

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Dedication	77
The Outlook—The Women's Parliament—Not a Police Row— Treatment in Prison—Additional Staff—The N.W.S.P.U. "At Home"—Features of the Paper—By-Election—Press Extracts—To New Readers	77, 78
Messages of Encouragement to Women:—Elizabeth Robins, Constance Smedley, May Sinclair, Mary D. Macdonald ..	79
An Argument with Pooh Bah. By Mona Caird	80
The Tactics of the Suffragettes	81
Women's Parliament and the House of Commons ..	82, 83, 84
Sonnet to the Suffragettes. By James H. Cousins	84
The By-Elections	85
Leading Article—The Lesson of History	86
The National Campaign. By Christabel Pankhurst	87, 88
Letter to the Press. By Christabel Pankhurst	88
History of the Suffrage Movement. By Sylvia Pankhurst ..	90, 91
Extracts from the Press	92, 93
Self Denial Week—Result	94
Our Letter Box	94
Concert in Aid of the Funds	94
A Schoolboy's Self Denial	94
A Sympathetic Tribute	95
Foreign Notes	95
Local Notes	95
The Song of the Suffragette. By Louise Iopling Rowe.. .. .	95
Programme of Events	96
Contributions to the £20,000 Fund	96

DEDICATION.

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

THE OUTLOOK.

The past month has been crowded with events in the women's movement. Every form of activity which has been undertaken has grown considerably since the February number of VOTES FOR WOMEN went to press. There is so much to record that it has been found necessary to increase the present issue to 20 pages in order to find space for anything like adequate treatment.

The Women's Parliament.

By far the most important event of the month was the Women's Parliament, held in the Caxton Hall, February 11, 12, and 13, resulting in the arrest of 62 women who were determined to lay their case before the Prime Minister at the House of Commons. The second occasion on which the women started to carry out their mission they were led by Mrs. Pankhurst herself, and the deputation were particularly careful to avoid doing anything con-

trary to the instructions of the police, except that they refused to abandon their intention of going to the House of Commons.

Not a Police Row.

In spite of this mode of action on their part, the Government endeavoured to play once more their game of branding the women as police offenders, refusing to admit the political nature of their breach of the law; but this trick of the Government is beginning now to be understood by the people of the country. On page 92 of this issue we give an extract from "Vanity Fair," in which the position is made abundantly clear in the editorial notes of that paper.

Treatment in Prison.

People up and down the country are also beginning to thoroughly understand the nature of the imprisonment to which the women are subjected, though they themselves have not protested against it. In the early days of the movement it was thought that the women were sent to a kind of comfortable retirement, where they had almost everything they wanted and could see their friends and have books, newspapers, &c. This was, in fact, the kind of treatment which men political prisoners have always received. But the desire of the Government to treat them as street rowdies obliged them to put women into a very different position. And various articles which have appeared in the Press have made it clear that life in prison for the women is an exceedingly hard one, solitary confinement for 23 hours out of the 24, and the most rigorous discipline being enforced. Now that these two cardinal facts are beginning to be understood, the Liberal Government—and the Home Secretary in particular—are learning that their action is not approved of by men and women of the country. On February 24 the "Daily Mail," in its leading article contained the following:—

On Friday, too, another awkward question will be raised in a Bill which is to be privately brought forward on behalf of the women Suffragists. If there are some Ministerialists and Labour members who are hostile to women's suffrage, there are thousands of Liberals in the country who do not approve of the way in which the Suffragists have been treated. This treatment has contributed, with the other events of the last few weeks . . . to weaken the prestige of the Government. The present is plainly not a time at which the Ministry can afford to estrange electors by the thousand or to provoke new and formidable enmities.

And similar remarks are beginning to be made in the Press in other places. It is surely a curious irony that the name of the man who in his own time stood all over the world for the enlargement of liberty should be associated in the person of his son with the incarceration of women seeking only political justice.

Self-Denial Week.

The unjust imprisonment of Mrs. Pankhurst has given an enormous impetus to the movement everywhere. The Self-Denial Week organised by the National Women's Social

and Political Union has been an unparalleled success, and accounts of the various ways which women have adopted in order to raise money for the cause have been given in all the daily papers. Many people who have taken a special interest in this week have been celebrated authors who have sent books, with autograph inscriptions, for sale:—Beatrice Harraden, May Sinclair, Violet Hunt, Evelyn Sharp, Mr. J. H. Cousins, Mabel Dearmer, Mr. Pett Ridge, Father Adderley, Rev. John Hunter, Mr. Israel Zangwill, Mr. John Galsworthy, Mr. Moreton Hall, Mr. E. V. Lucas, Rev. R. J. Campbell, and others. A friendly Member of Parliament also denied himself during the week by smoking no cigars—a great deprivation to him—as a mark of his sympathy with the cause. The Self-Denial Week forms the subject of a special article by Mrs. Pethick Lawrence on page 95, but the full amount which has been raised in this week will not be disclosed until the great meeting in Albert Hall on March 19.

Additional Staff.

Consequent upon the great amount of the additional interest which is being taken in Women's Suffrage and in the N.W.S.P.U. in particular, it has been found necessary again to increase the office staff, which now numbers over 15 persons, in addition to 15 outside organisers. In fact, since the end of the year, on an average, an additional member has been added either to the indoor or outdoor staff of the Union each week.

The N.W.S.P.U. at Home.

Another interesting indication of the growing interest which is taken in the movement has been the success of the "At Homes" held every Monday afternoon by the N.W.S.P.U. Originally the offices of the Union were open to accommodate the friends who cared to come and hear the news of the progress of the movement week by week; but at the beginning of last month it was found that accommodation could not be provided for the people who wanted to be present, as the large rooms of the offices were not capable of seating more than 150 people. Recourse was therefore had to the small Portman Rooms, which seat about 400; but so rapidly was the interest taken up, that after two weeks it was found necessary to make a further move to the large Portman Rooms, and on the last two occasions between 500 and 600 people have been present.

Features of the Paper.

The messages of encouragement to women appearing in this issue on page 79, are from Elizabeth Robins, the celebrated dramatist, who is a member of the committee of the N.W.S.P.U.; from Constance Smedley, the well-known authoress, whose clever book "Woman—a Few Shrieks," has been so widely read; from May Sinclair, the authoress, who was one of the special collectors in Kensington during Self-Denial Week; and from Mrs. Macdonald, well known

to all members of the Union as a keen and active supporter of our movement. Among other special features is an interesting and amusing article by Mona Caird, on an imaginary argument with Pooh Bah. Mrs. Pethick Lawrence writes on the tactics of the Union. The Women's Parliament is described as fully as space permits; and Miss Sylvia Pankhurst carries the account of the history of the suffrage agitation a further stage.

By-Election.

A page is devoted to the account of the by-elections which have taken place during February. Analysing these, it will be noticed that the Liberal poll has been reduced by an aggregate number of 2,000 votes. Ever since the Mid-Devon election the action of the women has attracted attention at these elections, and however much Liberals may refuse to acknowledge the importance of the part women play, there is beginning to be an uncomfortable feeling at the bottom of their minds that all is not well with them, and that their failure is due in large measure to their opposition to the women's cause.

Press Extracts.

On pages 92 and 93 will be found a number of quotations from the Press which have appeared at various times during February. Space alone prevents us from including a special number of important extracts, which are now so numerous that it is almost impossible to pick up any paper of the day, whether daily, weekly, or monthly, in which important references to the subject are not made.

To New Readers.

In the form in which it appears in this number VOTES FOR WOMEN is issued as a *monthly* newspaper, and contains articles and other material likely to be of special interest to the general public. A uniform price of 3d. a copy is charged, or (as it cannot be registered at the Post Office as a newspaper, which only recognises weekly publications) it will be sent post free to any address within the postal union for 4d. a copy. In each of those weeks in which the monthly VOTES FOR WOMEN is *not* published a special four-page sheet is issued containing all the principal news of the movement—an account of the happenings of the week gone by, and a programme of prospective arrangements for the week to come. This weekly bulletin will be known as the *Votes for Women Supplement*,* and will be sold for ½d. (by post 1d.).

In the course of the year there will be twelve monthly numbers of the paper, and forty weekly supplements. Subscribers will be able to obtain the paper either through their newsagents, or through local W.S.P.U.'s, or by post direct from the offices of the paper, 4, Clements Inn, W.C. The subscription for the year for all the issues and supplements is 7s. 4d., inclusive of postage; for the twelve monthly issues only, 4s.

* The Supplements to the present March number will accordingly be issued on March 5, March 12, March 19, March 26, and the April number will be ready on April 1.

MESSAGES OF ENCOURAGEMENT TO WOMEN.

MY DEAR EDITORS.—I have been here just six days, and I grasp at the first opportunity of keeping my promise. I think I cannot do better than make my message the saying of another—one of the most considerate English women I have known. She had done little travelling herself, and being generous in her appreciation of others, I was surprised to hear her make light of some much-vaunted long journey that another woman, known to us both, had accomplished in safety. The reason, my friend said, that any of us were afraid, even in remote or barbarous places, was that we underestimated women's strength and overestimated men's. "A woman who keeps her wits about her can give a very good account of herself, even at the worst." The lady in question was, to be sure, an uncommonly fine specimen herself, and may have overlooked the fact that we are not all possessed of even such vigour as Nature intended to bestow. But I have come to share her view, and I commend it to my fellow-women: that, granting man's superior advantages, a woman in straits can (if she has disciplined her nerves and does not underestimate her powers) make herself so very inconvenient a creature to tackle, that the enterprise will lose most of its *allure*. I think my friend's doctrine holds just as true with respect to contention on higher grounds. We weaken ourselves by imagining ourselves weak. We are strong—I had almost said invincible—as soon as we have cast out fear.

Elizabeth Robins.

There are two things that must win respect for any cause: courage and endurance. Those who denounced your first efforts as hysterical are learning the difference between hysteria and enthusiasm. The continuance of such zeal is the most unexpected development in your campaign. It is assuming the aspect of a national revolution, which draws together and harmonises every form of human temperament. So vast and passionate is the desire for freedom, that, impelled by it, the individual can rise above the limitations of her egoism, and sink her prejudices in her aspirations.

Nothing to me is more significant than the way in which the usual restraining circumstances of age, position, education, which differentiate the house-woman so inexorably, have melted and proved of no essential consequence in the mustering and conducting of your forces, and even more significant is the way in which the far greater divisions of race and country are being swept aside by the wave of the woman movement. It is sweeping through Europe.

Best of all, you are fighting with good humour; cheerfulness and hope are the most spirited of leaders. For too long the cause of woman has been hampered by despair and bitterness. You have come with flying banners and thundering drums and gallant bearing; you have trained your daughters to take part in the struggle, and they bring the freshness and the spirit of their youth; the daring of youth, also, that can hurl itself with a light heart at any obstacle, because it has never known defeat.

The pluck! The enormous pluck! That is the quality that first appealed to me when you invaded the pompous precincts of the "House," and faced what seemed impossible odds. You looked ridiculous then; only a few people understood the gigantic heroism which was needed for such action.

Now, you are still very fiercely reviled, still you are facing actual danger, but it is your opponents who are beginning to look comic. The henpecked husband is one of the most firmly-established butts of the English public.

Men are beginning to disown sex-kinship with the Liberal Government. The point is, will the Liberal Government stand being laughed at as serenely and good-humoredly as you did? Do they consider national ridicule "a good advertisement"? Are they as certain of the justice of their opposition as you are of the justice of your cause?

Constance Smedley.

I have been asked to send a "message" to the National Women's Social and Political Union. I do not know how far a "message" from an unpractical and uneducated outsider will have any value. I can only say that it is impossible to be a woman and not admire to the utmost the devotion, the courage, and the endurance of the women who are fighting and working for the Suffrage to-day. And I am glad and honoured to have this opportunity of recording my whole-hearted sympathy with them and with their aims.

May Sinclair.

Some fairly intelligent people seem to think the demand for the enfranchisement of woman is a war of the sexes. Her demand is responsibility which will fit her for her work in the world. Her training, her education, should not be handicapped. She should be encouraged to reach the most ambitious pinnacle. No one can deny the boy needs an expert mother if his feet are to be placed on the step of the ladder which ascends to success. The irresponsible youth, with no enthusiasm, no ambition, no real knowledge of self-preservation, one meets everywhere. For the sake of the betterment of the race women should have political freedom. The power which the vote will give them will enable them to stand alone. Self-reliant responsible citizens, and to those under their care, they are bound to transmit this subtle mental stimulus. What more valuable asset can we have than independence and courage?

In this struggle for existence, where men and women meet either for companionship or marriage, surely equality in courage, in knowledge, and in intelligent sympathy is necessary for success and happiness.

We cannot afford to ignore our duty to those working for the enfranchisement of women. Its consequences are too far-reaching. Every woman who has to earn her living must get a sufficient wage; not one which will wreck her constitution in the struggle. It is not economy. To ignore such waste is culpable. The nation's security depends on this ill-paid, underfed, being's progeny. If any woman will sacrifice her time and money to help this cause she will get back huge interest for it. A campaign carried on by women actuated by the highest motives, striving to make the world happier for all, is elevating, and worth associating oneself with. Leave your own happy little world for an hour or two a day, you women who can afford it, and come and help.

Mary D. Macdonald.

AN ARGUMENT WITH POOH BAH.

By MONA CAIRD

To discuss the subject of women's emancipation with the ordinary opponent who echoes traditional sentiment, produces the baffling sense of being transported into a world of comic opera, where it becomes one's fantastic fate to try to reason with the "Mikado" or "Pooch Bah" or the "Pirates of Penzance." Sometimes it is even more bewildering, and one finds oneself stumbling in helpless conflict with the dialectical ingenuity of the mad hatter or the mock turtle.

Yet to the majority (as to "Pooch Bah" and the mad hatter) nothing comic is to be discerned; they are, so to speak, on their native heath. They live solemnly in a comic opera kingdom, ruled by comic statesmen on strictly representative principles, whose main feature is that they are not the least representative.

The comic statesmen, at loggerheads on all other points, agree enthusiastically about this. Representation, the basis of men's liberties, and—rightly interpreted—the basis of woman's subordination! A most excellent institution, to be defended at all costs.

Statesmen, law-givers, plenipotentiaries, all the high magnificences and serenities of this grotesque realm, break into a lively dance, joined by a troupe of pillars-of-the-State, and a picturesque stage crowd representing the great heart of the British public. And all loudly express their sentiments in an exhilarating chorus.

And we all know what those sentiments are. The general crowd relies for its staple argument on the exhortation to "go 'ome and mind the biby."

The Pooch Bahs (a numerous class with a stuffy bourgeois soul) meet the case more loftily. But the thought is the same.

"The woman's sphere is the home." "Is, then, the man's sphere the polling-booth?" heretics are impelled to inquire.

But Pooch Bah does not see the inference. Seeing inferences is not his strong point. He merely hangs on to the "sphere" without budging.

"Must the owner of a vote pass his entire existence in the precincts of the ballot-box?" inquires the innovator, still hopeful.

Pooch Bah, without relaxing his hold on the "sphere," says, no, of course not, but men are men and women are women, a statement which derives its shattering force from the fact that nobody dreams of disputing it.

Basking in the effulgence of its axiomatic certainty, Pooch Bah remains solidly unaware that if his argument regarding the "sphere" has any validity at all, it implies that a voter ought to make voting the vocation of a lifetime; and so, if really applied, it would summarily disfranchise the entire human race.

The comic statesmen solemnly point out that women are ruled by impulse.

"Whereas the gentlemen who express their convictions by means of crackers and malodorous chemicals at public meetings are actuated by the lofty attitude of Reason."

"But of what avail is irony with the reigning gods?"

"It is their decree that a small property qualification shall give a man the right to a voice in his country's destinies, be he moved by reason, or impulse, or prejudice, or anything under heaven—including the aid of supporting friends in case of circumstances over which he has no control; whereas a woman must scale the dizzy heights of human achievement before her claims to full human rights can be even considered."

"Why this stern intellectual and moral test in the case of one sex only?"

The comic statesman explains:—

"There might arise some grave national crisis wherein women's influence (other than of the secret and irresponsible kind) would be disastrous." (The implication is that men's influence could never be disastrous.)

"Moreover," adds Pooch Bah, conclusively, "there must be a head in every household. A wife with a vote would mean wrangling and strife in the sacred precincts of home."

"My wife and I are one, and I am the one," quotes Irony, losing courage.

"A wife might actually vote contrary to the convictions of her husband," cries Pooch Bah, aghast.

Irony gives it up after this, and Satire helplessly folds her hands.

If a man not only desires but does not hesitate to announce that he desires to be placed in a position of unfair advantage over his wife in the "sacred precincts," what is there left for Irony and Satire to do? The very bread is taken out of their mouths.

Peace maintained between a handcuffed and a free person; affectionate accord as the result of disabling one of them, and providing the other with Maxims, a few small bombs.

Caricature herself is reduced to beggary!

Yet these same men and women, who defend their creed by puerilities such as these, are not really devoid of intelligence or a sense of justice; that is the perplexing thing. On other subjects they may show themselves quite as human as human beings usually are, and of average sanity. In fact, some are of remarkable intellectual power.

What sudden calamity, then, has fallen upon them at the mere mention of the word *woman*! It is like the danger-word that converts some sweetly reasonable inmate of a madhouse to idiocy or fury.

Here, in fact, we find the clue to the problem: it is insanity that reveals itself in these infantile absurdities so familiar to us all; the hereditary insanity which afflicts mankind as a result of thousands upon thousands of years of dominance and subjection in the relations of men and women, with all the cruelty and madness which that implies. What it *does* imply can only be faintly realised after a study of human records from the earliest ages and those of savages to-day. The story is hideous and heart-breaking enough to make pessimists of the most devout believers in human nature; and it turns a tragic light upon the real nature of the observer, which has eaten its way into the very bone and nerves and fibre of the human organism.

It is not the expression of some minds and hearts that we listen to in these monotonous puerilities; the real minds and hearts of the speakers have no part in them at all. We are hearing only the phonographic utterances of a far past, the mechanical records of centuries of "suggestion."

To release the race—women at least as much as men—from the power of this "dead hand," this tremendous hypnotic force thousands of years old, is the task which a handful of pioneers have taken upon their brave shoulders, not counting the cost; and they only know how heavy that cost is!

May the gods of Beneficence and Justice bring their cause to a speedy triumph, and the suffering world another gigantic step forward in the path of progress.

THE TACTICS OF THE SUFFRAGETTES.

What They Are and What They Mean.

By EMMELINE PETHICK LAWRENCE.

"If this had been a men's movement," said a police-constable outside Rochester-row Police-court to one of our members, "if this had been a men's movement, there would have been murder before now."

Judged by past and present events, in the light of human experience, this is a perfectly correct summing up of the position. When men are held down under laws which they have not made and which they have no power to change, then invariably there is revolt, and with men revolt means violence and bloodshed. Revolt means "murder."

Once the labourer was in the same position that women are to-day. He was without political or economic rights; he had to depend on the protection and the chivalry of his overlord. But by a long series of revolts, involving destruction of property and of life, reaching the great climax in the French Revolution, serfdom of man to man was abolished, and the principle of the political equality of men was proclaimed and established.

But ever and again despotism tightens its relaxed grasp upon the lives of men. How do men act then? We have not far to look for the answer. Constitutional rights are taken away in Portugal; a Dictator is set over the people. Those who protest are thrown into prison. It becomes a choice between political subjection or violence and outrage. "Anything rather than political slavery," says the champion of the people's rights. So the King and his innocent son are murdered. And what is the result? The Dictator is forced to leave the country. Political prisoners are set free; a Constitution is granted. At the cost of blood a victory for freedom is won.

That is the men's way of conducting a militant agitation. It is not the way of women.

The Way of Women.

Hitherto no alternative between slavish acceptance of tyranny and wrong and resistance by violence has seemed possible. It has been left to women to discover another alternative. The women's campaign is the first militant agitation carried on by any people wholly deprived of political rights, without violence, without injury to life or limb or property.

And yet no power was ever stronger than that which we have to fight. We have to deal with political tyranny backed by all "the powers that be." We are face to face with the strongest Government of modern times, and the strongest prejudice in human nature, aided by the press, the law, the police, and, as a last resource, the entire military strength of the country.

Now, political tyranny rests, and has always rested, on the ignorance, indifference, and apathy of the people. Its strength is in all negative things, in darkness, in concealment, in sloth, in silence, in oblivion. Therefore, the weapons of those who fight against political tyranny are light, exposure, action, truth, and perpetual remembrance.

The task which after more than forty years of futile agitation rapidly declining into slavish acceptance of women's subjection, we had to accomplish was to break down the conspiracy of silence on the part of politicians and pressmen, to expose the mean and unworthy subterfuges of Parliamentarians, to rouse the women of the country to action, to open the eyes of the general public to the injustice done in their name, and to keep our agitation continuously and persistently in the public mind.

To this end our tactics have been directed; our two

distinct methods of militant agitation are:—

1. Asking questions at the political meetings of Cabinet Ministers.
2. "Demonstrating" in Downing-street and Parliament-square.

Women, having no representative in the House of Commons, can only appeal to members of the Government. Cabinet Ministers will not meet them or give ear to their grievances. A Cabinet Minister is a public servant; his salary is paid by women taxpayers. To women, as well as to men, he comes on the public platform to give an account of his stewardship. Every political question he touches affects women as intimately and closely as it affects men. Voters can interpolate questions. Why not voteless women, who have no right of free speech through the ballot-box? We go to a Cabinet Minister's meeting to ask a question on the one subject which most deeply affects us, and underlies every other political reform.

This is the first method of drawing public attention to the political tyranny which exists towards women. It has succeeded beyond expectation because the enemy has played into our hands. To speak plainly, it is the imported stewards who make the uproar, not the women.

The Never Answered Question.

The Government representatives put themselves entirely in the wrong from the outset, when they allowed Miss Christabel Pankhurst and Miss Annie Kenney to be thrown out of a political meeting for asking a perfectly proper question, at the right time and in the correct manner, and let them be imprisoned as disorderly persons.

There is nothing more insistent than the never answered question; nothing that so readily becomes the all-important question of the hour. It is not two women, but all the country, that to-day are demanding an answer from the Government.

The outcry against the "Demonstrations" is that they are silly, and bring ridicule on the cause. Ridicule is a searchlight, and as such is part of our armoury. It is feared only by the powers of darkness.

It is not only upon the suffragettes that ridicule falls. It falls upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer escaping from his back door, upon the Cabinet Ministers, meeting behind doors strongly guarded by police, upon the men who bring a police force 1,500 strong, on horse and foot, to protect them from unarmed women.

To us ridicule is welcome. It is death to the pretender, or the tyrant, seeking concealment.

"But, how silly," people say, "of the women to chain themselves to railings in Downing-street. What good can that do?"

It tells the whole world that women are not prepared to submit tamely and without protest to political tyranny. It has just the same effect, neither more nor less, than if we were men, and used the weapon of "murder." It is the announcement of a mental and moral revolt against oppression. It arrests attention and arouses thought and quickens perceptions of a wrong hitherto ignored or slothfully accepted.

Doing something silly is the women's alternative for doing something cruel. The effect is the same. We use no violence because we can win freedom for women without it; because we have discovered an alternative.

To women's wit, to women's self-control and common-sense, to women's larger humanity, is due the discovery that there is another way than that of "murder" of running a militant campaign against political and legal tyranny. This discovery is the great contribution of women to political life.

WOMEN'S PARLIAMENT AND THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The following messages have been received from the women in Holloway:—

WORK, WORK, WORK.

I am overjoyed to hear of the efforts that women are making to strengthen this movement in every way. My message to them is to be of good courage and to work, work, work for the success of the great Albert Hall demonstration on March 19. They must not be anxious about me. Though I have been obliged to go into hospital for a few days, I hope soon to be better and to go back to the ordinary cells, where I can see our comrades every day in the exercise yard. Whatever happens, I shall stay in Holloway till my six weeks are up.

EMMELINE PANKHURST.

IN THE INTEREST OF THE COUNTRY.

Mr. Gladstone said, when asked in the House of Commons to put our women in the first division, that it was for the interests of the country that we should be punished severely. It is for the interests of our country that we women are prepared to suffer imprisonment to win for our sex political liberty.

ANNIE KENNEY.

"NOT DUE TO THE WOMEN."

I go to prison to help to free those who are bound by unjust laws and tyranny. I love freedom so dearly that I want all women to have it, and I will fight for it until they get it. When I get into my cell I shall be given a Bible, and I shall read there of the man who, being mortally wounded by a woman, said to his servant (a man), "Kill me! Run me through with thy sword, that it cannot be said that I was killed by a woman."

Is this not like the Liberal Government, which prefers to say that the people voted against free food than they voted because they supported the women?

MINNIE BALDOCK.

A great blow was struck for woman's enfranchisement last month in connection with the Women's Parliament in the Caxton Hall.

On Tuesday, February 11, Mrs. Pethick Lawrence presided, supported by Miss Annie Kenney, Miss Christabel Pankhurst, and others.

Mrs. Pankhurst sent a message from Leeds, in which she said that she would make the most of all that was said and all that was done in London that day. It might have a very big effect upon the result of the election in Leeds.

In moving a resolution protesting "against the unconstitutional action of the Government in refusing the Parliamentary vote to the women taxpayers of the country, and demanding the immediate enactment of a measure granting the Parliamentary franchise to duly qualified women," Mrs. Pethick Lawrence, addressing the women as "representatives of a voteless sex," said they had been called unconstitutional, but it was the Government which was breaking the fundamental law of the British Constitution that taxation and representation should go together.

It was impossible to use constitutional methods unless and until they should be included in the Constitution. The Government were acting illegally, and were unjustified in the opposi-

tion which they were making to the women's demands. Their demand was strictly legal and strictly reasonable. They meant to put forward their demands not in words only, but in actions.

A Miraculous Movement.

Their movement had been a miracle, as was shown by the fact that 200 women had been prepared to stand the test of imprisonment as a proof of their earnestness in the cause. The forces of destiny had declared that the womanhood of this country should be a free and a responsible womanhood.

Miss Christabel Pankhurst remarked that when they commenced by throwing down the glove to the strongest Government of modern times many thought they were audacious, but now they were all Suffragists together. (Applause.) Together they were the trustees of the honour of their sex.

Miss Pankhurst proceeded to show that the defeat of the Government in the recent by-elections was due to the work of the women, and not to the influence of Tariff Reform.

The Enfranchisement Bill.

Referring to the Bill for conferring the franchise on women (to be introduced this Session), Miss Pankhurst said: "It is a private member's Bill, and it will never become law if the Government are against it. We have got to bring pressure to bear on the Government between now and February 28, and we have got to make the Government wish they had given in before."

Miss Annie Kenney said that many of the Lancashire detachments were of the working-class, and before coming to London they had to bake the bread, to do the washing, and prepare for their husbands and families during the time they would be away in London. Every one was prepared to go to prison for her political enfranchisement.

She urged the women of social standing present to fight for the cause themselves, and go to prison if necessary, and not let the working-women do all the fighting. They wanted rich women and the middle-class women to go out and help to fight the battle.

Nothing to Stand in the Way.

Women had got to make up their minds, once and for all, that nothing should stand in their way and the way of their great movement, whether it be father, mother, sister, brother, or husband.

Miss Naylor moved that the resolution be at once conveyed to the Prime Minister.

The president said that this would not necessarily mean that they would be arrested, but all who went must be prepared for arrest.

Miss Haig appealed to all the women in the hall to help to swell the appeal to the Prime Minister. They might do wonders if they were all to work together.

Delegates from all parts of the country then addressed the meeting, and the resolution was unanimously carried.

While the meeting was going on in the Caxton Hall, a clever ruse was being adopted for bringing a number of women up to the immediate entrance to the House of Commons. A pantechinon van had been arranged to drive up the road shortly after four o'clock.

As the vehicle drew near to the entrance to St. Stephen's, the driver guided his horses well to the side of the road. On reaching the gate, the horses were pulled up, and in an instant the doors at the back of the van flew open, and some 20 to 30 women rushed out, and attempted to storm the entrance.

The police, however, were on the alert, and, although the leader of the troop got through the outer portal, the further progress of the women was prevented.

A little later the contingent from Caxton Hall, bringing copies of the resolution with them, proceeded down Victoria-

street towards the House of Commons. But they were refused admittance by the police, acting under Government orders. The women insisted upon their right to enter the House, and, on being again refused, attempted to make their way in, in spite of the opposition of the police, and were taken into custody.

A similar scene was witnessed in the evening, and altogether 50 women were arrested. They were as follows:—

Miss Marie Naylor, Chelsea.
Miss Florence Haig, Chelsea.
Miss Mayo, Chelsea.
Miss Mary Phillips, Glasgow.
Miss Mary Mill, London.
Mrs. Robinson, Manchester.
Miss A. Wilkinson, Bury.
Miss Joachim, Chelsea.
Mrs. Duncan, Cheshire.
Miss Alice Hamilton, London.
Miss Jessie Mackay, Leeds.
Mrs. Titterington, Leeds.
Miss Wentworth, London.
Miss Amelia Kern, London.
Mrs. Rigby, Preston.
Miss L. Saltonstall, Halifax.
Mrs. Brook, Huddersfield.
Mrs. Older, Huddersfield.
Miss Dorothy Young, London.
Miss Marie Howey, Malvern.
Miss Elsa Gye, London.
Miss Mary Lane, London.
Miss Margt. Graham, London.
Mrs. Bouvier, Lewisham.
Mrs. Aldham, Cricklewood.
Miss Elsie Howey, Malvern.
Miss G. Brackenbury, Kensington.
Miss Laycock, Bradford.
Mrs. Glyde, Bradford.
Miss Howes, Bournemouth.
Miss Ida Cunard, Birmingham.
Mrs. Taylor, Liverpool.
Mrs. Wood, Birmingham.
Miss Laura Hemming, Birmingham.
Mrs. Marie Edwards, Birmingham.
Miss Adeline Redfern, Stoke-on-Trent.
Mrs. Alderman, Preston.
Mrs. Towler, Preston.
Mrs. Hesmondhalgh, Preston.
Mrs. Aldis, Birmingham.
Miss Marie Brackenbury, Kensington.
Miss Maloney, London.
Miss Titterington, Leeds.
Mrs. Cullen, Paddington.
Mrs. Batchelor, Bradford.
Miss Kuper, London.
Miss Emily Jowley, Liverpool.
Mrs. Whitworth, Rochdale.
Miss Charlotte Griffiths, Rochdale.
Mrs. Mary Jones, London.

They were all taken to Cannon-row police-station, where they were kept till 10.30 p.m., and then released on bail, Mr. Pethick Lawrence being prepared to go surety.

Next day they were all tried at the Rochester-row Police-court; Mr. Muskett, prosecuting for the Crown, said that the powers of the authorities were not exhausted, that if the disturbances continued they would be obliged to prosecute under a statute of Charles II., forbidding a procession of more than ten persons to the House of Commons, the penalty for which was £100 or three months' imprisonment. Such a course would carry the case from the police-court to a higher court, and in the present instance he asked that the cases should be dealt with summarily under the Police Acts.

The prisoners took up an extremely dignified attitude in court, not disputing the evidence except in order to show the political character of their action. In 47 out of the 50 cases they were bound over in two sureties of £20 to keep the peace for twelve months, and in default to go to prison for six weeks in the second division.

Mrs. Kuper was discharged on the ground that the evidence against her was inconclusive, Mrs. Rigby and Miss Titterington as "old offenders" were fined £5 or sent to prison for a month.

In all cases except two (whose relatives were very ill) the women chose prison, and were sent off to Holloway.

Wednesday's Parliament.

When that afternoon Mrs. Pethick Lawrence announced to the Parliament of Women that 50 of their number who had the day before gone out from the meeting to carry a resolution to the Prime Minister, had been arrested and sent to prison for six weeks, there were hisses and cries of "Shame."

Mrs. Lawrence then moved a resolution deploring "the lowering of the British standards of justice and equity in the esti-

mation of the world through the treatment meted out to voteless women demanding their civil liberties by a reactionary Government." This was carried unanimously, the audience standing.

Mrs. Lawrence then went on to say that that Women's Parliament would go down to posterity as one of the most important Parliaments that had ever been held in history.

Miss Christabel Pankhurst referred to the speech made by Mr. Muskett when prosecuting the Suffragettes in the police-court that morning, in which he had threatened that an Act of Charles II. would be put into operation against them. "This takes us back to stirring times, ladies," she said. "At last it is realised that the women are fighting for freedom as their fathers did. If they want twelve women, aye, and more than twelve, if a hundred are wanted to be tried under that Act, and to be sent to prison for three months, they can be found."

Thursday's Session.

When Mrs. Pankhurst appeared on the platform on Thursday afternoon, she received a most enthusiastic reception, and the audience listened eagerly to her account of the by-election campaign in South Leeds, and especially to the story of the torch-light procession, and the wonderful meeting of 100,000 people on Hunslet Moor. Mrs. Pankhurst told how police assistance in organising the procession had been refused, and how Miss Mary Gawthorpe, Mrs. Massy, and Miss Barrett, who walked in front, had been obliged to clear their own way through the thronging crowds; and yet of how there had been no disorder, only sympathy and enthusiasm, all along the route with the vast crowds that parted to let the procession pass through, joining on to it behind. She spoke of the earnestness of the women, and of how some had kept calling out in broad Yorkshire, "Shall us have the vote?" and others answering, "We shall." "I have come back to London," continued Mrs. Pankhurst, "feeling as I have never felt before, that we are near the end of the struggle. I feel that the time has come when I must act. If you carry the resolution which I am about to put to you, I volunteer from the chair to be one of those to carry it to Parliament this afternoon."

The resolution, which called for the immediate enfranchisement of women, was then read. Miss Annie Kenney, in seconding it, said that she was prepared to follow Mrs. Pankhurst, as she had always done since first she met her. The resolution was then carried, and Mrs. Pankhurst and her following left to carry it to the Prime Minister.

An Extraordinary Scene.

Outside the hall an extraordinary scene took place. Mrs. Pankhurst's trap was stopped, and she was told she must walk; this she agreed to do. The police told her that the women must not walk in a block, they accordingly adopted single file. They then said that they must not go in a continuous file, but in twos and threes; this they also agreed to. But the police refused to allow them to proceed, and on their insisting upon going to the House of Commons took them into custody. The names of the arrested were:—

Mrs. Pankhurst.
Miss Annie Kenney
Miss Gladice Keevil.
Mrs. Baldock.
Mrs. Kerwood, Birmingham.
Mrs. Sidley, London.
Miss Frith, London.
Miss Annie Parker, Chelsea.
Miss M. Keegan, London.
Miss H. Allan, London.

When the Parliament reassembled at eight o'clock, the names of those who had been arrested were known.

The hall was crowded, and the audience seething with mingled indignation and enthusiasm, which burst out in a thunder of applause as Mrs. Pankhurst, Miss Kenney, and the other prisoners who had been let out on bail entered.

Mrs. Pankhurst's Speech.

Mrs. Pankhurst said: "When I left the hall this afternoon I did not expect to return in time to meet you this evening, but the adjournment of the House of Commons has given me the opportunity to explain to you what I was not permitted to tell Mr. Herbert Gladstone and others this afternoon. My experience in the country, and especially in South Leeds, has taught

The National Women's Social and Political Union,
4, CLEMENTS INN, STRAND, W.C.

A COURSE OF LECTURES

IN THE
PORTMAN ROOMS, BAKER STREET, W.,

On TUESDAYS, at 8.30.

- MARCH 3rd.** "What the Woman Movement Means." By Mrs. PETHICK LAWRENCE.
MARCH 10th. A Lecture - - - - - By Dr. GARRETT ANDERSON.
MARCH 24th. "The Importance of the Vote" - - - - - By Mrs. PANKHURST.
MARCH 31st. A Lecture - - - - - By Miss ELIZABETH ROBINS.
APRIL 7th. "Women and Practical Politics."
 By Miss CHRISTABEL PANKHURST, LL.B.

Numbered Seats, 5s. and 2s. 6d. each (£1 1s. and 10s. 6d. the Course); Unnumbered Seats, 1s. each; from THE TICKET SECRETARY, N.W.S.P.U., 4, CLEMENTS INN, STRAND, W.C.

VOTES FOR WOMEN.

March, 1908.

4, Clements Inn, Strand, W.C.

THE LESSON OF HISTORY.

Right for ever on the scaffold,
Wrong for ever on the throne;
Yet that scaffold sways the future,
And behind the dim unknown
Standeth God within the shadow
Keeping watch above His own.

—James Russell Lowell.

All down through the history of the world there has been one treatment meted out to those who would give new life and new light to their fellow men and fellow women.

Not honour, not reverence, not gratitude; but ridicule, persecution, suffering, shame, imprisonment, and death.

This was the reward of the prophets of olden time, of the great Master and Founder of our Faith, of the heroes of modern history. And this reward is still waiting for all who dare to come into conflict with tradition, and prejudice, and tyranny.

But if history teaches this lesson, it teaches also another with equal certainty that there comes a day when the judgment of the hour is set aside, the verdict is reversed, and the sentence is annulled.

But often, far too often, that reversal comes too late; it comes when the brave spirit which faced with unflinching courage the angry passions of men has passed away for ever from the scene.

Though to-day the whole of Christendom professes allegiance to the name of Christ, the only cry which pierced the air in that hour in Jerusalem was "Crucify him, crucify him."

In France it was not till after 24 years that the trial of

Joan of Arc was re-examined, and when the verdict of ultimate acquittal was pronounced there was no quick ear to hear and no living eye to smile. The cruel sentence had done its work, the fire at the stake had taken away one whose fearless being this poor world could so ill afford to spare.

Once more, John Brown was executed in America before the tide of popular feeling had risen to reverse the sentence of the Court, and to place his name upon the everlasting roll of honour of the human race.

Here to-day it is not too late. Cruel as are prison bars, they are not shut for ever; there is still opportunity to make good the wrong that has been wrought.

It is no personal gratification or honour or reverence for which our leader or her followers ask; they seek that their work may be accomplished and the women of the country freed.

Mrs. Pankhurst tells us that this brooks no further delay. She gives warning that the agitation has nearly reached the limits of her power of control; that if justice be yet further delayed she cannot tell what may be the result. It may then be too late.

But to-day, to-day while there is yet time, she calls upon the women of the country to come forward and with her to win the victory.

And in response to her appeal there is a determination in the hearts of the people, which cries with one voice "Yes, it shall be NOW."

THE NATIONAL CAMPAIGN.

BY CHRISTABEL PANKHURST.

When the history of this campaign comes to be written, one of its chief events will be held to have been the Women's Parliament, which met in the Caxton Hall some days ago. On the first day the meeting adopted a resolution condemning the unconstitutional action of the Government in withholding the franchise from women taxpayers. On the motion of Miss Naylor, it was resolved that this resolution should be conveyed to the House of Commons by a deputation, and this was done, with the result that 50 women were arrested by the police, and were, on the following day, sentenced to six weeks' imprisonment in the second division, because they refused to undertake not to repeat this action.

The solicitor for the prosecution, Mr. Muskett, hoping, no doubt, that fear of a yet heavier penalty would deter others from following the example of the 50 prisoners, threatened that in future an Act of Charles II. dealing with presentation of petitions to Parliament would be brought into operation against suffragist offenders. It was at once decided to take up the challenge by sending a deputation of 13 women to the House of Commons. In a few hours, more than the number of women required volunteered to run the risk of three months' imprisonment, and when, on the third day of Parliament, Mrs. Pankhurst declared her intention of leading the deputation to the House, she was accompanied by Miss Annie Kenney and 11 others, equally determined to claim political rights for their sex. Mrs. Pankhurst got into a pony-trap, and her companions followed on foot.

How the Procession Started.

Watching them, in the street, were many policemen and a curious crowd. There was something intensely moving in the sight of these women, one in a little humble cart, the others walking two and two behind. They were so small in strength and so few in number, and yet they had a purpose strong to overcome the resistance of the Imperial Government, supported as it is by every material resource. As the little procession moved away, a bystander said, "That lot won't get far"; and so it was, for they had not gone many yards before the police fell upon them, ordered the leader out of the trap, and broke the ranks of those on foot. Those who stayed behind at Caxton Hall then lost sight of them, for they were surrounded by the crowd.

What cannot be too often repeated is that our friends obeyed the directions of the police in every particular, except that they persisted in walking (singly on being told to walk singly) in the direction of the House of Commons. This purely political and technical offence was made the basis of a charge against them of obstructing the police. Having threatened to avail themselves of the provisions of an Act of Charles II., the authorities, when it came to the point, feared to institute proceedings in the High Court, because the consequence would have been to show unmistakably the political character of the women's action. Happily, in spite of the unsatisfactory police-court procedure, the world now begins to understand that our prisoners are not mere disturbers of the peace, but are serious and public-spirited women, who are seeking a constitutional right. This point is brought out very well in an extract, which is given on page 92, from the paper "Bon Accord."

The meeting at which Mrs. Pankhurst and Miss Kenney and others spoke on the evening of their arrest was wonderful in its enthusiasm. Since then numberless expressions of sympathy and support have reached us.

We are all eager for the moment of the prisoners' release. Arrangements for their welcome are being made, and a statement on the matter appears on page 84.

In the meantime, protest meetings are being held in Lancashire, Yorkshire, and elsewhere, and further meetings to be addressed by the prisoners on their release will be arranged. It is hoped that Mrs. Pankhurst will speak in Leeds, Edinburgh, Aberdeen, Glasgow, Manchester, Nottingham, and Northampton before Easter.

Our treasurer's appeal for the observance for a week of self-denial has been eagerly responded to by supporters of the Union. The way in which our members, in order to gain money for the cause, carried out tasks which they would not dream of undertaking for private ends has been a revelation to the public of the devotion which the Votes for Women movement has inspired.

In addition to a large number of meetings which have been held during the month all over England and Scotland, which have been highly successful, our by-election work has been particularly valuable.

The By-Elections.

Following on our great victory at Mid-Devon came in rapid succession by-elections at South Hereford, Worcester, and South Leeds. The Government nominee was defeated at Hereford, and according to the statement in the "Hereford Times," the local Liberal journal, much sympathy was won, and many votes turned against the Government by the work of the Union. At Worcester also we were entirely successful in our attempt to defeat the Government. In South Leeds the situation was complicated by a split in the Labour ranks and other circumstances. Our workers put forward great efforts, and were successful, according to the testimony of the Press, in making this a Women's Suffrage election. On the eve of the poll there was a torchlight procession and an enormous demonstration on Hunslet Moor. The great assembly showed every sign of strong support of our demand. Those whose memory goes back to the reform agitations of the last century declare that this great gathering equalled, if it did not exceed, in size the mass meetings held to demand the vote for men.

Our by-election work is now recognised as an important factor in every election. An article in the "Daily Chronicle," containing sarcastic advice to Liberals on how to lose a by-election, counted the Suffragists as one of the important forces which are arrayed against the Government. The President of the National Liberal Federation, addressing the annual meeting at Leicester, referred to our share in securing the defeat of the Government in recent elections. There are many other evidences of the fact that politicians are no longer blind to the influence we exert. The next election contest is to be in Hastings, Mr. Harvey Du Cros having resigned his seat. The first meeting was held on Tuesday evening, and was addressed by Mrs. Martel, Mrs. Drummond, and myself.

Lectures in the Portman Rooms.

Our militant campaign is making every woman think about woman's suffrage, and there is a great desire for information on the question. To meet this demand we have arranged a series of lectures to be held in the Portman Rooms, Baker-street. The first lecture will be delivered by Mrs. Pethick Lawrence on Tuesday, March 3, at 8.30 p.m., her subject being "What the Woman Movement Means." The second lecture is arranged for Thursday, March 10, and will be delivered by Dr. L.

Garrett Anderson. Mrs. Pankhurst has promised to give the third lecture on March 24, and as the term of her imprisonment, according to the latest accounts, will have already expired, she will keep to that date, taking for her subject "The Importance of the Vote." Miss Elizabeth Robins will be the speaker on March 31, and the final lecture will be delivered on April 7 by myself on the subject of "Women and Practical Politics." At these lectures each speaker will go more thoroughly and deeply into her subject than it is possible to do at, for example, the Monday "At Home," where time has to be devoted to making announcements and commenting on passing events. Admission to these lectures is 5s., 2s. 6d. and 1s.; tickets may be obtained from the ticket secretary, 4, Clements Inn.

The Albert Hall Meeting, March 19.

There is every sign that the great women's demonstration in the Albert Hall, to be held on Thursday, March 29, at 8 o'clock, will be attended by a vast audience. Our members are undertaking the business of ticket-selling with enthusiasm. One member has bought outright £11 worth of tickets, and will come back for more as soon as these are sold. As the paper goes to press she tells me she has only a few tickets left. Another member has undertaken to sell £6 worth of tickets, and a third has already disposed of three boxes. All this is most encouraging, but it must be remembered that the Albert Hall is the largest in the country, and that to fill it with an audience of women only is no small undertaking. Therefore, we have prepared several schemes for advertising the meeting and disposing of tickets. In a few days' time a number of women wearing "Votes for Women" scarves, will take up their stand in busy thoroughfares for the purpose of distributing handbills and selling tickets. I should be glad to have the names of further volunteers for this work. As the time for the meeting draws nearer, parties of women will write in chalk announcements on the pavements, and the meeting will be advertised in divers other ways.

The Women's Enfranchisement Bill.

February 28 will see the second reading debate upon the Women's Enfranchisement Bill, introduced by Mr. Stanger, M.P. for Kensington. This Bill is along the lines which we have always advocated; that is to say, it simply removes the sex disability, and would give votes to women on the same terms as they are at the present time possessed by men. The future progress of the Bill depends principally upon two things. In the first place, it is uncertain whether the Speaker will allow the closure. In the second place, it is uncertain to what committee the Bill will, if it is read a second time, be relegated.

As regards the Speaker, several Members of Parliament predict that on this occasion he will grant the closure, basing their opinion on the fact that the question has already been twice discussed during the present Parliament, and that Mr. Dickinson's first Bill of last year was on the same lines as the present one.

The House sits from 12 to 5 on Fridays, so that there will be ample time for a very full debate on the Bill. It cannot reasonably be argued that a period of 5 hours is inadequate for the discussion of a reform which has been before the country for the past half-century, and to which 420 Members of this Parliament are pledged. If the Speaker refuses the closure which may be moved on the stroke of 5 o'clock, the Bill will be talked out, and will be dead for the Session, unless the Government grants another day for the adjourned debate. If, on the other hand, the closure is accepted, then presumably the second reading will be carried, as a large majority of the House are pledged to vote for it. The question then turns upon

what will be done with the Bill afterwards. According to the present rules of procedure, the Bill will pass into one of the standing committees, and the discussion of it will go on during the next two months quite irrespective of the legislation which is being discussed in the House as a whole. But it is open to any Member of Parliament to move that instead of being sent to one of the standing committees it shall be sent to the committee of the whole House. If this motion is carried, no further discussion would take place on the Bill unless special time of the whole House were provided for it.

The Government Responsible.

The Government, if it will, can easily insist that the Bill be sent to a standing committee, and thus enable it to proceed through the committee stage without difficulty. If the Government use their influence to have the Bill sent to a committee of the whole House, then the Bill can only proceed if the Government are instrumental in affording time for its further discussion. It will be seen, therefore, that the Government have it in their power either to facilitate or to hinder the progress of the Bill, and the Women's Social and Political Union will hold the Government responsible for whatever happens.

Our immediate plan of campaign is well adapted to compel the Government seriously to face the Women's Suffrage question. The Albert Hall meeting on March 19, other important demonstrations in London and the country, the mass meeting in Hyde Park on June 21 will be evidence of the strength of women's demand for the vote. The opposition at by-elections and the militant action which our members are more than ever ready to take, will prove to be a most serious difficulty to the Government, if they decide to continue their opposition. For their own sake they would be wise to accept the opportunity afforded by Mr. Stanger's Bill to retrieve the mistake they made when, at the outset of their career, they refused to grant political enfranchisement to their countrywomen.

NOT A POLICE DISTURBANCE.

In order to make clear the real nature of the action of the W.S.P.U. leaders on Thursday, February 13, the following letter was sent to the Press:—

DEAR SIR,—The report of the proceedings in the Police-court yesterday, when Mrs. Pankhurst and her fellow-prisoners were tried, does not make clear the facts of the case. The prisoners were charged with obstructing the police. But this obstruction was of a purely technical character. The evidence showed that not only did the women use no violence of any kind, but that they followed in every respect the instructions given to them by the police, except that they refused to abandon their intention of proceeding to the House of Commons. There was no disturbance and no disorder, and the crowd was not of their making. The offence, if any, was a political one, namely, the insistence of a deputation of 13 women to go to present a petition to the Prime Minister.

The attempt of the Government, acting through the Crown Prosecutor, to pour contempt on the movement by pretending that our agitation is in the nature of a street row, will not succeed. Our object is political, and it can only be met in a political way. The Government, having failed to take the initiative in bringing in a Suffrage Bill, must now give every assistance to the Bill of Mr. Stanger, the second reading debate of which is fixed for February 28.

We look to the Government to secure, not only the second reading of this Bill, but also that it will be sent to a Standing Committee, and we require an assurance that "facilities" shall be given to it on its return to the whole House on the Report stage. In this way, and in this way alone, can our militant campaign be stayed.

Yours, &c.,

CHRISTABEL PANKHURST.

February 15, 1908.

The National Women's Social & Political Union,

4, CLEMENTS INN, STRAND, W.C.

A GREAT WOMAN'S MEETING

WILL BE HELD IN

The Albert Hall

ON

THURSDAY, MARCH 19th, at 8 p.m.,

TO DEMAND

VOTES FOR WOMEN.

Speakers:

Mrs. PETHICK LAWRENCE, Miss CHRISTABEL PANKHURST,
Miss ANNIE KENNEY, Mrs. MARTEL, Mrs. BAINES, and others.

Tickets and all information from the Ticket Secretary, N.W.S.P.U., 4, Clements Inn, W.C.

Prices:

Boxes, £3 3s., £2 2s., and £1 1s.; Stalls, 5s.; Arena, 2s. 6d.; Lower Orchestra, Balcony,
Organ Gallery, 1s.; Gallery, Upper Orchestra, 6d.

OTHER ANNOUNCEMENTS.

A Course of Lectures will be given on Tuesdays, March 3rd, 10th, 24th, 31st, and April 7th, in the Portman Rooms, W., on Woman Suffrage. The Speakers will be Mrs. Pethick Lawrence, Dr. Garrett Anderson, Mrs. Pankhurst, Miss Elizabeth Robins, and Miss Christabel Pankhurst, LL.B. Tickets, 5/-, 2/6, and 1/- each lecture, can be obtained from the Ticket Secretary, N.W.S.P.U., 4, Clements Inn, W.C.

The N.W.S.P.U. holds an AT HOME every Monday Afternoon, 4-6, in the Portman Rooms (Baker Street, W.). Visitors are specially invited. An Evening At Home is also held every Thursday, at 8 p.m., in the Offices of the Union, 4, Clements Inn.

A Monster Demonstration will be held in Hyde Park on June 21st, at 3 p.m., when all the Leaders of the Movement will address the audience.

THE HISTORY OF THE SUFFRAGE MOVEMENT.

By SYLVIA PANKHURST. VI.—*The Married Woman's Property Acts.*

The Married Woman's Property Act of 1870 provided that a married woman's earnings made during her marriage should be her own property to dispose of as she pleased, also that any personal property, or any sum not exceeding £200, that might come to a wife during her marriage, either through the death of an intestate relative or by deed or will, should become her own private property, but any gifts or bequests of more than £200 value should go to her husband as before the Act came into force. In the case of real estate, the Act provided that a married woman might receive the rents and profits that might come to her as the heiress or co-heiress of an intestate. A woman about to marry might deposit her earnings or personal property in a Savings Bank, which could only take £200, or invest it in her intended name as a married woman, in certain specified investments, considered by the Lords to be suitable. If, however, these things were done without the consent of her husband he could have them set aside, and could claim the money as though it had been his own.

The Act placed a wife possessed of separate property under the same Poor Law liabilities to maintain her husband as a husband to maintain his wife, she was also liable like a widow to maintain her children, but not to the exclusion of her husband's liability.

A wife was empowered to sue in respect of her private property, but she might not be sued. She had no power to contract, so that any contract into which she entered as a principle imposed no liability on anyone. Any action brought against a wife because of a wrong committed by her must be brought against the husband and wife jointly, and they must sue jointly in the case of any injury done to the wife. Any damages awarded became the property of the husband.

A wife could not make a will, except in regard to her specially protected property, unless with her husband's consent. This consent he might revoke at any moment, even after her death.

The Act did not apply to women married before it became law.

On December 29, 1870, a Married Woman's Property Act was passed by the Legislature of Victoria (Australia). Among other things it secured to married women the right to own and dispose of their real estate.

An Important Decision.

In 1871, the year after the passing of the first English Married Woman's Property Act, a very interesting and important case occurred. It will be remembered that until the Municipal Corporation Act of 1835, with its limiting phrase "male persons," came into force women had possessed and exercised the right to vote in all local affairs, and that even after the passing of that Act continued to do so in non-corporate districts.

Thirty-four years after, when the Municipal Franchise Bill, 1869, was under consideration, this anomaly was pointed out, and the municipal vote was extended to women under the provisions of the new Act.

As at that time the very fact of marrying meant the giving up of a woman's property to her husband, except in the few cases in which some special settlement had been made, a married woman could not possibly acquire a voting qualification. After the passing of the Act of 1870, however, a number of married women were able to qualify.

In the municipal elections of 1871 a candidate for the Sunderland Ward of the Borough of Sunderland was returned by a majority of one vote only. All doubtful votes were therefore inquired into, and objection was taken to the fact that two women had voted. One of these was a married woman living apart from her husband, and paying rates and taxes in her own name. The other had been placed upon the register as a spinster, but had been married nine days before the election took place.

In January, 1872, the case was heard before Sir A. Cockburn. It was argued on behalf of the women that "coverture" being no longer a bar to the holding of property should no longer be a bar to the exercise of a vote. On the other side it was contended that a married woman was not a person in the eye of the law, and was not therefore "sui juris." Sir A. Cockburn decided that this latter view of the law was correct, and he therefore disallowed the women's votes and the councillor was unseated.

Dr. Pankhurst's Bill.

In 1873, Dr. Pankhurst drafted on behalf of the Married Woman's Property Committee a Bill to amend the Act of 1870. This Bill was introduced by Mr. Hinde Palmer in 1873. On February 14, the second reading was supported among others by Lord Coleridge, the Attorney-General, and carried by a majority of 21, the ayes being 124 and the noes 103.

On February 21, there was a "count out" before the Bill was reached. On March 4, a few minutes before the Bill was to have come on, the House decided that no opposed business should be taken after 12.30. The Bill was therefore again postponed, and time after time similar obstacles were raised up to prevent its being discussed. These during the one session amounted to: Six counts out; progress reported three times; postponements owing to 12 o'clock Rule, 15; other postponements, six. Finally the Bill passed through Committee too late to be proceeded with further.

At the general election of 1874, Mr. Hinde Palmer and 84 others favourable to the Bill were defeated. In the following session no Bill was introduced on behalf of the Married Woman's Property Committee.

During the same session (1874) Mr. Anderson, M.P. for Glasgow, succeeded in getting passed into law the Scotch Conjugal Rights Amendment Act. This extended to the local Sheriff Courts the power hitherto confined to the Court of Session in Edinburgh of granting protection orders to deserted wives. This was a great advantage for poor women.

Now followed a period of depression and discouragement among those who were striving to obtain justice for married women. It was difficult to convince the public, and some even of those who had before worked for the cause, that the Acts of 1870, and 1874, had not satisfactorily settled the question. The agitation was suspended for nearly a year, and was then renewed more vigorously than ever, owing largely to the efforts of Mrs. Jacob Bright, who had become the treasurer, and of the secretary, Mrs. Wolstenholme Elmy. In 1876, no place could be obtained for the Bill, but in 1877, Lord Coleridge introduced a Married Woman's Property Act Amendment Bill, which was substantially the same as that drafted by Dr. Pankhurst and introduced by Mr. Hinde Palmer in 1873. This Bill came up for second reading in the

House of Lords on June 21. It was opposed by the Lord Chancellor (Lord Cairns)—who, on June 21, 1870, had moved the second reading of Mr. Russell Gurney's Bill—and negatived without a division.

Meanwhile an attempt was being made in the House of Commons to improve the position of Scotch married women. A large petition from Edinburgh had been presented during the previous session, praying that the Act of 1870, should be extended to Scotland, and in 1877, Mr. Anderson introduced the Married Woman's Property Act (Scotland) Bill. On April 18, the second reading was opposed by the Lord Advocate (the Right Hon. W. Watson) on the ground that it went further than the English law. He admitted, however, that some change ought to be made, and on behalf of the Government agreed that the second reading should be assented to on condition that amendments to be proposed on behalf of the Government should be accepted, but that the Bill should go at least as far as the English Act of 1870. These amendments were found to amount to a rejection of the whole measure, except the clauses which secured to a married woman all wages and earnings acquired by her after the commencement of the Act, and which limited the liability of the husband for his wife's pre-nuptial debts to the amount of her property received by him through the marriage. The Lord Advocate, however, expressed his willingness to deal with the whole question comprehensively at a later period. The Bill in its mutilated form passed through the House of Commons, was carried through the House of Lords by the Earl of Rosebery, and came into operation on January 1, 1878.

Futile Attempts at Legislation.

In 1878, the English Bill was again introduced into the House of Commons. Mr. Hibbert secured a place for second reading on July 24, but the Government took that day, and also one for a resolution on July 18, 1879. Meanwhile Mr. Anderson had reintroduced the Scotch measure in 1878, and had obtained a place for second reading on May 31, but the sudden death of Mr. Wykeham Martin led to the adjournment of the House on that day, and the notice of opposition by the Lord Advocate afterwards destroyed all chance of the Bill's proceeding further during that session. It was again introduced on December 6, 1878, and the second reading was fixed for March 5, 1879, when it was passed without a division. Immediately afterwards Mr. Roger Montgomerie, M.P. for North Ayrshire, put down notice of opposition, and the Bill was effectively blocked for the rest of the session.

Mr. Anderson then appealed to the Government, reminding them of the pledge made by them in 1877, to bring the Scotch law in regard to married woman's property at least to the level of that obtaining in England. Thereupon the Lord Advocate informed Mr. Anderson that the Government had given instructions for the preparation of a Married Woman's Property Bill. On Friday, February 6, 1880, Mr. Anderson reintroduced his Bill, and the second reading was set down for June 2, but by that time a general election had intervened. The English measure was equally unfortunate, for it was to have come on for second reading on the same day.

During the election the question of married woman's property was laid before the majority of the Parliamentary candidates, and 300 of the members returned were pledged to support the reform.

Mr. Hibbert, who had had charge of the Bill for three sessions, Mr. Osborne Morgan, and Sir Charles Dilke, who had backed the Bill, had now all taken office under the Government. With three ardent supporters in the Government one might have expected to find married woman's property in the King's Speech, but it was not there. Mr. Hinde Palmer, however, who had been out of Parliament for some time, was re-elected, and took

charge of the Married Woman's Property Acts Consolidation Bill. On June 9, 1880, he moved the second reading of the Bill, which was agreed to without a division, Sir H. James, the Attorney-General, having assented to it on behalf of the Government.

Immediately afterwards the Scotch Bill was also moved and agreed to without a division. Both Bills were, however, blocked by Sir George Campbell, who at once put down notice of opposition to them. Owing to the rule not to discuss opposed business after 12 o'clock their progress was barred for the session. In this same session the Married Woman's Policies of Assurance (Scotland) Act of 1880 was passed. This provides that married women may effect policies of assurance for their separate use, free of the *ius mariti* and right of administration of their husbands and assignable without their consent, and that an assurance may be effected by a husband for his wife, and if it has been effected as a provision for her he is a trustee for her, and it is safe from his creditors.

A Deputation of M.P.'s.

On January 7, 1881, a deputation of members of Parliament waited upon the Lord Chancellor in support of the Married Woman's Property Acts Consolidation Bill, when he expressed himself as favourable to the proposed reform.

On January 2, the Bill again passed the second reading, and was referred to a Select Committee. The amended Bill was reported to the House on March 10, but Mr. Bridport at once put down notice of opposition, and succeeded in blocking the measure for the entire session.

The Scotch Bill passed the second reading by 230 to 33 votes on January 13, and was sent to a Select Committee. One of the witnesses examined before this Committee was Lord Fraser, a Judge in the Court of Session. He said:—

For my own part, I do not see the necessity for this legislation. I think that the protection that has been thrown around women under the Conjugal Rights Act is sufficient. If the husband deserts her, she can get protection; if she succeeds to property, then she can apply to the Court and have the whole of it, if it be small, or a sufficient quantity of it, set aside as a provision for her; and why she should be allowed to have money in her pocket to deal with as she thinks fit I cannot understand.

The Select Committee redrafted the Bill, and reported it as amended to the House on March 29. It came up for consideration on April 25, and on a division being challenged there were 69 votes for the Bill and 19 against. It was read a third time on April 29, introduced by the Lord Chancellor into the House of Lords on May 5, and read a second time on May 27. The Bill went into Committee on June 16, and was reported on June 23. At both these stages amendments highly advantageous to married women were introduced. On June 23, and 24, the Bill was read a third time, and passed, and amendments having been accepted by the Commons, it received the Royal Assent on July 18, 1881.

In 1882, the Lord Chancellor introduced the latter measure, which applied to England and Ireland, to the House of Lords on February 14. It was read a second time without division on March 7, passed through Committee on March 28, was reported on May 9, and read a third time on May 22. During the three months that the Bill was before the Lords no opposition was offered to its essential principle. The only hostile amendments moved were trivial in character, and negatived without a division. The only amendments introduced into the Bill were designed with the object of giving a fuller practical effect to its workings.

The Bill now became a Government measure, and was introduced into the Commons by the Right Hon. G. Osborne Morgan on June 2. It was read a second time on June 8, without a division.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE £20,000 FUND.

(Exclusive of Self-Denial Cards.)

January 23 to February 24.

Table listing contributions to the £20,000 fund, including names and amounts in pounds, shillings, and pence. Includes sub-sections for 'Up to the End of March' and 'Important Future Events'.

PROGRAMME OF EVENTS.

Up to the End of March (as far as at present arranged).

Table listing events from February 27 to March 31, including dates, locations, and names of participants or organizers.

Important Future Events.

Table listing future events from April to May, including dates, locations, and names of participants or organizers.