

This Issue contains a full Report of the Debate on Women's Suffrage in the House of Commons, February 3rd, 1897, and the Division List.

THE WOMAN'S SIGNAL

A Weekly Record and Review devoted to the interests of Women in the Home and in the Wider World.

Edited by
MRS. FENWICK MILLER.

No. 163, VOL. VII. REGISTERED AS A NEWSPAPER. FEBRUARY 11TH, 1897. Every Thursday, ONE PENNY WEEKLY.

Principal Contents of this Issue.

Character Sketch: Mrs. Alexander, by Frederick Dolman.

Women's Suffrage Debate:

Reports of the Speeches of Mr. Faithfull Begg, Mr. Atherley-Jones, Mr. Radcliffe Cooke, Mr. Labouchere, Sir William Harcourt, Prof. Jebb, Mr. Leonard Courtney.

Signals from Our Watch Tower:

The Suffrage Debate. Character of the Opposition. Fighting as the Test for the Franchise. Text of the Bill, etc., etc.

The Division List.

Signals from Friend to Friend.

Current News.

Treasures and Troubles: A Domestic Science Story. Chapter VII. (continued).

What to Wear.

Our Open Columns:

Woman's Suffrage and the Women's Liberal Federation. Sandals. Shop Girls. &c., &c., &c.



"BELFAST HOUSE,"

Established for 131 years.

WALPOLE'S Irish Linen Sale NOW PROCEEDING.

During the past year WALPOLE BROS. have greatly increased their production, and, being anxious to keep their weavers constantly employed, have decided to sell all **Surplus Stock** during present Sale at truly striking reductions, in many cases amounting to more than 6s. 8d. in the £, or 33½ per cent. off their Printed List Prices.

Specimen Prices:

FINE IRISH HAND-LOOM DOUBLE DAMASK CLOTHS, 2 yds. square, reduced from 10s. 6d. to 6s. 11d. each.

SUPERFINE DAMASK CLOTHS, 2 yds. square, reduced from 12s. to 8s. each. Up to 8 yds. long at proportionate prices.

DINNER NAPKINS, full size, superfine quality, reduced from 22s. to 15s. per dozen.

WALPOLE'S LINEN SALE. THE RECORD TO BE BROKEN.

HEMSTITCHED ALL FLAX CAMBRIO HANDKERCHIEFS, Ladies' size, reduced to 4s. 6d., 5s. 6d., and 6s. 6d. per dozen.

LINEN SHEETS, Hemmed, for Single Beds, 9s. 6d., 11s., 15s., 22s. per pair. For Double Beds, 19s. 10d., 21s., 23s. 11d., 28s. 9d. per pair.

ALL GOODS HEMMED FREE OF CHARGE. Carriage paid to all parts of the Country on orders of £1 and upwards.

SPECIAL SALE PRICE LISTS FREE BY POST ON APPLICATION.

WALPOLE BROS. Ltd.,

Irish Linen and Damask Manufacturers,

89, New Bond Street, } LONDON, W.
(Two doors from Oxford St.) and
102, Kensington High St.

ALSO AT

45 & 47 CORPORATION ST., BIRMINGHAM.

Paris Kid, 2/11, 3/6, 3/11, 4-Button. Paris Suede, 2/11, 3/6, 3/11, 4-Button.
Chevrette, 2/11, 3/11.

Price Lists free on application.

GLOVES * GLOVES * GLOVES

Of any make fitted on previous to purchase at
J. S. GREGG'S (FIRST FLOOR), 92, New Bond St.

PLEASE CIRCULATE THIS NUMBER AMONGST YOUR FRIENDS.

Carter's Little Liver Pills

Is. 1½d. at Chemists.

Cure all Liver ills.

Exact size and shape of Package.

Cure Torpid Liver, Sallow Complexion, Bilious Headache.

BUT BE SURE THEY ARE CARTER'S.

Carter's Little Liver Pills are sometimes counterfeited. It is not enough to ask for "Little Liver Pills"; CARTER'S is the important word, and should be observed on the outside wrapper, otherwise the pills within cannot be genuine. Do not take any nameless "Little Liver Pills" that may be offered. But be sure they are CARTER'S.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Highest Award at Food and Cookery Exhibitions, London, May, 1895, and 1896. SUPPLIED TO H.M. the QUEEN and ROYAL FAMILY.

BREAD HOVIS BISCUITS

Regd.

CURE FOR INDIGESTION.

See that all Bread supplied as "HOVIS" is stamped "HOVIS," 6d. and 1s. Samples of BREAD and BISCUITS on receipt of Stamps to G. FITTON and SON, Millers, MACCLESFIELD.

HUGON'S REFINED BEEF SUET

FOR COOKING, PUDDINGS, FRYING, PASTRY &c.

ONE LB. EQUALS 2 LBS. RAW SUET.

8d. PER POUND

ATORA BRAND

THE MOST NUTRITIOUS COCOA

EPPS'S COCOA

GRATEFUL—COMFORTING.

WITH FULL NATURAL FLAVOUR.

Miss SADLER,

High-Class Corsetière,

SPECIALITY: ABDOMINAL CORSET

"One of the most popular Corsetières of the present day is Miss SADLER, of 211, Oxford Street. She thoroughly studies the peculiarities of each individual figure, but is specially successful with ladies who are inclined to be stout."—*Sunday Times*, May 3rd, 1896.

211, OXFORD STREET.

MISCELLANEOUS.

THE PERFECT FIFTH, the finest Violin, Violon and Cello string existing; new speciality supplied only to consumers direct from manufacturer. Used by the greatest artists, by members of Dresden Royal Opera Orchestra, and cannot be procured from any other source. First-class references. Every order sent post free.—R. Harcourt, 15, Ostbahn Strasse, Dresden, Saxony.

INSTITUTIONS, EDUCATIONAL, APARTMENTS, SITUATIONS VACANT AND WANTED, and Similar Matter.

15 words for 1s., each 10 Additional Words, 6d. Four insertions for the price of Three. ADVERTISEMENTS must be prepaid and sent to the Office, 80, Maiden Lane, Covent Garden, London, W.C.

HOTELS, HYDROS, &c.

THE DEVONSHIRE HOUSE TEMPERANCE HOTEL, 12, Bishopsgate Street Without, London, E.C. This First-Class Temperance Hotel is centrally situated for business or pleasure in the heart of the City. Telephone No. 2495. Telegraphic Address, "Exterior, London." H. G. CHALKLEY & SONS, PROPRIETORS.

I.O.G.T. "A Home from Home." L.O.R. TEMPERANCE FAMILY & COMMERCIAL HOTEL, 133 to 137, STAMFORD STREET, E.C. (Close to Waterloo Station, South Western Railway). VISITORS TO LONDON will find the above very convenient, being within five minutes' walk of Rail, Tram, Bus, and Boat, for all parts of the Metropolis. Single Beds, 1s. 6d.; Double Beds, 2s. 6d. Meals at correspondingly low prices. Special terms for parties of three or more; also for rooms taken by the week. No charge for attendance. J. WOOLLACOTT, Proprietor.

EDUCATIONAL

BOARDING SCHOOL & KINDERGARTEN COLLEGE, THE FOSSE, LEICESTER. Principal ... Miss MORGAN. Preparation for usual examinations, Froebel Union Certificates, &c. Inclusive Terms, 30 Guineas per annum. Comfortable Home for Children whose parents reside abroad. Reference permitted to the Mayor of Leicester, J. HERBERT MARSHALL, Esq., J.P.

Dr. Mary J. Hall-Williams (M.D., Boston) Will Lecture to Ladies at the WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL UNION, 405, Oxford Street, W. (entrance in Thomas Street), on the first Wednesday of each month, at 4 p.m. Silver Collection taken. Lectures, February 3rd, March 3rd, April 7th, May 5th and June 2nd.

NEW CROSS HYGIENIC HOME AND SCHOOL OF PHYSICAL CULTURE.

Under the Care of Miss RHODA ANSTEE, New Cross, South Petherton, Somerset. For delicate Girls and Ladies. To strengthen and restore to health by means of Gymnastics, Swedish Medical Movements and Massage, Pure Air, Pure Food, Out-door Occupations, &c. Specially recommended for the Cure of Spinal Curvature, Flat Chest and Round Shoulders, Anæmia, Dyspepsia, and many Nervous Affections. Apply for Particulars.

APARTMENTS REQUIRED.

A GENTLEMAN and his wife require, within 25 miles of London (Surrey preferred), two furnished rooms (sitting and bedroom), with board. Private family, with no other lodgers, preferred. Write, stating terms to B. D., Box 398, Willings, 125, Strand, London.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

A BOOK FOR LADIES.

The information contained in this book ought to be known by every Married Woman, and it will not harm the unmarried to read. No book is written which goes so thoroughly into matters relating to married women. Some may think too much is told; such can scarcely be the case, for knowledge is power and the means of attaining happiness. The book can be had in envelope from Dr. ALLANSON, Box Z, Spanish Place, Manchester Square, London, W., in return for a Postal Order for 1s. 2d.

JUST PUBLISHED. DISEASES OF CHILDREN. By DR. ALICE VICKERY. Price 1/-

HENRY RENSCHAW, 356, Strand, W.C.

Don't Cough—use

They at once check the Cough and remove the cause.

The Unrivalled

One Lozenge alone relieves. Sold everywhere, Tins 13d. each.

Keatings' Lozenges

THE WOMAN'S SIGNAL

A WEEKLY RECORD AND REVIEW FOR LADIES.

VOL. VII., No. 163.]

FEBRUARY 11, 1897.

One Penny Weekly.

Character Sketch.

MRS. ALEXANDER.

By FREDERICK DOLMAN.

The authoress of "The Wooing O't" is known to her readers as Mrs. Alexander, and to her friends as Mrs. Hector. These two heroic names both belonged to her late husband, "Hector" being his surname and "Alexander" his Christian name, and the circumstances under which she came to put the latter on her title pages, as they were once related to me by the authoress of "The Wooing O't" are worth recalling. A year or so before her husband's death Mrs. Alexander wrote her first novel, called it "Which Shall It Be?" and sent it to Bentley's. But she feared what her husband, a man of old-fashioned, conservative principles, would say, so published it anonymously, and never mustered up enough courage to tell him that she had written the novel. It was not until after Mr. Hector's death, and when "The Wooing O't" had made a success, that she ventured to put a name to the book, and then, instead of the surname, she resolved to use her husband's Christian name.

Mrs. Alexander's maiden name was Annie Malone, and the first nineteen years of her life were spent in Dublin. Her family belonged to the dominant party in Church and Government, and she was brought up strictly in accordance with the evangelical tenets of the Church of Ireland. But although Mrs. Alexander's family belonged to the extreme "Orange" faction, she has outlived all its prejudices, and now has no pronounced opinions one way or another. She sees good and evil in both parties; this Laodicean temperament is characteristic of Mrs. Alexander.

"I believe!" this is the only confession of faith she will ever make to you, "that one should do earnestly the thing that lies nearest to one, and leave the rest to God."

In Dublin forty or fifty years ago there was not such an institution as a girls' college. Of her own education by a visiting governess she retained such an unfavourable impression that when she had daughters of her own she took care to send them out to good schools in England and on the Continent.

"Such a thing as sending a girl to school would never have occurred to my parents," Mrs. Alexander once remarked to me, "but I am convinced that it is best for girls to learn in classes; they obtain the incentive of competition and the healthful influence of contact with other minds."

As a girl in her early teens, Mrs. Alexander used to write plays and send them to theatrical managers. They told her that her ideas were good, but that she had no stage construction, one well-known actress saying that her play was like a beautiful house without a staircase. And no wonder? There was—as there is still, I believe—only one theatre in Dublin, and even to that she was never taken. She got all her knowledge of the drama from reading. On coming to London, in the few years that elapsed

before her marriage, she wrote many short sketches and stories which were published by Dickens in *Household Words*.

Mrs. Alexander's drawing-room, with its polished floor, numerous rugs, and easy chairs, does not differ very much from those of her neighbours in Portsdown-road, Maida Vale. A grand piano stands in the centre of the room, and on one side are two long shelves of books, a glance at which satisfies one that her reading has gone far and wide beyond the sphere of literature to which her own writing is confined. The study in which she writes the books that have so much charm for girl readers is much more interesting to Mrs. Alexander's visitor. The desk at which she writes fills a large recess between the fireplace and the broad bay window. The novelist spends several hours there every morning, except when she is away from home, which is seldom for a longer period than a fortnight, as she dislikes long holidays. A few years ago a slight accident led to a serious injury to her foot, and from this Mrs. Alexander has never quite recovered. Her partial lameness has somewhat restricted her social activity, but she still finds and gives much pleasure in a small circle of friends. Mrs. Alexander has never cared much for society with a capital S. "I remember," she once said to me, "that I put myself completely into 'Which shall it be.' That contempt for the very rich, which shows itself in the book, I remember how heartily I felt it at the time. My husband was then in possession of a large fortune, and I remember how my spirit rebelled against the people we used to meet at dinner, and longed for something of the freedom and talent of Bohemia." Nowadays, however, Mrs. Alexander doubtless takes a rather different view of things. Sitting negligently in an easy chair, her motherly face full of smiling humour and twinkling fun, you find her the picture of content, having the manner of one to whom life had had all the compensation Emerson's philosophy claimed for it.

Mrs. Alexander has lived much abroad in France and Germany, chiefly for the sake of the education of her three daughters, and her Continental experience has greatly strengthened the liberal views she has always been disposed to entertain regarding her own sex. She considers that women on the Continent are practically in the same position as English women were a generation ago, and between that time and the present Mrs. Alexander considers that the comparison is all in favour of the present. Let me recall a conversation I had with her some time ago on this subject.

"For many years," said Mrs. Alexander, "as a novelist I've almost unconsciously given much observation and thought to the character of girlhood. On the other hand, I can remember with perfect clearness my own girlhood, and my deliberate judgment is that there has been a great improvement; in all the more essential things the girls of to-day have much the best of the comparison. If there is any loss it is in manners."

"In manners?"

"Yes; they have not, perhaps, the same softness, meekness, submissiveness—call it what you will—which in my girlhood the young always showed towards their elders. I have sometimes missed this myself. But how much more important is the gain in independence, self-reliance, individuality? Intellectually, the modern girl has a strength quite unknown to the girl of forty years ago, and with strength there is purity. Girls were then much more given to silly talk simply because they had nothing better to occupy their minds. The hardness I have just spoken of, too, is really only superficial; some girls assume it because it is considered to be the mark of an intellectual temperament. There is always affectation, but the affectation corrects itself. In my young days, girls affected ignorance of matters of common knowledge, because ignorance was thought necessary to innocence, and cultivated an affectation of helplessness as being necessary to elegance."

"Like Lydia Languish, for example."

"Well, the Lydia Languish period was rather earlier, but in my recollection the ideal of girlhood was not much better. Why, look at the faces in old pictures of women. In those of some of the great ladies there is beauty and elegance, it is true, but as a rule nothing can be more rapid, vacant, expressionless, indicating only too plainly subservience and helplessness. Then it was terrible that marriage should have been regarded as woman's only profession; only too many women had their lives spoiled because they had to marry for a living. Happily this is being altered, and it is a splendid thing that girls should be able to approach the question of marriage with independence, thanks to their better training and education."

Having regard to this expression of opinion it may be of interest to add that two of Mrs. Alexander's daughters are happily married; the third, Ida, was for some time private secretary to Mr. Rider Haggard. She has done a good deal of translation from the French, and has also some skill as a water-colour artist.

Although she has written so charmingly herself of girl-life, Mrs. Alexander is inclined to tire of heroines of "sweet seventeen." "But the public," she plaintively exclaims, "will have them. But what can the girl of that age know about life? She has feelings, but no opinions. I can well believe that the novel of the future will begin after marriage. Not, of course, in the French way, with a lover; but the deep interest of married life, the abiding importance of the duty of mother to child, will be recognised in fiction. If we only knew, there are but very few marriages of ideal happiness; in the best there are great trials and crises."

In concluding this brief character sketch of a woman who is all that her books would proclaim her to be, I must not altogether ignore the sense of humour, which makes itself as delightfully felt in her talk as in her writing. Two of her many "good stories" with which she can

brighten her dinner-table still linger in my memory. "I remember overhearing the cook in our house in Dublin soundly rate the confectioner's boy for bringing the pastry late. There was a difference of opinion about the time, when suddenly the church clock struck. 'Sure ye can't be right,' he exclaimed, 'if the church is wrong.'"

When the Pro-Cathedral at Kensington was being built Mr. Spurgeon happened to pass. He inquired of one of the workmen what was the building in course of erection. "A Catholic cathedral," replied the man, who was Irish. "Ah, I am very sorry to hear it," said Mr. Spurgeon, earnestly. "So is the devil, sir," promptly replied the man.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE. THE BILL IN PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, FEB. 3RD.

MR. FAITHFULL BEGG (Glasgow, St. Rollox), in rising to move the second reading of this Bill, said the question of the extension of the franchise to women was in no sense a party one. He had no desire that it should be dragged into the arena of party controversy, and he did not think the interests of those whose cause he was pleading would be furthered should such an event occur. He asserted, however, that, in his opinion, it would be a lasting credit to any party in the country which should undertake a measure embodying the principle which was embodied in the Bill. (Hear, hear.) The Bill was intended merely to establish the principle of the extension of the Parliamentary franchise to women. The Bill contained the irreducible *minimum* which should be granted by the House in the matter, if the franchise were granted to women at all. It was calculated that the Bill would enfranchise about 500,000 women. It had been said by the right hon. member for the Forest of Dean that it was not certain, from the phraseology of the Bill, whether it included married women or not. That point, however, could be settled afterwards when the details of the measure were considered; but, for his own part, he approved the inclusion of married women, and he did so because a series of recent Acts had given wives the control of their own earnings, the control of property that accrued to them as next-of-kin, and the right to hold property secured to them by bequest. That being so, surely married women should have a right to vote in connection with the management of that property. (Hear, hear.) It had been also said that the Bill would further complicate the existing Parliamentary franchise, but he hoped rather that it would tend to simplify it. Even illiterate persons were allowed to vote. No fewer than 73,000 illiterates voted in the last election, and it was not a credit to civilisation that, in such circumstances, intelligent women should be debarred from exercising the privilege. As to the qualifications of women to vote, he would point out that women were regarded as capable of holding property and paying taxes upon it, and it was a principle of the Constitution that taxation and representation should go together. (Hear, hear.) They had the power of voting in county council, town council, and School Board elections; they had been appointed on Royal Commissions, and from time to time had been called as witnesses in Parliamentary inquiries. Moreover, in recent years they had been granted educational facilities, through which they had distinguished themselves in many walks of life. (Cheers.) Nearly 500 women had already taken the B.A. degree at the London University, nearly 400 had passed tripos examinations at Cambridge, and nearly 300 had passed with honours at Oxford. (Cheers.) The criminal statistics of the country showed that women were more law-abiding citizens than men, for while 8,426 men were convicted last year at assizes and quarter sessions, only 1,267 women were convicted. (Hear, hear.) They were told that women did not understand politics. Did

all men understand them? (Laughter.) He denied that women were less capable of understanding difficult questions than men, but, even if they were, that would be no valid reason for excluding them from the franchise. But women had special interests of their own to protect, and they should have the means of giving effect to their opinions in regard to them in the only constitutional manner—namely, by voting for the election of members to that House. (Hear, hear.) There was a strong public opinion in this country in favour of the measure, and the experience they had gained of the working of Women's Suffrage in New Zealand and South Australia was most hopeful and encouraging. He was quite aware that there was a strong opposition in that House to the proposal. He was to be wounded in this matter in the house of his friends, for the rejection of the measure was to be moved by the hon. member for Hereford. The rejection was to be seconded by the hon. member for Northampton. He always understood that the hon. gentleman's mission in life was to break down privilege and to remedy injustice; yet here they found him an advocate of exclusiveness and the perpetrator of inequality. ("Hear, hear," and laughter.) He believed himself that the hon. member had in his mind a certain political institution in this country which, if he might say so, was his pet aversion—that great organisation, the Primrose League—and that he believed, if women were enfranchised in this country, their votes would be cast exclusively in support of Tory candidates. If that were so, and the hon. member did not dissent from it—

Mr. Labouchere (Northampton): I do dissent.

Mr. Faithfull Begg said that, however that might be, the argument was largely used in the country that the effect of the enfranchisement of women would be to bring a great reinforcement into the ranks of either one or the other parties in the State. In his opinion that was a most unworthy argument. (Hear, hear.) That was the very last consideration which should be advanced in connection with a matter of this kind. He was not aware that when they had to consider the granting of an extension of the franchise they had ever considered the particular direction in which the votes would be cast. (Cries of "Oh.") If they had done so he hoped they would never do so in the future. (Hear, hear.) Such an argument and such a consideration as that was pure and unadulterated Krugerism. (Laughter and cheers.) His general position was that there was no valid argument against the principle of this Bill. Arguments there might be, born of prejudice or of sentiment, but there was no logical, valid, or just argument against the position which he took up in this matter. He had had the greatest possible pleasure in bringing this matter before the House, and he appealed to all hon. members to cast themselves loose from any remnants of prejudice or sentiment, and recognise the inherent justice of the claim which was now being made once more in constitutional form in that House, and the recognition of which would tend to broaden, strengthen, and improve the basis upon which their representative system rested. (Cheers.) He begged to move the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. Atherley-Jones (Durham, N.W.), in seconding the motion, complimented the mover on the excellence of his maiden speech. The question, he said, of Women's Suffrage was one which in the last few years had made the most substantial progress in the opinions of the people of this country. (Hear, hear.) He did not deny that they might still be confronted with the ridicule which in times past was the usual way with which this question was approached by those opposed to it, but, on the whole, the subject had passed from the stage of ridicule to the intelligible ground of practical politics. The promoters of the Bill were initiating the principle of Woman Suffrage, leaving the questions of the scope and extent of the qualification to be dealt with by the House on the Committee and report stage of the measure. There were certain grotesque arguments still surviving against the enfranchisement of women. One of these was the argument that because women were not likely and could not be called upon to use arms in

defence of their country they ought not to be entrusted with the franchise. He should like to ask how many people who were responsible for involving this country in war were ever likely to bear arms in its defence. (Hear, hear.) They in that and in the other House were the persons who in a large measure were responsible for initiating that movement of popular opinion which might produce war, and yet he ventured to say that, with the exception of certain hon. and gallant gentlemen, there was hardly a solitary man in the House who would bear arms. He had no doubt that both the hon. member for Hereford and the hon. member for Northampton, who would not even, either of them, take the position of a drummer boy in the Army—(laughter)—would rise up in their places and say it was unjust and unreasonable to enfranchise people not capable of bearing arms in the defence of their country. If women were not able to take up arms, they bore the responsibilities and disadvantages of war, and the argument against their enfranchisement on this head was not one which could be sustained before any enlightened assembly. (Hear, hear.) It would no doubt be said that women were indifferent and did not care for the exercise of the franchise. But had the working classes of this country ever demonstrated with any remarkable ardour for the exercise of the franchise? (Cries of "Yes.") For centuries the working classes of this country acquiesced in their exclusion from the franchise. There was intermittent agitation raised by the enthusiasm of political leaders, but it was matter of common reproach at the time of the extension of the franchise, in 1867 and again in 1885, that the working classes were to a lamentable degree oblivious of the responsibility that devolved upon them with the franchise, and it was rather due to the exigencies of political parties than to any solid and persistent demand from the working classes that the franchise was extended. Women had not the same opportunities of making their views known as in the nature of things were conceded to men, and it was contrary to the nature of women to take part in those formidable demonstrations such as from time to time marked the activity of political enthusiasm among men. Yet there were not wanting many indications that among the sex generally the feeling was strongly in favour of the extension. Women of distinction had given expression to that view, and evidence of petitions was abundant in the same direction. The argument of undue and indirect influence would no doubt be advanced *ad nauseam*, but whence would the influence come? From the Church? But, were not the ministers of the various religious denominations fit and proper persons to exercise their advising influence, and would not the variety of opinion among the denominations provide check and counter-check? Again, the male influence that might legitimately be exercised would operate equally from all political parties and schools of thought. But these were merely speculative arguments. The working classes exercised the franchise with a full sense of responsibility, and it was unworthy the serious discussion of this great cause that the argument should be advanced that women would not as honestly, conscientiously, and intelligently discharge the trust conferred upon them. (Hear, hear.) Another familiar argument was that women would be degraded by being brought into the turmoil and dust of party strife. Was this an argument that should lie in the mouths of hon. gentlemen who were only too glad to avail themselves of the assistance women could render at the time of elections. Had not the hon. member for Hereford had such assistance? Did not the hon. member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) sometimes lean for support on Liberal women? His hon. friend repudiated the suggestion, but certainly among the ladies of Northampton he had hearty and sympathetic support. Members did avail themselves of the assistance of women in political organisation, and they dragged their wives through all the weary, dreary process of election from platform to platform to listen to their husbands' insipid oratory. There was no force in that argument. Already women were allowed to vote in local

elections, and they were allowed to take part in administration by local authorities. There were over two million women in this country employed in factories, and the influence of trade unions had been used to prevent the extension of the labour of women. Trade union bodies had continually hampered the attempts of women to freely sell their services in whatever direction they pleased. There were great and formidable questions in which women were interested affecting their home surroundings. To a large mass of men home was a mere hotel where they slept at night. Was it not of urgent and vital importance, in the interests of sanitation, that women passing much of their lives in factories and workshops should have power to bring direct pressure to bear on Parliament to enable them to work under better conditions? Were the questions of the education and the employment of children of no moment to women? They had a better knowledge of the wants and interests of children than men, with their limited opportunities, possessed. A great lever for dealing with the temperance question would be the enfranchisement of women. If women possessed the franchise an honest effort would be made, and he believed, would be crowned with success, if not to remove, at least to mitigate, the horrible evils which resulted from our unhappy social system. The number of women who would be enfranchised if the Bill passed would be comparatively small. It was his firm conviction that by admitting women to the franchise the House would do much to upraise morally, intellectually, and politically, the condition of women in this country, and to make woman what to a large extent she was not at present—a more fitting companion, comrade, and partner for man. (Cheers.)

Mr. Radcliffe Cooke (Hereford), in moving the rejection of the Bill, said he did so on two grounds—1, that there was no demand for it, and 2, that if there were a demand it would be unjust to pass it. It was suggested that we should follow the example of New Zealand and New South Wales. Children generally followed the example of the parent, not the parent that of the children. The only answer was to be given simply in two words—*flat experimentum*. When a civilised nation began to grant the franchise to women it might be time for the most civilised nation in the world (an Opposition member "question") to follow their example. Women had Parliamentary votes in Wyoming, a wild part of America, and they formerly had them in Washington. There were about 44 States in America. Only the smallest and most remote had adopted Women's Suffrage. None of the States close by which had seen the operation of the system, followed their example. This was considerable reason why we should hesitate and see what they were going to do in the matter. Before proceeding further he would like, with the permission of the House, to make a few respectful comments on the attitude assumed by some Members of Parliament on this question. Sometimes they called themselves wobblers and sometimes waverers; but he would not weary the House with particular instances, though he would mention in passing one hon. member who, when he asked him if he was going to vote for the Bill, said "Yes, to please my mother." (Laughter.) There were also a large number who said they would vote for the Bill, but hoped it would not pass, or would vote for it because they had a number of women bothering them to do so. (Laughter.) He had also a very good instance which would give rise to no little surprise if he ventured to mention the name of the hon. member. (A hon. member—"Name.") No, he was not going to give him away. (Laughter.) He was not going to expose him to the tender mercies of the women he had deluded and deceived. (Laughter.) What did that hon. member tell him only last Thursday as ever was when he met him in the lobby? The hon. member was in the House now. (Laughter.) He said to him, "Are you an advocate of Women's Suffrage?" He replied, "Oh, yes, yes." Then he looked very solemn, cast his eyes up to the ceiling, smote thrice upon his breast, assumed the attitude of the penitent publican, and said "But in our inmost

soul"—and then he smote his breast again so as to leave no doubt where he kept his soul—(laughter)—"in our inmost soul we dislike this measure. We are the victims of pertinacity. We are the victims of the importunate widow." (Laughter.) He would not say on which side of the House that hon. member was. He thought it was very dishonourable on the part of hon. members to deceive the ladies by telling them they would vote for this measure, though they did not want it. The hon. member then proceeded to deal with the societies established for the promotion of this cause, and said that the Parliamentary Committee appeared to have originated at Congleton, in Cheshire. It did not flourish there, and was brought up to London, and it consisted for some time of Miss Cousins, the secretary, and her mother. There were no office, no officials, and no money. Now, however, there was an imposing list of officials, headed by their old friend, Sir R. Temple, whom he regretted not to see in the House. Its financial condition, which he thought was, after all, the great test of the vitality of the society, was this. The subscriptions amounted to £15 1s. 6d., but the expenditure came to £26 1s. 9d. However, there was a balance of £12 in hand. He had asked Miss Cousins how that was made up, and she said it was no use trying to get subscriptions, so that they had a ball at Kensington Town Hall (laughter), by which they raised £40. The Manchester society was the earliest founded of any. It was founded in the year 1867. He would point to the condition of that society. Manchester was a city of 530,000 inhabitants. There were in that society about 160 subscribing members all told, and many of them did not reside in Manchester. Roughly speaking, they were in the proportion of one to every 3,500 of the inhabitants. The society was in debt to the extent of £70. It was remarkable in a locality where there must be a great number of women of property, who, if the great number of women were correct, must be supporters of the Bill were correct, must be pining for the Suffrage, that some of them did not at once wipe off this deficit and that others did not plank down their thousands in order to put the society in a position of permanent financial security. There were two branches of the society at Rochdale and Gorton. In the former place the total receipts for the year amounted to £4 9s. 3d., and the expenditure to £4 15s. 4d., leaving a debit balance of 6s. 1d. At Gorton the total income of the year amounted to 12s. only. Turning to Leeds, he found that there the number of members of the society in 1895 was 113, the population being 402,500. The annual receipts amounted to £7 6s. 4d., and the expenditure to £4 14s. 10d., leaving the society with the magnificent cash balance of £2 11s. 5d. In London, taking the members of both the principal societies as printed in their reports, and including many whose names appeared in both lists and making no deduction for many who lived away from London, he calculated that the proportion of members to population was one to every half-million. The natural and obvious inference to be drawn from these facts and figures was that there was no general demand in the country for the extension of the franchise, seeing that the interest taken in the movement was so trifling. The hon. member read extracts from the reports of the Women's Association containing references by Mrs. Fawcett and other ladies to the condition and lack of success of the movement, and he also showed the methods of propaganda adopted by holding drawing rooms and importing barristers and others as speakers.

Sir W. Lawson (Cumberland, Cockermouth).—Is the hon. member speaking to the question before the House?

The Speaker: The hon. member is within the limits of order, but he is somewhat discursive.

Mr. Radcliffe Cooke said he was supporting the argument that there was no sufficient demand for the Suffrage among women themselves, and that the movement was fostered by a "stage army," composed of ladies, which was sent about the country. The hon. member was again referring by name to Mrs. Fawcett, Miss Becker, Miss Tod and others, when

Mr. W. Johnston (Belfast, S.) said: Is it right that all the names of these ladies should be dragged into this controversy? (Cheers.)

The Speaker: That is not a question of order.

Mr. W. Johnston: It is very bad taste then. (Cheers.)

Mr. Radcliffe Cooke maintained that to mention the names and the manner in which the meetings were organised was not bad taste, but good argument. The hon. member went on to make some general reflections on the nature of the franchise, and was illustrating the theme with much amplitude of detail, when

Attention was called to the fact that there were not 40 members present. After the usual interval a quorum was found present, and the attempt to count out the House failed.

Mr. Radcliffe Cooke resumed his speech in the same strain as before, and at length.

The Speaker, interposing, called upon the hon. member to address himself more directly to the question. (Cheers.)

Mr. Radcliffe Cooke: Oh! He must, he continued, have egregiously failed to make himself clear. His argument was that all the material framework of society, all that enabled this country to be a social and civilised community was made and executed by man, and that as man made and maintained it, so he ought to govern it. Looking around them as they walked the streets, and observing how the standard of height among women had risen as compared with men, they might possibly expect the time when the equality of women and men would be physically and, as regards height, an established fact, or possibly, as was the case in certain families of birds, the female would become ultimately bigger than the male, and then men would have to take a back seat. But until this physical alteration should take effect he would be a convinced opponent of this measure, and would record his vote against it.

Mr. Labouchere (Northampton), said that what surprised him was that any Scotchman should have put his name on the back of this Bill, because he remembered that one of the works of John Knox was "The Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regimen of Women." (Laughter.) This question was first submitted to the House 30 years ago by Mr. John Stuart Mill, and on that occasion about 50 members voted for it. He was perfectly certain that, with the exception of Mr. Mill, there was not one of those 50 members who took the thing seriously. He himself had been one of those 50 members, but he had looked upon it as a joke, and it was because he might have done evil on that occasion that he had shown his repentance by doing what he could ever since to prevent women having votes. (Laughter.) It had been said that this was a woman's question, but it was also a man's question. As a man he objected to petticoat government, and he also objected on behalf of the vast majority of women, who clearly recognised that they were not fitted to govern in that House and did not wish to. (Cries of "Oh.") He gathered that the hon. member did not intend to proceed with the Bill. (Mr. Faithfull Begg.—I made no such statement.) Did the hon. member intend to proceed with this Bill to the third reading? (Mr. Faithfull Begg.—Yes.) The hon. member had told them that this Bill was one of the subjects which he could not understand, and that the phraseology of the Bill might be bad, but that he did not trouble himself with the cobwebs of phraseology. He could not help thinking that a lady must have drawn up this Bill.

Mr. Faithfull Begg said he was entirely responsible for the phraseology of the Bill.

Mr. Labouchere said the hon. member had at all events told them that he did not understand it. There was a certain amount of ingenious cunning in its wording. As far as he could see, and he had taken the opinion of eminent lawyers on the subject, the Bill would not give married women votes, although it was intended by it to give married women votes. The Bill, moreover, did not say what were to be the conditions of registration. A man could not be put upon the register if he were an alien, a lunatic, an idiot—or a peer (laughter); but by this remarkable Bill idiot, alien, or lunatic

women, and peeress in their own right, were to have a vote. (Laughter.)

Mr. Faithfull Begg thought the phraseology of the Bill was perfectly clear; the object was to attach to women the same disability as attached to men.

Mr. Labouchere argued that the words would not bear that construction. The male voter was subject to the incapacity he had pointed out, but the Bill distinctly said that a woman was not to be. ("Oh, oh.") Well, grammar was the same whether it applied to men or women. So far as he could see the only women who would be enfranchised by this Bill would be widows and spinsters who lived alone and had some little shop. It was a thorough property qualification Bill, and, therefore, he should be surprised if many hon. gentlemen on his own side voted for it. They had heard of the two million toiling women, but they were not the persons who would be enfranchised, so that the very class of women for whose sake hon. friends of his had advocated female Suffrage would not be benefited by this measure. Very possibly his argument did not affect hon. gentlemen on the other side. He had been very glad to notice on the other side in the present House of Commons so many young women—so many young men. (Laughter.) If he ignored their initial error in being Conservatives he had found them manly and independent in the views they expressed, and he wished to address a few remarks to them. His right hon. friend the member for the Forest of Dean had brought in a Bill which provided that every man and woman of full age, whether married or single, should be qualified to vote at Parliamentary or local elections unless disqualified for reasons other than sex or marriage, by common law Act of Parliament. The Bill further provided that no person should be disqualified by sex or marriage from being elected or being a member of either House of Parliament. If they did away with the barrier of sex, logically they must give the vote to every woman. (Ministerial cheers.) What would be the consequence?

What would be the consequences, for instance, with regard to electioneering? He did not know whether it would elevate elections or not, but he did know that it would make the life of a candidate absolutely intolerable. He trembled to think of the "heckling" which every candidate would receive from the ladies, and they knew what a woman was—she never could understand a plain answer to a plain question. (Laughter.) He had always observed that women were incapable of arguing. If you proved to a woman that she was wrong, she always repeated in almost the same words her previous proposition. (Laughter.) He received a letter that morning from a lady who was one of the leading members of the Liberal Women's Federation, who had recently founded a Liberal association in some town or another, and at the meeting a lady got up and said, "No one should be allowed to vote whose character does not bear the strictest investigation." (Loud laughter.) They knew what ladies were when they were investigating character, and he would ask what sort of a vigilance committee would be required if the moral character of every candidate and every voter was to be scrutinised. (Laughter.) That was the kind of thing they would be subjected to if women ruled the roost. And if the barrier were once broken down all women would have a vote, and would be in a majority. And if women were electors they would take care that they were elected as well. What would happen? That august assembly would be a sort of episcopic club, where men and women would meet to discuss matters. (Laughter.) Then women would claim to be on the Executive, and as there was a Lord of the Admiralty, there might be a Lady of the Admiralty. (Laughter.) They would have ladies and gentlemen mixed up—one lady, one gentleman—(laughter)—and when they got to that point, even the highest seat in the assembly would not be safe—it was possible that they might have a Speakeress. (Laughter.) Even if they did not have that he did not envy any successor of Mr. Speaker if he had to sit in that chair and keep order amongst a body of ladies. (Laughter.)

LADY WHIPS.

He took it that the Whips would be ladies, and if so he knew this—that if they would allow him to choose the Whips he did not know anything he would not be able to pass through that House. (Cheers and laughter.) It was a most dangerous and fatal possibility that the Whips should have all the blandishments and wiles of the other sex at command. The House had had an earnest of what might come the previous day, when the lobbies were full of ladies. He fled. (Laughter.) He did not pretend to be a St. Anthony. (Loud laughter.) He had seen in all corners of the lobbies ladies buttonholing gentlemen—beautiful and youthful ladies, too—and he really believed that a considerable number of the votes given that day would be due to the urgency of the demands made by the ladies.

Mr. MacNeill: Hear, hear!

Mr. Labouchere: Well, his hon. friend was a ladies' man. (Loud laughter.) Some thought that ladies would all vote for one party. He did not put the matter forward on that ground. A French King had said, "Often women vary; only a fool trusts them," and he thought that both sides would find that to be the case. (Hear, hear.) The case of the New Zealand Parliament had been referred to. Well, this was the Mother of Parliaments, and he was not going to be taught to suck eggs by the New Zealand Parliament. (Loud laughter.) If hon. gentlemen were going to vote for a measure that any New Zealander or South or West Australian might consider desirable for his country, were they prepared to vote in favour of all the legislation passed by these Parliaments? (Hear, hear.) They had been told that women had votes at municipal elections. Well, he was sorry they had, for he knew when they got them they would use the fact as an argument to get the parliamentary vote. He had no objection to them sitting on boards of guardians and school boards, because these bodies had domestic questions relating to women and children, which he thought women were well fitted to decide upon. But to say that there was no difference between these local bodies and that august assembly was an absurdity. (Hear, hear.) He had come across a good many women in his time, and he had not found among them anxiety to get the Suffrage. In fact, he did not believe that one woman in a hundred was in the least desirous of having a vote. (Cheers.)

"DO YOU BELIEVE IN LOVE?"

During the last Northampton election women went about the town and placarded the walls against him. He said to the working men, "You see these women, what do you think their husbands are doing? Nursing the babies, washing the babies' dirty clothes, cleaning the house, and cooking the dinner?" (Laughter.) Do you as practical men want your "missuses" to go about the country while you undertake these domestic duties?" They said, "No, we do not." "Very well," he replied, "then don't have anything to do with them," and they said, "We won't"—(laughter)—and he did not believe he lost a single vote owing to the action of these ladies, notwithstanding the fact that there were candidates of both parties who were prepared to give the suffrage to women. (Hear, hear.) To show the absurd sort of talk that these ladies indulged in, he would mention that a young and beautiful woman asked him if he was against Women's Suffrage, and on his replying "Yes," she said, "Do you believe in love?" (Loud laughter.) He replied that he did in moderation. (Renewed laughter.) And he added that he was surprised that so charming a young lady had not already succumbed to the wishes of some man who wanted to marry her. (Laughter.) She said, "I might have done it—a baronet wanted to marry me, but I did not care for him." He said, "Now, look here, I am a good deal older than you are, and if you take my advice you will go and get a baronet for yourself instead of fishing for votes for other people." (Loud laughter.) It had been said that they opposed Women's Suffrage on sentimental grounds. He thought that the sentiment was on the other side. An hon. friend of his who asked him if he was going

to vote against the Bill—no his saying that he was—said, "Have you a mother?" (Laughter.) He frankly confessed that he had had a mother. (Laughter.) He was sure, however, that his mother never wanted a vote, and that if she were alive now she would be opposed to any such proposal. (Hear, hear.)

This was the sort of silly talk which did duty for argument on the part of the female suffragists—(hear, hear)—and he could not help thinking that the men who were so anxious to put the country under petticoat government were generally under petticoat government themselves—(laughter and cheers)—though at the same time he did not doubt that there were gentlemen in favour of it entirely on its merits. His right hon. friend (Mr. Courtney) was certainly one of these, for he had never known his right hon. friend to be influenced by anybody. (Laughter.) Then there was the ground of argument and justice. "Are we to allow people to be taxed and not represented?" it was asked. All he could say was that by this Bill they were, for there was such a thing as indirect taxation, and only a very few women would be enfranchised by this Bill. They must remember that justice was based on common-sense—they must remember that nature had made a distinction between men and women, and no Act of Parliament would alter that distinction. Parliament could give them rights, but they would remain essentially women with the rights of men. Woman had her province, as they knew, and he would leave her to it. (Hear, hear.)

MEN HAD TO FIGHT.

If the country were invaded, it was the duty of every man who was sound in limb to fight for his native land. It was impossible to argue that women could fulfil the duty of citizenship unless they went back to the reign of Amazons, and no one suggested that. Then, again, women could not be policemen. (Laughter.) Intellectually, women had not those gifts which fitted them for electors. They were cute, and had a certain amount of what he would call instinct rather than reason, but they were impressive and emotional. (Cries of "Oh.") They had absolutely no sense of proportion—(cries of "Oh")—they would fall under the influence of the Church, and he had always considered that there should be a line of distinction drawn between political and religious matters. The Church should exercise its influence over its flock in religious matters, but should not have one atom of influence in politics. (Hear, hear.) He considered woman to be a paraphrase, who worked through somebody else, and he did not believe in women going into the market place and talking to the multitude. They respected Cornelia, not because she went into the Forum and spoke, but because she was the mother of the Gracchi. He asked hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House to vote fairly, squarely, and conscientiously. If they believed that women should have the power given them, let them vote in favour of doing so; but they must beware of treating the matter as an impractical question. He hoped hon. gentlemen would give a thoroughly practical vote. The Bill was drawn up in a perfectly ridiculous fashion. He hoped hon. gentlemen would vote honestly and squarely, either for or against this great constitutional change.

Sir W. Lawson said there was a strong feeling outside the House in favour of the Bill. He was sorry to hear Mr. Labouchere say that religion should not have any influence on political matters, and disagreed altogether with that view. There were 4,000 women connected with various Liberal associations in Cumberland, and every one of them was in favour of Woman's Suffrage. There had not been a full discussion of this question since 1892, when the debate consisted pretty much of Liberals making Tory speeches, and Tories making Liberal speeches, and it wound up with a Radical speech. He did not know if that would be the case to-day. He did not see why women should be debarred from having this power. What had they done that they should be excluded? There were only two reasons which could be urged against the change—want of intellect and want of conscience. He did not believe that either existed in any greater proportion in women than in

men. Special arrangements had been made providing for the voting of illiterates, but surely they should be excluded from the franchise as much as women. Why should not the better half of the population be allowed to share the politic life which was the source of their power? Mr. Gladstone had said, "All those who live in a country should take an interest in that country—love that country." The vote which was given fostered that love. (Hear, hear.) He could not understand how any Liberal Member could object to the proposal. What harm would a few women coming up to vote do? It gave one quite a thrill of pain to hear of his hon. friend the Member of Northampton being afraid. (Laughter and cheers.) Women's help would be useful in putting down the drink traffic, in preventing war and pestilence. He remembered the words the Prime Minister used at the first meeting he addressed after the present Parliament was born. The noble lord said: "It is the improving of the daily life of the struggling millions and the diminution of the sorrows which so many are called upon to bear which is the task—the blessed task—which Parliament is called upon to bear." (Cheers.) Was not that work in which women could assist? (Cheers.) He had heard many suggestions as to the manner in which they should celebrate her Majesty's reign, and he thought it would be a statesmanlike act and a permanent memorial if they this year gave women the franchise. (Cheers.)

Colonel Waring said he had had opportunities of gaining the views of ladies in various relations—(laughter)—and, with one exception, they were opposed to the Bill. They preferred their indirect power to the direct power which it was proposed to confer upon them. They held these opinions and would not be led by their fussy sisters, whom hon. Members saw running about the lobbies. (Cries of "Oh.")

Mr. G. Wyndham (Dover), observed that, while the hon. member for Northampton had made some new fun on this question, he had been unable to adduce any new arguments against the Bill. The hon. member hardly touched the merits of the question at all, for he did not call it an attack upon the merits to say in one sentence that women were so subject to the influence of the other sex that they ought on that account, and that alone, to be scratched off the register, and in the very next sentence to say there were not 20 men in that House who would vote according to their convictions because they were all subjected to the influence of women. (Laughter and "Hear, hear.") On that Bill hon. members were invited to say yea or nay, whether the other sex were to remain under the disability which had been pointed out, or not, and they were not invited to pronounce upon any other question of representation whatever. This measure was, in the opinion of its promoters, a Reform Bill, and they declined to associate it in their minds with any of the terrors which the hon. member for Northampton had depicted before them. What was the real motive of the hon. member in opposing the Bill? The hon. member said that if these ladies had a vote they would make the life of a candidate intolerable. What he really meant by that was that they would bring the Parliamentary existence of certain members to an abrupt close. (Laughter and "Hear, hear.") Mr. Bagehot, in his work on the English Constitution, said that when Lord Eldon was Lord Chancellor he had only one political view—that as things were, they were consistent with the continued existence of John Scott, Earl of Eldon; but if they changed, how was he to know whether they would be so consistent? ("Hear, hear," and laughter.) The hon. member for Northampton seemed to take a similar view with regard to himself, and to associate himself with the philosophic Radicals who were in favour of universal Suffrage if it did not include women. Talleyrand and Rousseau based their arguments against female suffrage on prescription. He submitted that the technical difficulties of our electoral system ought not to affect the decision of the House in regard to this Bill. (Hear, hear.)

Sir Barrington Simeon (Southampton) submitted that if the Parliamentary franchise were

extended to women they could not be denied the right of sitting in Parliament. There were 1,100,000 more women in this country than men. When every woman had a vote—and every woman undoubtedly would possess the vote if one got one—was it to be supposed that when they could swamp the views of men they would be content to remain outside? If ever women sat in Parliament the end of this country would not be far off. ("Oh, oh," and laughter.) The inevitable result of the Bill would be the biggest creation of fatigot votes ever known. The wives and daughters of rich men would have votes bought for them, while the wives and daughters of the working men who were flattered at every election by being told they were the backbone of the country, would have no votes. The immediate effect of the Bill would be the grossest possible injustice. This Parliament contained more new members than any previous Parliament, and if those new members were as wise and sensible as their predecessors they would reject this most unwise and pernicious Bill by a large majority. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. Jebb (Cambridge University), in supporting the Bill, said he should direct his remarks to the principle of the measure—that the vote should not be refused to women on the ground of sex alone, but that where women had the same qualifications as men they should have it. As to whether women really wanted the vote or not, the First Lord of the Treasury in 1892, when the Bill was last before the House, pointed out that women had manifested in every way open to them their desire for the Parliamentary franchise, and that when the agricultural labourer received the franchise in 1885 there was not more evidence before the country of his desire for the franchise than there was now shown on the part of women. No one knew exactly what proportion of women desired the franchise, but it was known that a very large number of educated and intelligent women had been active in demanding it. In his opinion, the demand had greatly increased even in the last five years. One argument used against giving the franchise to women was that they could not bear arms in defence of the country; but he submitted that there were many men who, in the event of an invasion, would probably not be capable of rendering very efficient services. Possibly, if the garrison of Inverness were in need of a librarian, he might offer himself for the post. (Laughter.) It was argued that no legislation remained to be passed in the interests of women which would not have an equally good chance of passing even if women continued to have no votes. He contended that the attention given to the interests of women had been largely influenced by the existence and progress of an active movement in favour of Women's Suffrage. (Hear, hear.) Moreover, women were better judges of the needs of women than men could possibly be. No doubt before the extension of the franchise to the agricultural labourer there was an earnest desire to do everything that was just for him; but the needs of his class were viewed from the point of view of that class for the first time after he got the franchise; and so, if the franchise were extended to women, legislators would legislate on questions affecting women in the light of the directly expressed views of women. (Hear, hear.) Women's Suffrage was specially desirable in the interests of those engaged in employments and those who were candidates for employment. No doubt the omission of the lodger franchise from the Bill would exclude a considerable number of women for whom the Suffrage was specially desirable, but in any extension of the franchise it was right to proceed circum-spectly, and that omission was not a reason for voting against the Bill. (Hear, hear.) The argument that women were more emotional and excitable than men, and, therefore, unfit for the franchise, deserved some respectful attention. It was said that a leaven of female voters in the electorate might be dangerous at times when popular feeling ran high, as, for instance, when the issue of peace or war was in question. What proof was there of that? He should say that as a sex they were more practical than men, and in his belief women had an even stronger motive than men for

using their influence against any rash or precipitate movement of public opinion. (Hear, hear.) Then it was alleged that women would lean towards an excessive and misplaced clemency in case of suffering caused by improvidence or vice. But as a matter of fact women were usually harder and more severe than most men in their judgment of certain delinquencies—for example, thriftlessness and offences against the life of the family. The women who had been most active in claiming the Suffrage were familiar with the arguments which had been used against their claim and would be especially on their guard against justifying the objections by committing those errors which their opponents had asserted that women, as a sex, would be sure to commit. The less educated portion of the female electorate would be influenced in such cases by the example of those women to whom they would look as their natural leaders in such a matter. Further, the political responsibility of the Suffrage would of itself tend to steady and sober the judgments of women. The new element which Woman's Suffrage would add to the electorate would probably have the quality of conscientiousness in a high degree. The result would tend to increase the importance of character in public life, and he thought it might safely be predicted that the general influence of women would tend to moderate extreme tendencies on either side in politics. When he weighed the objections which had been urged against Woman's Suffrage and placed in the other scale the advantages which might reasonably be expected from it, he felt no doubt to which side the balance inclined. He supported the Bill not only because it was just, but also because he believed it to be expedient in the public interest. (Hear, hear.)

Sir W. Harcourt (Monmouthshire, W.).—I do not feel as if I ought to give a silent vote upon this Bill. It seems to me that if there ever was a question upon which people ought to have the courage of their opinions it is this. (Hear, hear.) They ought to form an opinion and act upon it according to their convictions. It has been agreed all through this discussion that we are not dealing merely with the details of this particular Bill. That, I think, is generally admitted by both sides. What we are dealing with is a principle of the highest possible importance and of the gravest possible consequences. We have got to consider it not in the least, I should hope, with reference to speculations as to the effect of that principle upon political parties—(hear, hear)—but with reference to the result which it will have not only upon the present, but upon the future interests of this country. I suppose that if this Bill is intended to do anything it is intended to assert ultimately the identical rights of women to exercise the electoral franchise with men. I shall not discuss the question on the ground of the distinction between local and Imperial questions. Everybody must feel that there is a real and solid distinction between them. (Hear, hear.) You cannot import the mere fact of female Suffrage in local matters as a substantial and far less a conclusive argument in favour of female Suffrage in Imperial matters. (An hon. member: Why not?) If that does not commend itself to the hon. member he can answer me. To my mind the point is obvious. I decline altogether to enter upon invidious comparisons of the merits or capacities of the two sexes, for it requires a man with more courage than I have to make distinctions of that kind. (Laughter.) But some gentlemen have entered upon that dangerous ground. They will find abundance of such discussion in the modern literature of the day (laughter), conducted, I think, to a great degree, probably to the largest degree, by the more numerous sex. (Laughter.) I shall confine myself to one single point, a dry, statistical point, which is incapable of contradiction and introduces no controversy—namely, the numerical relation of the two sexes. That has been stated already over and over again in this debate. There are in this country 1,200,000 more women than men. This is practically a Bill for the ultimate enfranchisement of that majority. (Cheers.) The hon. member for Durham argued upon that basis. He did not proceed with the caution of the hon.

(Continued on page 90.)

THE WOMAN'S SIGNAL.

A Weekly Record and Review of Woman's Work and Interests at Home and in the Wider World.

Editor—Mrs. FLORENCE FENWICK MILLER.

Corresponding Editors—THE LADY HENRY SOMERSET and Miss FRANCES E. WILLARD.

Editorial Rooms and Business Offices, to which all letters, advertisements, subscriptions, and enquiries should be addressed, 80 Maiden Lane, Covent Garden, London, W.C.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

THE WOMAN'S SIGNAL will be sent post paid to any address, in Great Britain or abroad, on receipt of subscriptions:

12 months for ...	6s. 6d.
6 " " " " " "	3s. 3d.
3 " " " " " "	1s. 8d.

Or can be had to order, One Penny weekly, from any Newsagent in the United Kingdom; also sold at Messrs. Smith's Railway Bookstalls.

Published Every Thursday, Price One Penny.

THE TRADE SUPPLIED

By MARSHALL AND SONS, 125 Fleet Street.

NOTICE.

All communications intended for insertion must be written on one side only of the paper, and the writer's name and address must be given, not necessarily for publication. The Editor cannot answer correspondents privately, except on the business of the paper strictly.

If a stamped and addressed wrapper be attached to a manuscript offered for publication, it will be returned if declined; but the Editor cannot be responsible for the accidental loss of manuscripts, and any not accompanied by a wrapper for return will be destroyed if unaccepted. Space being limited and many manuscripts offered, the Editor begs respectfully to intimate that an article being declined does not necessarily imply that it is not considered an excellent composition.

SIGNALS FROM OUR WATCH TOWER.

In every respect satisfactory and encouraging was the debate and division on the Women's Suffrage Bill. Our readers know too well the difficulties that beset a private members' Bill (the opportunities that are offered by the rules of the House of Commons for obstruction on the part of the enemy, and the small force that can be exercised by a class that is not in possession of the vote in aid of a measure before the House) to believe that the cause is won. But assuredly an immense step forward was made.

If Mr. Balfour will exercise his great influence to the full, he can probably carry this Bill through for us. The practical objection in the mind of a party manager that a dissolution is expected to follow a Reform Bill is, however, so strong—from the point of view of the party in office—that we cannot hope too much from the best will towards us on the part of the leader of the House.

But one thing at least ought now to be declared by the Government. They certainly, at the very least, ought now to state

that they will consider it impossible to bring in a Registration Bill without including women householders in it. This is what would be the simplest and most practical plan. The assent of the House has been recorded to the principle of admitting rate-paying women to the exercise of the franchise, and it will, therefore, be not merely possible for the Government to include that class of women in the Registration Bill which (accidents apart) they will, no doubt, introduce when they begin to see a general election looming in near perspective—but it will be absolutely indefensible if they fail to do so.

In every circumstance the debate and division seem to us satisfactory. It was very desirable that no intimation of a Government wish in one or the other direction should be given, but that the Ministry should stand aside, allow cross-voting, and so wait on the decision of the country. It was desirable that the force of the enemy should be put forth with all the vigour that it still retains—in order that its weakness should be exposed. It was eminently satisfactory, above all, to see that no single person of consequence could be found to lead the crusade against justice to women, and that the brunt of forming an opposition fell to the buffoons and licensed jesters of the House, irresponsible jokers, whose support, and not whose opposition, is damaging to any proposition, and whose exhibition of their logical and moral standing in their speeches could not fail to make the serious and statesmanlike members more unwilling than before to be counted amongst the opponents of Women's Suffrage in such companionship.

Sir William Harcourt was the only opponent of the least moment, and, as Mr. Courtney pointed out, his interposition was a compliment to the strength of the cause. It was a token of his consciousness that the Bill would be carried. As far as his argument goes, it was no more important than the others against the Bill, for it was in no wise directed at the measure before the House, but was directed to the most distant and visionary consequences. It was of the character of the well-known German fable of how Gretchen went to the cellar to draw the beer and did not return, and when sought for was found weeping because she had observed a hatchet hanging in a dangerous position, and had bethought her that if it stopped there, and if she married Hans, and if she had a son, and if he were grown up enough to go down and draw the beer, and if the hatchet should fall on him in the course of his doing so, then how dreadful it would be! So Gretchen sat down and cried till Hans went to seek her—and so on.

The old fable is exactly applicable to Sir W. Harcourt's speech. Some day, he foresees, there will be no restrictions on the exercise of the vote by all persons not legally marked off. Now, there are more women in the kingdom than men. When the day comes that everybody votes, therefore, if women do not continue to be disqualified merely as women, the majority of votes to be cast will be those of women, and if these things be so, female influence will rule the country, and this is so "enormous" a change that no man should vote for the meek little Bill actually in hand.

This sort of argument was abundantly used against every previous Reform Bill, and the Liberal party used to laugh them to scorn. These problems of posterity can safely be left to posterity. The chances are that long before universal Suffrage is established in Britain, the baseless unreasoning terror with which Sir Wm. Harcourt regards women's influence will be a thing of the past.

How much improvement there is in the tone of the opinion of the average man already in this regard is well known to those of us who have been engaged for years in forwarding this movement. Mr. Labouchere may arouse a passing laugh by an imaginative and burlesque recital of an "Interview between Henry Labouchere and a Woman's Suffrage advocate" who asked him "if he believed in love;" he may gaily tell this tale and add, "by such arguments is Women's Suffrage supported;" he may pretend that women want to institute a searching inquiry into the moral character of every man before allowing him to exercise the franchise; and he may inform us of his opinion (for what it is worth to anybody who reads his speech) "that ladies are incapable of argument." But the world knows better. Everybody knows that those are not the ways in which women argue Women's Suffrage, and that women are not in public affairs what Mr. Labouchere pretends. Women have not pleaded for the vote for just thirty years past—they have not sat on school boards, gaining their places there by election contests as difficult as those for M.P.'s seats, involving making numerous speeches, answering questions, and so on—women have not topped the list again and again in the most severe University tests in mathematics, sciences and arts—women have not organised great societies and conducted their affairs with deliberation, decorum and ability—women have not so achieved all for nothing.

The scorn of womanhood that was so prevalent in men a quarter of a century ago, and that was then a veritable thing, is now reduced to the merest male-sex vanity, obviously baseless. It is nevertheless a feeling which exists, no doubt, but it is repressed as any other perceived prejudice and moral weakness is by all respectable minds in their own consciousness. The day to refuse women votes because they "cannot argue," or because they are merely feeble and impracticable fools, is over, and that is most strikingly apparent in the speeches in the House and the comments on them outside. A little further widening of the sphere of women, and the terror of Sir William Harcourt as to giving direct influence to women will be out of date as thoroughly as is now the impertinence of Mr. Labouchere.

With pleasure we give full report to the observations of the Member for Northampton, for we cannot think of anything more calculated to arouse the earnestness and indignation of women who, fortunate in their personal relations and history, have hitherto not perceived the full significance and meaning of the denial of the franchise, than are the insolent jeers and immoral jests of this champion of the existing state of affairs. Can any woman of the most ordinary self-respect be content to have all questions committed to such hands as these? Even the *Times*,

no champion of Women's Rights, is constrained to remark that "the strongest argument yet disclosed for intrusting the government of the Empire into the hands of women is the levity with which a House of Commons, chosen by men, yesterday voted" on the question of making women capable of political existence.

Our usual foe, the *Daily Chronicle*, gives an equally severe account of the speech of the leading opponents.

"I deprecate the spirit of levity with which this subject has been argued," said Mr. Labouchere, and, of course, everyone settled down, knowing we were going to have some fine fun. And what fun it was! Such novel arguments! Such fresh wit! Such sparkling illustrations! There was the story of the woman who wanted a "moral vote." "What vigilance societies would be wanted! Who of us would pass?" And then there was the picture of the House under the new régime—"A First Lady of the Admiralty"—"perhaps, Sir, a lady in your place—a Speakeress!" "At any rate, I pity the Speaker who sat in your place and had to rule over women!" Was there ever such cogent argument? And then the Whips. Suppose they were ladies! Then "If you will allow me to choose the Whips—" (But the House, now weak with laughter, again succumbed.) Then there was the tale about the young lady who had come to canvass Mr. Labouchere on the question, and who asked him, "Do you believe in love?" That was really too funny, and the House was convulsed for quite a long period. "I told her I did, and asked her why she was not married. She replied that a baronet had asked her and she had refused; so I said to her, 'You go about getting a baronet for yourself instead of fishing for votes for other people.'"

Excellent logic! Capital fooling! It is deplorable that any man should venture thus to play with the interests of the half of the human race involved in their being contemptuously excluded from citizenship. It is surely obvious how damaging to women in every walk of life must be this sex-contempt, engendered by the knowledge that women are classed out of the Constitution in company with no males except those who are idiots, boys under 21, criminals actually under detention (for one who has served his time is allowed to vote), and lunatics (again only those actually in asylums, for a lunatic's name is kept on the register, and he can vote the day after his release should an election occur). If those pretences of logic and miserable efforts after wit had succeeded, we should indeed have cause to blush for those women who might still say they "have all the rights they want." But as the House passed the second reading, we can listen with equanimity to Mr. Labouchere's fun and Sir William Harcourt's predictions. As to Mr. Radcliffe Cooke's speech, it is both in point of logic and of taste beneath notice from anybody but his disgraced constituents, who ought to be ashamed of their "representative."

Of course, both mover and seconder gave us the "women cannot fight" argument. It is really a most comical fact that this is invariably brought forth by the feeble atomies of the male sex, who are far more incapable of performing this "citizen's duty" than the average girl of to-day! I

have noticed this fact as to the quarter whence that argument comes uniformly in the innumerable debates on the question that I have opened in times past all over the country, and it is so in the House of Commons. Mr. Radcliffe Cooke and Mr. Labouchere are both mere shrimps; a stalwart German would make one easy mouthful of them both. I am sorry the House of Commons was so frivolously inclined, but it would make anybody laugh, it really, inevitably would, to hear these poor little tots talking about the right to vote as dependent on the ability to fight. I remember one amusing occasion in the public discussions. It was at a meeting organised at Hendon by Mrs. George Sims (the mother of the now famous author), then hon. sec. of the West Middlesex Suffrage Committee, and a member of the Central Committee. Mrs. Sims was unable to be present, and her husband kindly came in her behalf. The "women cannot fight" argument was brought forth, as invariably it is, by a feeble-bodied, tiny, yet impertinent, waspish-tongued male. Mr. Sims replied to him, "As far as physical force goes," said he, drily, "my wife, if she liked, could pick that little man up and carry him round the room on her left arm and shut him up in a cupboard till he grew polite."

But what a miserable and pointless argument it is! So far from it being a "citizen's duty" to fight, in return for fulfilling which men have votes, the immense majority of the men of our country not only never do fight, but have not prepared themselves to fight; nay, more, not only are they untrained (and therefore unable) to take the field, but nearly half of the males who are wished to fit themselves for fighting for their country are so physically unfit to do so that the State will not waste money on training such incapables. In 1885, for instance, 72,249 men presented themselves for enlistment, of whom only 55 per cent. could pass the medical examination; 28,933 were rejected as physically unfit. In 1886 the number rejected on medical examination was 32,783.

Where are these men? Do they vote? Of course they do. Yet they are actually declared unfit to fulfil the only "citizen's duty" that our House of Commons logicians can cite as putting the Franchise beyond the reach of women. Add to these annual tens of thousands of males declared on examination to be unable to fight, though they are willing, and had thought that they were big enough and strong enough, those far more numerous incompetents who know that they are physically unable to fight, and so never try to enter the army—remember that all these men can exercise the vote—and the absolute absurdity of applying the test of military fitness to women's claim to the vote becomes apparent. It is, however, enhanced, when we recollect the fact that every one of the tens of thousands of rejected men, returned to civil life as too weak and small for serving in the army, can exercise the vote; while the 55 per cent. who did prove able to fight for their country, and were taken into the army, are not allowed to vote!! And yet the preposterous pretence is put forward that women must not vote because they do not serve in the army!

But women do fulfil the "citizen's duty" of defending their country; they do it in precisely and exactly the same way as do the little gentlemen who spoke on Wednesday. Mr. Labouchere and Mr. Cooke pay to keep other men to fight, and to train them for that task, and to supply them with arms and ammunition to take the field. Women do precisely the same; they are excused no tax, and if they vote they will have just the same responsibility for defence. If women voted for war they would be voting for their own increased taxation, for the addition of a weight to their "citizen's burdens." If, on the contrary, women refused the needful supplies, and the invader should ever walk over our soil, women would have to bear their share of the burden of the indemnity that the conqueror would demand. In short, women defend the country exactly as all men but the few who are in the army defend it—by their money as tax-payers. The only difference is that the tax-paying men do all the voting as to what shall be expended, and as to the courses of action that lead to wars arising; women share in the burdens only, not in the consent to their imposition, nor in influencing the conduct that leads to the added weight of war charges.

Mr. Wyndham, who is the real leader of the question in the House now, made a capital speech. His hit at Mr. Labouchere's "moral votes" was excellently delivered. It was a short speech, but every word told. Sir Wilfrid Lawson drew attention to the propriety of this year—the Queen's Celebration year—being the one in which the enfranchisement of other women should be accomplished. There can be no more worthy national tribute to the value of the personal influence of the Sovereign than the extension for her sake of a measure of political influence to all women that one of their sex has shown herself so eminently worthy to possess.

By the way, it was a charming compliment that Mr. Radcliffe Cooke was so low as to think a slur—the statement made to him by one of the Members that he was going to vote for the Bill because his mother had asked him to do so. The happiness of that mother in a son who thus "honours his mother," and as the wise king advised, "gives ear to her commandments," is a pleasure to think about.

The whole debate will be a revelation to the men and women who are thinking of the question for the first time; they will have supposed that there *must* be something to be said against it, and when they see the speeches of Mr. Labouchere, Mr. Cooke, and Sir B. Simeon, they will be astonished to see that sex bias and vanity, lack of precedent, and the sort of fears that used to be urged against all reform, of some indefinite future extension of the demand, are all that can be urged.

Now, what can be done to press on the Government that at the least they should give an assurance that women shall be included in a future registration and distribution of seats Bill? Men who are open to the claim of justice and freedom should be asked to help. All women who care about the matter should send in at once letters to their members, thanking those who voted right and urging an expression of opinion from them to the Government. And also we

should approach Mr. Balfour—with calmness and reasonableness, but in all our strength. From every point of view this is a great opportunity, and we must make the most of it. The Bill is a very limited one—that must not affect our desire to get it through. The principle will be established, and, as Sir William Harcourt sees, it must be extended in course of time—unless experience proves (as we have faith that it will not) that women cannot use the vote as well as men. It will be right to try to improve the Bill, but it will be wrong to stand out in any way to injure its prospects, and we must not countenance any division of our strength.

Below are the words of the Bill. It will be seen that it only enfranchises women at the heads of houses as occupiers in their own names—the lodgers' votes, the "service" votes, and the owners' votes that are given to men would not be given to women under this Bill. Those of us who want nothing less than civil and legal equality between the sexes, cannot applaud such reservations; but we would rather have this Bill pass, and the stigma of incapacity thus taken off our sex, than have things remain as they are.

THE TEXT OF THE BILL.

"On and after the passing of this Act every woman who is the inhabitant occupier as owner or tenant of any dwelling house, tenement, or building within the borough or county where such occupation exists, shall be entitled to be registered as a voter in the list of voters for such borough or county in which she is so qualified as aforesaid, and, when registered, to vote for a Member or Members to serve in Parliament."

"Provided always that such woman is not subject to any legal incapacity which would disqualify a male voter."

By the way, can anybody understand Mr. Labouchere's pretence that the last clause would not mark out female minors and idiots?

Mr. Faithfull Begg, to whom it has fallen to carry the second reading of our Bill, sits for the St. Rollox division of Glasgow, and is the son of a famous Presbyterian divine, and nephew of one of the earliest of our Suffrage Workers, the late Emily Faithfull. He has had considerable colonial experience, especially in New Zealand (the first British colony to adopt Female Suffrage), where he spent some years in the service of the Union Bank of Australia. He is now a stockbroker. He only returned six weeks ago from a prolonged tour of inspection on the West Australian, New Zealand, and British Columbian goldfields.

Those members who signed and circulated an urgent appeal for votes against Women's Suffrage were the following:—Lord George Hamilton, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Chaplin, Sir Michael Hicks Beach, Mr. Hanbury, Sir John Mowbray, Sir Francis Powell, and Sir James Fergusson (Unionists); Mr. Asquith, Mr. Bryce, Sir U. Kay-Shuttleworth, Mr. Broadhurst, Sir Joseph Pease, Mr. Lloyd-Morgan, and Mr. Labouchere (Radicals).

Dr. Clark has given notice of an instruction to the Committee on the Suffrage Bill "to extend the Parliamentary Franchise to all women, whether married or single, who possess any of the qualifications that now enable men to be placed on the register." In Committee Colonel Milward intends to move an amendment limiting the operation of the Bill to widows and spinsters; and Mr. Maclure suggests a property qualification of £20 a year. Dr. Clark's amendment is, of course, the desirable end—the avowed end of the Suffrage societies—"the vote for women on the same terms as it is given to men." But though this total abolition of mere sex privilege is what is wanted, it would be very unwise to refuse to accept an instalment of our claim. "Tout ou rien" does very well for a motto in love, but is the reverse of wisdom in political reform.

Mrs. Massingberd's funeral service at St. John's Church, Westminster, was largely attended, not only by "Pioneers," but by the members of many other women's organisations. Before the service commenced, the beautiful floral tribute presented by the club was carried forward by twelve members, headed by the Viscountess Harberton, and laid down before the coffin. A cross of white arum lilies and white rosebuds was sent by the British Women's Temperance Association, and a wreath came from the National Central Society for Women's Suffrage. Other wreaths came from the Anti-Vivisection League, the Shakespeare Society, the United Kingdom Alliance, and the Humanitarian League. The service was read by Canon Wilberforce, who, in a brief address, spoke of the sympathy Mrs. Massingberd had always shown with the ever-widening forces of the times. She was, he said, "earnest in her struggle against those inane disabilities which had been placed on her sex, and it was strange that a debate on the subject for which she cared so much was even then taking place in the House of Commons."

It is peculiarly correct to use the term "remains," as by the deceased's own will her body was cremated, and the ashes only were enclosed in the casket over which the service was held, and which was afterwards removed to her estate at Gunby for interment. A remarkable proportion of women of distinction have chosen, since cremation became possible, the clean and rapid action of fire for the dissolution of the empty shell in which their life was spent—a striking testimony to the freedom of the female mind from prejudice and superstition.

Lady Henry Somerset is progressing favourably, but owing to the operation she is strictly forbidden by her doctors to transact any business, or even to see her correspondence. She must for some time abstain from anything that entails fatigue, and all her engagements are for the present cancelled.

Miss Agnes Weston has so far recovered from her recent bicycle accident as to be able to leave the hospital, but she is still quite incapable of walking. The Empress Frederick visited Miss Weston's Sailors' Home on the 8th instant.

(Continued from page 87.)

member for the University of Cambridge, who held out as an encouragement to men in this matter that this would be such a very small Bill. It is not a small Bill in the consequences which it may entail. It is a very great Bill for you cannot resist the ultimate results of this measure. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for Northampton referred to the Bill of my right hon. friend the member for the Forest of Dean. That is a Bill for manhood suffrage, universal suffrage, and if that principle is accepted this Bill will lead to universal female suffrage. There is not an argument used by the hon. member for the University just now which is not applicable to the ultimate extension of the suffrage to all women. That is the question upon which you are to vote to-day; that is the consideration that you ought to have in your minds. The hon. member for the University asked what connection there is between voting powers and a seat in the Legislature. Well, there is the most intimate connection. If such a change were to be made it ought at least, to be done on the initiative of the responsible Government of the day. (Cheers.) I have not seen any indication this day that her Majesty's advisers were disposed to take the responsibility. (Opposition cheers.) As to the women themselves, I should say that the great majority of them did not desire to have the vote. I shall, under those circumstances, vote against the motion. (Opposition cheers.)

Mr. Leonard Courtney said the leader of the Opposition had given a silent vote before, but apparently felt no scruple until that afternoon. Not only had he given silent votes, but he had heard the right hon. gentleman declare that he would never undergo the degradation of speaking upon that question. (Ministerial laughter.) Why had he spoken, then? It was a good augury; the promoters of the Bill were going to win. (Cheers.) What was the kind of argument addressed to the House whenever any discussion arose on Women's Suffrage? He always asked those who were debating the question to substitute men for women, and to see whether the same argument would not apply. The leader of the Opposition, disdaining the question as to the moral constitution of men and women, had placed himself on a firm basis as to the numerical argument, but they had heard that argument before in respect of men of the artisan class. They had heard it said that the admission of the artisans would swamp the men of property and intelligence, and though they might impose what checks and limitations they chose to the progress of manhood suffrage, the artisans would overwhelm the other classes. He remembered that on one occasion Mr. Lowe used an illustration to the effect that the artisans were so numerous that it might be said, as Curran said of the fleas, "if united they could pull a man out of bed." (Laughter.) If, therefore, the artisans were united they could break down all the limitations which were against their wishes. Had they done so? Now, it was in like manner said that women in the far distant time, when they were in a position of absolute equality, might unite to outvote the men. The apprehension, however, was unfounded, just as a similar apprehension was unfounded in respect of the labouring classes. He was astonished that his right hon. friend, who had listened with disdain to similar arguments when applied to different classes of men, did not see how it disposed of the same question when it was based on the numerical argument. (Cheers.) Then there was the argument that a Bill like this should not be passed on a Wednesday afternoon. Did the right hon. gentleman use that argument when the county or the borough franchise was advocated? (Ministerial cheers.) Not at all. Then it was a very proper exercise for the opinion of the House, if not to effect and promote legislation, at least to educate Ministers for the future. He hoped, therefore, that the House of Commons would disdain the notion that it had to wait for the Ministers of the Crown before it expressed its opinion as to whether women be enfranchised or not. The whole of these arguments were another illustration of the fears of the brave and the follies of the wise. (Laughter.) They

were afraid of a vast upsetting of human society, of overturning the relation of the sexes, and of altering the constitution of human nature. The House might do many things, but it could not achieve those ends. Those fears as to the dreadful consequences of this change recalled to his mind what was said by an even more advanced authority than his right hon. friend 60 years ago. It was not until the old House of Commons was burned down that women were admitted properly to hear the debates. There was formerly a ventilating cylinder in the centre of the hall, and in it was a gallery down which the ladies peeped and listened. When the question arose as to the rebuilding of the House after the fire there was a discussion as to whether there should be a gallery put in it for the ladies. Sir John Cam Hobhouse declared then that "life would be intolerable if there was to be a Ladies' Gallery." (Laughter.) Those were the terrors which Sir John held out in those days, and they were just as substantial as those with which his right hon. friend now tried to frighten the House. A former Speaker once interfered in a debate in Committee to express his opinion that if a ladies' gallery were provided, society as at present constituted could not exist. (Laughter.) But society had existed in spite of the ladies' gallery, and it would exist in spite of the passing of this Bill, that afternoon. (Cheers.)

Mr. Faithfull Begg moved that the question be now put.

The Speaker: I think it right that the House should have an opportunity of saying whether it does or does not desire to come to a decision on the Bill. I, therefore, accept the motion.

The closure was then put from the Chair.

The House divided, and the members were:—

For the closure...	214
Against	170
Majority for	44

The House then divided on the main question, the second reading, when there voted:—

For the second reading	228
Against	157

Majority for second reading ... 71

The second reading was declared carried amidst loud cheers.

The result was received with warm demonstrations of joy by the crowd of women who packed the lobby and hall of the House.

(For Division List, see page 92.)

SIGNALS FROM FRIEND TO FRIEND.

M. M. E. enquires:—

"Can you or any of your readers inform me where a party of young lady students could obtain physical exercise in the way of a gymnasium, fencing school, or tennis court, &c., near the University College, Gower-street?"

The editor can strongly recommend Mr. Stempel's gymnasium in Albany-street, where both she herself and her little daughters have been pupils. Mr. Stempel is a capital teacher and has every conceivable appliance. His ordinary classes are very good and amusing, but he is prepared to form private classes for parties of friends if preferred.

"Mary" writes:—

"I should be much obliged if you would kindly state in your next issue, or the following one, whether money saved by a married woman out of her housekeeping allowance is legally her own and can be invested and 'willed' by herself?"

It is distinctly provided by the Married Woman's Property Act that a wife may not make personal savings out of her housekeeping allowance. If her husband discovers at any time that she has done so, he is at liberty to reclaim the money, whether she has banked it or otherwise invested it, or keeps it in her own possession. Thus, as it is not hers, of course she could not bequeath it.

Mrs. Bunting desires to correct the Central News report that Mr. and Mrs. Reed have paid Miss Ellis £500 as damages for libel; the amount is £75 and costs, with an apology. Mrs. Bunting asks that evidence given before the County Council should be held to be "privileged," as in ordinary courts. "Witnesses can be now entrapped," she says, "by smart cross-examiners into making statements or admissions which form no part of the evidence they wish to give, but which are afterwards charged against them as libellous just as if they were their own volunteered suggestion."

A. J. says that in order to get up a debate on the Franchise in her branch of the W.L.F., she has undertaken the task of what used to be called in the Middle Ages' discussions, "Devil's Advocate;" she is so strongly in favour of Women's Suffrage that she cannot realise any arguments against it, yet she has undertaken to prepare a paper stating as well as she can all that is to be said against it. Well, we don't much care for the task being handed on to us, but to oblige a friend we will do it. The following are the most common objections: Women do not want the franchise; they have never had it in any great nation's history; they do not fight in war; they are under the domination of priests and parsons of various sects; Scripture forbids them to "bear rule"; they are too emotional and excitable to judge the great affairs of State; they are apt to be carried

out of their serious judgment by excess of sympathy; they are sufficiently represented already by their male relations in whose interests theirs (the women's) are included; they would vote at the orders of their male relations who would construct "faggot" votes for this end—no, there would be discord in families because they would vote against their male relations; they would all vote Tory—no, they are so easily swayed by agitators, that they would all be Socialists and Anarchists. There, what do you think of the "arguments"?

"IGNORAMUS" can obtain the information asked for about the sale of drink to children, from the Secretary of "the League for the Prohibition of selling Intoxicating Liquors to Children," 126, Edge-lane, Liverpool.

Mr. Chamberlain, speaking at Birmingham (notwithstanding the fact that he is an enemy to the Enfranchisement of women) was constrained to bear the following testimony to the present monarch:—"The present year is the sixtieth year of the reign of the Queen (cheers), and I think you will agree with me that the date marks an absolutely unparalleled chapter in the history of our country. (Hear, hear.) No monarch in England has reigned so long, no monarch has reigned so well and so wisely. (Loud cheers.) None have enjoyed so continuously and so increasingly the love and the respect of their subjects. In no previous reign has there been such progress, especially in all that conduces to the prosperity and the happiness of the masses of the population. (Hear, hear.) In no period of like extent has there ever been so great an extension of this Empire of ours. Gentlemen, a commemoration of a reign so remarkable should surely be exceptional also."

If you crush in man (or woman) the innate sense of self-respect, you decree the helot. If you sanction moral inequality to any extent, you either create rebellion with all its evils, or indifference, hypocrisy and corruption. If you punish the accomplice, leaving the sinner untouched, you destroy by arousing the sense of injustice every beneficial result of punishment. If you assume the right to legislate for any class, without allowing that class voice or share in the work, you destroy the sacredness of law, and awaken hatred or contempt in the heart of the excluded class.—*Mazzini*.

To refuse a share in the law-making of a nation to the most law-abiding half of it, to exclude the votes of the most conscientious, temperate, religious and most merciful and tender-hearted moiety, is a mistake which has not failed to entail great evils and loss.

Frances Power Cobbe.

LIEBIG COMPANY'S EXTRACT

Josie Liebig

FOR WINTER NIGHTS.

A perfect extract of the Finest Beef, highly concentrated. Cheapest for Beef Tea and Kitchen use; it goes such a long way.

FOR WINTER NIGHTS.

THE CENTRAL NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

FOUNDED 1872.

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

Treasurer—Mrs. RUSSELL COOKE.

Subscriptions and donations should be sent to Mrs. CHARLES BAXTER, Secretary, Central Office, Albany Buildings, 39, Victoria-street, S.W.

THE LATE MRS. MASSINGBERD.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Central National Society for Women's Suffrage, held on February 1st, the following resolution was passed:—"That the committee records its sense of the deep loss it has sustained through the death of its honoured and beloved colleague, Mrs. Massingberd. The committee wishes further to record its sense of the invaluable aid she gave to the cause of Women's Suffrage by her eloquence, her generosity and the deep conviction which led her not only to give many years of her life to its furtherance, but even on her deathbed to send this last message to her fellow workers: 'I feel sure the great thing to do is to get the Suffrage, other things will follow.'" The Society was represented at the memorial service held in St. John's Church, Westminster, for Mrs. Massingberd, on Wednesday, February 3rd.

THE DIVISION LIST.

	For the Bill.	Against the Bill.
Liberals ...	69	37
Irish Nationalists ...	18	11
Conservatives ...	115	91
Unionists ...	26	18

Majority in Favour ... 71

Appended are the names of members who took part in the division:—

FOR THE BILL—228.

Abraham, W. (Cork).
Abraham, W. (Rhondra).
Aird, J.
Allan, W.
Ambrose, W.
Arch, J.
Arnold, A.
Arrol, Sir W.
Ascroft, R.
Austin, Sir J.
Bagot, Capt.
Baker, Sir J.
Balfour, A. J.
Balfour, G. W.
Barlow, J. E.
Barnes, F. G.
Beach, W. W. B.
Bentinck, Lord H.
Bhownagree, M. M.
Bousfield, W. R.
Brigg, J.
Buchanan, T. R.
Bucknill, T. T.
Burt, T.
Cameron, R.
Carson, E.
Cavendish, R.
Chaloner, Capt.
Channing, F. A.
Clare, O. L.
Clark, Dr.
Clough, W. O.
Cohen, B. L.
Collings, J.
Colville, J.
Cooke, F. L.
Corbett, A. C.

FOR THE BILL—(Continued.)

Goddard, D. F.
Gold, C.
Goldsworthy, Gen.
Gordon, J. E.
Gorst, Sir J.
Goulding, E. A.
Gourley, Sir E.
Graham, H. R.
Gray, E.
Green, D. W.
Gull, Sir C.
Haldane, R. B.
Hall, Sir C.
Harrison, C.
Hazell, W.
Hedderwick, T. C.
Helder, A.
Hickman, Sir A.
Hill, Lord A.
Hill, A. Staveley.
Hogan, J.
Hoburn, J. G.
Holland, L. R.
Hopkinson, A.
Houldsworth, Sir W.
Howell, W. T.
Howorth, Sir H.
Hudson, G. B.
Hughes, Col. E.
Jacoby, J. A.
Jebb, R. C.
Jeffreys, A. F.
Johnston, W.
Johnstone, J. H.
Jones, D. B.
Jones, W.
Kearley, H. E.
Kemp, G.
Kenyon, J.
Kilbride, D.
Kinloch, Sir J.
Laurie, Gen.
Lawson, J. G.
Lawson, Sir W.
Lecky, W. E. H.
Leng, Sir J.
Llewellyn, Sir D.
Lockwood, Sir F.
Loder, G. W. E.
Logan, J. W.
Lorne, Lord
Lowles, J.
Lubbock, Sir J.
Lucas-Shadwell, W.
Lytelton, A.
MacAleese, D.
Macdonald, J. C.
MacLure, J. W.
MacNeill, J. G. S.
McDermott, P.
McKenna, R.
McKillop, J.
McLaren, C. B.
Marks, H. H.
Massey-Mainwaring, W. F.
Mellor, Col.
Melville, B. V.
Milbank, P. C. J.
Milner, Sir F. G.
Milward, Col.
Montague, J. S.
Montagu, Sir S.
More, R. J.
Morton, E. J.
Murray, Col.
Nicol, D. N.
Northcote, Sir S.

AGAINST THE BILL—157.

Ashton, T. G.
Asquith, H.
Bailey, J.
Balcarres, Lord.
Banbury, F. G.
Barry, A. H. Smith.
Bartley, G. C. T.
Beach, Sir M. H.
Beaumont, W. C. B.
Beckett, E. W.
Bethell, Com.

AGAINST THE BILL—(Continued.)

Brookfield, A. M.
Brown, H.
Bryce, J.
Butcher, J. G.
Buxton, S. C.
Caldwell, J.
Campbell, J. A.
Causton, R. K.
Cavendish, V.
Cawley, F.
Chamberlain, J.
Chamberlain, A.
Chaplin, H.
Charrington, S.
Clarke, Sir E.
Coddington, Sir W.
Cooke, C. W. R.
Cranborne, Vis.
Robinson, B.
Cross, A.
Curzon, G. N.
Dalbiac, Maj.
Dalrymple, Sir C.
Dane, R. M.
Darling, C. J.
Disraeli, C. R.
Rutherford, J.
Dorington, Sir J. E.
Douglas, A. Akers.
Duncombe, H. V.
Dyke, Sir W. Hart.
Egerton, A. de T.
Evans, S. T.
Evans, Sir F. H.
Farrell, J. P.
Fellowes, A. E.
Ferguson, R. C. M.
Fergusson, Sir J.
Fisher, W. H.
Fletcher, Sir H.
Folkestone, Vis.
Garfit, W.
Goschen, G. J.
(St. George's)
Goschen, G. J.
(Sussex)
Gunter, Col.
Hamilton, Lord G.
Hanbury, R. W.
Hanson, Sir R.
Harcourt, Sir W.
Hardy, L.
Hare, T. L.
Hayne, C. Seale
Hoare, E. B.
Hobhouse, H.
Howard, J.
Hubbard, E.
Hutton, A. E.
Jessel, Capt.
Joicy, Sir J.
Jolliffe, H. G.
Kay-Shuttleworth, Sir U.
Kennaway, Sir J.
Kenny, W.
Knowles, I.
Knox, E. F. V.
Lambert, G.
Lees, Sir E.
Long, W.
Lowther, J.

As a matter of fact, women will never vote unanimously upon one side of any question, any more than men will. They will be divided in opinion, like any other class of citizens. They will be affected by all the causes that affect the opinions of any voter. They must secure their information on economic and political questions through the same sources, the rostrum and the Press. The marked benefit of equal suffrage is that women are incited to secure this information. There is no political meeting in Colorado in which at least half the audience, and sometimes more, is not composed of women. Women have discussed the issues of the past campaign with as much intelligence as the older voters.—*Rocky Mountain News* (a leading Colorado paper).

Current News FOR AND ABOUT WOMEN.

The Rev. J. Chadburn, a Congregational minister, residing at Sutton, Surrey, has offered to contribute £5,000, being half the cost of endowing a ward for the treatment of cancer at the new hospital for women in Euston-road (where all the physicians and students are women), in commemoration of the Queen's reign, provided that the other half can be secured.

The Emperor of Russia has assigned a sum of 65,000 roubles from the Imperial Treasury for the erection of residential quarters for the female students attending the St. Petersburg Medical Institute for women. The building will be opened this year. The medical education of women in Russia had been entirely stopped under the late Czar, and it is due to the present Czarina that it has been resumed.

A largely attended meeting was held in Belfast on January 30th to discuss the subject of a memorial to the late Miss Tod. Alderman M'Connell presided, and the Lady Mayoress proposed a resolution, which was unanimously passed, declaring that the late Miss Tod's long and fruitful public services on behalf of temperance, education, philanthropy, and practical patriotism should be commemorated by some proper and adequate memorial. A committee was appointed to carry the resolution into effect.

At the Queen's Hall, Langham-place, the London United Temperance Council held their second anniversary festival. The chair was taken by Mr. A. F. Hills, who was supported amongst others by the Countess of Carlisle, Lady Elizabeth Biddulph, the Hon. Conrad Dillon, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, M.P., the Hon. A. Holland Hibbert, Canon Barker, Mr. R. W. Perks, M.P., the Rev. Newman Hall, Mr. R. Rae, and Mr. J. H. Raper. Lady H. Somerset was absent from illness. The chairman referred to the great advance which had been made during the present record reign in temperance principles, and spoke of the good which had already been accomplished by the council in uniting the temperance forces in London. Lady Elizabeth Biddulph moved a resolution expressing the pleasure of the meeting in the successful work accomplished by the council and commending to temperance organisations throughout the country, the great value and importance of that unity which the council sought to promote. Rev. Newman Hall, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, M.P., and Mrs. Ormiston Chant also spoke.

Lady Aberdeen announced to the Montreal branch of the Aberdeen Association the plan which Her Majesty wishes to have followed in celebration of her "Diamond Jubilee" in the Dominion. "Her Majesty," said Lady Aberdeen, "has intimated her desire that the commemorative measures adopted here might take the form of nursing and caring for the sick and suffering. In the isolated parts of the Dominion the hospitals and cottage hospitals at present existing are not sufficient to meet the wants of the people, and the idea is to have a band of women trained to nurse and look after the sick and suffering. Women eligible to join the Order must not be under 30 years of age, and would receive a thorough practical training in midwifery and first aid to the injured. A badge and uniform would be provided for all members of the Order. It is also thought advisable that members should be bound to work for a definite period of, perhaps, three years."

There is some talk again of the revival of flowered silk waistcoats for men's evening wear. The other day a gentleman of fashion was seen wearing a white silk vest with a blurred design of pink flowers upon it, and fastened with very small gold buttons. Tiny spots are likewise a popular pattern for silk waistcoats. The Prince of Wales has declared his intention of wearing one, and has bought a piece of English silk for the purpose.

TREASURES AND TROUBLES.

A DOMESTIC SCIENCE STORY FOR YOUNG MOTHERS.

CHAPTER VII.—(Continued.)

"Expense ought not to be considered in such a matter, any more than is absolutely unavoidable," remarked Mrs. Wynter.

"Quite true, my dear; and my own daughter uses this bottle on my recommendation, although she is not rich. But 'the million' positively cannot afford it. Before I show you the cheaper bottle, I will give you two warnings, in case you use this one. In the first place, you must tell the nurse never to let the bottle lie over on its side; because, when it does so, the ball is apt to fall out of its place, and the valve thus loses its efficacy. The second point is, that the centre-piece must be screwed in quite tightly, or else the air gets in there. But you can tell directly when this last is happening, by a peculiar sound as the baby sucks."

"Thank you. These are the trifling things that one can only learn by experience."

"And it is much better to learn them from somebody else's experience than your own."

"The other bottle is cheaper, you say?" said Bertha, laying down the "Fountain" feeder, and taking up the other.

"Yes, you can get one form of these for as low as sixpence, with what I think the great advantage of them, namely, the screw glass, or earthenware stopper, instead of the cork. You see, that is so very clean. Even a careless nurse can hardly leave anything which is so easily washed as that glass stopper, to get thoroughly dirty."

"It has, you see, the same 'fittings'—that is, the outside junction and the teat, which slips off it so easily, as 'The Fountain.' When the teat is taken off, the tube-brush can be passed quite through from end to end of the tube, with so very little trouble that she must be a lazy nurse indeed who neglects it."

"But the advantage of the valve is lacking here."

"Yes; the advantage of the valve always there, and not to be left out by the nurse's carelessness, is the special feature of 'the Fountain.' But for any feeding-bottle you can buy at the chemist's, you can get an india-rubber valve to fit in the glass at the bottom of the tube; or you can get a glass valve, which is fitted at the same place. These are as effective as the Fountain valve."

"Are they cheaply replaced when damaged?"

"Oh, yes, the cost is very trifling. They are not so durable as the 'Fountain,' however. I repeat, that for my own family, or anywhere where cheapness was not a main object, I should use the 'Fountain.' But where a cheaper bottle is required, take care to get one that has the main necessary advantages—notably the screw glass stopper, and the easily-cleaned tube."

"I must call at the chemist's as I go, and get one of each kind," said Bertha. "Is there anything else you can tell me, Mrs. Burton?"

"You must be always particular to have two in use at one time, whichever kind of bottle you employ," replied the old lady, "so that, while the baby is taking its food from one, the other may be lying in clean water to purify."

"You mean that the bottle, and tube, and everything connected with it, should be put into the water during the whole time that the baby is not feeding from it?"

"Yes, that is it. The dirty bottle should not stand about at all, but should at once be taken

to pieces, rinsed, and then put into the water, and the water should have in it either the least pinch possible of common soda, or borax, or else about ten drops of *Condy's Fluid*. Either of these prevents any particles of milk, which may escape the washing, from going sour. I think that is all I have to say about the bottles, my dear."

"Thank you so much, dear Mrs. Burton. If I had some more time I should be thankful to hear from you about what to put in the bottles, but John—"

"Yes, your husband can tell you that better, or at least with more authority than I can. So run away to him, my dear, you have about an hour left only."

Mrs. Wynter took a warm leave of her good old friend, and hurried away to give Dr. Wynter a pleasant surprise.

(To be continued.)

WHAT TO WEAR.

The modistes have failed to find acceptance for the long-skirted jackets, and the basques seem to get shorter every day. There was something rather novel and pleasing about the three-quarter length jacket, but it was only a tall woman who could wear it, and the short basques were considered to have a smarter effect. There is no more useful garment at present than the short, smart coat, with large revers and old paste buttons, as it looks so well for visiting and does not need to be discarded before entering a room. A pretty front of lace or coloured chiffon should be revealed when the coat is left open, and, granted a smart hat or bonnet, the plainest skirt will pass muster with this toilette. Jackets of this kind are made in velvet, silk or plain face cloth, and if they are not trimmed with fur, large revers of brocade may be applied, with a waistcoat to match. Chinchilla is still the favourite fur, for it combines so well with the colours of the moment, looking well with turquoise velvet, bunches of purple violets or jabots of old lace. Blue fox is worn, also sable (nearly every other woman seems to have come out in a sable tie since the advent of the snow), but chinchilla is the first favourite, both for day and evening wear.

I saw a very pretty little jacket in bronze velvet lately at a fashionable reception, with large draped revers of some beautiful brocade, figured with sprays of chrysanthemums in pale blue, pink, and mauve. The waistcoat showed a gleam of the same brocade, partly veiled by a large jabot of cream-coloured lace. One of the new muff-chains was twisted in and out among this lace, a slender chain of antique gold, studded with various semi-precious stones at intervals, the purple amethyst and pink topaz recalled the colours in the brocade. The bonnet was somewhat Japanese in effect, having a bunch of shaded chrysanthemums at either side of the brim. The skirt was in plain face-cloth in the same colour as the jacket. Another pretty jacket was in wine-coloured velvet, trimmed with a narrow border of chinchilla. The lining was of white satin, the buttons in old paste, and white gloves peeped out of a large chinchilla muff. The dress was in wine-coloured face-cloth, the toilette was completed by a large felt hat of the same colour trimmed with velvet and a large paste buckle. This jacket was somewhat an *article de luxe*, but almost as good an effect could be obtained by trimming it with narrow bands of any grey or black imitation astrachan fur, and lining it with plain black surah. Any black dress would look well with this jacket, and a black toque trimmed with astrachan.

Very bright head gear seems the fashion at present, and there has been quite an epidemic of hats trimmed with cerise satin ribbons. These pretty toques look very nice with dark dresses, but they are also worn with purple coats and skirts, when the effect is more daring than successful. Mimosa is to be seen on all the spring models, and the milliners are introducing hats of bright yellow straw, of exactly the same colour as the flower. CHIFFON.

BETTER THAN MEDICINE.

FREE TEST OF MERIT.

What does this mean? It simply means that without the use of noxious drugs, medicines, or the many so-called curatives which are foisted upon the public, a new nourishing, stimulating, and vitalising Food Beverage has been discovered, the merits of which have already been recognised to an extent hitherto unknown in the history of any preparation.

It is not a drug or a curative medicine in any sense of the word, yet it builds up strength and vigour by imparting nourishment, and possessing strengthening, stimulative, and restorative qualities unsurpassed by any other Food Beverage.

Medical men and the public are offering conclusive testimony on this point; and to show their confidence in the new preparation the proprietors make the unparalleled offer of a free test of merit, a dainty sample tin being sent gratis and post free to any address on mentioning the WOMAN'S SIGNAL. This offer is made because it sells Dr. Tibbles' Vi-Cocoa, the new preparation referred to; in fact the sales are increasing to such an extent that additional manufacturing facilities have had to be made.

What is Dr. Tibbles' Vi-Cocoa? We will tell you. It is a thoroughly scientific Food Beverage, prepared from the best Cocoa, Kola—the sustaining power of which has long been recognised—Malt and Hops. It promotes tone and vigour, and restores the rosy cheeks natural to health. It is no matter whether mental or physical labour is meant, or Summer languor and indolence creep over you, in any case, the discovery will be of inestimable service. In addition to the choicest cocoa, you obtain partial pre-digestion, with the property to assist in the digestion and conversion of other foods; if in further addition you have a highly vitalising and invigorative force, incorporated with the cocoa, together with stimulant and tonic powers, then you must, as in Dr. Tibbles' Vi-Cocoa, obtain these additional advantages free of expense.

Dr. Tibbles' Vi-Cocoa is made up in 6d. packets, and 9d. and 1s. 6d. tins. It can be obtained from all chemists grocers, and stores, or from Dr. Tibbles' Vi-Cocoa, Limited, Suffolk House, Cannon-street, London, E.C.

MEN might spin, and churn, and knit and sew, and cook and rock the cradle for a hundred generations and not be women. And women will not become men by external occupations. God's colours do not wash out; sex is dyed in the wool.—H. W. Beecher.

WHEN new opinions appear, they will be entertained and respected, by every fair mind, according to their reasonableness, and not according to their convenience, or their fitness to shock our customs.—R. W. Emerson.

The great law of culture is—let each become all that he was created capable of being; expand, if possible, to his full growth; and show himself in his own shape and stature, be they what they may.—Carlyle.

TEMPERANCE MISSIONS.—Applications for the Services of Mr. TENNYSON SMITH, Temperance Reformer, Leader of the New Crusade to arouse the Christian Church, Founder of the "Temperance Ironsides," and Editor of the *Temperance World*, may be addressed to 337, Strand, London, W.C.

A CHEQUE FOR £20 will be sent to the person who supplies the best ten Biblical Texts in favour of Vegetarianism. See this week's *VEGETARIAN*, of all agents and from THE IDEAL PUBLISHING UNION, MEMORIAL HALL, FARRINGTON STREET, LONDON, E.C. Mention the *Woman's Signal*.

Our Open Columns.

[The Editor does not hold herself responsible for the opinions expressed by correspondents. Discussion is invited on the subjects here written upon.]

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

To the Editor of the WOMAN'S SIGNAL.

MADAM,—Let me now appeal to all women to do everything that lies in their power to promote the passing of our Bill into Law. Let us have meetings everywhere. Let every head of a home, from the wife of a daily wage-earner, whose little sitting-room will only hold some five or six persons, to those whose reception rooms will hold from ten to twenty times that number, call together their friends and neighbours, and consider in what way they can promote the passing of this measure. What more fitting time than the present can be found? In what more suitable, more enduring fashion can we commemorate the long and most noteworthy reign of our much-esteemed Sovereign than by the enfranchisement of her sisters throughout the land? There is time for this Bill to become the law of the land before Commemoration day arrives. The Poor Law Guardian Bill passed through all its stages in less than two months. Why not this Bill? Let there be no hair-splitting, no quarrelling over details, no petty jealousies. Let women grasp the broad fact that the disability attaching to women as women will be broken down by this bill. Humanity is dual. Let the dual principle be felt in the Home, in the Parish, District, Municipal and County Councils, and in the Parliament of the Nation. I cannot bear to think that women will again allow themselves to be played with, and deluded into disputing about minor points (which can easily be dealt with afterwards) when the main principle of women's franchise is at stake. Therefore, let all women, and all lovers of justice among men unite in demanding the immediate passing into law of this most important measure.—Yours faithfully,

(Dr.) ALICE VICKERY.

SANDALS.

To the Editor of the WOMAN'S SIGNAL.

DEAR EDITOR,—In reply to your questions concerning Sandals, I am pleased to inform you that they are made of leather (soles and uppers), they are kept on by straps, and they are not home made. Ordinary woollen stockings are worn with them. I enclose some little sketches showing the various kinds of sandals worn by myself and sisters. No. 1 is made of tan leather by Mr. Lill, Shoemaker, Margaret-street, Sheffield; No. 2 is black leather, by Mr. Macdonald, Brotherhood Stores, Wadden, West Croydon; and No. 3 is also black leather, by Mr. Bailey, of 23, Torwood-street, Torquay.—I remain, yours faithfully,

A. J. C.

[Another correspondent states that special stockings for wearing with sandals are made by Mrs. Bishop, North Road, Hershaw, Walton-on-Thames.]



All Good Housewives

Pride themselves on being able to make Nice Sweet Bread, Appetising Tea Cakes, &c. Anyone can do it by using our celebrated "D.C.L." Yeast. Always ask for "D.C.L." If you do not know how to use it write to us for Booklet of Instructions.

Sole Manufacturers:—The DISTILLERS Co. Ltd., EDINBURGH.

SHOP GIRLS.

To the Editor of the WOMAN'S SIGNAL.

DEAR MADAM,—Knowing your thorough acquaintance with the laws affecting the welfare of womankind in this realm, I desire to ask if the Act which provides for the inspection of factories and milliners' workrooms, also applies to drapery establishments where the shop assistants live upon the premises. I know of a case at the West-end, of such gross inhumanity towards the young women employed, where life itself is in peril, that I feel inspection and enquiry imperatively called for. Are there inspectors for such establishments?—Yours respectfully,

JUSTITIA.

[No, there is no inspection or State regulation of retail shops as such. If the premises are insanitary complain to the vestry.]

WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE IN THE WOMEN'S LIBERAL FEDERATION.

To the Editor of the WOMAN'S SIGNAL.

DEAR MADAM,—The account of the 'Union of Practical Suffragists,' which you gave in the *Signal* of November 19th, 1896, drew the attention of Madame Salés to it, and in consequence she generously offered, also through your columns, to give £5 to our funds, if four other ladies would do the same. I have now great pleasure in informing you that this offer has been met by Mrs. Woolcot Browne, Lady Grove, Miss Priestman, and Mrs. Taylor, the last three being members of our Committee, and that in consequence Madame Salés has sent a cheque for £5 to our treasurer.

Allow me to thank you for the help you have given us, and believe me, dear Madam, yours truly,

HESTER LEEDS,

Hon. Sec.

Croydon,

5th February, 1897.

To the Editor of the WOMAN'S SIGNAL.

DEAR MADAM,—I have read Lady Carlisle's letter in your columns, and wish to point out that although the 33 Women's Liberal Associations in Cumberland include Women's Suffrage in their aim and work, it is, as she says, "work within the lines of a party," and in consequence no meeting for Women's Suffrage, as such, has been held in Cumberland for many years, while out of the 257,000 signatures appended to the special appeal for Women's Suffrage (an appeal which was organised by members of the Executive Committee of the Women's Liberal Association in conjunction with those of other societies), only 840 signatures were obtained in Cumberland, from the lack of women sufficiently interested in Women's Suffrage to take the trouble of collecting them. I may add that each of the 33 Women's Liberal Associations was asked to collect signatures with the result just quoted.

While, therefore, fully appreciating the value of the Suffrage work done amongst Liberals by Women's Liberal associations, the Suffrage societies represented at the Birmingham Conference were unable to regard with satisfaction such counties as Cumberland, where the matter is, as yet, worked only "within the lines of one party," and felt the need of endeavouring to gain adherents on a wider basis.

For those who have devoted themselves to the cause of Women's Suffrage realise more and more that there is no chance of passing such a measure as the introduction of women into the Parliamentary electorate except with the approval of men of all parties.

If I seem to speak over-confidently of the views of all the Suffrage societies it is because at the conference the proposition that "Women's Suffrage knows no party" received unanimous approval, and approval of this

CLERGYMAN AND PARISHIONER.

A POPULAR PARSON INTERVIEWED.

A FEW days ago, writes a reporter of the *Salford Chronicle*, it fell to my lot to inquire into a matter which I was told had created a good deal of interest amongst residents in the populous parish of St. Bartholomew's, Salford.

I presented myself at St. Bartholomew's Rectory and sent my name in to the Rev. G. W. Petherick. Mr. Petherick is one of the most popular clergymen in Salford. A man of broad sympathies and unflinching good nature, genuinely solicitous for the welfare of the people within his sphere of activity, the Rector of St. Bartholomew's is welcomed throughout his extensive parish as friend, philosopher, and guide.

My mission I explained to Mr. Petherick, was to make inquiries concerning a parishioner of his, Mrs. Bramhall.

"Mrs. Bramhall is a neighbour of mine," said the Rector, becoming interested at once. "The Rectory is, as it should be, in Parsonage-street, and Mrs. Bramhall resides at No. 10. Oh, yes, I know Mr. Bramhall and his wife quite well."

"She has lately passed through a severe illness?" I said, interrogatively.

"There cannot be any doubt about that," was the reply. "It was brought on, I believe, by overwork. I have not often seen a worse case of nervous breakdown. The poor woman was quite helpless. But I am glad to say she appears to have made a complete recovery."

"As to the means employed to bring about that satisfactory result, are you in a position to give me any information on that point?"

Mr. Petherick considered a moment and then said: "On the whole I think it would be best to let Mrs. Bramhall tell her own story."

"I will only trouble you with one more question then. A certain medicine, known as Dr. Williams' Pink Pills for Pale People, is spoken of in connection with Mrs. Bramhall's restoration to health. Have you had opportunities, apart from this particular case, of forming an opinion as to its value?"

There was a twinkle in the eyes of the clergyman as he answered: "Abundant opportunities, and believe me I have formed very decided opinions. Now, that is a fact. In cases of nervous debility and partial paralysis I am satisfied that the medicine is highly beneficial. Some time ago I had a case brought under my notice which was hardly less wonderful than that of Mrs. Bramhall."

"In your parish, then, the Pills have already an established reputation?"

"Individuals who have tried them—Mrs. Bramhall amongst the number—sing their praises so loudly that that is hardly to be wondered at."

Whatever Mrs. Bramhall may have been in other days, she certainly does not belong to the great family of Pale People now. I found her at the address given me by Mr. Petherick, namely, 10, Parsonage-street, New Oldfield-road, Salford, and experienced no difficulty, such is her enthusiasm on the subject, in eliciting the story of her dangerous illness and of the miraculous cure effected by Dr. Williams' Pills.

"About Whit-week," she said, "I had an attack of influenza. It was a severe attack, and I was reduced to a very low condition by it. This state of things lasted several weeks, and I don't suppose I was quite as strong as I ought to have been when I began to do my own housework again. I had a relapse. Diarrhoea, accompanied by inflammation of the bowels,

set in, and I was again completely prostrated. On this occasion it was found necessary to call in the aid of a doctor."

"Did he tell you what was the matter with you?"

"Yes, he said it was my liver. He told me I had worked every nerve down to the lowest point. The doctor gave me some medicine—I had five bottles from him altogether—but I cannot say there was any improve-

ment as a result. For a whole week I never tasted food or got an hour's sleep."

"You were still able to do your housework, though?"

"Housework? Oh, dear, no. Why, I could hardly crawl across the room. I could do nothing for fully five weeks. It was not a question whether I could work, but whether I could pull through alive. More than once as I lay there, I thought the end had come. I gave myself up, and my friends were equally alarmed."

"How came you to buy Dr. Williams' Pink Pills?"

"It was in this way. I had awful pains from my shoulders right down the back to the very ends of my toes, and one day I asked the doctor if he could give me something to relieve the pain. The doctor said it was neuralgia I had got, so I turned to my husband and said, 'If it's neuralgia I am going to try some of those Pills.' I had heard from different people how good they were for that, and I knew a young woman who had benefited by them so much that she wrote about it to the makers. My husband got me some of Dr. Williams' Pink Pills at once, and I began to take four during a day, after meals. I took that quantity every day for a week. The very first day I felt better, and from that time forward I began to eat and sleep and gain strength, and in less than a fortnight I was actually able to go about my work. That is a couple of months ago. I am quite my old self again now. If I do happen to feel a little over-tired or out of sorts at any time, I take a dose or two of Dr. Williams' Pills—there are always some in the house—and they never fail to set me right."

Mrs. Bramhall added, with marked earnestness, that a worse case than hers had been could not be found, or a more complete cure. Dr. Williams' Pink Pills act directly on the blood, giving strength and tone to the system; and thus it is that they are so famous for the cure of anaemia, rheumatism, scrofula, chronic erysipelas, and to restore pale and sallow complexions to the glow of health. They are also a splendid nerve and spinal tonic, and thus have cured many cases of paralysis, locomotor ataxy, neuralgia, St. Vitus' dance, and nervous headache. They are now obtainable of all chemists, and from Dr. Williams' Medicine Company, 46, Holborn-viaduct, London, at 2s. 9d. a box, or six for 13s. 9d., but are genuine only with full name, Dr. Williams' Pink Pills for Pale People. Pink Pills sold loose or from glass jars are not Dr. Williams'.

Mrs. Alice A. Minnick, a practising lawyer of Beatrice, Nebraska, was admitted to the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States last month. Mrs. Minnick is a strong advocate of free silver, and was secretary of the Woman's Silver League of Gage County during the last campaign. On the same day Miss Caroline H. Pier was admitted, on motion of the well-known lawyer, Miss Kate H. Pier. Both are members with their sister and their mother of the noted Milwaukee firm, Pier & Pier, and all are graduates of the Law School of the University of Wisconsin.



"STRONGEST AND BEST."—Health.



Fry's

PURE CONCENTRATED

Cocoa

OVER 140 GOLD MEDALS AND DIPLOMAS.

Everyone interested in Nursing Matters should read

The NURSING RECORD.

Edited by Mrs. BEDFORD FENWICK.

Published every Saturday.

Price One Penny.

Contains all the Nursing News of the week; Articles by well-known Medical Men and Nurses;



Notes on Science, Art, Literature, and the Drama; Hospital News; Discussions by Matrons in Council, etc., etc., etc.

11, ADAM STREET, STRAND, W.C.

THE 'SAFE' PURSE.



Patented by THE HON. MRS. PERY.

Prevents all danger of losing money while carrying it about. Cannot be snatched from the hand. Adjusted to size, leaving fingers and thumb free for other purposes. Safe and convenient for frequent use. No scrambling for pockets. No time lost in opening bags or other receptacles.

To be had at all Fancy Goods Warehouses. Wholesale at the Depot, enclosing 8d.

where sample Purse can be obtained by extra in stamps at prices from 2s. 6d. to 42s.

DEPOT:

SAFE PURSE SYNDICATE, Ltd.,
7, Wood Street, London, E.C.

"Am delighted with the Knickers, they are such nice comfortable things to wear, so neat and take so little room."—J. D., YELVERTON, July 10th, 1896.
"If women would wear knickerbockers always, many a chill and internal disease would be prevented."—From *Spinning Wheel*, Oct. 24th.
"I find the 'Kals' a most comfortable wear."—E. M., DUNBLANE, March 17th, 1896.
"I shall put all skirts aside for the future."—S. T-ST. HELENS, July 26th, 1896.

If you want
A NEAT FIGURE,
with
FREEDOM,
HEALTH,
AND
COMFORT, wear



'KALS'

The improved Knickerbocker for Ladies. Well made in good materials only, twelve qualities.

Price List post free.

To be obtained ONLY of Sample Pair.
McCALLUM & CO. 3/11
17, Stonehouse, Plymouth. post free.
(State size corset worn and height.)



NEW HARRISON SWIFT GOLD MEDAL
KNITTER
KNITS Stockings ribbed or plain, GLOVES and CLOTHING in WOOL, SILK, or COTTON. INSTRUCTIONS FREE. Lists free per post.
5 TRIUMPHANT AWARDS, including HARRISON KNITTING MACHINE CO. LTD.
Works: 48, Upper Brook St., Manchester.

GENUINE GRAPE JUICE.

FREE FROM ALCOHOL.

Price List,
250 Testimonials,
Etc.,
POST FREE ON
APPLICATION.

UNFERMENTED WINES
Congress,
Madeira,
Alto-Douro,
Muscat, Marsala,
Red Alicante.

Reputed Pints, 14/- to 20/- per dozen.
Reputed Quarts, 24/- to 36/- per dozen.

EXCELLENT COMMUNION WINES.

SMALL SAMPLES of any four of the above will be sent carriage free on receipt of 2/6 by

F. WRIGHT, MUNDY & Co.
Merton Road, Kensington, London, W.

The above Wines are recommended by the Unfermented Wine Dept. of the B. W. T. A.

"THE WOMAN'S SIGNAL."

A Weekly Record and Review of Woman's Work and Interests in the Home and in The Wider World. Price One Penny, every Thursday, from all Newsagents and Bookstalls (to order).

The "WOMAN'S SIGNAL" is sent direct from the office, 30, Maiden Lane, Covent Garden, London, W.C., post paid, for three months, from any date, to any address at home or abroad, for 1s. 8d., for six months for 3s. 3d., or for one Year for 6s. 6d.

SUBSCRIPTION NOTICE.

Subscribers who desire "THE WOMAN'S SIGNAL" by post from the Office should fill up a Form as under, and forward it with Postal Note for the amount.

To the Manager, "WOMAN'S SIGNAL,"

30, Maiden Lane, Covent Garden, London, W.C.

Please send me the "WOMAN'S SIGNAL," for _____ months.

Name _____

Address in Full _____

Date _____

Printed by VEALE, CHIFFERIEL & Co. LTD., 81-87 Cursitor Street, Chancery Lane, London, E.C., and Published by MARSHALL & SON, 125 Fleet Street, London, E.C. Advertisements, Letters to the Editor, etc., to be addressed 30 Maiden Lane, Covent Garden, London, W.C.