

*The Woman's Hour has Struck*



**WOMAN  
SUFFRAGE  
*is*  
COMING**

## **Expectations of Suffragists for the Municipal Vote and Beyond, 1921**

### **General Background and Script Concept**

(MD & RL 15/09/20)

#### **General Background**

The demand for women's suffrage in St. John's began with issues directly affecting women's families and homes. The right to a vote was first raised in the early 1890s and grew louder in first two decades of the twentieth century. The leaders initially articulated their demands as concerned mothers and homemakers. The leaders of the groups (WCTU, IODE, Alexandra Workers, child welfare and animal welfare advocates) were educated middle class women, not surprising as they were the ones with some time to devote to public issues. On some issues, namely housing, child welfare and sanitation they had the support of influential men but there was also a wide fear of increased taxation to meet their demands. They lobbied for:

- "Child welfare" services to address infant and maternal mortality. Some had lost children themselves. Mortality and sickness rates were higher in St. John's than in many North American cities. This was due in part to disease (typhoid fever, GI illnesses, TB, lack of sanitation). Leaders wanted a public nursing service and "well baby" clinics that provided medical help, education, milk for poorer families and information about nutrition.
- Sanitation (related to the above). There were many homes in the central city without running water and with outhouses. After the Fire of 1892 housing had been thrown up hastily (years later, some homes still had dirt floors!). "Night soil" carts still operated in the city to take away outhouse waste and trash but even this service was poor and underfunded. Diseases spread easily including cholera. Slum streets were filled with garbage. Poorer women had to carry water in heavy pails back to their houses from a street pump or fire hydrant. Those demanding the municipal vote wanted a modern water and sanitation infrastructure, including a sewer system put in. See "Slum Picture" for a vivid sense of conditions.
- Provision of affordable houses for workers.
- Animal welfare. There were several intertwining demands: (1) the humane treatment of all animals, encouraged by public education, starting with children in the schools. (2) Penalties for animal neglect and cruelty. Armine Gosling was especially concerned about workhorses (the provision of drinking fountains and load limits regulations). (3) The inspection of imported live animals for disease,

and regulation and inspection of slaughterhouses. Food purity was a concern as well as animal welfare.

- Some (not all) advocated "Local Option", i.e. a vote for women in referenda regulating or prohibiting the sale of alcohol. Temperance feminists linked alcohol consumption to domestic violence, crime and poverty. Others attributed these problems to "moral laxity," idleness, or lack of character and not alcohol per se. As a generality, women in St. John's tended to be divided denominationally on this issue. As with every generalization, there were exceptions.

Despite years of lobbying, without a vote women's groups got nowhere. Resentment grew. The lack of a say, even on municipal issues literally close to home and the failure of authorities to address their concerns as mothers, led leaders to overall questions about women, citizenship and the nation.

The lack of a vote was seen as a stigma upon all women, placing them in the same legal category as criminals and lunatics. A criminal might reform and a "lunatic" recover reason, and both could regain full citizenship. A woman never could. Beyond the world of municipal politics, as Armine Goslings influential speech in 1912 illustrates, they anticipated a vote would bring many things including sweeping changes in national "industrial legislation" (wages and working conditions), equal status under the law, and the opening of all professions and jobs for which women were qualified.

The suffragists hoped a vote would raise the entire status of women in society and bring recognition that they had unique needs and perspectives on government policy. Most of this generation made their case as Mothers and stressed the importance of that role to society. Others took an equal rights position regardless of marital status. Both agreed that society failed to treat their them as adults with equal worth and consigned them to male dependency and control.

### **General play concept**

The suffrage generation had high expectations about what the vote would bring. The script needs to highlight this in some way.

It will be followed by a panel weighing what has been accomplished by the vote but also what remains to be done in this generation, including women's equal representation in government bodies and inclusionary policies that recognize that barriers to equality are intersectional, varying by race, class, religion, family structure, marital status, gender identity, age and disability.

The play provides a lead-in to this broad discussion.



## Visuals: Concept Prompts

1. Womens Time Has Come
2. Suffrage Ad
3. Suffrage March
4. Wife dominates husband
5. Shutting them up
6. Central City slum picture

## Further Sources

Margot Duley, "Armine Nutting Gosling: A Full and Useful Life" in Linda Cullum and Marilyn Porter, *Creating This Place: Women, Family, and Class in St. John's., 1900-1950* (McGill-Queen's University Press, 2014), Ch. 5. [available as Google Play download](#)

Helen Woodrow, "Julia Salter Earle: Seeking Social Justice" in Linda Cullum and Marilyn Porter, *Creating This Place: Women, Family, and Class in St. John's., 1900-1950* (McGill-Queen's University Press, 2014), Ch. 4. [available as Google Play download](#)

Speech of Armine Gosling (1912) at the Ladies Reading Room. *Reprinted and distributed as a pamphlet. The speech proved to be so popular, she gave it twice. The Newfoundland movement drew its inspiration mostly from Great Britain. At the time she gave this speech the suffragettes were being criticized and lampooned in the Newfoundland press. Consequently, she starts with a history of the British movement but interweaves her own expectations for equal voting rights, regardless of sex, race or nation.*

"Votes for Women" (1925)

*Three Daily News columns authored by the Newfoundland Women's Franchise League. Though chronologically after the municipal vote, they illustrate the high expectation that this generation of activists had about its effect on uplifting the status of women as well as on government policy.*

SOURCE: MARGOT I. DULGY, WHERE ONCE OUR MOTHERS STOOD  
WE STAND: WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE IN NEWFOUNDLAND  
(PEI: Gynexy Press, 1993).

## WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Armine N. Gosling

A Paper Read at the Ladies Reading Room, St. John's, N.F.,  
Jan. 15, 1912

Price: Ten Cents  
Herald Print

While in education, social freedom, and opportunity, women have made a good deal of progress during the past century, their political standing is very much what it was a hundred years ago. They are still classed, for purposes of legislation, with idiots, criminals, paupers and minors, and even in that dubious company they hold an inferior place. A male idiot may recover his reason, a male criminal may reform, a pauper may acquire property, and a minor may grow up, in which case they will all be eligible to vote. But women, being women, remain voteless, legal and political nonentities to the end of the chapter. Very probably this was resented then, and that it is resented now we have ample evidence. The vote is the hall mark of citizenship, and the exclusion of women from it means practically their exclusion from the serious life of the age.

There is nothing in the British Constitution to prevent women from voting. It was never a sex privilege. Magna Charta was expressly framed not to exclude women. "To none will we sell, to none will we delay, to none will we deny the right of justice." And every man who denies women the vote to-day denies the right of justice secured to them by their fathers in Magna Charta. In medieval times, when titles and property fell to women, they inherited the offices and responsibilities that went with them, exactly the same as men. "Women have been High Chamberlains, High Constables and Sheriffs, Lords Marshals, Governors of Districts, Castles and Jails; Justices of the Peace and Clerks of the Crown. There is hardly a public office in England, that is not dependent on a University education, that has not at some time been held by a woman." Freeholders in the middle ages were women as well as men, and both had the privilege of being electors or chosen. Sex was no disqualification as it is to-day. In modern terms, as we should express it, every tax-payer could vote. In statutes and edicts the word "man" was always held to include women, and here and there women voted all through the Middle Ages, the number growing smaller as time went on, though their right of franchise was never taken away from them by law. But the male electors were always in the majority, and gradually women's franchise lapsed.

Towards the end of the 18th century we have the first definite protest made by a woman against the disabilities of her sex. This was the famous "Vindication of the Rights of Women," by Mary Wollstonecraft, chief among the pioneers of the Suffrage Movement in England. As one may imagine, to uphold liberty

of thought and action for women in those narrow and conservative times, was to commit an unpardonable sin, and the author was denounced on all sides. "A Hyena in Petticoats," Horace Walpole called her, and the epithet became historic. But we remember her with gratitude for her championship of her sex, and we honour her because she had the courage to say what she thought in an age when women were not expected to think at all. She was a woman of unusual intellect, and her book is full of brilliancy and wit. And she was a prophet — a hundred years ahead of her time. She led the way and pointed out the path, which we are still following.

Women have suffered from every Reformation and every Reform Bill, from that of Henry VIII., down to the Reform Bills of the XIXth century. The privileges of women were narrowed down while those of men expanded. I suppose the fortunes of Woman Suffrage were never at a lower ebb than in the year 1832, when the Great Reform Bill was passed. This act enlarged and extended men's franchise, but by the use of the word "male" before "persons," for the first time in English history, definitely excluded women. Then misfortunes followed thick and fast. In 1833 women lost their right of Dower, in 1835 the Borough franchise was taken from them. Gradually all Municipal Corporations introduced the word "male" into their various local charters, and the few civic privileges women had enjoyed were curtailed in every direction. It seems strange that they should have made no protest against such a crushing veto of their rights as human beings, but, when we study the conditions of women's lives in those pre-Victorian days, we realize how denial of educational privileges, and generations of repression had deprived them of the power to protest effectually.

In Lord Brougham's Act, in 1850, it was decided that "words importing the masculine gender shall be held to include females," and in the Reform Bill of 1867 the phrase "male persons" was swept away, and "man" substituted, with no express exclusion of women. But when women tried to vote on the strength of this they found their claims denied. At this time the first organized Woman Suffrage societies came into existence, and they set to work to secure a parliamentary majority in the House of Commons. Their great champion, the best friend women ever had, was John Stewart [sic] Mill, who entered the House in 1865, and worked steadily on their behalf during his whole parliamentary career. He was their guide, counsellor and friend all his life, and his great book, "Subjection of Women," is a most masterly and trenchant exposition of the injury inflicted on the half of humanity by denying them direct representation. It still remains the last word on the subject. We have merely gone on paraphrasing him ever since. He it was who induced English women to collect one hundred signatures to a petition for the suffrage, for him to present to the House of Commons. They were a timid little band of suffragists — not much like their modern sisters — and they seemed to have completely lost the power of initiative, but when they did finally galvanize themselves into sufficient energy to canvass for supporters, they collected not one hundred but two

thousand signatures. The Bill was thrown out, of course, but it was a beginning. After this they went on organizing petitions, (in fourteen years they sent in over 9,000 petitions, with over 3,000,000 signatures), holding meetings, and in every quiet and constitutional way trying to break down prejudice and convince the individual. Nothing could have been more lady-like or more dignified than their methods of propaganda, and they accomplished — just nothing. On the whole, I am inclined to think they did more harm than good to the cause. They certainly contrived to give an air of shadowy unreality to the whole question, which may have accounted for the fact that in all those lean years the subject never passed the Academic stage — it never became a question of practical politics at all. For years these poor ladies fed on promises. Time after time they presented their petitions, signed by thousands of women, backed by members of Parliament, and time after time they were tricked and betrayed by the men they had trusted. Their Bills rarely got beyond a second reading. They had the bitter experience of working for candidates for election to the House of Commons, pledged supporters of their cause, who, after their election had been secured by the women's efforts and influence, were not ashamed to own that their promises had meant nothing. It was as though men thought it no dishonour to lie, so long as they were lying to women. Nevertheless, in the days preceding the Reform Bill of 1884, the women suffragists' hopes ran high. They were largely supported in the Commons, and the feeling throughout the country was in their favour. The amendment to include them would probably have been carried, had not Gladstone, then Prime Minister, made a pronouncement to his followers urging them to vote against it, on the ground that the question had not been sufficiently sifted, and promising facilities for its consideration later on. Needless to say that time never arrived. In consequence of this, one hundred and four pledged supporters of women suffrage voted against the amendment and secured its defeat. It would seem that they did so without any sense of their own dishonour. They flung their broken promises in the faces of the women who had worked for them, and so far as history records the Woman Suffrage Societies bore this insulting betrayal without any adequate protest. They apparently went on kissing the hand that smote them, turning the other cheek, and conducting themselves generally in the most approved Scriptural manner. Up to this time they had toiled for the strengthening of men's political parties, regardless of their convictions, and had spent themselves freely in all avenues of service open to them. Then, as now, men were unappreciative of and ungrateful for the public work done by women. It has never been acknowledged at its full value, either in the industrial, social, political or religious world. Men have always been under the curious delusion that women neither expect nor want payment, or even acknowledgement. You will see this very clearly manifested in the various branches of church work — where the women's societies make large sums of money by their activities, and hand the same meekly over to the men, who manage all ecclesiastical and religious matters, to

be used at their discretion, without, apparently, the idea ever occurring to any of them, that the women who earned the money should at least have a voice in its expenditure.

This, however, is by the way. In 1902, the Women's Liberal Federation plucked up sufficient spirit to decline any longer to support candidates who were not publicly pledged to woman suffrage, and in 1904 they went a step further and decided to work against the Government at all elections, and to oppose the Government nominee at by-elections. They took the attitude that every Government that refuses to grant women suffrage, is *ipso facto* the enemy, and must be opposed. This was good, sound, constitutional policy, and has borne much fruit. It is a pity they did not adopt it sooner.

We may have some difficulty, here in Newfoundland, as we are content to take no share in Municipal or Political affairs, in appreciating the important part women play in English politics. Their influence, as they chose to exert it, has won or lost many an election, and English politicians understand to the full the value of their assistance. They call upon women to canvass for them, to speak for them, and to influence people to vote for them — but they refuse to trust women with votes, themselves! Women in England do everything with regard to political life that men do, except putting their mark on the voting paper. That, they are denied. It is a most hopelessly illogical position.

When the Liberal Government went into power in 1896, there were four hundred avowed supporters of Woman Suffrage among all parties in the House of Commons, but their Bill was talked out in the first session of Parliament. Some trivial reason was given — a disturbance in the Ladies' Gallery, or something equally convincing. In 1907, a similar fate befell it, and it even failed to reach a division.

I think this was the crisis.

After forty years in the wilderness of humiliation and barren effort and half a century of lady-like methods, the suffrage party had it borne in upon them that Parliament had been merely playing with them all along and that it had never seriously considered the question. They also realized to the full the utter ineffectualness of their previous methods. Perhaps they reminded themselves of Byron's words "Who would be free, himself must strike the blow!" At any rate, after so many years of patient endeavour they concluded that it was useless to plead for the vote any longer, and that there was an imperative need for a change of tactics. In plain words, the women had at last got tired of being humbugged.

The first militant proceedings, however, which took place shortly before this, were in the nature of an accident.

#### ORIGIN OF THE MILITANT CAMPAIGN

In the autumn of 1905 the general political outlook underwent a change. The sands of the Conservative Government were running out and Sir Edward Grey came to Manchester to expound what the Liberal policy would be if a



Liberal Government came into power. The W.S.P.U., then two years old, determined to find out what the Liberal policy would be to women. Christabel Pankhurst and Annie Kenney went to Sir Edward Grey's meeting, and after his speech, at the proper time for questions, put a question to him on this point. He ignored the question. It was then sent up to him in writing, but it was still ignored; and as the meeting showed signs of breaking up, Christabel Pankhurst and Annie Kenney stood on their seats and pressed for an answer. The only answer they got was to be dragged out past the platform and flung into the street. There they started a protest meeting, but the police refused to allow them to proceed, and arrested them on a fabricated charge of assault. Brought before the magistrate the next day, they were sentenced to fine or imprisonment. Christabel Pankhurst to one week and Kenney to three days, and both elected to go to prison. Thus did Sir Edward Grey prefer to see women flung out of his meeting and sent to prison, rather than give an answer to one straightforward question.

We may blame the militant section for violence, but there is not the slightest doubt that thousands of people in England and elsewhere who would never have considered the question at all, are now considering it seriously, because of the women who deliberately faced imprisonment for their convictions. As a mere matter of tactics, the women who went to Holloway scored a triumphant success. It is just as important to convince the public that women are angry, as it is to convince them that women are right. Their proceedings also made the Liberal Government ridiculous. The newspapers chronicled that English cabinet ministers had to be protected in the streets by body guards, relays of police stationed near their houses, even the great Houses of Parliament protected by policemen. And from what? — the attacks of unarmed women! The spectacle of Asquith hiding behind locked doors, or skulking down side streets to avoid the suffragettes proved irresistibly funny, as did the state of hysterical panic into which cabinet ministers were thrown at the approach of a petticoat. Women suffragists learned that in politics it is always the strong who receive attention. To be out of sight is to be out of mind. The needs of a voteless contingent will be neglected in the natural course of things, because it has no means of redress, but no interest with votes behind it can safely be ignored for long. They learned that the only measures politicians understand and respect are violent ones. And they are the ones by which men have time and again won their political rights.

I am not here to defend all the actions of the militant suffragists. Throwing stones, ("concrete messages," Punch calls them), has always seemed to me a singularly unconvincing form of argument. But let it be clearly understood that these tactics which men so loudly condemn in women, are the very ones they have used and approved themselves, on many occasions. A distinguished member of the Labour Party, Mr. T.D. Benson, wrote recently of the riots which preceded the Reform Bill, in 1831:

"Of course, when men wanted the franchise, they did not behave in the unruly manner of our feminine friends. They were perfectly constitutional in their

agitation. In Bristol, I find they only burnt the Mansion House, the Custom House, the Bishop's Palace, the Excise Office, three prisons, four toll houses, and fifty-two private dwelling and warehouses, and all in a perfectly constitutional and respectable manner. Numerous constitutional fires took place in the neighbourhoods of Bedford, Cambridge, Canterbury and Devizes. Four men were respectfully hanged in Bristol and three in Nottingham. The Bishop of Lichfield was nearly killed, and the Archbishop of Canterbury was insulted, spat upon, and with great difficulty rescued from amidst the yells and execrations of a violent and angry mob." And adds: — "I think we are well qualified to advise the Suffragettes to follow our example, to be respectable and peaceful in their methods as we were, and then they will have our sympathy and support."

Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, the leader of the Labour Party, referred in terms of horror and indignation to the conduct of the women who drove Mr. Asquith off the platform at the City Temple last month, but he extolled to the skies the violent actions of the men during the strike riots last summer. It is quite evident that what is sauce for the gander, is by no means sauce for the goose!

The Daily News, commenting on this same protest at the City Temple, says: "The frenzied people who in the name of Woman Suffrage are guilty of such an outrage, are beyond the appeals of reason and decency." In the same paper, in a parallel column to this virtuous outburst, is an account of another meeting — the Servant Protest against Lloyd George's Insurance bill, in the Albert Hall, in which interruptions from Liberals are chronicled. This is a horse of a different color. Does the Daily News censure these interruptions? On the contrary. It describes them with pride and joy, giving details of the manner in which all the speakers were interrupted by hisses, wails, cries of dissent, and loud laughter, to such an extent, that at times not a word these orators said could be heard. "Pantomime," it gleefully asserts, "is the only word that can be used to describe the meeting." This is quite Pecksniffian, and shows up the hypocrisy of the whole criticism.

With few exceptions, the English newspapers are most unfair in their accounts of suffragist happenings. They exaggerate the bad, and suppress the good, and the truth is not in them. The reports we get in our cabled news, are so biased that events are made unrecognizable.

The interruption of speakers is a time honoured method of expressing disapproval in England. Meetings have been broken up, platforms stormed, and speakers prevented from uttering a word, on countless occasions, by male enthusiasts, none of whom have ever had half the justification these women have for rebelling against political conditions.

Tax resistance is found to be a very effective form of protest, and many women suffragists are taking this means of showing that so long as they are refused the rights of citizens, they cannot be expected to fulfill the responsibilities citizenship entails. They have even gone to prison in defence of their principles. Sometimes the Government has run up a bill of £6 or £7, trying to

collect taxes to the amount of [four shillings and six pence] from one of these recalcitrant would-be citizens, who in the end has elected to go to jail rather than pay. So the powers that be are finding the situation both unpleasant and unprofitable. At a suffragist meeting recently, one of the speakers pertinently remarked she wanted to know why we had a statue in the House of Commons to John Hampden, for resisting taxation, and why we had a woman in prison for doing the same thing! Women also refused information to the Census Taker last year, with the idea of harassing the Government.

On July 12th, 1911, a suffrage Bill was drafted by a committee of members of Parliament, known as the Conciliation Committee, and the Bill was called the Conciliation Bill. Members of all parties voted for it, and it carried the second reading by the enormous majority of 110 votes. It was a very moderate Bill, designed to give votes to women householders. Every man who is head of a household can qualify as a voter, and this gave single women earning their own living, and widows, the same privilege. About 1,000,000 women of all classes, in the United Kingdom, would have been enfranchised, and more than half of them would have been working women. So the Bill was sufficiently Democratic to suit all classes. The committee had received a definite pledge from the Prime Minister, for ample facilities for their Bill, in the Session of 1912, and there was every reason to suppose that this very moderate measure would have been carried. Hope sprang again in the breasts of the suffragists. But their joy was short lived. In November, 1911, Mr. Asquith announced his intention of introducing a manhood suffrage Bill, which was to be forced through all its stages in 1912 and to which an amendment might be added to include women suffrage, if desired. This pronouncement completely cut the ground from under the Conciliation Bill, for it is clearly impracticable to have manhood Suffrage for men, and a property qualification for women. Mr. Asquith has thus, in spirit if not in the letter, broken his pledge to the women suffragists. They have taken his action as a declaration of war from the Government, and have again resumed hostilities. In spite of the brutal treatment former deputations to the House of Commons have received at the hands of the police, another raid was made on November 21st, and there were the usual scenes of violence, breaking of windows, conflicts with the police, and the arrest and subsequent imprisonment of over two hundred women.

Meanwhile, Lloyd George has announced his intention of fighting for an amendment to the new Reform Bill, to include Woman Suffrage, but he knows, and Mr. Asquith knows, and the suffragists themselves know how slight are its prospects of success. A few are still hopeful, but the majority share the profound distrust that Lloyd George seems to have inspired among the suffragist leaders, by his fast and loose policy in connection with woman suffrage, and his disregard of the best interests of women, in his Insurance Bill.

The suffragists feel the deepest resentment and indignation, and they do well to be angry. Their provocation is great. There is no demand for manhood

suffrage, and thousands of representative women have been asking for the vote for many years. Women have asked and men are to receive. And if this Manhood Suffrage Bill becomes law — as it will — it must not be imagined that women will be no worse off than they were before. It may be thought that as women have managed to get along somehow without votes hitherto, no great harm will be done them. But their position will be very different and much worse than in former times. Then, most men had no votes; Now, women alone will stand in the ranks of the governed, with all the men to govern them. Their personal Liberty will be more and more curtailed, and they will find themselves obliged to submit to the system of elaborate regulations and inspection, necessary in thickly peopled countries; without any effectual means of protest. It will be nothing short of tyranny.

This battle for Women's Suffrage stands out as the hardest fought campaign ever waged for any reform. The final struggle must come soon, and sympathizers all over the world are watching. They know that when England adopts equal suffrage the women of every country shall profit by it.

While England had undoubtedly been the storm centre of this movement, there have been signs of abundant activity elsewhere. In Germany, Italy, and Austria, it is attracting great attention and making progress. A large International Convention was held last year in Italy, and many converts were made. In France, the women are enthusiastic feminists, possessing a degree of industrial liberty unknown to Englishwomen. In Sweden and Denmark women have Municipal Suffrage, and in Norway women vote on equal terms with men and are eligible to hold office. All the Colonies that make up the Australian Commonwealth, and New Zealand, have full suffrage, and their statesmen have testified time and again to the beneficial effect of women's participation in political life. Their vote had been solidly against vice and the liquor interest, and in favour of progress and reform. All the social reform legislation for which Australia is noted, has been vigorously supported by the women voters. In America, six States have full suffrage. Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Idaho, Washington State, and last year, by a brilliant victory, California, the second largest State in the Union. Other states are expected shortly to follow their example, for nothing succeeds like success, and woman Suffrage has achieved a pronounced success even in these early stages. Women in the six suffrage States have equal powers with men to make laws and control their execution. A significant incident occurred recently in Washington State, which has a law called the "recall," providing that ten per cent of the voters in any community can force a new election for any office at any time. A Mr. Gill was Mayor of Seattle when women were given the suffrage. He was a "sporting" type of man, and his laxity with regard to the public morals was so marked, that Seattle attained an unenviable notoriety on account of its appalling social conditions. The first important achievement of the women voters was his recall. It was pressed by the women immediately upon their enfranchisement, and his defeat at the subsequent election by 6,000 votes was



undoubtedly due to them. His successor, Mr. Dilling, was a man of totally different type, a public spirited man, and a member of the Public Welfare League, and he went into office with instructions that could not be misinterpreted. The local newspapers reported, "This change has been brought about by women. All the wards wherein the women cast a heavy vote gave majorities for Mr. Dilling." Here is a case where the women's vote ranged itself solidly on the side of order and morality, and good government, and I contend it would generally do so.

Finland, little Finland, has the credit of possessing the most perfect system of representation in the World. Women there are on an absolute equality with men, socially, industrially and politically.

The vote is a great educator. Even this agitation for the vote has done more to educate the women of England than anything else ever did. They have learned many things during the last five years. They have learned how to co-operate—a thing men are fond of telling you women can't do — and they have discovered the value of solidarity.

They have learned to consider great questions, and they have found out how to organize — their monster meetings, the enormous Hyde Park Demonstration, and their wonderfully beautiful processions, have been among the most perfect things of their kind. Further more, the suffrage movement has done much to break down the barriers of class, and bring together people of every rank and station. It is admitted that women are conscientious, that they take responsibility well, and it is impossible to deny that whatever tends to develop their public spirit, to give them a wider outlook and larger interest, must be a good thing for them, and for their children, and for their country. In questions of education, infant mortality, industrial conditions where women are concerned; the housing of the poor, the treatment of the poor, the insane and criminals — questions now legislated upon solely by men, women feel that their point of view should be recognized. Infant mortality is essentially a woman's question. It has been reduced nearly fifty per cent in South Australia since woman suffrage was granted.

Further, women need the vote to safeguard their own interests. To hear people talk one would think all men had an inborn genius for mastering the intricacies of public questions. One would think that the world was wholly masculine, and that national questions did not touch women's lives at all. But neither sex has a monopoly of common sense or political wisdom, and the active and intelligent cooperation of women is almost a necessity if comprehensive and far reaching reforms are to be effected.

I have read and heard a good deal about woman suffrage, both for and against, but I have never yet met an argument on the other side, worthy of the name. I am still looking for one anti-suffrage argument with a leg to stand on, but it refuses to materialize. I find prejudice (any amount of it), and iron-bound custom and tradition — two of the most powerful of social influences — and

feeling, and sentiment — but no arguments. Most of our opponents have nothing more convincing to advance than "men are men and women are women," and then they think they have clinched the matter. So they have, but not in the way they imagine. It is just because men are men, and totally different from women, that they cannot satisfactorily legislate for both. Women have suffered many things in the past under the ignorant but perfectly well-meant laws framed by men. It is the wearer and not the shoemaker that knows best where the shoe pinches.

Another "Anti" will assert that the behaviour of the suffragettes proves conclusively that women are unfit to exercise the franchise. I merely take occasion to refer him (or her) to a study of the methods employed by men in their various agitations for the vote.

Another has heard that something has happened, or has not happened, as the case may be, — in New Zealand or Colorado, which demonstrates that women's voting has mischievous effects. And there are still people who sincerely believe that it would "unsex" women to exercise an intelligent interest in the laws by which they are governed. But to have an opinion on politics is not incompatible with the strictest domesticity, and in the countries where women do vote, their feminine characteristics do not appear to have been eliminated by the process. A more developed intelligence has perhaps rendered their outlook on life broader, but they remain womanly.

One often hears it said that women do not need votes, because they can always exert enough influence over men to get what they want without direct representation. Miss Marie Corelli is a passionate exponent of this theory. But this indirect influence, this *sex* influence (for it is nothing else) is bad. It is bad for women to have to wheedle, coax, and cajole men into giving them something which should be theirs as a right, and it is equally bad for men to be coaxed and wheedled. It tends to make women sly and scheming, and in men it fosters the already too well developed spirit of domination. We are told that women's place is the home. But how can women stay at home when they are obliged to earn their own living or starve? In the factories of Great Britain, the number of women employed is double the number of men. Of what use is it then, to tell women that their place is the home, when too often, the home as an institution, is dependent for its very existence on the wages of its female members.

The last bulwark of the anti-suffragists is that women should not vote because they do not fight. This is the sort of argument that sounds convincing, but goes down like a nine-pin at the first attack. Men are not given votes because they can fight, nor are they deprived of the franchise if physically unfit for martial enterprise. Why so much stress should be laid upon this disability of women, it is hard to see, because it happens to be the case that the moment the man becomes a soldier he loses his vote! It is to the peaceful householder who pays taxes for the upkeep of the army, navy and police force, that the vote is

entrusted, and women are not let off paying those taxes because they are women. They pay for the upkeep of these institutions just the same as men do. So much for the physical unfitness of women to exercise the franchise, and the argument that they are intellectually unfit will hardly carry weight with manhood suffrage in sight in England. When every lot of 21 is considered fit to vote, it is difficult to understand the exclusion of educated women!

We are told that women do not want the vote. We know there are, unfortunately, many women who do not appreciate this symbol of citizenship, but we know also that a large and ever increasing number of women do want it. Why should they be prevented by the dog-in-the-manger-ish policy of the women who don't? The right to vote carries with it no obligation to do so. No one will be hounded to the poll and constrained to vote. Men frequently have votes and do not use them and to give Mrs. (say) Brown a vote which she wants, and can use with intelligence and discretion, need not upset the equilibrium of Mrs. Jones, who prefers to rule the world by staying at home and rocking the cradle of the little Joneses! It is difficult to understand the mental processes of people who say, in effect, "I don't want to vote, and therefore you shall not have one!"

May I now present for your consideration a few arguments in favour of Woman Suffrage. Women should have the vote —

Because — most laws affect them as much as they do men, and some laws affect them more, and they are now framed without consulting the persons they are intended to benefit.

Because — people who have to obey laws should have a voice in making them. This is the foundation of all liberty.

Because — laws dealing with the welfare of children should be regarded from the women's point of view as well as the man's. Questions concerning the home are now continually being legislated upon, and women have knowledge and experience which could be brought to bear helpfully on domestic legislation.

Because — men no matter how well-meaning they may be, never have made, and never can make suitable and just laws for women. No law concerning women has ever passed the House of Commons, that has not borne the unmistakable stamp of sex-legislation.

Because — no class, or race, or sex, can have its interests properly attended to in the legislation of a country, unless it is represented by direct suffrage. Women workers, for example, have learned that unless you have political power you cannot get industrial justice. And, lastly, women should have the vote,

Because — a very large number of representative women all over the world are asking for it.

The laws dealing with women are notoriously unfair and badly administered. Very few women of the better class, living what we call a sheltered life, have any idea whatever of their legal position. It would probably surprise them very much to learn that as mothers they have no legal existence, and no

more rights over their children than their own nursemaid has. The father is the only parent recognized by law, and his is the sole control over his children. He can take them away from their mother when they are infants, can direct their education and occupations, and regulate their lives generally, quite regardless of the mother's wishes. The only case in which, by English law, a mother has a right to control her children, is when they are illegitimate. The unmarried mother is rewarded by being given the full custody of her child. She becomes the sole parent. But let us not delude ourselves into thinking that this is done by way of concession to women. It is merely for the purpose of shielding the father from the penalty of his misdeeds.

Similarly, in marriage, according to English Common Law, the wife ceases to be a person. For purposes of legislation husband and wife are regarded as one, and needless to say the husband is that one. Further, no promise made by a man before marriage can deprive him of his rights over wife and children. He may make a hundred promises before marriage, and break them after it, and the law will sanction his conduct. Fortunately for us, men are seldom as bad as the laws they make. The position of women would be intolerable if men acted up to their legal rights. Only twenty years ago a married woman couldn't call a penny her own. When she married, her husband, in theory and with the assistance of our archaic Marriage Service, endowed her with all his worldly goods. In fact, however, he absorbed her property and herself. He could, and did, possess himself of her earnings, and squander them in riotous living. Since the Married Woman's Property Act passed in 1883, women have been graciously allowed to keep what belongs to them. But, even now, if a man refuses to give his wife a suitable allowance or a reasonable share of his income, she has no redress. A well-to-do man can legally starve his wife for years, and dying, can cut her off without a penny and still be within the rights the law gives him.

If he die intestate, his wife gets one-third only of his real estate, but if a woman dies intestate her husband inherits her entire property, real and personal. This is an appalling injustice, and bears very heavily on the average housewife possessing no qualifications for earning her own living. John Stewart Mill said, "If marriage were all it might be, looking to the laws alone, a woman's life would be a hell upon earth."

The Divorce Laws are grossly unfair to women. A man can divorce his wife for unfaithfulness alone, but she has to prove cruelty or desertion as well against him. He may be grossly and persistently immoral, but this fact would not entitle her to a decree of dissolution of marriage.

Women have suffered under the laws of primogeniture and entail from feudal days until the present. There was a reason in the old days, when active military service was required, for the preference of the eldest male, but when this system was replaced by payments of money (in the time of Henry II), there remained no reason why the eldest son should inherit, any more than the eldest daughter. The law is opposed to the natural principal of justice, but the nation

has grown accustomed to it, and continues to accept it. In the majority of families the prospects of the girls are entirely subordinated to those of the boys, to this day.

It is characteristic of male legislation to regard offences against property with more severity than those against the person. A man may beat his wife, or grossly ill-treat a horse, in England today, and get off with a more lenient sentence than another who steals a pair of shoes or a loaf of bread. Women would certainly impart a more humanitarian tone to legislation. They would refuse to encourage that double moral standard — the golden calf which men have set up. Let us get it firmly into our minds that the law ignores women wherever and whenever possible. A woman is a citizen when the question is one of taxation or punishment. She is non-existent when rights and privileges are under discussion. And it is surely a travesty of justice, for a woman to suffer the extreme penalty of a law which neither she nor any other woman has had a voice in framing.

Furthermore, when men legislate for women, they are apt, no matter how benevolent their intentions, to do more harm than good. When Mr. John Burns attempted to regulate the times at which women should not be allowed to work in factories, he caused untold misery to the women he was trying to benefit. He simply could not understand the situation as a woman would have done. Male legislators have a habit—and an objectionable habit — of lumping women and children together for purposes of legislation. Now, women are not children, and they resent being classed with them, and the needs of women and children are vastly dissimilar.

In old, far-off days, woman was the mother of all the industries. She was the potter, the weaver, the spinner. She prepared the food, she tilled the soil, she bore the burden of the race. In civilized countries to-day, work which was formerly regarded as belonging essentially to women, has passed to a great extent, into the hands of men. Even the needle, women's earliest tool, has been adopted by them. To-day, men do cooking, sewing, hair-dressing, house-work, and kindred occupations, in all parts of the world, and no one questions their right to do so. But let a woman attempt to earn her bread in any trade or profession hitherto fulfilled by men, and they make haste to place all possible obstacles in her path. As doctors, women have scored a brilliant success, but the pioneers in the medical profession had a thorny path to tread. Dr. Sophia Jex-Blake, for instance, whose death occurred a few days ago, was the leader in the movement, at Edinburgh University in 1868, to give women a medical education. Her obituary notice in a recent number of the "Times" speaks of the impediments thrown in the way of these women students, especially when it was found that they had attained a higher degree of success than the males. Things grew so unpleasant that it was not safe for the ladies to go to and from the College without a bodyguard, and their environment was extremely hostile. Even now the prejudice against women doctors still survives. In England all the

best and most lucrative appointments are reserved for men. Of the twelve great general hospitals in London, eleven are closed to women. In America women are treated more fairly. In the Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore, one of the model hospitals of the world, there are always several women internes [sic] on the Staff, on precisely the same terms as the male doctors, doing good work. In this, as in other professions, America is not above utilizing the brain-power of its women citizens for the general good.

The legal profession is not open to women in England, though they have been practising law successfully for a good many years in France. Even Newfoundland is more progressive in this respect than the Mother Country. But the chief grievance that women complain of is unfairness of payment. The practice, which is almost universal, of giving women one-third the pay a man receives for doing the same work is so radically unfair, as to need no comment. And the fact that the Government is one of the worst offenders in this respect, is significant.

Teaching, in England and elsewhere, has a regular scale of wages, by which every woman teacher is paid from one-third to one-half the salary a man receives for doing the same work, quite irrespective of training or qualifications. One of the first questions to which women gave their attention in the Australian Colonies, on receiving the franchise, was this, of equal pay for equal work, and in most of the American States where equal suffrage prevails, work is paid according to its merits, and not according to the sex of the worker. When people say the possession of the vote will make no difference to the wages of women, they forget what happened in Norway, when women got the vote there. The Norwegian Government immediately raised the wages of its female employees to the level of those of men doing the same work. When the English Government employs women it invariably pays them less than men. One of the reasons for having girl messengers in the Post Office, was because they were a shilling a week cheaper in wages than boys. In England, the Government is a very large employer of labour, but it differentiates in a very marked manner between the sexes. It is a model employer for men who have votes. It is a bad master for women who are politically helpless. When male workers are underpaid, they have the right as voters, to make their representatives stir up the Government and get things set right. But women, however down-trodden, have no representatives in the House of Commons to attend to their interests, and every fresh restriction made by law on women's labour, puts the woman at a disadvantage as compared to the man. The principle of unequal pay follows them everywhere, even into domestic service. It is quite conceivable that a parlor-maid may be a better and more useful servant than a footman. But he gets higher wages. Why? Simply and solely because he is a man.

The "Lancet" comments recently on the fact that male attendants in lunatic asylums, who work sixty-six hours a week, receive higher pay than the women attendants, who work seventy-two hours. The same system prevails in all branches of Government service. A male factory inspector is paid a salary of



£1200 a year, where a woman is thought lucky to get £400. A woman school inspector receives £300, where a man is paid £1,000, and so on.

The female post office clerks, while doing the same work, and doing it quite as satisfactorily as the male clerks, receive one-third to one-half the wages of the latter.

Finally the English Government has the name of being one of the worst of sweaters. In 1911, it reduced the price paid for making service dress trousers at the Pimlico Clothing Factory, from 3d. to 2 1/4d. per pair! This system of cutting down the wages of voteless women is all the more serious when one remembers that in this and other Government factories, the lowest wage paid to the male workers, however unskilled, is about three times as much as the lowest wage paid to the women employees. The Government, representing men and their interests, is continually interfering with women and their work, and threatening to deprive them of, first one and then another means of livelihood. They are forbidden to be acrobats; well paid nightwork is taken from them (as in the printing trades); the positions of barmaids and florists are attacked; the married teachers are turned out, all in their own interests of course! Working women are never allowed to pursue their walk in life peacefully; they never know when some new and entirely unnecessary and unjust regulation will be sprung upon them. Millions of women must work or starve — there is no getting over the fact, and it is the height of cruelty to make their hard lot harder by hedging them about with artificial restrictions, from which they cannot protect themselves, owing to their political helplessness. They understand their own work better than men can ever do, and they ought to have a say in the laws that regulate their lives.

These things may not touch us. But, at least, we can understand that conditions which would make little or no difference to people in comfortable circumstances, might be almost intolerable to the very poor. And that is where a consideration of this question brings us. It shows us clearly that though we may feel none of the hardships resulting from the unjust legislation concerning women, yet we know that the laws do press very hardly on women not so fortunately placed. And though the franchise may make very little difference to us, personally, yet it seems to me that we ought to stand shoulder to shoulder in the fight for it, because of what it would mean for our poorer sisters. The laws that so materially affect their lives are bound to be haphazard and one-sided, without the aid of the counsel of responsible women. It is so now, and it will prove worse unless women's political disabilities are removed. We can no longer afford to do without the help of half the nation in organizing the life of the whole.

The Suffrage Movement grows apace. Since writing the above, the Parliamentary vote has been granted to the women of Sweden. In America, a Bill has been introduced into Congress to enfranchise women for the Federal Legislature, while Mr. Roosevelt, long a strenuous opponent of woman suffrage, has come boldly out into the open as its champion.

In London, at a meeting of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies, on Feb. 3rd, Lloyd George reiterated his promises of support to the movement, and declared his belief that the amendment to the new Reform Bill to include women, would certainly be carried next session. He stated that three-fourths of the Liberal members of the House, and two-thirds of the members of the Cabinet were in favour of it.

Source: Adelaide Nutting Historical Nursing Collection, Teacher's College, Columbia University, New York City.

### “THE THING IS HOPELESS ...”

“We are also told that they have the vote in Australia and Canada but that is no reason why they should have it here. I do not believe in the theory of following the crowd.

I believe that the members of Parliament in England allowed the measure go through because they were actually intimidated into doing so and as soon as they got the women in the House they saw the folly of ever having permitted it.

Another argument that is put forward in support of the contention that women should have their vote is that of their war record but I do not see how people can allow their minds to become warped. A woman who would make an excellent Red Cross nurse might be hopeless as a politician. Now, I wish to say that I intend to oppose this Bill at every stage and especially when it comes into committee. It is not that I think women are not good enough for the vote, it is rather that I think the vote is not good enough for women. When we come to equal rights for women, I believe that the women themselves would be the very first to object to the principle when they realized what it really meant. Equal rights would mean that one would no longer need an introduction to a lady to address her because one does not need an introduction to a man if he gets on board a train and wishes to enter into conversation with him. He simply drops down beside him and starts talking and if the same thing applied to women, all a man need do would be to sit down and start talking to the first pretty girl he saw, regardless of whether he knew her or not. The same way a man would no longer give a lady his seat in a tram if it happened to be filled because I am sure I would not give my seat in a car to any hon. member of this House; nor should I raise my hat to him if I met him on the street but I do take off my hat to ladies of my acquaintance. The thing is hopeless and I know the women themselves would be long sorry to see it work out to that extreme.”

James R. McDonnell (Liberal, St. George's),  
House of Assembly Proceedings, 1921

TH QRY.  
 Howells, Pres-  
 Carbonar (Teach-  
 ) Molle Kelly, Mercy  
 Road, (Rudiments);  
 Mercy Convent, Military  
 late J. T. C. L. P.  
 DER OF MERIT.)  
 HER LOCAL.  
 Halley, Josephina  
 Convent, Military  
 D INTERMEDIATE.  
 urrence J. P. Farguson.  
 Pass—Margaret, God-  
 vent, Military Road.  
 ERMEDIATE.  
 M. Pike, Magdalen  
 ation Convent, Car-  
 Furlong, Lillian, May  
 Mercy Convent, Mil-  
 ry Martin, St. Joseph's  
 estown; Eleanor Jones,  
 Presentation Convent,  
 Marcella Lee, Pres-  
 ent, Carbonar Pass,  
 Presentation Con-  
 Grace.  
 VANCED JUNIOR.  
 Sullivan, Mercy  
 ary Road; Agnes Con-  
 Collins, Victoria Street.  
 O'Dea, Catherine, Sum-  
 onvent, Military Road.  
 JUNIOR.  
 M. Humphries,  
 ictoria Street; Mercedes  
 Kathleen Fitzgerald,  
 Military Road; Ellis  
 St. Patrick's Convent,  
 off, Presentation Con-  
 Marguerite Murphy,  
 Military Road; Mary  
 Presentation Convent,  
 re; Mary Williams,  
 Military Road; Estel  
 Presentation Convent,  
 re; Margaret Stoddy,  
 Convent; Triffle Par-  
 M. O'Brien, Georgina  
 intation Convent; Car-  
 y B. Furneaux, Pres-  
 ent, Harbour Grace;  
 ms, St. Joseph's Con-  
 vent; Geraldine E. M.  
 e L. Goodwin, Presen-  
 Harbor Grace; Grace  
 Collins, Victoria Street;  
 by, St. Patrick's Con-

Pass—Julia Kavanagh, Presenta-  
 tion Convent, Carbonar; Mary Har-  
 rington, St. Patrick's Convent; Han-  
 nah Coody, Presentation Convent,  
 Cathedral Square; Helen Ash, Jesse  
 Rowe, Presentation Convent, Carbon-  
 ear; Margaret M. Hayden, Presenta-  
 tion Convent, Harbour Grace; Nellie  
 J. Earle, Presentation Convent, Car-  
 bonar; Eleanor Coody, Miss Collins,  
 Victoria Street; Mary C. R. Hogan,  
 Presentation Convent, Harbour Grace.

**Votes For Women.**  
*DAILY NEWS, 23 Jan 1925*

It was not opposition to women's  
 working that caused objections, be-  
 cause throughout the ages they have  
 been forced to work without anything  
 being said. It was the fact that wom-  
 en wished to choose their fields of  
 labor that brought on the troubles.  
 Women worked as scrub women in  
 office buildings and nothing was  
 said, but when they came to those  
 same office buildings as lawyers and  
 doctors then it was that they were  
 accused of neglecting their homes.

In a democracy the ballot is the  
 symbol of human freedom and human  
 responsibility. The women of New-  
 foundland are asking that the govern-  
 ment of this country be a government  
 of the whole people, for the whole  
 people, and by the whole people, and  
 not a government of, for and by half  
 the people. We are asking that we  
 who live under laws which we must  
 obey and which affect our relations in  
 life may have something to do with  
 the making of these laws. We are  
 asking that we who pay a very con-  
 siderable portion of the taxes of the  
 State and of the country may have  
 a voice in the apportionment of those  
 taxes. We are asking that we who  
 work may have a say as to the con-  
 ditions under which we work, condi-  
 tions which, even now, are largely  
 under political control, and which,  
 every year that we live come more  
 and more fully under that control.  
 We are asking for the full responsi-  
 bilities, duties and dignity of citizen-  
 ship. We are asking for justice, for  
 fair play, for a square deal. We are  
 asking to be enfranchised.

**DANCE—To-night! To-night!**  
 "Galaxy" Hall. Music by

By Monday's train Brother A. An-  
 drews, District Deputy Supreme  
 President, proceeded to Harbour  
 Grace for the purpose of installing  
 the Officers of the above Lodge. The  
 District Deputy was accompanied by  
 Past Presidents W. P. Butler and  
 G. T. Phillips, Vice-President Dr. A.  
 Bishop, J. Harvey, E. Long and H.  
 Barnes.

Arriving at Harbor Grace, the visit-  
 ing brethren were taken in charge  
 by the Reception Committee and con-  
 veyed to the Le Drew Hotel where a  
 sumptuous dinner awaited them.

At 8 p.m. the District Deputy and  
 the following acting Grand Lodge Of-  
 ficers, Brothers E. Simmonds, P. D.  
 D., S. P. W. H. Harris, P. P., J.  
 Fox, P. P., W. P. Butler, P. P., G.  
 T. Phillips, P. P., and Dr. A. Bishop  
 V. P. were received by the Lodge.

The following officers were then  
 installed by the District Deputy amid  
 much enthusiasm among the Breth-  
 ren:—

- W.P.P.—Bro. A. J. Goodland.
- W.P.—Bro. R. Sheppard.
- W.V.P.—Bro. T. J. Murphy.
- Chaplain—Bro. W. B. Walters.
- Rec. Secty.—Bro. A. W. Heath.
- Fin. Secty.—Bro. E. E. Parsons.
- Treasurer—Bro. C. C. Butt.
- Surgeon—Bro. Dr. Cron.
- 1st Guide—Bro. Arthur Ash.
- 2nd Guide—Bro. J. C. Payne.
- 3rd Guide—Bro. H. L. Yetman.
- 4th Guide—Bro. M. Wells.
- 5th Guide—Bro. H. Kitchen.
- 6th Guide—Bro. W. Stevenson.

The District Deputy, at the request  
 of the newly installed W.P., pre-  
 sented Bro. W. B. Walters with a  
 Jewel of Merit for meritorious ser-  
 vices as Chaplain for the past seven-  
 teen years. Bro. Walters in a few  
 well-chosen words thanked the breth-  
 ren for the honour conferred upon  
 him.

The most pleasing event of the  
 evening was the conferring of the  
 rank of President upon Bro. E. E.  
 Parsons for excellent services ren-  
 dered the Lodge during his twenty  
 years of office. Bro. Parsons thank-  
 ed the brethren for the very high  
 honour conferred upon him.

After the Installation Ceremony was  
 completed and the usual congratula-  
 tory speeches made, the brethren re-  
 tired to the Banquet Room, which was  
 artistically decorated for the occasion  
 where a well-prepared banquet was  
 partaken of. After the good things  
 prepared by the Committee were dis-  
 posed of, the following toast list was  
 very enthusiastically carried out.

Bro. W. P. Butler, P. P.; Resp.  
 R. Sheppard, W. P.  
 Song—Bro. John Harvey.  
 "The Chairman"—Prop. Bro.  
 Phillips, P. P.; Resp. Bro. R.  
 pard, W. P.

The past year has been a suc-  
 ful one for Diamond; Justice  
 great credit is due the Brethren  
 the excellent services rendered  
 Lodge.

The gathering dispersed with  
 singing of the National Anthem  
 Auld Lang Syne and was voted b  
 as the most successful gathering  
 held by the Lodge. The visitor  
 turned to town by train Tuesda  
 ternoon.

**Card Tournament**  
**K. of C. vs B. I.**

The first of the contemplated  
 round series of Auction forty  
 between the K. of C. Club and  
 B. I. S. was played in the fe-  
 rooms on Tuesday night. Sixty  
 bers of each club participated un-  
 20 tables in all or six at each  
 a trio of one club against a tr  
 the other. At the opening of  
 game Mr. Wm. Oakley, on b  
 of the K. of C. extended a b  
 tivation to the B. I. S. on v  
 behalf President Higgins made  
 suitable reply and then the gam  
 ens. Thirty deals were allow  
 each sextet of players, the con  
 proceed continuously at each  
 from the first to the last of the  
 At the tot up it was found th  
 B. I. S. players had totalled  
 whilst their opponents' score  
 to 5,690, the former winning th  
 night's round by 225 points.  
 special prizes, splendid pipes  
 awarded the trio making the b  
 score and the team comprised  
 K. of C. members, namely  
 McNamara, Jas. Lacey, and  
 Duddy. At the conclusion of the  
 refreshments were served at  
 tables to all the participants  
 printed programmes of the un-  
 tive lively songs were dis-  
 amongst the gathering, all ju  
 the words and in a rollicking  
 style at the bidding of our  
 William Wallace. Special song  
 also rendered by Messrs. Ed  
 Power and William B. I  
 whilst Mr. Thomas Keat



their severe loss, and a fervent expression of hope that the very near future may witness their complete recovery from the misfortune that has befallen them, the re-erection of their College and the resumption of his all-important work in the cause of education in Newfoundland.

Forward on behalf of Terra Nova Council,

(Sgd.) J. G. HIGGINS,  
Grand Knight.

DN. Jan. 31, 1925 (5)

## Votes For Women.

DAILY NEWS, 31 Jan 1925

It is sometimes difficult to realize that until a few years ago women were denied the right of an education. And the wonder is, considering how short the time since the first woman entered college not how little but how much they have achieved.

It is significant to note that the arguments used against the education of girls were practically the same as those used at the present time in Newfoundland—one of the last countries to still class its women with criminals and lunatics—against extending the franchise to women. And now in most countries educational laws have been passed compelling girls as well as boys to go to school.

One of the chief aims of the suffragists is to remove the stigma now placed upon all Newfoundland women and in this way to raise the whole status of women. This is a stigma which every self-respecting and thoughtful woman must resent, and so must any man who is forced to swear before the altar that he will "honour" his wife. It places her in a lower and more hopeless position than the male lunatic, for he may recover; than the male criminal, for he may reform; than the male pauper, for he may acquire property; than the male alien, for he may become naturalized; than the male felon for he may become an adult.

Women desire the vote to forward the progress of humanity towards a higher and purer civilization which will include the whole race.

Insist on



## Jersey Slim, Crepe-de-Chene

Very handsome models in Black only, rich looking Dresses,—showing round neck, short sleeves and side panels, etc.; all straight line effects. Sizes range from 16 to 38 bust. It's an opportunity you should avail of. Reg. \$10.00  
Dresses for

# 4.98

## Bungalow Aprons

Sensible Aprons for the housewife, in Ginghams and Striped Cottons of great durability, short sleeves, round or square neck, self trimmings. Regular \$1.98  
\$2.20. Special ..

## LADIES' U

A snap in Vests and Pant and fancy slits. Sizes 36 to 46. Special .....

## CORSET V

Children's ting Corset Ws attached. day .....

## DRESS OR

Elegant aff oriental effects to 75c. Friday,

## JUMPERS

Ladies' and 3 from 26 to 44. Navy and Black plaited girdle. \$1.50. Friday,

## Velour P

Fair Lady P made, each i ed package.

## Bonnie I

Just slip t sing, tying sorted shade .....

# Footwea

We have singled out the following Special this week's selling event, they're good, even them extra good.

**MEN'S BOOTS**—In Dark Tan shade, made of light weight Calf, equipped with Rubber Heels. A very natty Boot. Special \$4.28

**INFANTS' BOOTS**—Laced and Buttoned styles in mixed shades of good grade Kid. Sizes 1 to 4. Regular 50c. Friday, Saturday 39c. and Monday .....

**INFANTS' BOOTS**—In Dark Tan and Black Dongola Kid, Laced and Buttoned style. Sizes 3 to 8. Special \$1.18

**YOUTHS' BOOTS**—In Dark Tan Calf, sturdy Boots for wearing in rubbers, fitted with rubber heels. Sizes 9 to 13½. Clearing at \$1.98

**LADIES' SPATS**—High grade shapely fitting all wanted sizes. 1 Brown and Grey; 1 and very necessary urday and Monday .....

**WOOL GLOVES**—Knitted Wool Glove wrist, assorted sizes urday and Monday .....

**LADIES' GLOVES**—Fabric Suede Glo shades, Beaver, Gr Black; 2 Dome Special .....

## Gentlemen

Our Unbeatable

# 17.75



**Votes For Women.**

In demanding the ballot women are asking to have their opinions count as half the people and in the most direct way possible for the ballot is the best way yet discovered as the means of representing the will of the people. It is no mad desire on the part of women to put a piece of paper in the ballot box. It is not the vote only that they seek, but what the ballot means—that freedom for which men have been fighting for all these many generations, the moral, mental, economic, and spiritual enfranchisement which political enfranchisement would help bring to pass.

No one person can represent another. Likewise no one sex can represent another. Men can no more represent women than women could represent men. If group representation were better, sons would beseech their fathers to represent them as well as the women of the family, and with one accord they would flock to the proper office seeking to be disfranchised. All admit the fallacy of saying that any of these groups could be adequately represented by the other, and yet many throw logic to the winds and argue that men can represent women. It is a time-old saying that "if there is one thing a man can never understand it is a woman;" but still he persists in trying to represent her in government. The women want to have their opinions count directly, and there is no reason why this should interfere with their indirect influence any more than it does with man's. It would not take the woman any longer than it does the men to vote, and their homes would not be neglected any more than man's business is neglected by their going to the polls.

EVERYONE KNOWS THAT  
SHERRIES  
JELLIES EXTRACTS

**Another NEW**

Ex S.S. "Digby"—

**"EM-AR"**  
**FOR**

**GREY TWEED**

**19.50**

This line Raincoats specialized for the season. SILK

**Also, Ladies' Silk**

**VESTS—Round Neck and Short Sleeves**

**VESTS—Low Neck, Strap over shoulder**

All neatly finished

**KNICKERS TO MATCH—Wide Elastic**



ty sat on a wall,  
ty had a great fall"  
edicate a Lutheran  
ented another Church  
of Luther's religious  
e 60 or 70 feet hcle  
bout all that's left to  
the ex-Kaiser's visit.  
Gate is called New  
no history.  
Damascus Gate and  
est embellished and  
can fancy we see one  
with a number of  
wing that gate and  
scus road. They are  
They have a long  
us, but they don't  
Gate is interesting  
e the proto-martyr  
path while Saul held  
his executioners.  
ing on rapidly. The  
led the Pillar Gate.  
s not far away. He  
nt built before he  
not so acted, this  
adrel, this man of  
de, of ambition, and  
ld never have had  
is tragic end. Ah!  
passerby doing?  
hey are firing stones  
llar. How long a  
to a man.  
the Golden Gate  
ld temple grounds,  
rod, where James  
a poor cripple, a  
ated than silver or  
is called the Single  
ld to be the gate  
I went to the Lord  
If that be so it  
is importance.  
ate has architectur-  
The triple arches  
close to the Up-  
Jesus prepared his  
losing scenes of his  
ave them his nar-  
y. "Let not your  
L" Ac.  
late is high unto  
of King David, and  
is control.  
te lands to the Val-  
e Judas hanged him-