

"The Suffragette," May 2, 1913.

Registered at the G.P.O. as a newspaper.

The Suffragette

EDITED BY CHRISTABEL PANKHURST

The Official Organ of the Women's Social and Political Union.

No. 29.—VOL. I.

FRIDAY, MAY 2, 1913.

Price 1d. Weekly (Post Free.)

RAIDED!!

Notes and News.

The Labour Party's Election Plans.

The Annual Conference of the London Labour Party was held at Essex Hall, Strand, on Saturday last, when Mr. Henderson dealt with the new Franchise Bill and the steps the Labour party proposed to take to obtain a larger Parliamentary representation at the next general election. A scheme is to be submitted by the Executive of the Labour Party to the conference which will be held next January in Nottingham, and includes special provisions with regard to women members. They may be enrolled individually in the Labour Party in their constituency, and when the number of women members in a local Labour Party exceeds 500, it is proposed that they shall be entitled to send a woman delegate to the annual conference of the National Labour Party. They are to have four representatives on the National Executive, and it is further provided that in all cases in which the individually-enrolled members of a local Labour Party are entitled to more than one delegate to the national conference, the second delegate must be a woman.

An effort is also to be made to attract a new class of member. "Producers by brain" are in future to be eligible as well as "producers by hand," so that the Party will be open to anybody who works for his or her living, provided that he or she subscribes to the constitution and programme of the party. The Trade Unions, who have hitherto dominated the party conference, are now faced with the introduction among the individually-enrolled members of a new element whose influence is very difficult to calculate, but they still retain their "card vote," or system of voting by solid blocks, and ignoring the minority.

Disfranchisement of Conscientious Objectors.

On November 21st, the House of Commons decided, by 209 votes to 171, to disfranchise conscientious objectors. The Home Secretary, however, made it clear that at a later stage the Government would bring forward amendments securing the vote to conscientious objectors who have accepted non-combatant service, or done work of national importance. Some curious indications were given in the debate of the disposition to regard the vote as a reward, which is still so prevalent among some of our legislators. Lord Hugh Cecil, however, made a really fine plea to the House of Commons to respect freedom and the consciences of others as well as their own. He said:—

"Shall we retain for ourselves that self-respect which is essential in maintaining a great moral cause if we do not act up to our own principles for which we are fighting in the face of Europe, if we do not act up to ourselves and in our own country, when people are acting conscientiously, that their conscience must not be punished and disabled for so obeying because that is the allegiance we owe to the higher law we obey, and because so we must act as citizens of the true city, of the new Jerusalem which is the motive of us all?"

"It is in the belief in that higher region of allegiance which imposes on us something more than the State can ask from us, and which gives us something that the State can never give, that we should vindicate our great cause we have in hand."

"The amendment appears to enforce the law of the State as superior to the moral law, and I am certain that if we give countenance to that way of thinking, we run the danger of becoming, as I fear the Germans have some of them become, idolaters of the State, so that it is indeed the abomination that maketh desolate, a blood-stained flag, the symbol of our time."

Further Work on the Representation of the People Bill.

On November 22nd, the proposal to apply the principle of the single transferable vote to constituencies returning three or more members was defeated by 202 votes to 126: an adverse majority of 76. The principle of the transferable vote in single-member constituencies has, however, been accepted.

On November 27th, the House agreed that the grant of the proxy vote for soldiers and sailors should not be limited to the duration of this war.

An attempt to elaborate the provisions which prohibit expenditure by unauthorised persons on meetings and literature in support of candidates at an election, was defeated, but Mr. Hayes Fisher announced that the Government would in the House of Lords try to strengthen the clause which deals with these matters, "with a view to stopping the undesirable practice of outside propagandist bodies invading the constituency and interfering with the election."

Married Women and National Insurance.

The National Health Insurance Bill was read a second time in the House of Commons on November 23rd. We publish on page 407 an article dealing with the clauses of the Bill that specially concern married women in industry, and a letter on the same subject on page 410.

An Education Bill Next Session.

A deputation representing all shades of opinion in the House of Commons was received on Monday by the Prime Minister, Mr. Bonar Law, and Mr. H. A. L. Fisher, with regard to the desirability of passing the Education Bill during the present Session. Mr. Adamson, Chairman of the Labour Party, introduced the Deputation; Mr. Birrell spoke for the Liberals, Sir Philip Magnus for the Unionists, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald for the I.L.P. Sir James Yoxall also expressed the views of teachers, Sir Charles Bathurst those of agriculturists, and Sir Swire Smith the interests of technical education. All the speakers maintained that the House of Commons as a whole was anxious that the measure should be passed as soon as possible. Both the Premier and the Chancellor of the Exchequer expressed their sympathy with the object of the deputation, and said that though no definite promise could be given, it was the firm intention of the Government to pass the Education Bill into law at the earliest possible moment permitted by the circumstances of the time. If the Second reading cannot be taken during the present Session it will be given precedence at the opening of next Session.

Welfare of the Blind.

In reply to a deputation from the National League of the Blind, Mr. Hayes Fisher stated last Monday that the War Cabinet had agreed to the setting up of a special department in the Local Government Board to deal with the welfare of the blind, and had sanctioned the expenditure required for immediate administrative purposes. He also gave his assent to the proposal to set up an Advisory Committee whose first duty would be to advise the departments on the preparation of schemes for the consideration of the War Cabinet. He hoped it would be possible to settle the personnel of the Committee very shortly. Mr. Stephen Walsh (Parliamentary Secretary of the Local Board) had consented to act as chairman, and he proposed to appoint some blind representatives and some women.

Dr. Addison on Health.

A meeting of the Faculty of Insurance was held on November 24th, at the Central Hall, Westminster. Dr. Addison, the Minister of Reconstruction, addressed the meeting, and asked for its support in evolving a comprehensive national scheme of health administration. The need for such a scheme was plainly shown he said, by the million defective children in our schools, the quarter-million unnecessary child-deaths since the war, the four million mothers and children still living in slum districts. The question of Health Administration was not being neglected: it was being confused. Dr. Addison showed how six Government Departments must intervene before a soldier discharged with tuberculosis could have his case dealt with.

The most illuminating part of Dr. Addison's address came when he quoted from the reports of the Committee set up to consider the health of munition workers. In one case the reduction of women's working hours from sixty-six to forty-five per week resulted in the increase of output from 100 to 158; boys' labour of seventy-two hours, producing 100 output, when reduced to forty-five gave an output of 158; men whose hours were reduced from fifty-eight to fifty-one increased their output by 39 per cent. Since decrease in hours of labour means not decrease, but increase, in national product, Dr. Addison rightly holds that one of the first steps towards national health should be to shorten the cruelly long hours of work which are ruining the efficiency of our industrial worker.

New Offices for the N.U.W.S.S.

The N.U.W.S.S. Office is full of hope that it has found a new home. Arrangements are going forward and we hope to be able to announce the address next week.

A RECORD OF FACT.

On the night of April 23rd an explosion occurred in the Free Trade Hall, Manchester, and several windows were blown out.

The damage is attributed to Suffragists, but no arrests were made.

On Saturday morning, April 28th, it was discovered that a train belonging to the South-Western Railway had been fired near Teddington. Three compartments were completely burnt out, and others were considerably damaged.

On April 24th a bomb explosion occurred at the Northumberland County Council Offices in Newcastle.

During the week-end the Cricket Club Pavilion at Perth was completely destroyed by fire, many valuable relics and records being included in the destruction.

TRAIN FIRED AT TEDDINGTON.

NO ARREST MADE.

Early on Saturday morning a train, standing on the sidings between Teddington and Hampton Wick Stations of the London and South-Western Railway, was set on fire, and three second-class compartments of one coach were completely burnt out and others were considerably damaged.

The damage is attributed to Suffragists.

About three o'clock a police-constable was patrolling his beat in Sandy Lane, which runs parallel with the railway. When close to Bushey Park he saw flames issuing from the railway carriages in the siding. Hurrying to Teddington Station, he informed a signalman and the stationmaster. A message was despatched to the Teddington Fire Brigade, which quickly turned out. On arrival they found the middle section of one of the coaches burning fiercely. As a plentiful supply of water was available, the flames were extinguished in about twenty minutes.

In the carriages three empty one-gallon cans were found. These had contained petrol. A fourth can was still half-full of spirit. The seats of the compartments had been saturated with the petrol. The method of firing the train was by placing a large piece of cotton-wool, saturated with petrol, under each of the seats, with a lighted candle on the top of it.

Several other carriages in the train were found with the seats saturated in this way. Pieces of candle that had evidently burnt for some time and apparently been accidentally blown out were also discovered. Undoubtedly the whole train would have been destroyed for the early discovery of the fire and the prompt arrival of the fire brigade.

Later inquiries elicited the fact that the fire occurred in a train that was lighted by electricity. Had it happened in a gas-lighted train a serious explosion would probably have occurred, followed, possibly, by a series of other explosions, as several trains in the siding were lighted by gas.

An examination of the neighbourhood of the siding led to the discovery of a lady's small wicker dressing-case, which contained a quantity of cotton-wool similar to that disposed in the carriages, as well as a number of candles. In a field near by was a bundle of papers in a roll tied with a string to the bough of a tree. On being unrolled this was found to contain copies of journals devoted to the Suffragist campaign and a number of postcards, pamphlets, and newspaper cuttings dealing with the movement. Some of the pamphlets were addressed to Mr. Asquith and to Mr. Churchill.

EXPLOSION IN MANCHESTER FREE TRADE HALL.

WINDOWS BLOWN OUT.

Shortly before 11 o'clock on Wednesday night, April 23rd, a loud explosion started the attendants of the Free Trade Hall in Manchester. The police were informed of the matter, and on their arrival search was made of the hall.

During the course of the investigations attention was directed to a thin cloud of smoke at the back of the platform, underneath which a smouldering heap of canvas was found, and near by a metal canister which had contained gunpowder or some other explosive substance. A further search revealed that three windows were broken. One of these windows was from twenty to twenty-five yards away, another lighted the rear staircase on the street level, and the third was a small pane of glass in a dressing-room. There was nothing left to show who placed the explosive material under the platform, but it is locally believed that Suffragettes are responsible.

BEWARE DANGEROUS BOMB!

On Thursday the 24th, a bomb explosion occurred at the Northumberland County Council offices in Newcastle.

The caretaker stated that late at night he discovered a label attached to the railing on which was inscribed the words "Beware dangerous Bomb." Almost immediately afterwards there was a loud explosion, and a window of the building was shattered.

The damage is attributed to suffragists, but no arrest was made.

"NO VOTES, NO TELEPHONES."

Telephonic communication in Norwich was partially interrupted on Wednesday, April 23rd, through damage to wires near the receivers in several public kiosks. Inside one of the kiosks was found a card bearing the words "No votes, no telephones."

CRICKET PAVILION DESTROYED BY FIRE.

VALUABLE RECORDS BURNED.

In the early hours of Saturday morning the Perthshire Cricket Club pavilion, Perth, and its contents were completely destroyed by fire. The fire was discovered by the groundsman, but by the time he arrived the whole building was in a blaze.

It was soon apparent that nothing could be saved from destruction, and the contents of the building, which included a number of valuable photographs, relics, and records which cannot be replaced, were totally destroyed as well as the pavilion itself.

The damage is estimated at £1,250. The fire is believed to have been caused by Suffragists, but no arrest was effected.

RAILWAY COACH IN FLAMES.

It is reported that during the week-end a train in a siding was fired at Crickwood, one of the carriages being destroyed and it is believed the Suffragists are responsible. During the fire an explosion occurred and the roof of the carriage was blown completely off.

The Suffragette.

Official Organ of the Women's Social and Political Union.

FRIDAY, MAY 2, 1913.

PRICE ONE PENNY—EVERY THURSDAY.

Obtainable at Messrs. W. H. Smith and Son and Messrs. Wyman, in Scotland at Messrs. Menzies, and at all Newsagents, or by post 6s. 6d. per annum; Foreign, 8s. 6d. per annum.
IN PARIS at W. H. SMITH and SON's, Rue de Rivoli.
IN VIENNA at GOLDBACH'S.
NEW YORK at BRANTANO'S.

ESSEX HALL MEETING,

8 p.m.,

THURSDAY, MAY 1st.

POLICE COURT PROCEEDINGS.

MR. BODKIN OUTLINES THE CASE FOR THE PROSECUTION.

Just before three o'clock this afternoon (Wednesday) those members of the W.S.P.U. and the general public waiting in the queue at Bow Street were admitted to the Court, which was crowded to hear the opening of the case officially opened upon the W.S.P.U. The prominent members of the Union arrested were Miss Kerr, Miss Barrett, Miss Lennox, Miss Lake, and Mrs. Sanders.

Mr. Bodkin, with Mr. Lewis, appeared for the prosecution; Mr. Marshall represented the W.S.P.U.

Mr. Bodkin, in a long address to Mr. Cuttis Bennett, the magistrate, said that the defendants were prominent and active members of the W.S.P.U., by means of which and by whose encouragement a very enormous number of crimes, involving damage to property, risks to life and limb, and a vast amount of inconvenience to the public had been brought about almost daily. These persons were among the ringleaders of this organisation, which continued to carry on its nefarious practices, notwithstanding repeated warnings, "for this is the second time within twelve months," he said, "that I have stood before you to deal with a case against its ringleaders. These warnings have been entirely disregarded. If anything, the number and seriousness of the crimes committed by its encouragement have increased."

It was impossible for Mr. Bodkin to open the case formally, he explained, until he had examined "the large quantity of printed matter and writing which is in course of being taken possession of by the police."

Mr. Bodkin then called upon an inspector of police, who stated that he went to the offices of the W.S.P.U. and arrested Miss Lennox, who said nothing in answer to the charge. A

second inspector testified to the arrest of Mrs. Beatrice Sanders; a third stated he had arrested Miss Barrett.

"Did she make any remark?" asked Mr. Bodkin.

She asked what was the date of the first date of the warrant—what period it covered.

"What did you say?" "I said October 1, 1912."

Miss Lake's name was the next brought up by a fourth inspector.

Miss Lake also inquired as to the date of the inclusive period, October 1, 1912, it appeared, was the date in this case also.

Miss Kerr had only remarked when arrested that she supposed she must go.

Mrs. Drummond was arrested as she went into the office at 12.30. She only remarked on being arrested, "If you say so, I suppose it is so."

Formal identification of the ladies and of their arrest having been given, Mr. Bodkin agreed with the magistrate that Friday, May 2, would be convenient for the cases to be taken.

On bail being applied for, the magistrate curtly refused it.

There was no demonstration in court.

An application for the prisoners to see their friends was granted by the magistrate, with the proviso that it was to be one only in each case.

The prisoners were then taken out of court.

Some of the public remained in the neighbourhood of the court in the hope of seeing the prisoners removed.

Members of the W.S.P.U. went briskly their various ways.

In the Kingway, as they passed the W.S.P.U. offices, the Government was removing the literature necessary for the information of Mr. Bodkin in a pasticheous van! Guarded by police!

PUNISHMENT WITHOUT CONVICTION.

"The New Statesman" of April 26th contained the following leading article:

We regard with the gravest concern the latest step which the Government has taken in its efforts to escape from the dilemma in which the militant women have placed it. It is the specific evil of legislation that it pervades malignancy, and that malignancy leads to its turn to legislation. It is a law that Mr. Asquith has up to now found no way of escaping the express undertaking which accompanied the Conciliation Bill. It is the least of it, inconvenient that we should, in consequence, have our money houses burnt down and our letters seized. It is not creditable that we should fail to suppress "hostility" and crime in either sex. But between the "fall and innocent points" of such "mighty opposites" as Mr. Asquith and Mr. McKenna, M.P., we must not allow our liberties to be destroyed.

The latest device of the Home Office is to bring the Women's Social and Political League speakers before a police magistrate for the purpose of binding them over to be of "good behaviour," under the Statute 34 Edward III, c. 1, which Parliament enacted in 1350, when the jail was full of soldiers discharged after the Peace of Brétigny. At first sight there seems nothing to object to in requiring people to promise to be of good behaviour. We all ought to be of good behaviour at all times. But once the defendant is before him, the magistrate has large powers. He can fix the amount of the sum for which the defendant is bound; he can require security for this or any other sum that he may fix; and in default of such recognisances being entered into, he can send the defendant to prison for any period not exceeding six months—this it will be noted, without the defendant being charged with any criminal offence, and without being convicted of any offence. If a charge were preferred, the defendant might, under certain circumstances, have the right to have the case tried at the Assizes with a jury. An offence against the law would have to be proved by evidence. If it led to a conviction, the conviction might be appealed against to Quarter Sessions; and if it led to a sentence of imprisonment, this, too, might be made the subject of

appeal. But under the procedure chosen by the Government the magistrate can, without the defendant being charged, with the commission of any offence, without any evidence being preferred of an offence having been committed, require the defendant to find security or go to gaol in default—merely because the magistrate chooses, on information received, or "on his own view and knowledge," to regard him or her as being, to use the words of the statute, "not of good fame."

This ancient statute, the very wording of which is in the words of the House of Commons of doubtful antiquity, has in the past been used to the oppression of all sorts of poor people. Even a century and a half ago the notorious Bawn warned the justices to be discreet in their application of it. Unfortunately it was dug up for use in Ireland, against Mr. Dillon and others, in the evil days of coercion. It has since been occasionally used in England, usually as a means of dealing leniently with petty offenders without convicting them of an offence. Now Mr. McKenna is trying to extend its use in a manner wholly unjustifiable. There is absolutely no reason in this country of any proceedings under this statute against persons for merely inciting to action. It is ludicrous to contend that this was what the Parliament of 1350 meant by being "not of good fame." If Miss Kewsey can be arrested, and bound over and required to find security, or go to prison in default, merely because the Home Office informs the magistrate that she has been "inciting" it is a way that the Home Office finds inconvenient, then any Labour agitator, any person addressing a strike meeting, any unpopular person doing anything that the Home Secretary at the day may dislike, may be—under the pretence that he is what the Parliament of 1350 deemed "not of good fame"—simply arrested or laid by the heels. "The Morning Post" has gleefully avowed as much. This power may, moreover, be exercised in a country district by any two unpaid Justices of the Peace.

This is no idle imagining. As India an exactly similar provision is to-day habitually made use of, as the official Indian state, as a convenient administrative device in cases where detention in gaol is desired, but where, owing to lack of evidence or a desire to avoid publicity, or to avoid trouble to the officials, no formal charge is preferred. The defendant is, without charge, without evidence, without conviction, simply bound over, called upon to find security of such a character that it is known that

(Continued on page 492.)

WHAT MILITANCY MEANS.

WE have noticed lately some criticism of militant methods.

Thus the leader of the anti-militants says that recent militancy is an "outbreak of the barbaric temperament which in certain natures is bound to find expression as the result of political dissatisfaction." Now, as this lady supported militant methods of winning votes for men in South Africa, we are not at all clear as to the distinction she draws between her own nature and that of the militants in the woman suffrage movement. What, we ask, is the moral difference between her vicarious "barbarism" and the "barbarism" of the Suffragettes? These women who approve and encourage the militancy of men have obviously a temperament as "barbaric" as those other women who are militant for the sake of the liberty of their own sex.

If we believe that militancy is right for voteless men, we must necessarily believe that it is right for voteless women. If we applaud wars in South Africa and rebellions in China, we cannot logically withhold our approval where rebellion against injustice in our own land is concerned.

The anti-militants have issued a manifesto on the situation in the course of which they speak of militancy "staining" the Suffrage cause. If militancy stains the Suffrage cause, then the whole British Constitution is also stained, and stained deeply, because, as Gladstone declared, if the people had always loved order and law, violence the liberties of our country would never have been attained. British constitutional freedom has been won by militancy. Some freedom—the freedom of women—still remains to win. That is why militancy is still needed.

Hampden, one of the greatest of our Constitutional builders, a man particularly revered, we believe, by anti-militants, was first a passive resister of the law and then an active resister. He was not content to attack property; he attacked human life. What is the moral difference between Hampden and a Suffragette? None, absolutely none.

When we read the anti-militants' attacks upon their militant sisters we wonder what, so far as they are concerned, has become of the fighting spirit of the British race. It is all very well to condemn in words the treachery of the Prime Minister, and to tell him he is a wether—"to fight him with your mouth"—but it is deeds, not words, that count in politics.

Consider the case of Montenegro! A tiny Nation, thousands of its fighting men already dead, impoverished at every point—yet holding the Powers at bay. Answering words by deeds, Montenegro is miraculously strong. All Europe against her and she defies all Europe. The British Government against her, and even many of the rank and file of British Liberals, including the "Nation," grouped against her, every other great Government against her, she fights, and, because she fights, by her weakness baffles their strength. What the end will be who can say? But the episode gives a glimpse of what militancy can do; and where the issues of right and wrong are more clearly defined than in this case it can do even more.

One thing is certain; militants need never surrender. Their bodies may be ground into the dust but they need never surrender, whereas non-militancy—obedience to unjust authority—is in itself a surrender.

Everybody admits that there are cases where law may be broken to vindicate a higher law and where violence may be done to prevent a greater violence. We have there the justification of Suffragist militancy. The existing law of the land is being broken by women in order to vindicate the higher law of the British Constitution, and of justice, that government shall be of the

people, by the people, for the people. Suffragist violence is committed with intent to put an end to the violence done to sweated women, to white slaves, to outraged children.

Even Mr. McKenna recognises such a plea as valid. When he was defending himself against the charge that in releasing the Suffragist hunger striker Miss Lenton from prison he broke the law, he said to his accuser:

"I will ask him a question. If he saw a house on fire and he knew somebody was in danger of being burned to death; if the front door was locked and the windows closed, would he have any authority to commit a trespass? Would he not be committing an illegal act? Nevertheless, would it not be his duty in the nature of the case to break into the house, to commit a trespass, and to rescue the person who was in danger of death?"

An admirably reasoned, admirably stated defence of Suffragist militancy! Mr. McKenna breaks the law to save life, and so do the Suffragettes.

When the militants reply to their critics, they do so that those critics may have more light and may if possible be filled with the spirit that strengthens women to stake their life and liberty and to face torture. That others should misjudge them and condemn their militancy is nothing to the militant women. They remember that Ose said: "Was unto you, what all men shall speak well of you! for so did their fathers to the first prophets."

They shall love those that hate them and bless those that curse them. They are not bitter against the people who denounce them; personal injury they are ready to ignore. Their militancy and their attacks are directed against those who hurt others, and though it may be right to suffer injury to our selves, we are nowhere taught that we must meekly suffer injury to others who are defenceless and oppressed.

No militant could go to prison for her own sake; no militant could endure torture merely to redress a personal wrong. It is for the sake of other people more helpless and more unhappy than themselves that the militant women are ready to pay this heavy price.

It is charged against the militants that they bring strife and violence into the world. Even if this were so, their little violence would not add much to the strife and preparation for strife, the violence and preparation for violence already there. The truth, however, is that finding strife, finding violence, finding wrong, finding cruelty, harming and hurting women, the militants defy them by pitting their small force against immensely greater force. Thereby they seek to prove that force cannot overawe women and cannot keep them in bondage.

Violence has a place in the scheme of things whatever anti-militants may say. The Creator has not disdained to use it. New lives come to birth in pain and struggle. Great storms break and leave a fresh and shining world behind them. Great wars and rebellions have in the past cleansed human society and put out cancerous wrongs.

The militancy of women is doing a work of purification. Nowhere was purification more needed than in the relationship between men and women. These relationships ought to be, and will be, fine and ennobling. Yet all kinds of evils have come into existence where they are concerned—tyranny, impurity, inequality, prejudice. A great upheaval, a great revolution, a great blasting away of ugly things—that is militancy. It was sorely needed. The bad and the old have to be destroyed to make way for the good and the new. When militancy has done its work, then will come sweetness and cleanness, respect and trust, perfect equality and justice into the partnership between men and women.

But first must come women's breaking of fetters, their assertion of independence, their demonstration that their gentleness covers strength, and that their magnanimity is not weakness; the lesson that while they are content to exercise a joint and equal sway with men over human affairs, they will not, and, indeed, they cannot, be ruled. All that is militancy.

CHRISTABEL PANKHURST.

RAIDED BY THE POLICE.

FIVE ARRESTS.

At about eleven o'clock on Wednesday morning Lincoln's Inn House was raided by the police and warrants were served on five members of the staff. Police officers and plain clothes men swarmed all over the building, entering each department, and asking the names of the women found there at their various occupations.

Every member of the staff and also all voluntary workers were taken to the entrance hall and once more their names and addresses were written down, and then each person was passed out into the street separately.

Miss Kerr, Mrs. Sanders, Miss Barrett, Miss Lennox, and Miss Lake were removed in custody to Bow Street, and there charged with conspiracy to do wilful damage.

The detectives, on first entering the office, took charge of the telephone, and subsequently men entered every department in order that no one might escape. In most cases they examined the personal belongings of the women, searching despatch cases and reading private letters; one member of the staff had great difficulty in persuading them to allow her to carry away library books.

At the time these proceedings were in progress at Lincoln's Inn House, another party of detectives, armed with a special warrant, proceeded to the printers and seized all the copy that was in the way of being set up in type there for to-day's issue of the SUFFRAGETTE.

About 12.30 the SUFFRAGETTE Bus returned from an advertising tour, and its occupants were promptly ordered to enter the office, where their names were taken. By 1 p.m. the offices were closed, and in the hands of the police.

AN IMPRESSION OF THE RAID.

BY ONE WHO WAS PRESENT.

On Wednesday morning the orderly routine of Lincoln's Inn House was suddenly and rudely disturbed by an invasion from Scotland Yard.

Constables and plain clothes detectives poured into the offices, standing twelve deep in the doorways, and blocking every possible means of exit.

Their spokesman then proceeded to explain that they had come with warrants for the arrest of certain members of the staff.

The warrants were then read, and Miss Kerr, Miss Barrett, Miss Lennox, Mrs. Sanders, and Miss Lake were arrested.

Other members of the W.S.P.U. who happened to be in the building were forbidden to leave the premises until a note had been made of the name and address of each one.

There was no confusion in the offices, and the constables must have been surprised at the cheery and amused looks with which they were greeted.

The members of the staff received the news of their arrest with the greatest equanimity, and

nowhere was there the slightest sign of agitation or despondency. Indeed, the raiding of the offices might have been an everyday affair from the philosophical calm with which it was received. In fact, it was noticed that the typists went on with their work as if nothing had happened, and were genuinely surprised, and somewhat indignant, to be greeted by a police official with the words: "Ladies, you may now put on your hats."

When hats were at length donned, and stairs descended, it was only to find the main entrance blocked by half-a-dozen stalwart policemen, and each woman was politely informed that she must await the calling of her name in the Central Hall, into which she was accordingly ushered. The Central Hall, in consequence, was soon filled with women, who quietly discussed the situation, and it was evident from their demeanour that the raid was not altogether unexpected.

Then the calling of the names began. One after another women stepped forward in response, and, having satisfied the police as to their identity, quietly left the building.

It was remarked that all things and cases were searched by the police before their owners were allowed to depart with them.

Mrs. PANKHURST DEFEATS THE GOVERNMENT.

STILL AT LIBERTY.

On Monday last, when Mrs. Pankhurst completely ignored the terms of her licence, and remained at the residence of Mrs. Ayrton, 41, Norfolk Terrace, W., the authorities took no action in the matter.

Early on Tuesday morning, however, Mrs. Pankhurst's medical attendant received a letter from the Home Office, stating that, as Mrs. Pankhurst had not fulfilled the conditions of her licence, a warrant had been issued for her re-arrest, and a police officer would be at Mrs. Ayrton's house with it at noon. The letter went on to add that the police officer would be accompanied by a medical inspector, in order that Mrs. Pankhurst might not be removed to prison, if, upon medical examination, her condition was found to be such that her health would be seriously endangered.

The news quickly spread among friends and sympathisers, and by 11.30 a considerable crowd had assembled outside the house.

The square presented a somewhat curious appearance. Boldly challenging attention hung two large tricolours from an upper storey, and in friendly adjacent doorways, as well as on the doorstep and in the area of the house itself, were crowded little groups of women, who in this way were able to evade the "Move on, please!" of the police.

Dr. Smalley, medical inspector of prisons, together with Chief Inspector Quinn and another police officer, walked up to the house. They were greeted with an outburst of booing.

On being informed of their arrival, Mrs. Ayrton demanded to see the warrant before admitting them. This was read on the doorstep, and the three men then entered the house, Mrs. Ayrton informing the medical inspector that Mrs. Pankhurst would submit to no examination.

He entered the doorway of Mrs. Pankhurst's room, but, upon her refusing to answer any questions, he bowed and immediately withdrew.

Dr. Smalley then stated that Mrs. Pankhurst was too ill to be moved, and that the licence would be renewed, but made no statement as to the length of time for which the renewal would operate.

As the three men left the house, they were greeted by the women with a veritable storm of booing, in which the assembled crowd heartily joined. Cries of "Cowards!" "Cads!" "Murderers!" followed them out of sight.

Mrs. Pankhurst's medical adviser states that in her opinion Mrs. Pankhurst was unfit even for the excitement incident on receiving the medical inspector and police officers, and that all responsibility for the proceedings must rest with the Home Office.

(Continued from page 491.)

he will find it impossible to comply, and then sent to prison for anything up to twelve months merely in default of finding the sureties required! At all times, unfortunately, there are hundreds of men in prison in India who have not been convicted, who have not even been charged, but who are there simply because they have been unable to find the sureties which it was deliberately intended that they should not find. Doubtless they are mostly "bad characters," known to the police, and so on. Yet they ought not to be in prison unconvicted, and the Secretary of State should insist on the practice being given up. One, at least, of them not long ago was merely an itinerant preacher of the Arya Samaj, whose teachings were disapproved of by the Government, but it was not thought expedient to make them the subject of any charge. He lingered a year in goal.

What we did in Ireland, what we do in India—these chickens come home to

roost. This is a matter in regard to which we have neither the need nor the desire to exaggerate. It is surely obvious that, even upon the lowest grounds of political expediency, the proceedings under 34 Edward III ought to be abandoned forthwith. What is at stake is the personal liberty of the subject; and the issue is raised in the simplest and most elementary form—namely, that of imprisonment without trial, for it is impossible to describe as a "trial" proceedings in which it is unnecessary to prove the commission of any criminal act. Mr. McKenna's lapse may be explained by the circumstance that he is at his wit's end for expedients wherewith to meet the tactics of the W.S.P.U. But what of the Prime Minister, and the Lord Chancellor, and those 667 other gentlemen who sit in Westminster as the volunteer guardians of our liberties? Have they all allowed the Suffragettes to wreck their principles as well as their personal

THE "CAT AND MOUSE" BILL

THE THREE INCITERS.

POINTS FROM THE DEBATE IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

CASES ADJOURNED UNTIL SATURDAY.
AN ANCIENT STATUTE.

On the motion for the third reading of this Bill,

Mr. KEIR HARDIE.**Unnecessary, Harsh, and Cruel.**

Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydfil, Lab.) said he came to make a final protest against the Bill. It was unnecessary, harsh, and cruel, even for the purpose for which it was intended. It had been supposed that the Home Office were seeking for an alternative to forcible feeding, but what was offered was not such an alternative, but an addition to the powers of the Home Office in regard to forcible feeding. Under the provisions of the Bill the period of the licence, which was not to exceed as part of a sentence, might be prolonged indefinitely, and so the original sentence might be indefinitely stretched, and even quadrupled.

That was, he submitted, not only a violation of the practice hitherto obtaining, but also of the law of the land. A failure to comply with the conditions of the licence would render a prisoner liable to re-arrest without warrant, and behind a proposal of that kind great danger lurked. Moreover, the Bill considerably increased the secret powers of the police authorities, and he certainly had no desire or will to enlarge those powers in a way which would enable them to act in the dark and without that publicity to which all charges against the subject should be subjected. The Bill was perfectly futile, and the time spent on it had been wasted. If he could find any one to tell with him, he should vote against the third reading.

Mr. MUNRO.**No Alternative Suggestion.**

Mr. Munro (Wick, Angus, L.) said the present situation was quite intolerable, and required a drastic remedy. He should vote for the third reading of the Bill, because he attached weight to the fact that the Home Secretary had come to the House with the statement that with the existing machinery he was powerless, because no alternative suggestion which had any considerable support had been made, and because he considered the Bill to be reasonable.

Sir A. MARSHAM.**The Bill Must Break Down.**

Sir A. Marsham (Nottingham, Mansfield, L.) said he wished to protest against the action of the Government. They had drafted the Bill in such a way that it could not be altered sub-

stantially, and the House of Commons had merely to register the decree of the Executive, which, after all, was what the House of Commons seemed to exist for now. (Applauding cheers.) The Bill must inevitably break down, and he did not like to see the House of Commons made ridiculous.

Mr. HUME-WILLIAMS.**No Security.**

Mr. Hume-Williams (Barnstaple, U.) recognised that the Home Secretary was in a great difficulty and had to do something, but was clear that the Bill would not effect the object that the Government had in view. If the conditions of release were not drastically enforced, the Bill would effect no security to prisoners, in so far as the Bill gave that the Home Secretary could, at any time, revoke the licence, and then, perhaps after receiving a warning, not commit some fresh offence, which they might never know of, the author. The provision in the Bill that a person who had been released on licence might be re-arrested without the authority of either the Home Secretary or a magistrate was a flagrant departure from the principle of the law; and to suggest that a person properly released could bring an action for false imprisonment was to add to the horror of his or her situation.

Mr. MALLIN.**No Security Possible.**

Mr. Mallin said it was impossible for him to give any security that a prisoner released temporarily on licence under the Bill would observe the conditions of the licence. The alternative to the method proposed in the Bill was that those prisoners who declined to take food and could not be forcibly fed without serious risk to their health must be discharged absolutely. The possession of power to discharge such prisoners temporarily would enable him to approach somewhat more towards enforcing the sentences of the Courts than he could do at the present time. If prisoners who were released temporarily could not be brought back to prison immediately their licences expired, either they would have gone out of jurisdiction and would cause no further trouble or they would be regarded as escaped or loose. The danger of which the hon. member spoke as to those persons being wrongly arrested, and carried off by any policeman who was in a position to see them, was a danger to which any law would

Miss Annie Kenney, Mrs. Flora Drummond, and Mr. George Lansbury appeared at Bow Street Police Court on Saturday to answer further the complaint of inciting women to violence by inflammatory speeches, and to show cause why they should not be ordered to enter into recognisances and find sureties to keep the peace and be of good behaviour. The case of Miss Kenney was taken first, and after an interesting argument as to the interpretation of an Act of Edward III., another adjournment was ordered.

Some time before the proceedings commenced a large and demonstrative crowd assembled in Bow Street, including a number of women, who paraded up and down handing sandwiches, banners and banners. Upon seeing up some members of the crowd, who were offered by their supporters a section of the arrest, received from a man and yielded, gave Mr. Kenney an equally heavy reception. They afterwards sang "The Red Flag" and the "March Song" and shouting and cheering continued during the time that the hearing lasted.

Miss Kenney being taken for her arrest, Mr. Muir said he should like to hear the grounds upon which it was suggested there was justification in the facts alleged, to bind the defendant over.

Mr. Bullen replied that such a case was justified by years and, indeed, centuries of practice.

A number of police officers produced shorthand notes of speeches made by Miss Kenney at various meetings, and also records of convictions of Suffragettes.

Mr. Alexander Sandilands, a clerk of the Investigation Branch of the General Post Office, deposed that on January 27 there had been 600

cases of damage to letter-boxes in London.

Mr. Dickinson remarked that such evidence was clearly material, because in one of her speeches the defendant said it was the duty of every Suffragette to go on attacking letter-boxes throughout the country.

"OF GOOD FAME."

At the close of the case for the prosecution, Mr. Muir submitted that there was no evidence upon which the magistrate had power to bind the defendant over. It was clear that, that as it stood in the Statutes of the Realm was a mistranslation of the original French. The section conferred upon justices of the peace an addition to the powers they at that time possessed.

In the translation as it stood in the Statutes of the Realm, it was suggested that the words "of good fame" could be suggested as a good fame. Counsel suggested it was common knowledge now that the reason for that was that, some years ago, some clerk set to transcribing the Statute in book form transcribed it with the word "not" in it, and the book form, being the more convenient for reference, had been copied ever since, and justices came to be misled, and the law itself suffered in that was the meaning of it.

Mr. Bullen, replying, said he did not consider it necessary to pursue antiquarian researches into the origin of a practice that had been in existence for centuries.

Mr. Muir, however, appealed for an opportunity to submit further argument, and the magistrate said he would grant an adjournment until next Saturday, when he hoped all three cases would be disposed of.

Miss Kenney and the other two defendants renewed their undertakings not to participate in the planned movement in the meantime.

notification would have to be given to the superintendent of the District in which a prisoner was living before her arrest could be effected.

Mr. Bath (Bath, L.) thought regret would be widely felt that the Home Secretary had not said that this Bill would be only an alternative to forcible feeding.

The House divided, and the motion was carried.

For the third reading...

Majority...

Majority...

THE HYDE PARK MEETING.

WOMEN SUCCEED IN ADDRESSING THE CROWD.

In spite of dismal skies and threatening clouds, thousands of people assembled in Hyde Park on Sunday afternoon, evidently intent on discovering whether or no the Suffragettes would again defy the Government's prohibition and attempt to hold a meeting in the Park.

From the expectant air of the assembled throng, it was apparent that an affirmative reply to the question was anticipated. The proceedings opened with a meeting addressed by members of the Men's League for Women's Suffrage, and thither flocked men and women in their thousands, evidently expecting a Suffragette invasion of the platform.

In this, however, they were disappointed, and the vast majority of the audience settled down with every sign of interest and attention to follow the arguments of the speaker.

Nevertheless, the rowdy element, consisting for the most part of gangs of youths and boys, succeeded in making its voice heard, and as time wore on, these youths, annoyed apparently at the futility of their vocal efforts in disturbing the serenity of the speaker, began to push against the tory, white-robed line of constabulary. The result was that the police throughout was that of the passive observer, no effort of any kind being made to maintain order until the cast upon which the speaker stood was actually attacked.

In one instance a man, evidently the worse for liquor, stood actually shaking to shoulder with a constable, who, in a belligerent and friendly fashion with the man, in a loud voice, incited the youths to overturn the tory.

Meanwhile, an eager watch was maintained for the appearance of the Suffragettes. Small groups began to break off from the main meeting and to spread themselves over the Park. Unparaphrased criticism of the behaviour of the ill-mannered youths and strong comments upon the denial of the right of Free

Speech were to be heard on all sides.

At length the patience of the crowd was rewarded, and in a wide green space not far from the entrance gate the banner of the Women's Social and Political Union was unfurled. There was an instant stampede in its direction. Another moment, and a woman was seen to mount a platform. Amid cheers and cries of "Free Speech," she began to address the crowd.

The police made frantic efforts to reach her, and at length, by violent pushing and shoving, with an utter disregard of any injury they might inflict upon individuals in the process, they succeeded in pushing the woman from her platform, but not before she had addressed the crowd for the space of ten minutes. Many other attempts followed. Time after time the purple, white, and green banner was reared aloft, again and again the crowd formed up around it, eager to bear what the women had to say. The police, however, were now upon the alert, and every fresh effort on the part of the women to address the crowd was met by a rush in that direction on the part of the police. Men and women were badly treated in the process, and the women's platform was smashed and destroyed. Throughout the afternoon it was evident that some of the police were determined to effect the removal of women from the stage, but in the end it was solely due to the intervention of a woman named Mrs. Zangwill, who was sitting on the ground, that the police ceased hunting at the women's roughs.

As the evening wore on, the rowdy element of the crowd melted away, and the throng resolved itself into small groups, each group engaged in discussing the question of Women's Suffrage. Cheers were given for Free Speech, and every sign of sympathy was displayed by the women in their midst, those to maintain a rights which has been so hardly won.

THE LORDS ON THE "CAT-AND-MOUSE" BILL.

On the second reading of the "Cat-and-Mouse" Bill in the House of Lords, where its second and third readings were rushed through in a single day, the Lord Chancellor expressed his regret that the Bill should be necessary at all.

He said it was notoriously directed against a certain class of prisoners—women who had committed acts of violence and been properly sentenced, though they were actuated by no sordid or personal motive, but believed they were fighting for their liberties.

Lord Salisbury said the Opposition assented to the request of the Government with reluctance, because it was not the proper way of passing legislation affecting the liberties of the subject.

A TAX RESISTANCE MEETING.

On Monday, the 28th, the Tax Resistance League held an enthusiastic meeting at Carlton Hall, and was addressed by Mr. Zangwill. Acting on the principle that "it is a ridicule that kills," he hit off the illogicalities and contradictions of the Government attitude on taxation and representation in a series of epigrams. The question before them, he said, sounded like Alice in Wonderland, but it was really Asquith in Blunderland. Perhaps the happiest hit of the evening was the maxim, "When a poor man is married to a rich woman, she enjoys taxation without representation, and he enjoys representation without taxation."

RESOLUTIONS AS TO FREE SPEECH.

The London Branch of the Domestic Workers' Union has passed a resolution condemning the action of the House Secretary in prohibiting the holding of meetings by the W.D.U. The action being contrary to the principles of free speech and the best traditions of Liberalism.

The London branches of the B.S.P. have passed a resolution of protest against the attempt of the Government to invalidate the right of public meeting and free speech.

Westminster Adult School (Men's Section) have adopted a resolution protesting against the Government's action to stifle free speech.

McKenna's attempt to prevent free speech in the parks has been condemned by the Wheelwright and Dockers' Operatives Union, as has the suggestion of Lansbury, whilst Carson and other Unionist fire-eaters are allowed to go scot free.

Similar resolutions to the foregoing have been passed by Marylebone and District Trades and Labour Council, the Labourers' Minimum Wage Movement, Marylebone Branch L.L.P., the Eastern Branch of the National Union of Public Workers, the Seaford Branch of the B.S.P., and the Stratford Branch of the Associated Society of Amateurs, Engineers and Firemen.

PETITIONS IN THE HOUSE.

We printed last week an account of the petition presented by Lord Robert Cecil in the House of Commons, and signed by Mrs. Fawcett, Mrs. Bospard, Lady Selborne, and others, asking that women should be allowed to appear at the Bar of the House and there plead the special claim of women to enfranchisement. We have now to record that this application has been refused by the Prime Minister, who has informed Lord Robert Cecil and Mr. King that he cannot find time for any discussion of the proposal.

Meanwhile Mr. Keir Hardie has presented a further petition praying that the House would pass a resolution enabling the petitioners to be heard at the Bar of the House in favour of enfranchisement of women. This petition has been signed on behalf of the Women's Co-operative Guild, the Women's Labour League, the Fabian Women's Group, and the National Association of Midwives; and it thus represents no less than thirty-five thousand working women.

WHAT WORKING WOMEN WANT.

The following is the text of the Working Women's petition to the House of Commons:

To the HONOURABLE the COMMONS of the UNITED KINGDOM of GREAT BRITAIN and IRELAND, in Parliament Assembled.

The Humble Petition of The undersigned, representatives of organisations of working women.

Sheweth, that

That it is in the power of your honourable House to pass

A Resolution to enable us to lay before the House these special claims to enfranchisement, feeling that the exclusion of working women from the rights of citizenship is detrimental to the interests of the State.

Firstly: Because women as wage earners occupy a weaker position in the industrial world than men and therefore actually require the protection of the State in dealing with industrial legislation affecting working women.

Secondly: Because the majority of married working women who are not wage earners are deeply concerned as wage earners in all industrial legislation and in such social questions as sanitation, education, housing, and land reform.

Thirdly: Because the lives of women are greatly affected by questions of national service and foreign policy, and they should therefore have a voice therein as citizens.

Fourthly: Because so long as women are excluded from the councils of the nation their capacity for public service is lost to the State.

Fifthly: Because justice demands political freedom for men and women alike, and the refusal of it to working women hinders them in the struggle they are daily waging to raise the burden of poverty from their homes and gain a happier future for their children.

PROTEST MEETING AGAINST FORCIBLE FEEDING.

A magnificent meeting of protest against the practice of forcible feeding was held on Tuesday, the 28th, by the M.P.U. The meeting was originally planned with special reference to the case of Mr. Hugh Franklin, but fortunately he had by Tuesday been already released, though only under the provisions of the "Cat-and-Mouse" Bill. Mr. Nevinson presided, and Mrs. Pethick Lawrence and Mr. Zangwill were among the speakers. A passionate appeal for the right of free speech was made by Mr. Scurr, of the Dockers' Union. A most courageous and dignified letter from Mr. Franklin himself, who had been forcibly fed one hundred and fourteen times before his release, was read and profoundly impressed the audience.

A HERO'S LETTER.

35, Porchester Terrace,
Hyde Park, W.,
April 29, 1913.

I am writing to tell you how grateful I am for the sympathy you are all showing with me in my protest, both by convening the meeting to-night and by bringing that brass band with ringing cheers to the very window of my cell. Will you, please, express my warmest thanks to those men who supported and proposed the resolution?

There are many impressions that are left on my mind after this seven weeks' forcible feeding in what was spectrally solitary confinement—impressions both of a personal and of an impersonal nature.

As I am the first who has had the honour of displaying in a practical manner contempt for the Cat-and-Mouse-trap, I want to tell you what it feels like to be lying weak and safely shut up in bed, with the Cat solemnly parading in a dark-blue uniform, strutting to and fro with its back up, just beyond the bars of my cage.

I am supposed on Monday, May 12, to send my way to Wormwood Scrubs Prison, sing the ball, and have a solitary little boy, named "Tom," "Please, sir, I've come back to be punished." In reality, I am to be sent to the hospital, to be adequately looked after as long as I place my movements into the hands of that benevolent old gentleman—the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police.

Should I, in fact, wish to leave my mattress for more than twelve hours, he hopes to be immediately informed, so that he may despatch with all speed a messenger to see that I am not up to any boyish pranks. Moreover, believing that time might hang heavy on my hands, I am enjoined to exercise special self-control in putting on my best behaviour—as Susan so often findeth mischief for Suffragas hands to do! All these precautions, however, are but to make assurance doubly sure, since the spring which keeps my mouse-trap closed—namely, ill-health—is not likely to release its pressure much before that day of penitence—May 12th.

I intend to ignore the licence completely, as I consider I have already suffered far more than nine months' imprisonment (especially as I had been offered the first division if I ceased the hunger-strike, and was led to expect a reduction in the length of my sentence). Therefore I shall consider that, if any further imprisonment be indicted on me, there would be just one little item lacking—namely, an offence.

HUGH FRANKLIN.

RELEASED UNDER CAT AND MOUSE BILL.

Phyllis Brady.
Millicent Deane.
Ella Stevenson.
Hugh Franklin (114 times fed).

Pleasance Pendred (to be released on Saturday).

Printed by THE VICTORIA HOUSE PRINTING CO., LTD. (T. E. S.), Tudor Street, E.C.4, and Published by the WOMAN'S PRESS, Lincoln's Inn House, Kingsway, London, W.C.2. May 2, 1913.