

## RELATED THINGS

### CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

#### A PRAYER.

Ella Higginson in Scribner's.

God of the lonely soul,  
 God of the comfortless,  
 God of the broken heart—for these,  
 Thy tenderness!

For prayers there be enough,  
 Yea, prayers there be to spare,  
 For those of proud and high estate;  
 Each hath his share.

But the beggar at my door,  
 The thief behind the bars;  
 And those that be too blind to see  
 The shining stars;

The outcast in his hut,  
 The useless and the old;  
 Whoever walks the city's streets  
 Homeless and cold;

The sad and lone of soul  
 Whom no man understands;  
 And those of secret sin, with stains  
 Upon their hands,

And stains upon their souls;  
 Who shudder in their sleep,  
 And walk their ways with trembling hearts,  
 Afraid to weep;

For the childless mother, Lord,  
 And, ah, the little child  
 Weeping the mother in her grave,  
 Unreconciled—

God of the lonely soul,  
 God of the comfortless,  
 For these, and such as these, I ask  
 Thy tenderness!

Whose sin be greatest, Lord;  
 If each deserve his lot;  
 If each but reap as he hath sown—  
 I ask thee not.

I only ask of thee  
 The marvel of a space  
 When these forgot and blind may look  
 Upon Thy face.

+ + +

## ONE MAN, ONE VOTE: ONE WOMAN, ONE VOTE.\*

### The Suffrage Question in England.

*What is the vote?*

It is the people's political safeguard against op-

\*Leaflet No. 4, issued by the Peoples Suffrage Federation, League House, 34, Mecklenburgh Square, London, W. C.

pression. It is the means of Government according to the people's ideas.

*Who ought to have the vote?*

The people, without distinction of class, wealth or sex.

*How many of the people can vote now?*

Seven and a half million adult men out of an adult population of twenty-four and a half million.

*Which of the people can vote now?*

All rich men, but not all poor men.

A vote can be got by—

The man who as "occupier" can hire a house or a room.

The man who occupies a dwelling because he is in some one's service (coachman, gardener, shop manager).

The man who can pay £10 a year for his lodgings unfurnished.

The man who can hire a shop at a rent of £10.

The man who can hire a house rented at £20 jointly with another man.

The man who has land worth £2 a year.

*Can all these men be sure of a vote?*

Not at all. A man may move down in the world from a house to lodgings in a time of bad trade, or up in the world from lodgings to a house, and may lose the vote for two years in each case. In Woolwich thousands of men were struck off the register from this cause during the recent bad times.

Or the vote may be lost by moving into another constituency. Thus navvies can seldom vote, because their work takes them from place to place, and in London alone 40,000 votes are lost yearly by removals.

Again, the revising barrister, whose business it is to hear claims, may disallow votes wholesale according to his view of what makes the difference between an "occupier" and a lodger, or between a lodger and a mere resident, who is nobody's tenant. Many thousands of votes thus depend not on the law, but on what the revising barrister makes of the law, and one barrister will allow votes for reasons which would lead another barrister to refuse them.

All classes suffer from these stupidities of the law, which may often turn elections, but the working class suffers by far the most.

*How many votes can a man have?*

A poor man cannot expect to get more than one, if he gets one at all. A rich man can get about as many as he cares to have. If a landlord has land in ten county divisions he has ten votes. If a tradesman has thirty shops in thirty constituencies he has thirty votes. Such men are called plural voters, and the plural votes have been estimated at 784,000. The plural vote of course is a rich man's vote.

*Why is the electoral law so bad?*

Because we have put our trust in wealth rather than in human nature.

*What about the women?*

Politically the women are nowhere. They have no part in government. Nothing to do with the taxes—but pay them. Nothing to do with the laws—but obey them.

*Ought women to have the vote?*

Women need the vote as much as men. They are as closely concerned with law and government as men are. Much of the worst paid labor is women's labor; as parents, women have an equal place; and their personal rights need the protection of the vote. Property and tenancy qualifications are much more unfair to women than to men, because women's earnings are smaller, and because the working housewife, though her labor is truly self-supporting, does not receive money payment.

*What then is to be done?*

Money, houses and land ought not to give votes. Let men vote as men, women as women, and both as human beings. Let us have *no sex disqualification, no marriage disqualification, no poverty disqualification, but one man, one vote; one woman, one vote; that is adult suffrage.*

\* \* \*

### LLOYD-GEORGE ON WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE IN 1908.

Points from the Speech of the Right Hon. D. Lloyd-George, M. P. Chancellor of the Exchequer, At the Royal Albert Hall, December 5, 1908.

I am here as a Cabinet Minister, not merely to make clear my own personal position in the matter, but to declare what I conceive to be the attitude of the Government towards this problem, and their intention towards it. . . .

I should like to explain why I support the cause of woman suffrage. Before you can carry any measure of women's suffrage you must go through a process of educating the country, and therefore every appeal from every quarter, every argument addressed from anybody who can get a hearing on behalf of women's suffrage, is a contribution to the cause. . . .

You must prepare the ground; you must get every assistance that is possible in order to convert and to convince, and I am simply taking my share in this very essential work. . . .

I have come to the conclusion that it is fair, that it is just, that it is equitable, that it is essential, in the interests of the state, that the suffrage should be granted to women. . . .

To-day you have 5,000,000 women who earn their daily bread. . . .

This is the first time a Cabinet Minister has ever appeared on a women's suffrage platform. . . .

Brilliant and cultured women are deemed to be more unfit for the franchise than a sandwich-man

carrying an advertisement. Well, now, that is indefensible; it is irrational, and it must come to an end. There is nothing exceeds the stupidity of such a position except its arrogance. . . .

The real practical difficulty is that it is not a party measure. . . .

You have got a majority, and a great majority, of the Liberal party—a majority inside the Cabinet and a majority outside the Cabinet. . . .

The declaration made by the Prime Minister in May of this year—its real significance for women's suffrage—is this: That, for the first time in the history of this country, a Prime Minister has declared it to be an open question not merely for his party, but for his Cabinet as well. . . .

The Prime Minister attached two conditions. One is that the measure must be a democratic one—that it shall enfranchise not property, but womanhood; and the second is that there must be a clear demonstration that it is the wish of the women of this country to be included in the franchise.

\* \* \*

### EDUCATING WOMEN FOR SUFFRAGE.

By Harold Gorst, English Author and Journalist, and Son of Sir John Gorst, a Tory Supporter of the Budget.\*

It seems to me that girls are more miseducated than boys, especially now that every girl is destined to come forward as a citizen. It is natural to think at some time in her life every woman will fulfill her normal destiny, that of a wife and mother; but in these days, whether that be so or not, she will soon be exercising the privileges of citizenship. Are the girls and women of America prepared for this? I am asked. No, far from it, but they are no more lacking than all boys and some men. It is incomprehensible to me, in view of the fact that suffrage will soon be given to women, both in this country and Great Britain, that all the girls' schools and colleges do not have instruction and training in parliamentary law.

American women are going to be a wonderfully potent element in politics when they have the ballot, for women will realize that the machinery of politics means less than men think it does. The latter mistake the means for the end. Women will take a much more human view of politics. They will never cease working until they have divested politics of the sham and complications which men have invented to conceal graft and throw dust in the eyes of the public. American men are so overworked, so engrossed in business, that I believe the whole future of America lies in the hands of women, and when women have the franchise they will shake the foundations of gov-

\*See Public of November 5, page 1070.