

the dignity of the nation here and abroad, or to quell an insurrection, where would he get the money? Will this be the great wealth concentrator of the century—the master of business, of the government, of the people?



Suffragette Obstruction to Suffrage.

The (London) Daily News (Lib.), Feb. 24.—The meeting at the Albert Hall addressed last evening by the Chancellor of the Exchequer was called to demand woman suffrage in 1912, and Mr. Lloyd George began his speech by telling his audience that the outlook for the cause to-day was far better than it had ever been before. His theme was the position of the suffrage in relation to Parliament, and he advised the women's leaders to lay their plans on the assumption that a franchise bill giving the vote to women would pass the Commons, but be rejected a first and second time by the Lords. Challenged by the interrupters to say why the suffragists in the Cabinet, being in the majority, did not enforce their will, Mr. Lloyd George gave the only possible answer—namely, that any attempt to force either the Government or the Liberal party into giving the vote to women would inevitably shatter both. The Parliamentary situation remains unchanged, and Mr. George could only repeat that the Government's promise of facilities represented the only way by which the measure could be got through the House of Commons during the ensuing session. . . . It is deeply to be regretted that even on such an occasion as last night Mr. Lloyd George should have had to deliver his address in the teeth of almost unbroken interruption.



Woman Suffrage in Great Britain.

The (London) Nation (Ind. Lib.), March 2.—The Albert Hall has been the scene of two great meetings on woman suffrage in the past eight days. At the first, a meeting organized by suffrage societies with the object of obtaining the vote in 1912, Mr. Lloyd George was continually interrupted by militant suffragists in spite of a dignified appeal from Mrs. Fawcett. Mr. George urged a "broad and democratic measure," but stated that if there were no alternative means of extending the suffrage to women, he should vote for the Conciliation Bill in preference to leaving the matter untouched. . . . On Wednesday, the anti-suffragists made their demonstration, but though the Lord Chancellor put the familiar arguments, or rather the considerations that weigh with many men, with his accustomed dignity and terseness, it cannot be said that any new fact emerged. In the interval a letter appeared from Mr. Churchill stating objections not only to the Conciliation bill but to the enfranchisement of seven or eight millions of women at a stroke. The effect is to throw Mr. Lloyd George's advocacy of a democratic franchise into stronger relief. . . . If Mr. Lloyd George should, after all, succeed in carrying a suffrage amendment to the Reform Bill this session, it would certainly make a great many denunciations of his alleged treachery sound foolish. But this is really no excuse for the attempt of one organization to spoil a meeting organized by another

having the same object in view. It is, in our view, utterly unworthy to write of the unreasoning action of a small band of women as an argument against the political capacity of an entire sex; but human nature being what it unfortunately is, the action of any prominent set of women is sure to be used as an argument against the ability of women in general to form a balanced political judgment. Moreover, the fact that any prominent politician who identifies himself with the suffrage at once lays himself open to attack from the militant suffragists has its effect on the less staunch supporters of the movement.

RELATED THINGS

CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

SPRING SONG.

For 'The Public.

Give me your hands across the distance and the fear—

So prays Earth's spirit for the touch of Spring.
The long, long hopes of patience to their welcome cheer

Lift all glad gifts of joyful answering.

Give me your song, full sweetened by its use of pain,
To blend with one my heart alike has brought.

Thro' Winter's loss comes to the brave that greater gain

The potencies of faith for love have wrought.

Give me your trust, as happily my own to you gives all.

The upheld bloom of Spring has naught to keep.
And tho' from higher suns your sympathy shall call,
Sings my response from gratitude as deep.

Give me to know yet more of what your longing needs.

Must still unheeded all my tribute waste?
O hear you not the voice that deep within you pleads,
Bidding your hunger of life's fulness taste?

GEO. E. BOWEN.



WHY I WANT WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Part of an Article in Collier's Weekly for March 16,
By Frederic C. Howe.

Long habit has made men think in terms of dollars. Long habit has made women think in terms of husbands, children, and unborn babes. Men vote the terms they think in. Women will vote the terms they think in. That is what the women did in Colorado. They voted in terms of the home.

I want a civilization in which one-half the people will vote in terms of humanity rather than in terms of property.

I want to live in a world that is free from the law-made privileges that beget the poverty from which we all suffer; free from the terror of hard times, of lost jobs, of periods of sickness and accident almost as fearful as death.

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.)