

3. Claremont Rd Balls & poles  
binders - Sent Nov 8.  
Nov. 8<sup>th</sup> 1910.

Dear Miss Stacey,

ALY 856

The packets arrived on Saturday - the parcel was very dilapidated but the contents were all right.

Princess Alexandra of Teck approves of the Suffragette but cannot (as I expected) give her name as a patroness for our February performance.

Miss Thomas - is a splendid help - in Slough. She hunts up people and is most energetic. She has just found a printer there who is a suffragist and will give us special low rates.

I am sending off today for our one share in "The Common Cause" - we cannot manage more.



I enclose a notice of the last meeting  
in the Slough and Maiden  
papers.

Sincerely yours

Frederic R. Gibb.  
Hon. Sec.

Both Mr. Sweett and Miss Thomas  
are getting up parties for the  
Albert Hall next Saturday.

Mr. C. M. G. C. Shannon

The Hall.

Plough Lane,  
Parley.

with  
G.

is willing to undertake to send out  
notices - leaflets etc. She cannot  
have a meeting yet because her  
present house is too small but  
she is to move into another soon  
and then she will -

will you communicate with  
her! She is very keen - and rather  
rich.



AL/856

Nov. 5. 1910

THE SLOUGH, ETON AND WINDSOR OBSERVER, NOVEMBER 5, 1910.

OME & SO

Windsor Rd.,

Y, STRAW, AND SEE

ES.

ON FIRE, LIFE, and EMPLOYERS' L

#### VOTES FOR WOMEN.

A young and very able member of the Men's League for Women's Suffrage gave an eloquent address on Monday evening on the man's view of Women's Suffrage and the Conciliation Bill.

The meeting was held in the Grove-road School, Windsor. The hall was comfortably filled, between 50 and 60 being present.

Mrs. W. Gibbs was in the chair, and said that as hon. secretary it was her duty to give a short account of the business of the past year, October being their opening month. They had a small balance left, in spite of the fact that work was growing each year. She sketched out a programme of work for the ensuing year, which included monthly "at homes" and a Suffrage play and concert in February, the concert very kindly being arranged by Mr. Thomas Dunhill.

The speaker, Mr. Theodore Guggenheim, said that England was supposed to have representative government, but that was not the case so long as half the nation had no voice in the making of the laws. He touched on the abstract justice of the woman's claims to the vote, and then passed on to the Conciliation Bill. This Bill had been carefully drawn up by a committee, consisting of Members of Parliament, with a view of satisfying all political parties, and had succeeded so well that after two days of serious debate it passed the House by a majority of 110. This was a larger majority than Mr. Asquith had for his Government measures. It then by a large majority was referred to a Committee of the whole House, and what the Suffragists were now very moderately asking was that time should be given at the beginning of the new Session, a week perhaps, in which the House might thoroughly discuss it and to give opportunity for any amendment to be suggested.

An informal talk followed. Any anti-suffragist present were pressingly asked to speak, but none responded.

A hearty vote of thanks was proposed by Mr. Dunhill and seconded by Councillor Bressey.



# WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

AL 856

## ENTHUSIASTIC MEETING AT THE GUILDHALL.

The Vicar of Windsor (Rev. J. H. Ellison) presided on Wednesday evening at the Guildhall over a large meeting held under the auspices of the London Society for Women's Suffrage, in connection with the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies, to hear an address from Mr. Baillie-Weaver, of the above Society. Although the ladies predominated in numbers, there was a good sprinkling of the "lords of creation," but who were evidently unanimously in sympathy with the object of the gathering, "Votes for Women," judging by the fact that there were no adverse interruptions throughout the whole meeting, the arrangement of which was due to Mrs. F. Gibb, and among other ladies in the audience were Mrs. J. H. Ellison, Mrs. Tower, Mrs. Nagel, Mrs. Bernard Everett, and many others. The Chairman was supported by the Rev. Bernard Everett, the Rev. A. Lee, Aldermen E. Bampfylde and W. P. Reavell, Councillor W. Bressey, and Mr. R. Wood.

In opening the proceedings, the Chairman said that as such he supposed it was his duty to see to the proper conduct of the meeting, and especially that the views and feelings of those present should receive proper and right attention. Mr. Baillie-Weaver, who had come to address them, would propose: "That in the opinion of this meeting it is right and expedient that some form of the parliamentary franchise should be granted to women." He would point out that among those who were in favour of Women's Suffrage, different views were represented, and that the resolution had been drawn up in the form read in the hope that it might draw in all people who wished to give the vote to women without delay. There were two things on the general question he wished to say. First, that he had read a good deal of literature which Mrs. Gibb had supplied him with, and everyone must feel a debt of gratitude to her for the time and trouble she had taken in organising this meeting [applause]. He noticed the question was asked, mainly from one point of view—and it was the woman's—what are known as woman's rights? What was pointed out were the inequalities between the two sexes, and the various forms of injustice which they suffer from. That point of view appealed to a great number of people, but there were some people to whom it appealed from a different point of view, the right of the State to which they belonged to have every point of view represented in its councils [hear, hear]. All his life long he had had the privilege to work with women, and if anyone ought to speak out on the question it was the clergy who had to work with women workers. He did not know himself where [such work as he had been able to do would have been without the women workers [applause]. The point of view from which women regarded things was very often different from that of the man's view, and he believed that there was a very large number of questions, including more especially that large number of social questions coming to the front now-a-days, which must be adequately discussed, where they could get the woman's point of view as well as the man's. It was a principle recognised in family life, and on such public bodies as Education Committees and Boards of Guardians, and they asked themselves the question, how could they have got on for so many years without woman's influence? He knew that the character of committees had been changed for the better by the introduction of women. He urged that they should, in favour of trying the experiment of giving women the Parliamentary vote, say that the influence which had worked well in other departments, would work equally well when applied to Parliamentary life [applause]. They did not ask that the experiment should be tried in  
first instance woman



not ask that the experiment should be tried in a reckless way. In the first instance, woman suffrage should be tried in a limited area. The second thing he wished to say was to express his personal satisfaction, and he believed he was expressing the feeling of many persons present, that at all events for the present, what were known as the militant methods had ceased. If it had not been so, they would not have seen him in the chair and perhaps not that meeting in that hall. He knew of more than one man who would have been present but who had been alienated by the militant methods. During the whole of his working life he had been in favour of trying this experiment, and he would ask them to prevent this great cause from being handicapped by those methods which would never commend it to the sober judgment of the country [applause].

In the course of an hour and a quarter's address, Mr. Baillie-Weaver went very fully and with much detail into the question of Woman Suffrage. The question had been asked, why do women want votes? The answer was simple: because they want to be citizens, and because they were as much interested in the British Empire as men. It seemed after all very odd that they should be discussing what was a very elementary proposition of justice. Take the case of a man who possessed a vote by any sort of qualification, when he died, his wife succeeded to his position, and carried on the same responsibilities, but because she had lost her natural protector, she was deprived of a vote. That was an injustice they were going to remove if they hammered at it from now to Doomsday. Women might live in a district the whole of their lives and yet never have the vote. A woman had to pay taxes on the same basis as man, had to obey the same laws and be punished with the same penalties as man; had to earn their own living if there was no one else to do it for them; and sometimes had to keep their husbands just as men keep their wives. Women suffered more than men when their men-folk go to war, and did their part as nurses. He had not time to go through all the principal objections to woman suffrage, but the first was that there was not a majority of women in favour of the vote being granted. That was said by the Anti-Suffragist League, but as there are 13 million adult women in the country, it was a large order to say the Anti-Suffragists represented them. The truth was that the position of women in this matter was one of complete indifference, and that was where the value of the work of the Anti-Suffragists' League came in: they were widening the scope of the agitation. But assuming that there was not a majority of women in favour of the vote, what had that to do with it? The agricultural labourer was said once not to want the vote, but that proved nothing, and he had since received it. Was there any doubt that the State would be likely to suffer if women had the vote? In regard to employment, women were paid half what men are, with the result that men's wages were cut down, and would be so until women have the vote. Did anyone question the power of the vote to affect wages? Take the case of women teachers, they were paid only half what men teachers were, though their qualifications were the same. Then there was an objection to women having the vote on the ground of physical fitness; that physical force is the basis of the State, and that as women are deficient and incapable of military service, that therefore they were not entitled to full rights. He denied that physical force was the basis of the State; co-operation and consent was the basis. If a million women refused to pay their rates, and further supposing they would not earn the money to pay the rates, but throw themselves on the Poor Law Guardians, there would soon be a smash up of the whole question. He thought what people had in their minds was the administration of the law. It was said if women could not enforce the law, that they were not entitled to the full rights of citizenship. If women could have the vote they could control the Civil service. It was





THE  
**Windsor, Eton, & Slough Express**

SATURDAY, APRIL 23rd, 1910.

all that women could not form sound opinions. A man who had been in an examination room would think differently on seeing women at the top of the list and men at the bottom. But suppose it was true they were not capable of forming an opinion, since when was it demanded of men that they should be able to form a capable opinion before receiving the vote? [applause]. A man might be a drivelling idiot, but if he had a property qualification, was entitled to a vote. Then it was said women were fully represented by men. He controverted that by the Unemployed Bill, in which there was no mention made of women. There was nothing which had effected the alteration in women so much as the reception they had received from Members of Parliament, some of whom had said to them that they were not in Parliament to represent women, but had something else to do. It was said if women were given votes they would swamp the men. That could not be so, as the men were in the majority. He (the speaker) did not care about adult suffrage; he claimed the vote to which women were entitled, and there was no reason why they should be deprived of it. But women could not make terms upon which they should be given the vote. Another point against giving the vote was that woman's place is the home, but he would like to discuss whether man's place was not in the home also [laughter and applause]. Whether it was his office, factory, or workshop, he had a place and a vote for it. Well, why not leave the home alone? The Children's Bill was an interference with women's rights. Then he would like on the subject of finance, to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer if woman was not the purse-bearer in the home. Upon the question of tariff reform they were giving women one of the strongest arguments possible. The divorce court, he contended, was another argument in favour of woman suffrage.—Mr. Baillie-Weaver referred to the Australian Colonies where woman suffrage had come into force and found workable, and went on to say that with regard to militant tactics, although there was a truce at present, if there was no move before long by the Government he was confident they would be renewed, but he did not know what tactics had to do with it. He concluded by saying that the agitation for woman's vote was the outcome of man's own action, and moved the resolution.

Alderman Reavell in seconding, said as a temperance advocate, he believed if women were given the vote that the temperance cause would be greatly strengthened.

Mr. W. G. Stoneham, from the back of the hall, put some questions to the chief speaker which were answered to the satisfaction of the audience, and the resolution was then put to the vote and declared carried with four dissentients.

The Rev. B. Everett moved a vote of thanks to Mr. Baillie-Weaver for his address, which was seconded by the Rev. A. Lee, supported by Alderman Bampfylde and duly acknowledged. A vote of thanks to the Vicar for presiding, on the motion of Alderman Reavell, concluded the meeting.