

I want to live in a world where one hundred warships, costing \$200,000,000, will not be proudly paraded before a city too poor to feed its hungry school children; to live in a world where the opinions of long-dead grandfathers inscribed in constitutions will be of less consequence than the mangled arms and limbs and the destitute women and children of our factory workers; where breaker boys will not be permitted in coal mines, where it will be criminal to place little children in canneries, chemical vats, glass mills, or phosphorus factories.

I want to live in a city where the daily wages of women and girls will support life; where the lost job means something other than the street or starvation. I want to live in a country where prostitution will not be the price we pay for our bargain-counter economies; in a country where the doors of the prison will open outward for those who have become tangled in the machinery of the modern industrial world.

I want to live in a world that hates these things, hates them so thoroughly that it will abolish them.

I want to live in a world that thinks of its people rather than of business, of consumers rather than producers, of users rather than makers, of tenants rather than owners; in a world where life is more important than property, and human labor more valuable than privilege.

As women are consumers, users, and tenants rather than producers, makers, and owners, I have hopes for a society in which women have and use the ballot.

I want woman suffrage because I believe women will correct many of these law-made wrongs that man has made. For women will vote in terms of human life rather than in terms of special privilege.

Men might continue to vote for the hunger taxes on all that goes on to the table. Men do not know how many dollars are taken from the weekly pay envelope because of the tariff. Woman will know. And when she learns that the price of sugar behind the tariff wall in New York is twice what it is in Hamburg and London, she will want to save her share of the \$150,000,000 that experts say the tariff exacts from all of us for the benefit of the Sugar Trust and planters and beet sugar growers.

Women with babies will think more about the prohibitive cost of woollen blankets, underwear, and clothes than men do. She knows what it is to pay monopoly prices for woollen goods which turn out to be shoddy or cotton; knows the cost of sickness and industrial accidents to those she holds dearer than her life. Women will have to be shown that wages at \$7 to \$9 a week for a man and \$3 to \$6 a week for a woman, with from 20 to 100 per cent dividends for stockholders of textile mills, is really protection to American labor.

Women does not know the meaning of "bulls" and "bears," of "long" and "short," of stocks and bonds. She will not tremble when Wall Street

threatens to close the banks and the factories if its privileges are disturbed. She may get hysterical over dirty streets, inadequate schools, crowded street cars, and monopoly prices, but she will not be terrorized by the scare headlines of a subsidized press.

Women read the foolish gossip of the fashion page, but they do not read the foolish gossip of the stock market page. They may vote in ignorance, but, at least, they won't think themselves wise when they merely vote the opinions of those who control the agencies for making false public opinion.

Women will have to be shown.



## LLOYD GEORGE ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Principal Portions of the Speech Delivered by Lloyd George at Albert Hall, London, February 23, at a Meeting Organized by Suffrage Societies with the Object of Attaining the Vote in 1912. From the Report of the London Daily News.

Mr. Lloyd George was the principal speaker at the Albert Hall last night, at a non-party demonstration in favor of women's suffrage.

The meeting had been organized by the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies and the London Society for Women's Suffrage. The vast hall was crowded, the majority of the audience consisting of women who wore the distinctive colors of their societies. Mrs. Henry Fawcett presided.

"This is called a democratic country. By that it is meant that the citizens are expected to obey the laws and those who make the law. That is not true. (Hear, hear.) At least one-half of the adult citizens of this country whose lives are deeply affected by every law have absolutely no voice in making that law. (Applause.) They have no more voice in the matter than the horse that drags their lords and masters to the polling booth. The drunken loafer who has never earned his living for years is consulted by the Constitution on questions like education and the upbringing of children. He is even consulted as to the best method of settling the temperance question—(interruption)—but the wife whose industry keeps him and his household from beggary, and actually pays the rent that constitutes him a voter, and who is really responsible for his qualification, is not taken into account in the slightest degree. That is a position of things which no unprejudiced person can defend for a single moment. It is a barbarous anachronism, and what I say is this—in this year of Grace, in this session of Parliament, is the best opportunity you have had to put an end for ever to that system. (Loud applause.)

"You have got to get the assistance of members of Parliament, but this is a fact that I want you to get well into the minds of those who are laboring for the attainment of this purpose—that this year, this session, determines as far as the next general election is concerned the fate of this question.

"I am proceeding on the assumption that the House of Lords may, if it is sent up there, reject it. I am not an authority on the views of the House of Lords. If I am wrong, all the better. If they do pass it, well and good. But you had better prepare your plans on the assumption that they will throw it out, at any rate the first and second time, and that it will go through the third time. What I want to emphasize is this: It is exceedingly important that we should realize exactly what the position is, and lay our plans accordingly.

"Here is an opportunity never provided before. Do not forget that. You may be dissatisfied with it. You may wish that that opportunity were improved upon, but still the fact remains that it is the best opportunity that has ever yet been given for women's suffrage." (Cheers.)

At this stage there was an outbreak of interruption, and cries of "Turn them out." "No, no. Do not turn anyone out," said the Chancellor. A white-haired old lady in the front row of the stalls stood up, and, in a loud voice cried, "Cannot you behave like ladies for once?" a rebuke which was received with cheers.

Managing to gain a hearing after further interruptions, Mr. Lloyd George said a Reform bill would be introduced this year for the simplification and extension of the franchise to men, and would be carried through this year. (A Voice: "When?") "It is really immaterial when, from the point of view of the suffrage," he retorted, "so long as it is carried through this session. Don't let us pick quarrels, don't let us make them, merely in order to be disagreeable. (Laughter.) It will be drafted in such a form that a woman's amendment can be incorporated, and if it is incorporated in the measure the Government will be responsible for it as a whole." (Applause.)

The question had been put to him, "Seeing you are in a majority in the Cabinet, why don't you enforce your will?" If they attempted to enforce their will either in the Cabinet or in the party, they would hopelessly shatter both. (Cries of "No, no.") Mr. Lloyd George: "I know what I am talking about." If they attempted to enforce their will, he went on, although they were in the majority either in the Cabinet or in the party, they hopelessly shattered both. (Ironical cheers.)

Cabinets and parties existed not merely for the promotion of one question, but several. What would happen if they insisted on splitting the Cabinet, dividing the party, in order to get a sort of empty victory for the suffrage? The first thing

that would happen would be such a serious division in the party that it would be paralyzed for all practical purposes. (Voice: "Hurrah!") Very well; if the object was merely to turn out the Government, if their object was a party one, that was a perfectly legitimate object, but it was not the purpose for which they were there that night. (Hear, hear.) Their idea as men and women of all parties was to consider the best method of carrying the suffrage. They could not form a suffrage Cabinet that would live for five minutes. ("Why not?") "Because," promptly replied the Chancellor, "although you might not know it, a Cabinet cannot exist without a Parliamentary majority." (Interruptions.)

"A majority on one question alone is not enough to keep any Cabinet together. (Fresh interruptions, a cry of "Good old George," and booing.) You cannot find a member on either side who is prepared to wreck his Cabinet, his party, and the party program merely for the sake of forcing his will for the moment upon that one issue. (Further interruptions, followed by counter cries of "Shut up.") Supposing you do find a Liberal Minister prepared to undertake that responsibility and the wrecking of the party and of the program which it was returned to carry out—(interruption)—has it ever occurred to you for a moment whether you would advance the suffrage by a single yard? ("Yes" and "No.") There is only one alternative administration—"Play the game straight"—a Unionist administration." ("It could not be worse.") "Don't be too sure," rejoined the Chancellor. "Three-quarters of its members would be anti-suffragists."

Gradually the number of interruptions had increased, until Mr. Lloyd George was forced to pause in the middle, or at the end, of nearly every sentence. The interruptions were not overpowering, and the bulk of the audience resented them, but they became so frequent and such a nuisance that finally Mrs. Fawcett rose and appealed for order. "I think it is a disgrace to women to behave in this way," she said sternly, and her rebuke was indorsed by the audience, who loudly applauded it. "When we find men fomenting and taking part in these interruptions," she went on, "I wonder they do not have more feeling, and seeing that we have only women stewards, help them to maintain the order of the meeting." Despite this appeal, Mr. Lloyd George was subjected to further interruption.

"I want," he said, not heeding the interpellations, "to challenge anyone here or anyone outside to produce a single statesman of authority on the other side who will undertake that if a Unionist administration comes into power they will put through a women's suffrage bill. (Hear, hear.) I will go beyond that. I will challenge you to produce any statesman of authority who will undertake that a Unionist administration would ever

give the facilities which the Prime Minister has given for a women's suffrage bill. (Cheers and hoots.) There is only one way by which they could carry the Suffrage bill this year."

"Make it a Government measure," shouted an interrupter, at which Mr. Lloyd George retorted sharply, "You won't get that."

There was only one way, continued the Chancellor, by which they could carry the measure this session. It was the way which was thrown open by the Prime Minister's declaration. If they proceeded along with all sections, all parties of suffragists, together unitedly, without jostling and clawing each other, it would get through. (Applause.) He was convinced that if they acted unitedly nothing could prevent their triumph this year. (Loud cheers.)

Those who made it difficult for them to march upon the road seemed to him to be deliberately throwing away the greatest chance they had ever had in this country of carrying through that great measure. "There never was a time, said Mr. Lloyd George, ignoring the interruptions, "when the nation stood more in need of—"("Votes for women")—the special experience and the sympathy of womanhood in the government of its affairs. (Shrieks from women, and a male voice, "Have a drop of gin, old dear.") Do listen for two minutes, please (as a fresh disturbance broke out). There are the great questions of peace and war. Who can tell what will happen? Have women no interest in those great questions? There has never been a war yet in the history of the human race to which women did not contribute their share of the indemnity of suffering—(applause)—and they have a right to a voice in shaping the policy which will control their destinies.

"There is the great labor unrest. (Hear, hear.) During the last few days we have had clamors on all sides for Government intervention. ("That is what women want.") After all, when Governments intervene—Governments are the creation of the electorate. ("Man.") If you have a great strike in this country who will suffer? ("Women," and "The poor.") Have you ever seen a great strike? I have, and I know that the burden of the privations falls upon the women, not merely themselves, but in watching the hunger of their children—(female shrieks)—and all I say is this, that in this legacy of life women have a right to share and share alike. (Applause.) As they have to bear a full share of the burdens, they have a right to claim also a share of the privileges which will enable them to lighten that burden." (Applause.)

Mrs. Philip Snowden moved a resolution calling upon the Government to enfranchise women in 1912, and Lord Lytton seconded. Mr. Lloyd George rose to answer questions, amid cheers and booing.

He said there were three questions with regard to his attitude on the Conciliation bill. He dis-

liked a narrow franchise measure, but if he were convinced that owing to Parliamentary difficulties no other franchise was possible, then he would certainly support the Conciliation bill, much as he disliked it. But he believed it was possible to carry through a much wider measure. He expressed his own views with regard to the Referendum. There was no doubt about a Parliamentary majority for a suffrage amendment, and he predicted that if they agreed on the form the amendment should be moved, they would have earned a great Parliamentary crown before the year was out.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

## BOOKS

### THE WAGES OF VIRTUE.

**Making Both Ends Meet.** By Sue Ainslie Clark and Edith Wyatt. Published by the Macmillan Co., New York. 1911. Price, \$1.50 net.

Investigators for the National Consumers' League have made in the last two years a careful inquiry into the personal finances of working women in New York city—women who do not live at home. Away from shop and factory, Mrs. Sue Ainslie Clark—now president of the Boston Women's Trade Union League—painstakingly interviewed saleswomen, shirtwaist makers, machine operatives, and laundry workers about what their wages were and how spent. Her records with some additions have been put into book form by Edith Wyatt—with what witty, sympathetic truthfulness and rare literary skill, this author's many readers need not be told. Others may guess from such a little editorial touch as the following: "She was sitting, as she spoke, in the parlor of a Christian 'home,' which, like that of many others where shop-girls live, was light and clean, but had that unmistakably excellent and chilling air so subtly imparted by the altruistic act of furnishing for others—the air that characterizes spare rooms, hotel parlors, and great numbers of settlement receiving rooms."

The account of the New York shirtwaist makers' strike in 1908, of the cloakmakers' compromise, as well as the careful description of "scientific management, where applied to women's work, are valuable industrial history. But the reader's interest centers in these recorded budgets of the working women. One of the several score of sad little stories may be taken as typical, though many are more, and a few less, tragic.

Miss Carr lived in a furnished room with two other women, each paying a dollar a week rent. She cared nothing for her fellow-lodgers; her only reason for spending her time with them in such close quarters was her need of living cheaply. She cooked her breakfast and supper in the crowded