Because we have put our trust in wealth rather than in human nature.

What about the women?

Politically the women are nowhere. They have no part in government. Nothing to do with the taxes—but pay them. Nothing to do with the laws—but obey them.

Ought women to have the vote?

Women need the vote as much as men. They are as closely concerned with law and government as men are. Much of the worst paid labor is women's labor; as parents, women have an equal place; and their personal rights need the protection of the vote. Property and tenancy qualifications are much more unfair to women than to men, because women's earnings are smaller, and because the working housewife, though her labor is truly self-supporting, does not receive money payment.

What then is to be done?

Money, houses and land ought not to give votes. Let men vote as men, women as women, and both as human beings. Let us have no sex disqualification, no marriage disqualification, no poverty disqualification, but one man, one vote; one woman, one vote; that is adult suffrage.

#### • • •

### LLOYD-GEORGE ON WOMEN'S SUF-FRAGE IN 1908.

### Points from the Speech of the Right Hon. D. Lloyd-George, M. P. Chancellor of the Exchequer, At the Royal Albert Hall, December 5, 1908.

I am here as a Cabinet Minister, not merely to make clear my own personal position in the matter, but to declare what I conceive to be the attitude of the Government towards this problem, and their intention towards it...

I should like to explain why I support the cause of woman suffrage. Before you can carry any measure of women's suffrage you must go through a process of educating the country, and therefore every appeal from every quarter, every argument addressed from anybody who can get a hearing on behalf of women's suffrage, is a contribution to the cause. . .

You must prepare the ground; you must get every assistance that is possible in order to convert and to convince, and I am simply taking my share in this very essential work. . .

I have come to the conclusion that it is fair, that it is just, that it is equitable, that it is essential, in the interests of the state, that the suffrage should be granted to women. . . .

To-day you have 5,000,000 women who earn their daily bread. . . .

This is the first time a Cabinet Minister has ever appeared on a women's suffrage platform. ...

Brilliant and cultured women are deemed to be more unfit for the franchise than a sandwich-man carrying an advertisement. Well, now, that is indefensible; it is irrational, and it must come to an end. There is nothing exceeds the stupidity of such a position except its arrogance. . . .

The real practical difficulty is that it is not a party measure. . .

You have got a majority, and a great majority, of the Liberal party—a majority inside the Cabinet and a majority outside the Cabinet. . .

The declaration made by the Prime Minister in May of this year—its real significance for women's suffrage—is this: That, for the first time in the history of this country, a Prime Minister has declared it to be an open question not merely for his party, but for his Cabinet as well...

The Prime Minister attached two conditions. One is that the measure must be a democratic one —that it shall enfranchise not property, but womanhood; and the second is that there must be a clear demonstration that it is the wish of the women of this country to be included in the franchise.

# EDUCATING WOMEN FOR SUFFRAGE.

+

÷

### By Harold Gorst, English Author and Journalist, and Son of Sir John Gorst, a Tory Supporter of the Budget.\*

It seems to me that girls are more miseducated than boys, especially now that every girl is destined to come forward as a citizen. It is natural to think at some time in her life every woman will fulfill her normal destiny, that of a wife and mother; but in these days, whether that be so or not, she will soon be exercising the privileges of citizenship. Are the girls and women of America prepared for this? I am asked. No, far from it, but they are no more lacking than all boys and some men. It is incomprehensible to me, in view of the fact that suffrage will soon be given to women, both in this country and Great Britain, that all the girls' schools and colleges do not have instruction and training in parliamentary law.

American women are going to be a wonderfully potent element in politics when they have the ballot, for women will realize that the machinery of politics means less than men think it does. The latter mistake the means for the end. Women will take a much more human view of politics. They will never cease working until they have divested politics of the sham and complications which men have invented to conceal graft and throw dust in the eyes of the public. American men are so overworked, so engrossed in business, that I believe the whole future of America lies in the hands of women, and when women have the franchise they will shake the foundations of gov-

\*See Public of November 5, page 1070.

ernment in a way that will be of incalculable good to the country.

## WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN COLORADO.

Marie Jenney Howe in La Follette's of December 18. The chief gain to the State of Colorado in the enfranchisement of its women, has been the development of the women themselves. Never have a body of voters so humbly and earnestly prepared themselves for the privilege of citizenship. Study clubs, discussions, an awakened interest in civic and political questions, are the natural response to responsibility. An increased self-respect and a growing political consciousness are marked characteristics of Colorado women. A majority of women were indifferent and many were opposed to their own enfranchisement, but it is difficult to find a Colorado woman today who does not approve of her own enfranchisement now that it is an accomplished fact. Larger interests shared in common with husband and son, unite men and women in closer companionship, uplift the home, and help to redeem women from the personal and petty qualities which we as a sex are supposed to possess.

The second gain to the State of Colorado in the enfranchisement of its women is an increased humanitarian spirit as shown in legislation and in the establishment of new institutions.

The power of Colorado women in creating institutions is shown by the establishment of industrial schools for boys and girls, a school for deaf and blind children, the first kindergarten for blind children in the United States, provision for feeble minded children, juvenile courts, probation officers, truancy officers, houses of detention, and a State home for dependent children.

A Bureau of Protection for animals and children has been made a State department with offices at the capitol and with funds and officials provided by the State. This bureau commands the services of 600 agents throughout the State. These agents are given power above the sheriff, so that any abused or neglected animal or child may be restored to safety and comfort without delay.

The establishment of this bureau alone ought to justify woman suffrage in Colorado.

The power of Colorado women in legislation is shown by the passage of some twenty laws affecting the welfare of children. According to Ellis Meredith of Denver: "We have the best child labor law in the world, and no child is abused or neglected for more than a few days at the longest. We have the strictest laws for the prevention of the abuse, moral, mental or physical, of children, of any country in the world and the best enforced, not merely in our cities but throughout the entire State. We have the strongest compulsory school law and the most enlightened laws concerning delinquent children of any section in the world, save where our laws have been copied."

Women have secured the enactment of laws protecting the home. Colorado has no dower or community law, while on the other hand the wife's property is hers absolutely. There is also a law forbidding the selling or mortgaging of a homestead without the signature of both husband and wife. Mothers are now co-equal guardians of their children, and the age of consent for girls is eighteen.

It is true that these results might have been accomplished without the ballot. But in other States where woman's influence is used as a substitute for power, her work is accomplished at a tremendous cost of time and strength. It is to the self interest of a State to encourage and not discourage the service of its citizens; to help and not hinder the purposes of the public spirited few; to render their efforts easy instead of difficult. In New York, Massachusetts, or Illinois, the efforts of the most valuable and sensible women too often result in discouragement, exhaustion and delay. The saving of their time and strength would be a saving to the State itself, and an increase in its efficiency.

In measuring the political influence of women, two things must be borne in mind. It must always be realized that they do not seek big offices. No woman has ever served in the Senate or in any important State office which means political control. It must also be recognized that women do not represent big business. They do not stand for or command large commercial interests. These two facts weigh against their influence for certain kinds of political reform, and give them in politics, as in the home, a woman's point of view. Freed from political ambition and from commercialism, they contribute to the State or city a class of voters who regard all subjects from the viewpoint of humanity and education, a valuable offset to the over-commercialized standpoint of the average man, who is apt to decide all public questions according to the interests of business alone.

A third gain to the State of Colorado, therefore, in the enfranchisement of its women is in the possession by the State of a latent moral force backed by power. The mere fact that the woman's point of view is backed by power makes that point of view prevail. On most occasions women, like men, are divided in party allegiance; but they may be roused en masse by their own leaders at especial times and for especial purposes. The mere existence of this latent tendency exercises a restraining influence upon legislation. That women have raised the standard of moral character for political candidates is undeniable. At political caucuses when a man of questionable character is suggested for nomination, the man is often turned down with the explanation, "The women won't stand for him."

Digitized by Google