understood that one of the principal

grounds upon which this measure is based is that women shall be placed upon an equality with men. Some have said they support the Bill because men have been hostile to women. Both the grounds I believe to be untenable. If the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill is asking for the political equality of women with men, will he, in his reply, state why he shrank from approaching that subject? My right hon. friend says he supports the Bill in order that redress for women's grievances may be obtained. If so, why does he shrink from Parliamentary equality? The attempted explanation of my right hon. friend is one entirely devoid of logic. By this Bill it is sought to give to Parliamentary women—if I may use the term—a municipal franchise, while we retain to men the Parliamentary franchise. The municipal franchise proceeds on certain grounds. In dealing with municipal matters you have to deal essentially with the imposition of rates, and the application of those rates. Therefore, in the municipal franchise you have to deal wholly with a rateable franchise. You will not extend it beyond the rateable franchise. You will not allow the 40s. freeholder to vote in the municipality, nor will you allow the lodger franchise to be extended to the municipal voter, nor will you allow the service voter to vote for one and the same reason—that is, because they are not rated. Thus, when in 1888 the House had to deal with this question in the Local Government Bill, they always kept the distinction clear between the Parliamentary voter and the municipal voter with a rating franchise. The promoters of this Bill, whilst extending the Parliamentary franchise to women, yet keep her within the municipal rating area, and refuse to give her the 40s. freehold vote, the lodger vote, or the service vote. You are thus erring exactly in the wrong direction. I listened just now to the eloquent language of the hon. member for Dover (Mr. Wyndham), who drew a picture of a lonely woman, with no one to guide her, without a husband to protect her, and with no paternal roof to cover her. O she wandered into—where? Lodgings, I presume. That homeless lady, the particular friend of the hon. member, is thus shut out from the franchise of this Bill. You refuse to give Parliamentary equality to that homeless person who needs a vote to redress her grievances, for the simple reason that you are endeavouring, as a matter of tactics, to say that what you are going to give is to be given because it has been given before without any consideration of the reasonableness or the unreasonableness of the different qualifications now existing. Now, Sir, one word more with regard to my right hon. friend the member for Bodmin (Mr. Courtney). He says that although this is but a partial measure, he accepts it, and does not care to what it will lead. Should that be the view of any man who desires to take part in public life—that he will look only to the immediate effect of a particular Bill, without considering whether its natural result must be for good or for evil? I say the man who sets the stone rolling at the summit of the hill is bound to see what effect will be produced in

the valley. And, Sir, as has been pointed out in the course of this debate, the House is bound to contemplate the time when, in consequence of the spread of education and the increase of intelligence and political knowledge, which must be factors in the progress of this country, we shall put on one side those evidences of fitness by property qualifications, and ask that every man shall have a vote. I do not contemplate whether the time will be sooner or later when that condition of affairs is reached; but it is in that direction the political forces of the time are drifting. When that day is reached, no one will hear of this timid shrinking from political equality. If you give universal suffrage to men, with the admission by this Bill that you are seeking to obtain Parliamentary equality, then you must give it also to women. Well, Sir, we have 900,000 more females than males in the United Kingdom. That is the proportion of the two sexes, I do not say of adults, and we should, consequently, have a large majority of female voters over male voters. What I ask is, are you prepared to say that the destinies of this country shall be governed and controlled by that preponderating majority? Are you prepared to say that this majority shall have the power of directing a policy which, as my hon. and learned friend the member for Fife (Mr. Asquith) has pointed out, they never can be called upon to carry out? Mr. Speaker, there is also one practical view of this question. What do our politics consist of? Men may be eloquent upon subjects, especially Imperial subjects, from an abstract or theoretical point of view; but in the main our politics are composed of practical subjects, and they must depend for their decision upon practical knowledge. We hear discussed here questions affecting the control of the army, and we listen to military men on the subject. Naval questions are also discussed, and we have the opinions of naval men to guide us. Commercial life is represented by commercial men, and even legal matters are represented by lawyers. Now, upon none of these subjects can we receive practical assistance from any woman, she not being a member of any of these professions. Yet it is proposed to give the preponderating influence to women, who are unskilled from lack of practical knowledge, while at the polling booth, as well as in Parliament, women will be allowed to take the same share as men in deliberating on and determining questions of which they are totally ignorant. The House must look to the consequences of such a proposal as this. Logically hon. members must accept the proposition that if women have equal power of voting with men they should also have a seat in Parliament, and should have the privilege of filling many offices. That is the view of the supporters of this Bill. The hon. and learned member for Haddington (Mr. Haldane) has introduced a Bill in which he proposes to make it almost a duty of the State to appoint a woman as Archbishop of Canterbury, Prime Minister, and Commander-in-Chief, whether she be competent or not. If the principle of Parliamentary equality is established, all the positions of this House must be open for women,

even that of being a "Whip," and I have no doubt she would administer that office against us with great efficiency. The result is that we should be regarded as a nation of women instead of a nation of men. Sir, there is one argument I should have shrunk from if it had not been for some remarks that fell from my right hon. friend (Mr. Courtney), and that is as to the fitness of women for this measure. It has been said that one becomes personal if he states that a woman is more unfit than a man to exercise the franchise; but I confess, if I were not afraid of the consequences, I should be disposed to express that view strongly. My right hon. friend the member for Bodmin (Mr. Courtney) on one occasion made a statement on which I may rely in confirmation of my opinion that women are not so fit as men to exercise the franchise. This is the opinion of my right hon. friend the member for Bodmin, who, in moving the introduction of the Bill, said:—

"The narrowness of women's range of ideas is absolutely deleterious in its effects."

My right hon. friend went on—

"Our earliest lessons are received from them. Are they not often lessons that we have afterwards to unlearn with great difficulty? We often find a difficulty in freeing ourselves from them, and in emancipating ourselves from the errors of our earliest days."

My right hon. friend has passed on from the days of infancy to what I hope are happier days.

Mr. COURTNEY: Read a little further.

Sir H. JAMES: Certainly I am about to follow my right hon. friend into his later life. Again, he says—

"Of those who enter into the married relation of life, how constantly does it happen that the man's freedom of intellect is hampered, and he is incapable of imparting to the woman with whom so much of his life is spent any conception of his thoughts."

It is true my right hon. friend uttered these words many years ago, but he goes on to say—

"He does not find in her any companionship, but, on the contrary, a drag upon his aspirations."

My right hon. friend, referring to women individually, declared that, speaking on behalf of his country, he is willing to give to such women, who have taught us these evil lessons in our youth, the franchise. But at what expense? What time of probation is a woman to go through, and what price are we to pay for this school of treatment? It is at the expense of the Government of this country that this instruction will be given: the nursery will be the polling booth, and the schoolroom this House of Commons. But does it occur to him that there are men who take a different view of the subject, and who believe that those first lessons have not been deleterious to us. There are men who believe that such instincts for good as they have they received from their mother's teaching. It may be that teaching was

not always logical, but to that teaching of the child could, oftentimes, be traced all the lessons for good that were applied in manhood. And these women who gave these lessons are women who never had the vote, and who did not spend their time on the platforms of the country. Upon the second subject on which my right hon. friend touched, the subject of married life, it certainly is a strange anomaly that whilst my right hon. friend wishes to teach the mother and make her a better mother he would not extend the benefit of the lesson to the wife. He will allow the drag to continue on an imaginary husband; he will still allow the deleterious effect of the narrow range of ideas to affect a learned husband. If it is the intention of my right hon. friend to give married women the vote let him say so; let the mover of this Bill say so. Do not let them take advantage of us by saying that this is a simple and harmless measure, and then say that they are willing to give the vote to married women. If this Bill passes, the natural consequence must be that the married women must have a vote as well as the unmarried women. It is an absurdity otherwise. Whilst men have their professions women have only one, and that is marriage, and yet we are asked to impose a disability upon her as soon as she is successful. The last time I referred to this subject there was great dissent from the view that a woman's destiny in life was controlled by the profession of marriage, and I believe an echo of that dissent was heard from a source which is invisible, though it may be audible (the Ladies' Gallery). But my foundation for the statement is that when Lord Herschell brought a Bill into this House to abolish actions for breach of promise of marriage the women of England, under the handwriting of Miss Lydia Becker, protested against the measure, because they said that women's profession, in which she alone could succeed, was marriage, and they objected that the right to bring an action for breach of promise of marriage should be taken away from them. What is the absurdity of this proposition? The timid supporters of this measure would allow a woman, who has been unsuccessful in her profession, to retain the vote; but the one who has gifts and qualities of mind to attract, and becomes successful in that which those ladies termed their profession, the moment she attains the crown she is to be deprived, by her success, of the vote, and disfranchisement is to follow. These are, indeed, strange arguments upon which to found a Bill which is to appeal to the intelligence and logic of men. We are no enemies of women who seek to prevent their inroads into public life. It was a gifted woman who said that the woman who rocks the cradle rules the world, and she who has the power in the homes of England, she who can influence men, she who can, notwithstanding my right hon. friend's view, enter into the thoughts and guide the actions of men, is a power irresistible in its force. But if she seeks for another mode of action, if she is asking through her advocates for a different power, she must pay the cost of it

by losing those influences which proceed from her very inability to enter into the contentions and rough struggles of public life. Whenever she does this she will yield up real forces and influences for good, she will fail to maintain her higher power when she struggles against man, but she will not fail in producing influences which will be destructive and disastrous to the very best hopes and interests of this country.

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): I should not have thought it necessary or entirely for the convenience of the debate to have intervened if it were not that I find myself in opposition to the greater number of friends of mine who sit on these benches, and with whom I am in the habit of acting in the closest agreement on all political matters; and knowing, also, that the opinions I am about to express are not shared by a large number of gentlemen who sit on this side of the House, I am unwilling to give a vote without very briefly stating some of the reasons which influence me in taking that course. The debate has been an extremely able and interesting one, and the burden of the attack upon the Bill introduced by the hon. member for South Islington has been borne by two gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House, the right hon. gentleman who has just sat down, and the hon. member for Fife. The right hon. gentleman the member for Bury, though he made a very able and interesting speech, laboured under two or three disadvantages. He laboured, amongst other things, under the disadvantage of having replied to a speech which he had not heard, and he attacked my hon. friend who moved the second reading of this Bill on grounds which he never advanced at all. He supposed that this Bill was introduced in order to produce absolute equality and symmetry in the position of men and women in regard to politics. My hon. friend would have been guilty of the greatest absurdity if he had advanced arguments of that kind in support of a Bill which, on the very face of it, does not profess to produce that equality. And many of those who are going to support this Bill do not support it on any ground of abstract right or equality, or on any abstract right at all. We support it for practical reasons which I will endeavour shortly to state to the House. Another argument put forward by the member for Bury was, if he will permit me to say so, fundamentally inconsistent with the arguments advanced by the member for Fife. The right hon. gentleman drew a picture of what the condition of England would be when eleven million women had a vote, and only ten million men had a vote. He said—

“You will then be under the subjection of women. Women will control the policy of this country, and we shall be a nation of women and children.”

That implies that the women are all going to vote on one side and the men on the other, and that women would outvote the men. In other

words, it pre-supposes that there is a class distinction and cleavage between women and men in matters political which would put all the women on one side and all the men on the other. That is altogether and wholly inconsistent with the argument of the member for Fife, who told us that to consider this question as one of class distinction was altogether to misconceive the conditions of modern society. Turning from the right hon. gentleman to the learned gentleman behind him (Mr. Asquith), he gave us a very good Tory speech of the old tune upon the question of Reform Bills in general, and, in fact, there has been an unexpected vein of Toryism, or, at all events, what is described as Toryism by Liberal critics, in the speeches of gentlemen who sit on the opposite benches on this question. As the member for Dover (Mr. Wyndham) has pointed out, had the words "agricultural labourer" been substituted for "women," some of those speeches were such as might have been heard from the small knot of gentlemen who were opposed to the Reform Bill of 1885, and precisely the same arguments have been used with respect to the incompetence of the class to be admitted, and as to the interests of that class having been hitherto fully considered. These are arguments with which we are all familiar, and have been familiar from time immemorial, the only difference being that they have much less justification in the present case than, I think, they had on previous Reform Bills. The hon. and learned gentleman mentioned three points in which this particular alteration of the franchise differed from any previous alteration of the franchise that had ever been proposed. He said that in every previous case the class to be enfranchised had shown their very great anxiety to obtain the franchise, and that in this case no such anxiety had been shown. I differ from the hon. and learned gentleman. I think those who wished to be enfranchised have used the only methods they could use in the matter. That is to say, they have expressed their desire to obtain the vote on platforms and by public meetings, and by whatever other means were open to them. The hon. gentleman appears to think that there was a widespread desire on the part of agricultural labourers to claim the franchise in 1885. I do not believe the desire existed, and I am sure it was never demonstrated. I am sure it could not be demonstrated; there were no means of demonstrating it except the means which have been used in the present case—platform speeches, public meetings, petitions, votes, and resolutions. Then, Sir, the second point on which the hon. gentleman says this Reform Bill differs from every other Reform Bill is that the class to be enfranchised on this occasion are not capable of performing the duties of active citizenship as the classes which were previously enfranchised had been. What duties? So far as I know, the main one to which the hon. gentleman alluded, is that of fighting for their country. That duty cannot be performed with efficiency by gentlemen over 60 years of age. At all events, I am not aware that

the severest conscription in any country requires any person over 60 years of age to serve under any contingency whatever, and yet I do not think the hon. and learned gentleman desires to disfranchise them. The *posse comitatus* does not go out and fight the enemy; the enemy is fought by the disciplined forces of the country, and the chief duty of the ordinary citizen consists not in shouldering a rifle and going off to the frontier; it consists in paying the bill. That is a duty which the people desired to be enfranchised by this Bill can perform; it is a duty they are obliged to perform; and the mere fact that they cannot enrol themselves in volunteer corps does not appear to be an adequate reason for refusing them some control over the policy by which the foreign relations of our country are conducted and means of defence are to be secured. The third argument of the hon. and learned gentleman was that in the case of every previous Reform Bill there had been a grievance of the class to be enfranchised which required to be redressed, and which could not, and would not, be redressed until the franchise was given to them, and he pointed out with great force that in connection with each of the great Reform Bills the grievances of the enfranchised class came to the front. But when did they come to the front? Did they come to the front before the enfranchised class received the vote or after it? The hon. and learned gentleman has only to consider the list of cases he has himself given, and he will discover that it was only after the vote was conferred that it was discovered that this House really had a function to perform in modifying legislation in this country in the interests of the new class of voters. Now, Sir, leaving the speech of the hon. and learned gentleman, and referring to the general course of the debate, there is one argument which has been used which I desire directly to traverse. We have been told that to encourage women to take an active part in politics is degrading to the sex, and that received the assent of an hon. friend of mine below the Gangway. It has received the assent of almost every speaker to-day. I should think myself grossly inconsistent and most ungrateful if I supported that argument in this House, for I have myself taken the chair at Primrose League meetings, and urged to the best of my ability the women of this country to take a share in politics, and to do their best in their various localities to support the principles which I believe to be sound in the interests of the country. After that, to come down to the House, and say I have asked these women to do that which degrades them appears to me to be most absurd. I do not know much about these matters, but I understand that there are other associations of the kind of which women are members, and I have heard of a Liberal-Unionist Women's Association; I do not know if it has given my right hon. and learned friend the member for Bury (Sir H. James) that valuable assistance they are always ready to give. There is also, I think, a Women's Liberal Federation. I daresay the learned member for Fife (Mr. Asquith) has taken part in its meetings.

Mr. ASQUITH: Never.

Mr. McLAREN (Cheshire, Crewe): Mrs. Gladstone is president.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The House will understand that I do not wish to introduce personal questions at all, but I think I may take it that every section in this House is only too glad to use the services of women when they think they can profit by them, and it does not lie in the mouths of any of us to say that taking a part in framing the policy of the Empire is degrading to the sex. In any other department of human thought than politics such an argument would be described by no milder word than "cant." Cant it undoubtedly is. The argument which appealed most, I am convinced, to those who oppose this Bill is not an objection of this character, but the conviction—the ill-founded conviction, I think—that it must necessarily carry with it, as what they call a logical consequence, the result that women must have a seat in this House, in the Cabinet, and should in all respects, so far as public offices are concerned, be placed on an equality with men. I do not believe a word of that argument. I can quite agree that it is very difficult to stop in such a course—to fix an arbitrary point and say there you will stop—if the arguments for going further are precisely those which made you travel thus far. The point, therefore, for us to consider is, Can the arguments that are brought forward in favour of this Bill be also brought forward in favour of women having a seat in this House? No, Sir; they cannot. There is no fundamental distinction between giving women the right to vote in municipal affairs and giving them the right to vote in Imperial affairs, and yet, though there is no distinction, you have resisted the change for 20 years, and according to the hon. member for Fife, you are going to resist it for 20 years more. How easy it would be to resist a change which involved a new departure—a new principle! Everybody must assent to the proposition of the hon. gentlemen the member for Flintshire (Mr. S. Smith) that women cannot engage on an equality with men in a large number of professions. They cannot; and I quite agree that the profession of politics is one of these. In my opinion women could not with advantage to themselves, or to the community, take part in the labours of a great deliberative assembly like this. That is a reason for not giving them a seat in this House, but is it a reason for not giving them an opportunity of expressing an opinion and giving a vote every four or five years? I do not know what the average duration of Parliament has been during the last 100 years, but I think in the future it will probably not be so long. If you want to prevent further progress you ought to stop at a point where defence is possible, but at the present point logical defence is not possible. Therefore, those who are greatly moved by logical consistency should, I think, move on till they come to a point where further change could be successfully resisted. The debate has now almost reached its natural termination, and all I will say is that the matter which surprises me

in this debate is the position taken up by hon. gentlemen opposite. I understand that part of their programme is a great alteration of the franchise, in spite of what fell from the hon. member for Aberdeen (Mr. Bryce). I understand one plank of the Newcastle platform was one man one vote. When that is brought forward I believe we shall have all the old flesh-and-blood arguments urged again, all the old arguments for political liberty, and the whole train of commonplaces again thrust before us for our acceptance, by which each successive change in the franchise has been accepted, and yet the very gentlemen who say they are going to bring forward that programme at this moment absolutely refuse to admit the validity of a single one of these arguments when they are directed towards enfranchising not the least worthy class of the community, but what I believe to be one of the worthiest classes. You will give a vote to a man who contributes nothing to taxation but what he pays on his beer, while you refuse enfranchisement to a woman because she is a woman, whatever her contribution to the State may be. She has sufficient ability to look after lighting and paving, but is not so fitted to look after the interests of the Empire as a man who cannot point out on the map the parts of the world of which that Empire is composed. I think from all I can hear that this Bill is not likely to be successful on this occasion; but, depend upon it, if any further alteration of the franchise is brought forward as a practical measure, this question will again arise, menacing and ripe for solution, and it will not be possible for this House to set it aside as a mere speculative plan advocated by a body of faddists. Then you will have to deal with the problem of woman suffrage, and to deal with it in a complete fashion.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes 152; Noes 175.—(Div. List, No 86.)

THE DIVISION LIST.

Wednesday, 27th April, 1892.

Numb. 86.

Parliamentary Franchise (Extension to Women) Bill.

—Order for Second Reading read;

Motion made, and question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the question to add the words "upon this day six months."—(*Mr. Samuel Smith.*)

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the question."—The House *divided*; Ayes 152, Noes 175.

AYES.

Abraham, William (Limerick)	Banes, Major George Edward
Acland, A. H. Dyke (Yorks)	Beach, W. W. Bramston (Hants.)
Addison, John	Beaufoy, Mark Hanbury
Anstruther, Col. Lloyd (Suffolk)	Rentinck, Lord H. C. (Norfolk)
Bain, Sir James	Bigwood, James
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r)	Birrell, Augustine
Balfour, Gerald William (Leeds)	Bolitho, Thomas Bedford
Balfour, J. Spencer (Burnley)	Borthwick, Sir Algernon

Bridgeman, Col. Hon. Fran. C.	Holden, Isaac (Keighley)
Broad, Harrington Evans	Holloway, George
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn	Howorth, Henry Hoyle
Cameron, Charles (Glasgow)	Hozier, James Henry Cecil
Channing, Francis Allston	Hughes, Colonel Edwin
Clark, Dr. G. B. (Caithness-sh.)	Hunter, Wm. Alex. (Aberdeen)
Coleridge, Hon. Bernard	Illingworth, Alfred
Compton, Francis (New Forest)	Isaacs, Lewis Henry
Conybeare, Chas. A. Vansittart	Isaacson, Frederick Wootton
Corbett, Archibald C. (Glasgow)	Jebb, Richard Claverhouse
Courtney, Rt. Hon. Leonard H.	Johnston, William
Cozens-Hardy, Herbert Hardy	Keay, John Seymour
Crossman, General Sir William	Kerans, Frederick Harold
Cubitt, Rt. Hon. George	Kimber, Henry
Dillwyn, Lewis Llewelyn	King, Henry Seymour
Dimsdale, Baron Robert	Knightley, Sir Rainald
Dixon-Hartland, Fred Dixon	Lafone, Alfred
Dunn, William	Lawrence, Sir Trevor (Surrey)
Elcho, Lord	Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cumb'land)
Esslemont, Peter	Leahy, James (Kildare)
Farquharson, Dr. R. (Aberd'sh.)	Leake, Robert
Finch, George H.	Llewellyn, Evan Henry
FitzGerald, R. Uniacke Penrose	Lockwood, Frank
Fry, Lewis (Bristol)	Logan, John William
Gane, Lawrence	Lubbock, Rt. Hon. Sir John
Gaskell, Chas. Geo. Milnes-	M'Carthy, Justin (Londonderry)
Gathorne-Hardy, Hn. A. (Suss'x)	M'Kenna, Sir Joseph Neal
Gedge, Sydney	M'Lagan, Peter
Giles, Alfred	Madden, Dodgson H. (Dub. U.)
Godson, Augustus Frederick	Maden, John H. (Lanc. N.E.)
Goldsworthy, Major-General	Mallock, Richard
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon	Manfield, Moses Philip
Gourley, Edward Temperley	Maxwell, Sir Herbert E.
Graham, Robert Cunninghame	Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Grey, Sir Edward (Northumb.)	Montagu, Samuel
Grimston, Viscount	Morgan, Octavius V. (Battersea)
Grotrian, Frederick Brent	Morgan, W. Pritchard (Merthyr)
Haldane, Richard Burdon	Morrell, George Herbert
Hamilton, Col. Chas. E. (South'k.)	Nolan, Colonel (Galway, N.)
Hanbury, Robert William	Northcote, Hon. Sir H. Stafford
Hanbury-Tracy, Hon. F. S. A.	Norton, Robert
Harrison, Henry	O'Brien, Patrick (Monaghan)
Heathcote, Captain Edwards-	O'Brien, William (Cork, N.E.)
Heaton, John Henniker	Pearson, Sir Charles John
Hervey, Lord Francis	Philipps, John Wynford
Hill, Rt. Hon. Lord Arthur (Down)	Plowden, Sir William Chichele
Hill, A. Staveley (Staffordshire)	Pomfret, William Pomfret

Puleston, Sir John Henry
 Quinn, Thomas
 Randell, David
 Rankin, James
 Reed, Henry Byron (Bradford)
 Rentoul, James Alexander
 Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
 Robinson, Brooke (Dudley)
 Roby, Henry John
 Round, James
 Rowlands, W. Bowen (Card'sh.)
 Rowntree, Joshua
 Russell, Sir George (Berkshire)
 Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
 Seton-Karr, Henry
 Sidebottom, William (Derbysh.)
 Smith, Abel (Herts)
 Stanley, Edward James
 Stokes, Sir George Gabriel
 Stuart, James (Shoreditch)
 Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)

Tellers for the Ayes, Sir ALBERT ROLLIT and Mr. WALTER M'LAREN.

NOES.

Austin, John
 Baden-Powell, Sir Geo. Smyth
 Bailey, Sir Joseph R.
 Barclay, James William
 Baring, Viscount
 Barnes, Alfred
 Barran, John
 Barry, A. H. Smith (Hunts.)
 Barry, Francis Tress (Windsor)
 Bartley, George C. T.
 Baumann, Arthur Antony
 Beaumont, H. F. (Yorks. W.R.)
 Beaumont, W. B. (Northum.)
 Beckett, Ernest William
 Bethell, Commander
 Biddulph, Michael
 Blundell, Col. Hen. Blundell H.
 Bolton, Jos. Cheney (Stirlingsh.)
 Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire)
 Bolton, Thomas H. (St. Pancras)

Summers, William
 Temple, Sir Richard
 Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
 Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.)
 Thorburn, Walter
 Tyler, Sir Henry Whatley
 Villiers, Rt. Hon. C. Pelham
 Vincent, Col. Chas. E. Howard
 Walrond, Sir William Hood
 Watkin, Sir Edward W.
 Webb, Alfred
 Weston, Sir Joseph Dodge
 Whitmore, Charles Algernon
 Wilson, John (Lanark)
 Wolmer, Viscount
 Wood, Nicholas
 Woodall, William
 Wortley, Charles Beilby Stuart.
 Wright, Caleb (Lanc. S.W.)
 Wright, H. Smith (Nottingham)
 Wyndham, George

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)
 Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r.)
 Chamberlain, Rich. (Islington)
 Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
 Charrington, Spencer
 Clarke, Sir Edward (Plymouth)
 Cobb, Henry Peyton
 Cooke, C. W. Radcliffe
 Cox, Joseph Richard
 Craig, James
 Crawford, Donald
 Cremer, William Randal
 Cross, Hon. Wm. H. (Liverpool)
 Currie, Sir Donald
 Curzon, Hn. Geo. N. (Lanc. S.W.)
 Davey, Sir Horace
 De Lisle, Edwin
 Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Ackers-
 Ebrington, Viscount
 Elliot, Hn. Art. R. D. (Roxburghs)
 Ellis, James (Leicestershire)
 Evans, Francis H. (Southampton)
 Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
 Ewing, Sir Archibald Orr
 Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
 Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r)
 Finlay, Robert
 Fitzgerald, J. Gubbins (Longf'd.)
 Fitzwilliam, Hon. W. H. W.
 Flower, Cyril
 Fowler, Rt. Hon. Henry H.
 Gardner, Herbert
 Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E.
 Gladstone, Herbert J. (Leeds)
 Goldsmid, Sir Julian
 Gower, Geo. Granville Leveson
 Green, Sir Edward
 Grove, Sir Thomas Fraser
 Gully, William Court
 Gunter, Colonel
 Gurdon, Robert Thornhagh
 Hall, Alexander Wm. (Oxford)
 Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord G. (Midx.)
 Hamley, Gen. Sir Edw. Bruce
 Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
 Harcastle, Edward (Salford)
 Hinckes, Harry Tichborne

Hingley, Benjamin
 Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampstead)
 Hobhouse, Henry
 Howard, Joseph
 Howell, George
 Hunt, Frederick Seager
 Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. Lawies
 James, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry (Bury)
 James, Hn. Walter H. (Gatesh'd)
 Jarvis, Alexander Weston
 Kelly, John R.
 Knatchbull-Hugessen, H. (Kent)
 Knowles, Lees
 Knox, Edmund Francis Vesey
 Labouchere, Henry
 Lambert, Cowley (Islington)
 Lambert, George (Devon)
 Lawson, H. L. W. (St. Pancras)
 Lefevre, Rt. Hon. George Shaw
 Leon, Herbert Samuel
 Lowther, Jas. W. (Cumberland)
 Lyell, Leonard
 Maclean, James Mackenzie
 M'Ewan, William
 Makins, Colonel
 Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
 Marjoribanks, Rt. Hon. Edward
 Matthews, Rt. Hon. Henry
 Morgan, Rt. Hn. G. O. (Denbighs)
 Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
 Morley, Arnold (Nottingham)
 Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
 Mowbray, Rt. Hon. Sir J. (Oxf'd.U.)
 Mundella, Rt. Hon. Anthony John
 Murdoch, Charles Townshend
 Newark, Viscount
 O'Connor, John (Tipperary)
 O'Kelly, James
 Paget, Sir Richard Horner
 Palmer, Sir Charles Mark
 Paulton, James Mellor
 Pease, Alfred E. (York)
 Pease, Henry Fell (Yorks. N.R.)
 Pease, Sir Joseph W. (Durham)
 Penn, John
 Penton, Capt. Frederick Thomas
 Picton, James Allanson

Plunket, Rt. Hon. David R.	Stern, Sydney James
Portman, Hon. Edwin B.	Stevenson, Jas. C. (S. Shields)
Potter, Thomas Bayley	Sutherland, Sir Thos. (Greenock)
Powell, Francis Sharp	Talbot, John Gilbert
Priestley, Briggs	Tanner, Charles Kearns
Quilter, William Cuthbert	Taylor, Francis
Reed, Sir Edw. James (Cardiff)	Theobald, James
Reid, Robt. Threshie (Dumfries)	Tollemache, Henry James
Rendel, Stuart	Waddy, Samuel Danks
Robertson, Edmund	Warmington, Cornelius M.
Robinson, Thomas (Gloucester)	Watson, James
Roe, Thomas	Watt, Hugh
Roscoe, Sir H. Enfield	Weymouth, Viscount
Rothschild, Baron F. James de	Whitbread, Samuel
Rowlands, James (Finsbury)	Will, John Shiress
Samuelson, Sir B. (Oxford, N.)	Williamson, Steph. (Kilm'nock)
Samuelson, G. Blundell (Gloucs.)	Wilson, Sir Samuel (Portsmouth)
Sidebotham, J. W. (Cheshire)	Winterbotham, Arthur Brend
Sinclair, William Pirrie	Woodhead, Joseph
Smith, Samuel (Flint)	Young, Charles Edward Baring
Stephens, Henry Charles	

Tellers for the Noes, Sir WALTER BARTELOT and Mr. ASQUITH.

PAIRS.

FOR.	AGAINST.
Sir W. Marriott	J. S. Gathorne Hardy
S. Hoare	P. Wroughton
Rt. Hon. A. Forwood	C. Acland
P. A. Muntz	J. G. Mowbray
A. Duncombe	Hon. P. Stanhope
Col. Cotton Jodrell	A. M. Brookfield
Sir E. Lechmere	Wilson Noble
J. Collings	Sir U. Kay-Shuttleworth
Thos. Lea	C. J. Darling
W. G. Ainslie	W. E. M. Tomlinson
H. Fisher	E. Stanhope
S. Storey	Forrest Fulton
Sir E. Birkbeck	D. H. Coghill
Geo. Dixon	H. Wiggan
G. Pitt-Lewis	Sir H. Fletcher
F. F. Halsey	W. H. Long
J. Bazley-White	R. G. Webster
J. T. Agg-Gardner	Sir M. Hicks-Beach
Col. Eyre	Alex. Asher
Capt. Grice Hutchinson	F. S. W. Cornwallis

FOR.
Rt. Hon. J. Stansfeld
W. Mather
Col. Cornwallis West
Col. Hill
T. R. Maguire

AGAINST.
Lord R. Churchill
Thos. Wayman
Sir Saville Crossley
Col. Sandys
W. E. Macartney

ANALYSIS OF THE DIVISION LIST.
(Pairs and Tellers included.)

	IN FAVOUR.				AGAINST.			
	Known Friends.	Unknown or Doubtful.	Changed Votes.	Total.	Known Opponents.	Unknown or Doubtful.	Changed Votes.	Total.
Conservatives . .	73	16	3	92	40	35	9	84
Liberal Unionists .	13	5	—	18	16	10	1	27
Gladstonian Liberals	43	14	—	57	31	31	22	84
Nationalists . . .	7	5	—	12	—	6	1	7
Totals . . .	136	40	3	179	87	82	33	202

SUMMARY OF DEBATES ON WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

				Votes for.*			Votes against.*			Majority.	* Tellers and Pairs included.							
				Lib.	Con.	Total.	Lib.	Con.	Total.									
1867	May 20th	Amendment to Reform Bill, Mr. J. S. Mill	66	15	81	80	122	202	121	Against the amendment.							
1870	May 4th	Bill, Mr. Jacob Bright ..	L.	93	31	124	52	39	91	33	In favour of the Bill.							
"	May 12th	" " " "	79	40	119	150	94	244	126	In Committee, when a strong pressure was brought by Mr. Gladstone to bear, so as to rally a full House against its further stages.							
1871	May 13th	" " " "	100	59	159	123	105	228	69	Against the Bill.							
1872	May 1st	" " " "	113	50	163	123	119	242	79	" "							
1873	April 30th	" " " "	121	51	172	123	116	229	67	" "							
1874	..	" Mr. Forsyth (Q.C.) ..	C.	<i>Bill withdrawn.</i>												
1875	April 27th	" " " "	99	71	170	76	129	205	35	" "							
1876	April 26th	" " " "	94	67	161	88	161	249	88	" "							
1877	June 6th	" Mr. Jacob Bright ..	L.	<i>Bill talked out.</i>												
1878	June 19th	" Mr. Leonard Courtney..	L.	110	45	155	76	159	235	80	" "							
1879	March 7th	Resolution, " "	74	29	103†	70	147	217†	114	Against the resolution. † Exclusive of tellers and pairs.							
1880	..	No Bill brought in this year.	Year of the General Election.							
1881	..	Resolution, Mr. Hugh Mason	L.	<i>Postponed.</i>												
1882	..	" " " "	"	"											
1883	July 6th	" " " "	132	29	161	78	99	177	16	Against the resolution.							
1884	June 10th	Amendment to Reform Bill, moved by Mr. Woodall ..	L.	39	98	137	245	27	27	136	Against the amendment.							
1885	..	Bill " "	<i>Day absorbed by Government business</i>														
1886	Feb. 18th	" and on Mr. Woodall vacating office, Mr. Courtney took charge. A division, whether the Bill should be read took place on February 18th. After which the Bill itself	103	58	161	69	35	104	57	In favour of proceeding with the Bill. It did not, however, reach the stage of Committee before the dissolution.							
1887	..	Bill introduced by Mr. Woodall	<i>Days taken by Government business.</i>														
1888	..	" " " "															
1889	..	" " " "															
1890	..	Resolution by Mr. McLaren	L.															
1891	April 30th	Bill by Mr. Woodall— Debate, whether the day be kept	G.L.	Nat.	L.U.	C.	G.L.	Nat.	L.U.	Con.	218	59	Against retaining the day. The Bill was therefore discharged.				
1892	April 27th	Bill by Sir A. Rollit ..	C.	53	11	13	75	152	78	7	24	66	175	23	Against the second reading.			

CONVERSAZIONE.

THE numerous company who assembled on the evening of Tuesday, the 26th, at the Galleries of the Royal Institute of Painters in Water Colours, Piccadilly, included:—

Mrs. Penrose Fitzgerald, Mrs. Culme Seymour, Clara, Lady Rayleigh, The Lady Frances Balfour, Sir James Bain, M.P., Mrs. Fawcett, Miss Garrett, Miss Atkinson and Miss Lee (Manchester), Miss L. M. Hubbard, Miss Emily Davies, Mr. and Miss Babb, Miss Phillott, Mr. and Mrs. Hallett, Mrs. Shaen, Mr. and Mrs. Benjamin Clark, Mrs. and Miss Sheldon Amos, Mrs. Foote Crowe (Iowa, U.S.A.), The Hon. Mrs. Colborne, The Lady Maude Wolmer, Sir Richard Temple, M.P., Rt. Hon. Leonard Courtney, M.P., Mrs. and Miss Ashford, Mrs. and Miss Garrett Anderson, Mrs. and Miss Penrose, Lady Pearce, Mr. and Mrs. Beazeley, Mrs. Louis Blacker, Miss Tod and Miss Andrews, Colonel Birch, Miss M. C. Sturge and Mr. Clement Sturge, Mrs. Goodbody, Miss Maude Biggs, Miss Youngusband, Mrs. Vansittart, Mr. and Mrs. S. Spring Rice, The Hon. Mrs. Ponsonby, Miss Catherine Drew, Dr. Helen Webb, Mrs. Clayton East, Mrs. W. E. Lecky, Mrs. Magnussen, Miss Kingsley, Miss Reid and Miss Guinness, Mr. and Mrs. Lewis Sargeant, Mrs. W. G. Rea, Mr. J. T. H. Bailey, Mr. W. P. Snell, Miss Borchardt and Miss Helena Borchardt, Miss Belloc, Mrs. Earnshaw, Miss Staepoole, Mr. A. E. Southall, Colonel and Mrs. Ronald Taylour, Mr. and Mrs. Russell Cooke, Mrs. and Miss Sterling, Mr. and Miss Stone, Miss M. H. Hart, Dr. Ellaby, Miss O'Connor Eccles, Miss Malcolm, Miss Helen McKerlie, Dr. Clarinda Boddy, Miss Musson, Miss Grove, Miss Morrison, Miss Mack Wall, Miss Lyall, Mr. W. W. Marshall, Rev. E. T. and Mrs. Gurney, Mr. J. J. Gurney, Miss Mary Gurney, Miss Hamley, Mrs. Parker Smith, Rev. H. and Mrs. Hawies, Mr. and Mrs. Rowe Bennett, Mr. and Mrs. Calverley Bewicke, Rev. Marmaduke Brown, Rev. John Penfold, Mr. Michael Cook (Luton), Mr. Alexander Coote, Mrs. C. G. Newton Robinson, Miss Rosalind Paget, Mr. and Mrs. Wilkinson, Mr. and Mrs. Charles McLaren, &c., &c., &c.

In the course of the evening addresses were given by Mrs. Fawcett and Miss Tod.

Mrs. FAWCETT said she thought she might answer the question, "What was the present situation?" by saying "We have no new enemies and they have no new arguments." Their enemies were the old enemies; in the main they were the official wire-pullers and

"old Parliamentary hands" of the Liberal party. Up to the present their hostility had been veiled and secret, now they had been obliged to drop the mask and come out into the open. She, for one, did not regret the change. Their enemies were the same who in 1884 issued a five-lined whip against Mr. Woodall's amendment in the Reform Bill of that year; they were the same who in 1886 stopped all further progress being made in the Women's Suffrage Bill after the second reading had been carried; and they were the same who in the present Parliament had succeeded in preventing any discussion of the subject. At last one move had been won in the game, and a place had been secured for discussion of the Women's Suffrage Bill; and she attributed the failure of all attempts to take the day to the fact that for the first time for many years the Leader of the House of Commons was favourable to the claims of women to representation.

The securing a day for the Bill was a great gain in itself. They had everything to gain by discussion. The more the question was debated, the more evident became the strength of its position and the weakness of the position of their opponents. Just as the ladies' protest in 1889 against women's suffrage became a source of strength to their movement, because so many people said, "If this is all that some of the cleverest women and most practised writers in England have to say against women's suffrage, they must indeed have a poor case," so at the present time people were saying about Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet, "If this is all that the ablest tactician and most dexterous debater of the present century can say against women's suffrage, his case must be a very poor one."

Although their foes were not new foes, there was something rather novel in their combination and position—Mr. Labouchere leading, Mr. Gladstone following. Mr. Labouchere doubtless felt that voting would "trespass upon the delicacy, refinement, purity and elevation of women." (Laughter.) She thought they shared in her view that they need not trouble themselves much about Mr. Labouchere. To quote James Smetham and apply his words to the member for Northampton, "We need not trouble about him, he will very soon have rushed violently down a steep place."

The keep of the castle they were besieging was represented by Mr. Gladstone and his pamphlet, and when they came to look at it, there was nothing very terrifying about the pamphlet except the signature at the end of it, and even this signature suggested some consolatory reflections. Their first consolation was derived from the fact that Mr. Gladstone had at one time or another in his life denounced almost every political change that he had finally led to success. Secondly, there was reason to believe that the causes which had sometimes produced these rapid changes were still operative. The explanation had been given us in Mr. Gladstone's own words in the *Review of Reviews*. With the courage and candour for which the editor of that periodical was so well known, he had asked Mr.

Gladstone to explain his remarkable change of front on so many important political questions. Mr. Gladstone had replied, "One great fact . . . is the key to these changes. I was educated to regard liberty as an evil, I have learned to regard it as a good. . . . Liberty is a good in itself." The progress of Mr. Gladstone's mind in freeing himself from the errors of his education was evidently not yet complete. He still regarded liberty for women as an evil. If his life should be prolonged, as she was sure they all hoped it would be, there was little doubt he would come to regard it as a good. The process of his education on other subjects had been hastened by explosions and assassinations, and the fact that they were not likely to stimulate his mental activity in that way was the only thing that gave her any doubt that he would be converted to women's suffrage in time to carry it to a triumphant success.

If they looked seriously at his pamphlet, one of the first things that most women would object to was the curious assumption that only married women, or especially married women, have "a life-long habit of responsible action." Women are not born married, and surely of the many women who have a life-long habit,—a habit that is dating from early childhood,—of responsible action, some marry and some do not. Again, the married woman—with a life-long habit of responsible action—may become a widow. Does she, with the loss of her husband, lose her life-long habit? She (Mrs. Fawcett) would have thought the motives for responsibility would have been strengthened rather than weakened by her misfortune. When she stands alone, in many instances with a family to maintain and educate, is not her responsibility greater than in the happier days when her husband shared it with her?

Another curious passage was that in which Mr. Gladstone expressed his fear that voting would trespass upon the delicacy, the purity, the refinement, the elevation of the womanly character. He thought the quiet placing of a paper in a ballot box would be open to these risks, but that no similar danger was to be feared from women taking an active part in the canvassing, speaking, and other political work of a contested election. Just before the contest of 1880 he addressed the women of Midlothian at the Foresters' Hall, Dalkeith, and urged them to take an active part in the impending election. "So far from involving any departure from your character as women," he said, this active political work would "be associated with the fulfilment of that character and the performance of that duty." Neglect of this opportunity of political work would, he added, be a source of pain and mortification, whilst its accomplishment would "serve to gild their future years with sweet remembrances." The contrast between the two sentiments was rather striking. Mr. Gladstone's mind on the subject seemed to resolve itself into this:—if you work politically for me, that is womanly; but if you vote, possibly, against me, that is unwomanly.

Mrs. Fawcett added that she could not conclude without a few words of hearty thanks to the women of the Women's Liberal Federation who had lately made so firm a stand for their convictions in regard to women's suffrage. They had been true to their principles in a position of great difficulty, and they honoured them for it. Their example drew them all closer together and made them desirous always to be for women first and party afterwards. Many of those present might have asked themselves "How should I behave under the excitement of great physical danger, in a fire or shipwreck?" The chances of behaving well in these emergencies were much strengthened by habit, example, and inherited tradition. In a moment of very considerable moral stress the majority in the Women's Liberal Federation had given them a good example, and made it easier for them to do the right thing if they were placed in similar circumstances. Their action would be an immense source of strength to the women's suffrage movement, and she most cordially, in the name of those with whom she worked, thanked them for it.

Miss TOD said:—Mrs. Fawcett had given them a most practical address. She would like to look back to the past. The arguments used against them now were precisely what they were at the beginning; they were founded upon ignorance, and it might have been thought they would have died away before this. It was rather a remarkable thing that there should be a recrudescence of these old arguments now. One or two leading men had given encouragement to opponents, but what they had to do was to show that they had a larger number of the good men with them than had their opponents. The majority of the men who cared about the well-being of their fellow creatures were on the side of women's suffrage, and pains ought to be taken to make that known. The number of women who make themselves heard on this question of the suffrage was comparatively small, and without the encouragement of men the vast army of silent women would not have the courage to make themselves heard and felt. Women were stirred up already, but they needed a little more courage and strength to speak out. There was not a political party which ventured to go to the country without the help of women. Every party had invited women to come to their assistance, and it would be a very serious thing indeed for the party whom the women deserted. They were told that the pressure of business was such that their friends were unable to give them the attention they would at another time. No wonder they were afraid to lose the help of women. There was not one great question before Parliament in which women had not the same vital interest as men. For some of them, life, liberty, everything that makes life worth having, was at stake. If ever there was a time when women ought to press their claims, it was precisely now, and she trusted women would feel this great duty that was laid upon them to appeal to every member of the House of Commons to give women the constitutional right to vote on the great

questions which concern the country. Law will and must be brought into harmony with their deepest convictions, and was it not desirable that they should make themselves heard before the law was passed? There would always be a number of women who would have much influence; those who can make themselves heard by voice or pen will always have influence, but they asked for the protection and power of the vote on behalf of the large number of women who cannot do either. The householders are carrying on a hard struggle for life. They ought to make themselves felt by their votes when they cannot do so in any more conspicuous way. She did not feel discouraged, for they could not really be thrown back. Only they must not rest on this; they must feel that success would only come when each woman was doing her duty, and she trusted each woman there was prepared to do her duty. (Applause.)



National Society for Women's Suffrage

CENTRAL COMMITTEE

Office:—10, GREAT COLLEGE STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

REPORT

OF THE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

PRESENTED AT THE

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

HELD IN THE

Westminster Town Hall

MAY 31ST, 1892.

*With Appendix "Women's Suffrage Candidates for the
General Election."*

London:

WOMEN'S PRINTING SOCIETY, LIMITED,
21B, GREAT COLLEGE STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.