

'Coppertails and Silvertails': Queensland Women and Their Struggle for the Political Franchise, 1889–1905

Jessica Paten

Sides have now been taken. The temperance women will have a skirmish of their own for any stray man with no beer stains on his tie, but Miriam's loud timbrel has sounded for the battle royal between Labour and Government women — coppertails and silvertails!¹

This call to arms sounded by the *Worker* towards the close of the campaign for womanhood suffrage in Queensland captured well the class antagonism that prevailed within the movement. At this late stage, there was little chance that the conflicting elements within the movement could put aside their differences and unite in a concerted effort to secure the female franchise. To all intents and purposes, the struggle for womanhood suffrage had become a class war.

This study explores the nature of the womanhood suffrage movement in Queensland from its faltering beginnings in 1889 to the period leading to the attainment of the female franchise for white women in 1905. It primarily addresses how class-related issues dominated the movement from the outset, causing internal division which hampered its ultimate effectiveness. More specifically, it uncovers how the terms on which the vote would be sought came to assume greater importance in the campaign than the actual achievement of the vote itself. This requires first an examination of those factors comprising the 'Queensland difference', which contributed to the delayed development of a womanhood suffrage movement in the colony, as well as the motivations for its eventual rise. It then undertakes an exploration of the campaign itself, which spanned three distinct periods of organisation. The first period began in 1889 with the formation of the colony's first womanhood suffrage association. The second period spanned from 1894, upon the establishment of the movement proper, until 1902, whereupon the women of Queensland were extended the Commonwealth franchise. The third and final period

commenced in the lead-up to the first political election at which Queensland women could vote, and lasted until 1905, when the goal of the movement was realised. It is suggested that, with the passage of each successive period of organisation, the womanhood suffrage movement became increasingly divided over the issue of the plural vote, and that this lack of cohesion undoubtedly contributed to the delayed attainment of the white female franchise.

The ‘Queensland Difference’²

The first signs of Queensland’s political deviance were cemented on its separation from New South Wales in 1859. Queensland continued to operate under 1853 electoral legislation that precluded the enfranchisement of itinerant workers and men without property, despite the fact that New South Wales had acquired full manhood suffrage in 1858.³ Whilst these voting rights had been restored by 1871, plural voting was not abolished in Queensland until women had gained the parliamentary franchise in 1905. The plural vote enabled men to cast one vote in every electorate in which they owned property. This factor greatly contributed to the concentration of political power in the hands of the conservative ‘squattocracy’,⁴ and was to play a decisive role in delaying the enfranchisement of the women of Queensland. Whilst in 1899 Western Australian women had been extended the franchise before the abolition of the plural vote in that colony (1907), Queensland proved to be the only Australian colony where a protracted struggle for womanhood suffrage was fought before, and in the end its goal not achieved until, the abolition of the plural vote.⁵

The prevailing class structure in Queensland also differed from that of its southern counterparts towards the close of the nineteenth century. The colony’s economy was heavily reliant on primary industry, which contributed to Brisbane’s slowness to industrialise.⁶ This resulted in the absence of a significant educated and urbanised middle class from which a womanhood suffrage movement could reliably draw its strength.⁷ When combined with the longevity of the plural vote, this polarisation of Queensland society ensured that, when a woman’s suffrage movement did finally emerge, the question of the female franchise would be closely fought along class lines.

The Queensland difference also manifested itself in the demography and geography of the colony. Although the colony’s population was concentrated in town centres, it was still very decentralised.⁸ This regionalism, largely exacerbated by the eccentric location of the capital in the south-eastern corner of the colony, meant that Brisbane failed to achieve the dominance in Queensland which Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide had achieved in their respective colonies.⁹ The effects of this political decentralisation, combined with the resulting constraints of distance that had proved disastrous for working-class mobilisation throughout the colony,¹⁰ would prove equally constraining for the development of a mass womanhood suffrage movement.

Queensland's demographic difference also manifested itself in the colony's ethnic profile. In 1891, Queensland had proportionately the largest foreign-born population of all of the Australian colonies, with only 52.1 per cent Australian-born. The proportion of immigrants was even higher among the female population, 58 per cent of whom were foreign born.¹¹ Religious differences were also marked, with Queensland having a significant Irish-Catholic population.¹² Although the Catholic-Labor nexus did not strongly emerge until the end of the 1890s,¹³ members of the Irish-Catholic population, in social, national and religious spheres, always conceived themselves to be a group apart — particularly since they were typically concentrated among the landless labouring classes.¹⁴ These distinct ethnic and religious differences amongst the adult female population would have affected the women's capacity for political organisation. This is certainly the opinion of Pam Goring, who contends that these factors created a 'polyglot' and fragmented female population which had a reduced potential for developing the shared values necessary for group formation.¹⁵

Even if ethnic and religious diversity did not overly hamper the women's organisational capacity, the marked sex imbalance, and the resulting increased emphasis on women's traditional roles, would certainly have done so. The census data for the colony of Queensland for the period 1881–91, the years in which most of the Australian colonies began to form womanhood suffrage organisations, indicates the presence of a strong sex imbalance in the adult population. In 1881 there were 193 males for every 100 females.¹⁶ Although this imbalance began to rectify itself towards the close of the century, in 1891 there were still 163 males for every 100 females in the colony.¹⁷ In rural areas, this disparity was even more marked.¹⁸ These figures were duly reflected in the colony's high incidence of marriage and high birth rates. Katie Spearritt, in her study of marriage in colonial Queensland, draws attention to the 'near universal experience' of marriage amongst Queensland women from 1870 to 1900.¹⁹ She reveals that Queensland experienced the highest marriage ratio of all of the Australian colonies for the period 1859–89, and that although this number steadily declined as the century progressed, in 1891 there were still more than 72 per cent of adult women in the colony who were married.²⁰ During the last quarter of the nineteenth century, Queensland also had the highest birth rate of the six Australian colonies.²¹ This strong emphasis upon women's traditional roles as wives and mothers in colonial Queensland would significantly have impacted upon their capacity for political organisation.

John Stuart Mill, the noted British suffrage campaigner and author of *The Subjection of Women* (1869), first highlighted the deleterious effect that marriage and childbirth could have upon women's capacity for political organisation. In 1868 he had expressed the hope that Australia would lead the world in extending the political franchise to women.²² Yet the next year, in a letter to South Australian suffragist Catherine Helen Spence, he explained that Australia's high marriage rate might negatively impact upon any emergent suffrage campaign:

It is likely, I think, to be successful in the colonies later than in England, because the want of equality in social advantages between

women and men is less felt in the colonies owing, perhaps, to women's having less need of other occupations than those of married life.²³

Even though Mill's observations proved inaccurate, the correlation he noted between the 'comforts' of marriage and a reduced propensity for political activism would later prove to be a great point of contention. Although it is quite true that women who were married with young children were less likely to participate in suffrage campaigns,²⁴ and were most certainly better 'protected' than unmarried women, the social and legal disabilities that women suffered under the apparently 'protective' institution of marriage would prove to be a great driving force behind Queensland women's quest for the vote.

'Women's Wrongs'

In 1888, the Queensland newspaper the *Boomerang* carried an article by Mrs Leontine Cooper entitled 'Women's Wrongs'. It highlighted the extent of the legal subjection of women, both within the private and the public spheres. She noted how the laws of the colony failed to protect women from violence, denied them the fruits of their own labour, and sanctioned their exclusion from institutions of higher education. Most importantly, however, the law denied women access to the one tool with which they might remedy this inequitable situation: the political franchise.²⁵ In closing, Mrs. Cooper urged:

What has taken place among the working classes would take place also among women. Allowed some interest beyond the petty details of their own households ... They would soon learn, as men have learned, that union is strength and by organisation, of which at present they appear incapable, they would compel the alteration of the laws, respecting their persons and their property, which now press so heavily upon them. At a time when the natural rights of all men are being daily more fully granted, it seems strange that one half of humanity should be dealt with as if they had neither rights nor reason.²⁶

This article constituted the first serious attempt by a woman in the colony to publicly broach the 'woman question', and all its attendant complexities. In writing this piece, Leontine Cooper — who would later assume a leading role in the struggle for the vote after 1894 — set the tone that the movement would take. Her comments represented a significant departure from those earlier expressed by the *Boomerang's* editor, William Lane, under the *nom-de-plum* of Lucinda Sharpe:

Woman's rights indeed! I want a vote on theory, but I really don't care whether I get it or not. I'd like things fixed so that I — the wife and mother — was the legal and recognised head of the household, as is most fit, but what should I enthuse over when I am to all intent. The woman who can't manage a man must be somewhat dull-witted ...²⁷

What Lane had failed to grasp at this time was that the greatest value of the franchise was seen to lie not in abstract notions of equal justice, but in its status as a tool of reform. Whilst the Queensland movement was relatively slow in its development, when the women of the colony eventually came to demand the vote it was done so largely on the basis of expediency. Women needed the vote to right material wrongs.

One of these wrongs was discussed with brutal clarity by Sydney suffragist Louisa Lawson in an 1890 article published in her journal, the *Dawn*. Here she depicted the great suffering to which many women were subject at the hands of their drunken husbands. She referred to women for whom the marital bed was nothing more than a 'Chamber of Horrors'.²⁸ Yet the greatest oppressor of a married woman, in many cases, was not her husband himself, but the complex web of legal restrictions that arose from their conjugal relationship. The married woman's legal status as *feme covert*²⁹ provided the justification for a body of legislation wherein legal protection amounted to subjection.³⁰ As one observer commented, a woman's legal status within marriage meant that she was 'literally a slave brought to the altar and the bill of sale was signed at the vestry'.³¹

Until 1891, when a woman married in the colony, any real property that she possessed, with the exclusion of personal paraphernalia, became the sole property of her husband,³² including her earnings. Her negligible legal status ensured that her husband became the sole guardian of their children, and that upon his death, if he chose to, he could will this responsibility to a third person, effectively denying a woman her parental rights. Women were also legally debarred from entering a contract (including a will), unless under the express permission of their husbands, and were unable to sue.³³

The laws of divorce were also inherently unjust. In 1857, the British Parliament had passed a *Divorce Act* that provided the basis for similar legislation in the Australian colonies.³⁴ Under this legislation, whilst a man could divorce his wife on the basis of a single act of adultery, in order for a woman to do the same, she was required to provide evidence of aggravated adultery. This meant that, in addition to adultery, a husband needed to be guilty of incest, bigamy, rape, sodomy, bestiality, cruelty or desertion without reasonable cause for two years and upward.³⁵ This gendered disparity made it particularly difficult for many women to secure a divorce from abusive husbands.³⁶ As one commentator wryly noted, the bond of marriage could only be loosened 'after it ha[d] been rolled in the mud and soaked in the sewer of licentiousness'.³⁷

The need for the reformation of such inequitable legislation dominated the earliest discussion of women's political rights in Queensland. An article in the *Boomerang* entitled 'Justice for Women' exhorted:

Woman should have justice and one simple measure of justice is to have her marriage recognised as a partnership and not as enslavement ... She should have a share of the common property which no dead man's hand could take from her; and she should have equal rights over her children recognised and enforced.³⁸

Reform in the colony had already begun to take place by the time the womanhood suffrage movement had properly established itself in the mid-1890s.³⁹ Despite this, women's legal disabilities within the private sphere provided the original key motivating force behind the quest for the vote. And, even after legislative reform had begun to occur, there still remained so many anomalies in the laws relating to women in the Australian colonies that many women became convinced that the political franchise was the only means by which to hasten practical reform.⁴⁰

Women and Work

While the motivation for the female franchise in the colony undeniably stemmed from the desire for reform within women's 'traditional sphere', issues relating to women's position within the public sphere were also of concern. This was particularly so with regard to women's status within the labour market in the period leading up to their enfranchisement. For, although women's work was the least skilled and the poorest paid, they were denied the benefits of trade unionism which their male counterparts enjoyed.⁴¹

Although it is clear that Queensland women did not constitute as significant an element of the paid workforce as did their southern counterparts during the last decades of the nineteenth century,⁴² women's poor status within the labour market did play an important role in motivating them to seek the power of the ballot. The greatest concentration of the colony's female workforce was in the 15 to 19 years age bracket.⁴³ This indicates that, while comparatively fewer women engaged in paid labour, the majority of the commanding female labour force would have lacked the economic protection which marriage offered.⁴⁴ Thus it could be fairly deduced that issues of economic independence would have been of vital importance for a sizeable proportion of the colony's female workforce at the turn of the century. In addition, the concentration of women workers in the traditional female occupations of domestic service and textile work⁴⁵ resulted in a sexual division of labour that was reinforced by the low wages and poor conditions offered by such employment.⁴⁶

The circumstances under which women laboured in the colony during this period were often dreadful. The *Boomerang*, yet again proving its reputation as the socially conscious organ of the people, bemoaned such conditions:

They are becoming herded in stifling workshops and ill-ventilated attics; they are dragged back to work late in the summer nights; and they are forced to stand from morning till night behind the counters of the large emporiums that are the boast of the great towns. They are 'sweated' by clothing factories and boot factories; they are housed when servant girls in disgraceful kennels; they are used in this far Australian land well nigh as badly as they are used in the modern Babylon of wealth and want.⁴⁷

The proliferation of such reports eventually forced the hand of the 'Griffilwraith' government, which in 1891 established a Royal Commission into Shops, Factories

and Workshops.⁴⁸ This commission was unique in British politics insofar as it was the first on which women were allowed to sit.⁴⁹ The female commissioners were clearly affected by the evidence of women's terrible working conditions and poor wages. The 'Queensland Notes' section of the *Dawn* reported:

The women on the Commission confine themselves in great measures to women's work. The standing of girls during shop hours is a point about which they mean to make a great fight.⁵⁰

Of the six women who sat on the Commission, all voted in favour of the introduction of legislation to improve working conditions, and four would later play significant roles in the development of a womanhood suffrage movement in the colony. Elizabeth Edwards, the well-to-do wife of a well known trader, would hold the first ever woman's suffrage meeting in her home on Wickham Terrace in 1889;⁵¹ Leontine Cooper would later become the president of the Women's Franchise League; and Sarah Bailey and May McConnel (nee Jordan) would assume leading roles in the labour-oriented Woman's Equal Franchise Association.

The trade union movement would prove to be another source of suffrage activity in the colony. Women's exclusion from the male-dominated trade unions⁵² forced the women workers of the colony — possessed of 'idiotic notions that they can feel the benefit of unionism in a year'⁵³ — to formulate their own. The Queensland Female Boot Trade Union was formed in July 1890.⁵⁴ The next month witnessed the establishment of a Women's Section of the Australian Labour Federation (ALF), with May Jordan as its secretary.⁵⁵ Women's unions also proliferated throughout the remainder of the colony, in such places as Winton, Charters Towers, Townsville,⁵⁶ Blackall,⁵⁷ Hughenden,⁵⁸ Croydon and Etheridge.⁵⁹ As noted by Robin Gollan, these women's unions were viewed not only as a necessary precondition of economic equality, but were also seen as a means to achieving political equality.⁶⁰ Indeed, in her column in the *Dawn*, Leontine Cooper urged:

An effort is being made to get women's unions in the different parts of Queensland to take up the Suffrage Question. If women could have it brought home to them that the question of the vote is an economic one; that their vote or no vote really means the price of their day's work, and the condition under which it is done, they would take more lively interest in the matter than they do at present.⁶¹

The push to repeal the 1868 *Contagious Diseases Act*⁶² proved to be another source of suffrage activity which was associated with the so-called public sphere. Aimed at the colony's prostitutes, the Act had been brought into effect in order to prevent the spread of venereal disease in the colony.⁶³ The principal means by which this goal was to be achieved was through the compulsory medical examination of women suspected of engaging in prostitution within any of the towns proclaimed under the Act and, if need be, their forcible containment in a locked hospital for a minimum period of three months. This legislation raised considerable ire amongst the socially conscious women of the colony — particularly since the high incidence

of ‘fallen women’ was seen as being closely tied to the pitiful wages on which many women were forced to live. The repeal of the Act was one of the principal concerns of the first womanhood suffrage organisation in the colony — the North Brisbane Woman’s Suffrage League⁶⁴ — and, following its subsequent demise, this cause would continue to be championed by the Queensland branch of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union (WCTU).⁶⁵

Coppertails versus Silvertails

The first womanhood suffrage organisation to be formed in the colony was inaugurated in the drawing room of Mrs Edwards on Wickham Terrace on 4 February, 1889.⁶⁶ For a short time, it would be known as the North Brisbane Women’s Suffrage League, and subsequently as the Queensland Women’s Suffrage League.⁶⁷ The Sydney paper, the *Woman’s Voice*, claimed that the principal object of the league was legislative reform. Of greatest concern, the paper reported, was the raising of the age of consent and the abolition of the *Contagious Diseases Act*.⁶⁸ It is also apparent that the women were agitating for the introduction of a *Married Women’s Property Act*.⁶⁹ In this sense, this early attempt to gain the franchise for women in the colony was clearly a response to perceived ‘women’s wrongs’.

This early organisation drew its members from a broad cross-section of society,⁷⁰ and in doing so appeared to represent different class interests. In keeping with its apparent apolitical stance, the platform of the organisation, as enunciated by Leontine Cooper, failed to mention the contentious issue of the plural vote. It simply stated: ‘The platform is the granting of a personal vote to every woman over the age of 21 who has resided for 6 months in an Electoral District.’⁷¹ This failure to seek ‘one vote and one vote only’ for the women of the colony sparked a rapacious onslaught from the *Boomerang*, which claimed that the league was ‘nothing but a selfish little clique of the Bulcock variety, which want[ed] only the property vote and ha[d] no notion of a higher possession than a bank balance’.⁷² Furthermore, the *Boomerang* proclaimed, if progressive women such as Leontine Cooper did not escape from the League in order to form a separate organisation of their own, they too would be lost in the ‘quagmire of conservatism that would swallow up the whole world if it got a chance’.⁷³

Although by 1891 the WCTU had joined the league in its struggle for womanhood suffrage through the formation of a Colonial Suffrage Department,⁷⁴ and the first Bill to enfranchise women had been introduced into the Legislative Assembly,⁷⁵ in May of that year Leontine Cooper announced that the League was in a ‘moribund condition’, having suffered the resignation of several of its most active members.⁷⁶ Two months later, the *Boomerang*, on reporting the state of the womanhood suffrage movements throughout the colonies, simply commented that Queensland was ‘quiescent’.⁷⁷ Little evidence is extant of the reasoning behind these resignations that Cooper cited; however, 1891 was a time of great political upheaval in the colony. The Labor Party had been born amidst the humiliating defeat of the workers in the Maritime Strike of 1890 and the Shearers’ Strikes of 1891, which had seen

the government more or less openly side with the employing class.⁷⁸ This bitter class conflict that had divided the Queensland population so drastically would surely have impacted upon the League, whose members came from all sides of the political spectrum. It can be deduced, however, that the demise of the organisation was not in consequence of apathy, but due to differing opinions on the all-important question of the plural vote.⁷⁹

It was reported that there was a possibility that a new society possessing the same object as the now-defunct League would be formed in its place,⁸⁰ yet no such society emerged. For the next three years, the colony lacked a separate womanhood suffrage organisation. During this time, suffrage activity was primarily confined to the women's unions and the WCTU, which were limiting their involvement to attempts to secure legislative reform, as well as increasing female support for the cause through education.⁸¹ These efforts were relatively successful, and by 1894 many of the cross-class legislative reforms on which the league had set its sights had already been achieved. These gains, which included the *Married Women's Property Act*, the *Guardianship and Custody of Infants Act* and the raising of the age of consent, would constitute a mixed blessing.⁸² When the movement finally re-established itself in 1894, there would be few issues over which the different political factions of the movement could unite.

The second period of suffrage organisation in the colony was triggered by reports that the women of New Zealand had voted for the first time in November 1893.⁸³ A small public meeting was held in Taringa the next month, with the intention of discussing the formation of a new suffrage society.⁸⁴ Yet, even at this early stage, signs of division were beginning to show. It was reported that some members of this initial committee were urging that a resolution should be passed which would embody the principle of 'one person one vote', yet after a prolonged discussion the question was simply put aside. Instead, it was agreed to seek the extension of the franchise of the colony, on whatever terms it may be operating at the time, to women.⁸⁵ In other words, as far as the plural vote was concerned, there would be maintenance of the status quo.

A larger public meeting was held on 28 February at the Brisbane Protestant Hall to discuss the formation of a womanhood suffrage society. Many women attended, and many bore ribbons that denoted their connection with the WCTU and affiliate organisations.⁸⁶ Dr William Taylor MLC occupied the chair and received support on the platform.⁸⁷ After Dr Taylor had addressed the large audience, Leontine Cooper took to the chair and communicated to the meeting the resolution that had been agreed to by the provisional committee.⁸⁸ She noted that the wording of the resolution reflected the desire of this new organisation to remain apart from the turmoil of party politics. She claimed that they owed no allegiance to any party as no party in Queensland had made womanhood suffrage a plank of its platform.⁸⁹

Yet a non-partisan suffrage organisation would not be an easy thing to form in the Queensland political climate. This initial meeting was continuously interrupted by motions from the Labor men and women to amend the proposed resolution so as to embody the principle of one woman, one vote.⁹⁰ These attempts were rejected by the conservative Taylor.⁹¹ At one stage, a Mrs Moginie took to the platform and

informed the crowd that the Labor men should not expect the women to fight their battles for them. She claimed that the meeting had been called for the sole purpose of forming an association, and until that association was formed, what right had those who would not join them to dictate the basis of their association?⁹² The original motion was subsequently passed, and it was decided to call the organisation the Women's Franchise Association.

Shortly before the next meeting, the secretary of the Provisional Committee, Eleanor Trundle, communicated her hope that both working women and women of leisure would attend. For, she alleged, 'it must on no account be representative of any class or party, but voice only the political wishes of their sex'.⁹³ Trundle would no doubt have been greatly disappointed by the outcome of the meeting that would follow. Of the 130 ladies present,⁹⁴ almost immediately, the *Worker* claimed, they divided into two opposing camps — the 'Property Vote Party' on the right, and the 'One Woman One Vote Party' on the left.⁹⁵ So great was the ruckus that was caused, principally by the male members of the crowd,⁹⁶ that it was decided that the men should be asked to leave the hall so that the feelings of the women could be established.⁹⁷ After another berating from Mrs Moginie, the women agreed not to take a vote on a one woman, one vote amendment, and the original motion, which retained the property vote, was carried. The meeting decided upon the rules of the organisation, including its new name: the Women's Equal Franchise Association (WEFA).⁹⁸

A few days after the meeting, Leontine Cooper resigned from her position as the vice-president of the WEFA. Whilst expressing her sympathy with the desire that every woman should have one political vote, she felt it unwise to 'clog the movement with the huge political revolution which the "one-woman-one-vote" subtends'. This, she claimed, was a Labor Party battle — one she felt the party was quite strong enough to fight 'without clinging to our petticoats for help'.⁹⁹

After resigning, Leontine Cooper announced her intent to form a separate suffrage organisation.¹⁰⁰ The Woman's Franchise League (WFL), as it became known, was formed on 3 April 1894 with the aim of securing the parliamentary franchise on the basis of political equality with men.¹⁰¹ Later that month, the WEFA held elections and staunch labour advocate Emma Miller was elected president.¹⁰² Miller immediately sent a circular to the headquarters of the WFL, in which no reference was made to the issue of one woman, one vote. This led the *Queenslander* to intimate that the two organisations were considering a reconciliation.¹⁰³ The *Brisbane Courier* was quick to congratulate the two suffrage associations on deciding to forget the plural vote issue, stating that to the male mind it came as 'an illustration of the doubtful capacity of women for affairs that they should have allowed their movement to split upon the Labour rock'.¹⁰⁴ May McConnel responded to the *Courier's* misplaced praise in a letter to the editor. She noted that the movement had not split upon the 'Labor rock', as he called it, because the platform of one woman, one vote had never been agreed upon.¹⁰⁵ Although she may have been correct in her statement, the WEFA did finally decide to pursue the female franchise on this basis at its meeting just a few days later.¹⁰⁶ McConnel later protested in another letter to the *Brisbane Courier* that this decision did not mean that the

WEFA was aligned with the Labor Party;¹⁰⁷ however, this and subsequent declarations convinced neither the paper nor the newly established Women's Franchise League.¹⁰⁸

The womanhood suffrage movement would progress along similar lines for the remainder of the 1890s. The Suffrage Department of the WCTU, now under the leadership of Eleanor Trundle, managed quite successfully to remain aloof from the political wrangling between the WFL and the WEFA.¹⁰⁹ All three organisations presented petitions to Parliament in 1894 in support of two Bills that had been presented to the Legislative Assembly by Thomas Glassey¹¹⁰ and Charles Powers;¹¹¹ however, both Bills were shelved. A subsequent deputation to the premier by several members of the WCTU and the WFL would meet a similar fate.¹¹² There appeared to be little that could be achieved as long as a Conservative–Liberal government with Hugh Nelson at the helm remained in power.

The situation was not helped by the apparent inability of the three organisations to unite in a single movement. In the lead-up to the 1896 election, the secretary of the WEFA, Catherine Hughes, reported that she had been approached by Leontine Cooper,¹¹³ president of the 'comatose Franchise League', to organise a 'monster public meeting', yet had subsequently heard no more from her on the topic.¹¹⁴ Cooper responded that she had decided to call off the meeting after consulting with 'a gentlemen of conservative influence in the political world who took part in the movement two years ago', and who had warned her that 'if a disturbance occurred it would discredit the movement'.¹¹⁵ The disturbance which this unnamed gentleman alluded to was most certainly the animosity that existed between the two organisations over the issue of the plural vote.

Another attempt was subsequently made — this time by the WEFA — to establish some semblance of unity within the womanhood suffrage movement. The organisation sent a letter to the Queensland WCTU, which had convened for its annual convention, asking if its members would consider cooperating with the WEFA as their sisters had done in South Australia. Yet, according to the second annual report of the WEFA, the letter was not even acknowledged, although they knew that it was received and read.¹¹⁶ As noted by Audrey Oldfield, whilst the WCTU *had* cooperated in South Australia, it had done so with a non-partisan Suffrage League.¹¹⁷ The WEFA's ties to the Labor Party, although frequently denied, would most certainly have conflicted with the union's non-partisan stance.

With Nelson reinstated as premier at the 1896 election, the suffragists continued their campaign, yet realised that they had little chance of achieving their aim under the unresponsive premier. The WCTU attempted to maintain its non-partisan stance. In 1897 it drafted a petition that simply asked for 'the rights and privileges of citizenship so that women can protect themselves from unjust laws'.¹¹⁸ No mention was made of the contentious plural vote. In this sense, although the WCTU attempted to remain non-partisan by completely abstaining from making references to the plural vote, by failing to voice an opinion — at least as far as the WEFA was concerned — the organisation had indeed chosen sides.¹¹⁹ Despite this, the WCTU would maintain its position when canvassing for support in the lead-up to the 1899 elections. In a letter to the *Brisbane Courier*, Eleanor Trundle and her co-superintendent, Agnes Williams, stated that they were distributing a circular to each

candidate asking whether they would support womanhood suffrage 'irrespective of party'.¹²⁰ Both women were, however, aware that this non-partisan stance would not necessarily be echoed by the other suffrage societies which, they contended, 'preferred their own form of asking'.¹²¹

In 1898, Thomas Byrnes had succeeded Nelson as premier. Byrnes had been described as a man 'free from the fatal fault of meanness'.¹²² He had initially claimed that women were indifferent to the franchise; however, he later informed members of the WCTU that it was unnecessary for a deputation to wait upon him during his northern tour of the colony because 'his views as to the attitude of women had changed. He also announced that he would take an early opportunity in Parliament of declaring his intentions on the subject.'¹²³ Any hopes that the suffragists may have harboured were dashed when Byrnes died unexpectedly of pneumonia the same year,¹²⁴ and James Dickson took his place. In February 1899, Dickson announced that the question of womanhood suffrage was 'sentimental fireworks', and that its achievement 'would not make two blades of grass grow where there was one before'.¹²⁵ Perhaps one positive outcome of the premier's announcement was that the suffrage organisations were able to momentarily put aside their political differences for the first time in five years. The *Brisbane Courier* reported that several members of the WEFA in fact attended a meeting that the WCTU held several days later.¹²⁶ This appearance of cooperation was, however, to be to no avail. Dickson was reinstated as premier in 1899, to be followed only a year later by the like-minded Robert Philp.

Federation ushered in a new period of organisation for the suffrage movement. This third and final period was one in which cooperation between the different suffrage societies became virtually impossible. Although the WEFA, the WFL and the WCTU had managed to unite in a deputation to the premier in July 1900,¹²⁷ this would constitute one of the last of such attempts. In June 1902, the *Commonwealth Franchise Act*¹²⁸ had received Royal assent. This Act extended the Commonwealth franchise to all white women over the age of 21, and made womanhood suffrage a political reality. The suffragists not only continued to campaign for the extension of the state franchise, but also sought to direct the newly enfranchised women of Queensland on the way in which they should utilise their ballot at the next federal election, to be held in December 1903. The attempts by the varying political factions to capture the female vote polarised the suffrage movement — making 'cross-class' cooperation between the suffragists a political impossibility. The continuation of the plural vote in Queensland's electoral laws only served to exacerbate the situation.

Although, in June 1903, Agnes Williams of the WCTU was touring Charters Towers and urging the women there to cherish their vote but not to take sides in party politics,¹²⁹ the scene was decidedly different in Brisbane. On 3 July, the *Brisbane Courier* announced that the 'first public political meeting for women voters ever held in Queensland' had taken place days beforehand. At this meeting, a Woman's Branch of the National Liberal Union (NLU) was inaugurated. It was here that Mr Digby Denham intoned: 'It was no longer a question of whether the women ought to have the vote or not. The fact was, they had the vote, and it was

their duty to use it to the best possible advantage.¹³⁰ According to the *Worker*, he urged the women present:

Every vote is needed. Make yourselves agreeable to the wives and daughters of the working men. Get alongside them in the train, bus, or tram. Shake hands with them. Engage them in conversation. We want their votes. Set aside feelings of caste or class — FOR THE TIME BEING AT LEAST.¹³¹

A joint meeting of the mayoress, members of the WEFA, the WCTU and the Pioneer Club¹³² was convened in an attempt to formulate a non-partisan organisation, the aim of which would be to educate women voters in the lead-up to the federal elections.¹³³ It is unknown whether members of the WFL attended this meeting, for the president of the league, Leontine Cooper, had died on 12 March that year. The absence of the tempering influence of the progressively minded Cooper could perhaps explain the outcome of the meeting. Almost immediately, the *Worker* reported, the parting of the ways began. The WEFA women chose the Labor men to speak on their behalf, and the Pioneer Club women did the same with the government men.¹³⁴ After announcing that it was 'too late now to do anything but take sides', the mayor read aloud the platform of the NLU and proposed its adoption. Emma Miller 'opened up' on the mayor with 'shot and shell', claiming that she had attended the meeting on the invitation of the mayoress to discuss a broad program, not to adopt the platform of the NLU with its pledge to work for the prevention of 'socialistic legislation'.¹³⁵ When the WEFA president had 'ceased firing', the NLU platform was adopted in a hurry by the mayoress and the 'Pioneer' women.¹³⁶

Following the spectacle of the joint meeting, Emma Miller formed the Labor-oriented political organisation to capture the female vote — a Women's Section of the Worker's Political Organisation.¹³⁷ Soon afterwards, the mayoress, Christina Corrie, and her supporters formed the conservative counterpart to the WWPO — the Queensland Women's Electoral League (QWEL).¹³⁸ According to the *Worker*, the battle lines had thus been drawn:

The class war is raging. It is useless for full-blooded women to imagine they can remain neutral while the battle surges around them and invades their daily lives. To dream of working with both sides is fond foolishness. We must all of us — male and female — choose our banner. The question is: 'Under which flag?'¹³⁹

The heightened division within the movement was clearly apparent when, upon announcing its intention to hold a 'mock election' to educate women on how to vote, the WWPO noted that 'NLU and [Q]WEL "ladies" are not invited to this lesson, because next to eating 'possum, we love *their* informal votes'.¹⁴⁰

The WWPO and the QWEL shared little common ground. The platform of Emma Miller's organisation included such Labor-oriented goals as the maintenance of white Australia, compulsory arbitration, the nationalisation of monopolies, and

equal pay for equal work.¹⁴¹ The QWEL, on the other hand, had adopted the platform of the NLU, with particular emphasis placed upon the prevention of socialistic legislation.¹⁴² Although the League boasted among its members the committed temperance advocate and suffragist Margaret Ogg,¹⁴³ as well as Queensland's first woman doctor, Lillian Cooper,¹⁴⁴ the organisation did not espouse feminist principles.¹⁴⁵ Its platform did not even include the franchise for women in Queensland state elections.¹⁴⁶ At one of the early joint meetings of the WEFA, the WCTU and the Pioneer Club, one of the 'society' ladies proposed that MLA George Story would be a good speaker for one of their public meetings. When Emma Miller proclaimed: 'Why, he's a bitter opponent of woman suffrage; he has voted against it in the House, and spoken against it on the public platform', the woman simply responded: 'Oh, what does that matter ... he can tell us about land laws!'¹⁴⁷

The approaching election saw all branches of the womanhood suffrage movement concentrate their efforts on campaigning for the female vote. Emma Miller travelled the state, forming branches of the WWPO in Bundaberg,¹⁴⁸ Toowoomba,¹⁴⁹ Gympie and Maryborough,¹⁵⁰ announcing that, at 65, she was only just beginning to live.¹⁵¹ The QWEL invited the Sydney suffragist Rose Scott to visit Queensland in order to organise for the League.¹⁵² Scott was not, however, to be drawn so easily into taking sides. She accepted invitations from both the 'Conservative' and 'Democratic' organisations,¹⁵³ and remained on friendly terms with the QWEL, the WEFA and the WCTU after her visit.¹⁵⁴ She must have created quite a stir amongst the ranks of the QWEL, though, when she announced in Bundaberg that she was shocked to hear that Queensland still had plural voting.¹⁵⁵ After Scott's visit, the QWEL secretary, Margaret Ogg, wrote to Scott that: 'We may differ from you on some points because we understand the Labour conditions here better, and know that the next elections must be a clear issue if we are going to help our country.'¹⁵⁶

The WCTU continued to distance itself from partisan politics,¹⁵⁷ organising separate mock elections of its own to prevent occurrences of informal voting.¹⁵⁸ Yet, although the temperance women were true to their non-partisan stance, they expressly opposed the exclusion of women from parliamentary careers,¹⁵⁹ and were sympathetic to the plight of working women.¹⁶⁰ This, Agnes Williams laughingly commented in a letter to the Charters Towers Franchise League, led one section of the Mackay press to claim that she represented Labor.¹⁶¹

After Queensland women had exercised their franchise for the first time in the federal elections of December 1903, it was apparent to most that it was simply a matter of time before the state franchise was extended, as had already occurred in South Australia, Western Australia and New South Wales. By early 1904, real progress had begun to occur in Parliament itself. Many of the difficulties that the suffragists had encountered in the past had stemmed from Queensland's political instability. Throughout the 15-year campaign for the female franchise, the suffragists were forced to lobby a succession of nine different premiers.¹⁶² Although seven of the nine leaders had headed Conservative-Liberal coalitions, the looseness of the political party system meant that a government's politics principally depended upon individual personalities rather than definitive party doctrines as such. The constant succession of different premiers thus made it particularly difficult for the womanhood suffrage movement to mount a sustained, and hence effective, campaign.



BREAKING-UP!
Not to be taken for the consideration of any of the local and foreign news on any other page.

Premier Arthur Morgan forces the Queensland Legislative Council to reconvene in special session in January 1905 to pass the one-adult, one-vote Bill which the Council had rejected in late 1904.

The Worker (Brisbane), 17 December 1904. Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales.

Premier Robert Philp 'killed' any attempt in the Queensland Parliament to abolish the plural vote or give votes to women. This is how a cartoonist saw what was happening.

The Worker, 11 August 1900, State Library of New South Wales



BULLY HAD A LITTLE BAMB.

The August 1904 election had returned a coalition of Liberal and Labor members under the leadership of the Speaker, Arthur Morgan. Despite being repelled by much of the Labor Party's platform, Morgan was a strong advocate of electoral reform, as he felt the people demanded it. He was particularly He opposed to the continued existence of the plural vote.¹⁶³ His coalition's support for the abolition of the plural vote as well as the extension of the female franchise ensured that disputes over the plural vote in the Legislative Assembly would no longer prolong the realisation of the suffragists' goal. On 29 September 1904, the Home Secretary, Peter Airey, moved the second reading of the Electoral Franchise Bill.¹⁶⁴ This Bill, which abolished the plural vote and enfranchised white women, had bipartisan support. The result was that it passed through the Assembly on 4 October 'amid Government cheers'.¹⁶⁵

The quick passage of the Bill through the Assembly represented a significant departure from measures proposed by previous governments. For instance, in 1901, under the leadership of Robert Philp, the government had introduced a Bill which, although seeking to abolish the plural vote and enfranchise women, also provided for the extension of a second vote to men with two or more legitimate children.¹⁶⁶ It was suspected that the government had included the 'baby vote' in order to 'kill the Bill' in the Assembly or the Council. One member had joked:

If we are going to go in for Phallic worship, why not carry the matter to its logical conclusion, and give every man who possesses the power of fecundity in the form of creating children a proportionate award.¹⁶⁷

By late 1904, many of the arguments that had been employed to deny women the franchise had lost much of their veracity. For the exercise of the female franchise at the federal level had not, as many had predicted, led to 'divided households [or] divided skirts'.¹⁶⁸ The most timeworn of these excuses was the supposed apathy of the colony's women. In 1900, the *Brisbane Courier*, whilst reporting that women should be granted the vote if they desired it, had insisted that if this were not the case, 'they should not be subjected to the inconvenience and annoyance (to use no stronger word) which its possession involves'. The paper had also claimed that it would be 'very much astonished if one in four were found desirous of the franchise, and if at least two out of every four were not found strongly opposed to it'.¹⁶⁹ MLA George Thorn, speaking six years previously, had apparently thought that the odds were even less favourable:

I find there are five kinds of women in the colony ... There is the ugly woman, the plain woman, the fair woman, the lovely woman, and the beautiful woman ... I find the first two kinds — the ugly and plain woman — constitute about 10 per cent of the women of the colony ... [and they are] the only women in favour of the extension of the franchise ...¹⁷⁰

In addition, past opponents of womanhood suffrage had also argued that the vote would make women 'unwomanly',¹⁷¹ that it would cause dissension within the family,¹⁷² that polling booths were too dangerous a place for the likes of women,¹⁷³ and that mothers would encounter great difficulty in finding someone to mind their children on election day if both her *and* her husband had to cast ballots.¹⁷⁴ It had also been claimed that, since women were not expected to bear arms, they should not be harassed with the 'clash and soilure of politics',¹⁷⁵ that women were at a different stage of evolution than man — having not yet developed elements of logic¹⁷⁶ — that ladies of education and refinement may be unwilling to meet rowdy men at the polling booths — leading to the preponderance of the 'unintelligent vote'¹⁷⁷ — and, worse still, that the franchise might result in a 'petticoated battalion' on the front benches of Parliament!¹⁷⁸

These and other arguments in opposition to the female franchise enjoyed little currency by the close of 1904. In fact, at this time the most strident opponents of the Electoral Franchise Bill were not those hostile to the female franchise, but rather those opposing the abolition of the plural vote. The most vehement of these could be found in the Legislative Council who refused to allow its passage.¹⁷⁹ The *Worker* raged against the Council's rejection of the Bill. It labelled it 'the House of Prejudice, Privilege and Property', and commented:

It is an oligarchy of Toryism in its dotage. It is the slaughter-house of reform. The venerable baldheads who compose its majority are transformed into a band of furious, choplicking butchers when a democratic measure is flung into their midst.¹⁸⁰

A citizens' indignation meeting was held under the auspices of the WWPO, with Emma Miller and Lizzie Adler as the main speakers.¹⁸¹ The government was not, however, about to enable the class prejudices of the Council to defeat the much-needed electoral reform. As parliamentary procedure precluded the reintroduction of the Bill in the same session, a special joint sitting of Parliament was convened on 5 January 1905. The prospect of reconvening on their annual holiday in 100 degree Fahrenheit-plus (40°C) degree heat did not please all members:

To bring us here at this season of the year is a thing unheard of in the history of Queensland. It is evident to me that, to use a word that is often used in political life, this Bill is to be dragooned through the two Houses of Parliament.¹⁸²

Nevertheless, in what was described as a 'bit of an off-ceremony',¹⁸³ the special session was commenced and the Electoral Franchise Bill was reintroduced, this time accompanied by the Machinery Bill as requested,¹⁸⁴ and was passed by the Assembly with a 'beetle-crushing majority'.¹⁸⁵

The members of the Legislative Council were acutely aware that, if thwarted at this juncture, the Assembly had it in its power the ability to swamp the Upper House with sympathetic nominees. In addition to this, the call was being sounded by the Labor press for the abolition of this political 'remnant of feudalism'.¹⁸⁶ Thus,

in the sweltering century-plus heat, the Council succumbed to public and parliamentary pressure, and agreed to the passage of the Electoral Franchise Bill with only minor amendments.¹⁸⁷

Combined, the Electoral Franchise Bill and the *Elections Acts* Amendment Bill extended womanhood suffrage to all white women, abolished the plural vote, and extended the vote to many previously disenfranchised itinerant workers.¹⁸⁸ The state now boasted some of the world's most progressive electoral laws. There were, however, two significant omissions. This right was not extended to Indigenous Queenslanders, and women were not granted the right to stand for Parliament. Women would not be permitted to become state parliamentarians until 1915.¹⁸⁹ Indigenous Queenslanders would not gain the franchise for another 60 years.¹⁹⁰

On 24 January 1905, Premier Morgan congratulated the House on passing the Bills. He also extended his congratulations to the more than 100,000 women of Queensland who now had the political franchise, as well as to the large number of previously disenfranchised male adults.¹⁹¹ That night, a number of women who were connected with the suffrage movement were introduced by the Labor member, George Ryland, to Premier Morgan.¹⁹² It was reported that the ladies congratulated the premier on passing the legislation for which they had been striving for so many years. The premier thanked the women for their congratulations, and afterward entertained them with light refreshments.¹⁹³

The Bill was gazetted on 26 January 1905.¹⁹⁴ On that same day, the Home Secretary, Mr Airey, released a statement on the passage of the legislation. He expressed the sentiment that the Assembly would have been content if the Legislative Council had agreed only to the abolition of the property vote, yet they were pleased that 100,000 women had also been enfranchised!¹⁹⁵ Thus it would appear that, even at the close of the struggle for their enfranchisement, the women of Queensland had run a close second to the apparently more important battle for the abolition of the property vote. Nevertheless, their goals had finally been realised. As the *Worker* jubilantly announced: 'Women ha[d] now the power in the land that nature destined her to wield. Hoop-la! Things are going to begin to happen.'¹⁹⁶ And indeed, they would.

Notes

- ¹ *Worker* (Brisbane), 18 July 1903: 5.
- ² This idea that Queensland is 'different' or deviates from the norm established by her southern counterparts has been an enduring theme in Queensland historiography. This argument has been voiced by: Humphrey McQueen, 'Queensland: A State of Mind', *Meanjin* 38(1) (1979): 41–51; Deane Wells, *The Deep North* (Collingwood: Outback Press, 1979): xi–xii; Margaret Bridson Cribb and D.J. Murphy, 'Winners and Losers in Queensland Politics', in Margaret Bridson Cribb and P.J. Boyce (eds), *Politics in Queensland: 1977 and Beyond* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1980): 8–25; Peter Charlton, *State of Mind: Why Queensland is Different* (Sydney: Methuen-Haynes, 1983); Patrick Mullins, 'Queensland: Populist Politics and Development', in Brian Head (ed.), *The Politics of Development in Australia* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1986); Chilla Bulbeck, 'The Hegemony of Queensland's Difference', *Journal of Australian Studies* 21 (1987): 19–28.

- 3 George Shaw explains that this was due to the fact that, unlike the other colonies, Queensland was established by an Order of Council rather than by an Act of Parliament. The first draft of this Order in Council appeared in 1857 when New South Wales was still subject to a restricted property franchise. See "'Filched from us ...': The Loss of Universal Manhood Suffrage in Queensland 1859–1863", *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 26(3) (1980): 372–85.
- 4 This *favourable* concentration of electoral power in the hands of the conservative landowners was highlighted by Governor G.F. Bowen in a letter to the Secretary of State for the Colonies in 1860. See W. Ross Johnston, *A Documentary History of Queensland* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1988): 307–9.
- 5 The plural vote was abolished in New South Wales in 1894, Tasmania in 1900 and Victoria in 1899. South Australia did not have the plural vote in its Constitution. See Audrey Oldfield, *Australian Women and the Vote* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994): 19.
- 6 Ross Fitzgerald, *From Dreaming to 1915: A History of Queensland* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1982): 325.
- 7 This anti-intellectualism was fostered by the colony's lack of a university. Queensland's first university, the University of Queensland, was not opened until 1915.
- 8 Bradley Bowden, 'The Limits to Consciousness: Urban Workers in the Maritime Strike of 1890', in Carole Ferrier and Rebecca Pelan (eds), *The Point of Change: Marxism/Australia/History/Theory* (St Lucia: Department of English, University of Queensland, 1998): 75.
- 9 Lawson, *Brisbane in the 1890s*: 6.
- 10 Martin Thomas, 'Australian Labour History and Marxism', in Ferrier and Pelan, *The Point of Change*: 33.
- 11 See *Census of the Colony of Queensland/Registrar General's Office* (Brisbane: Government Printer, 1891): xxvi.
- 12 Celia Louise Hamilton notes that in 1891 Irish Catholics comprised 23.98 per cent of the Queensland population, whilst in New South Wales and Victoria they were respectively 25.96 per cent and 22.90 per cent. Queensland would later surpass both colonies in this figure, becoming known as the most Catholic of the Australian states. See Hamilton, 'Irish-Australian Catholics and the Labour Party: A Historical Survey of Developing Alignments in New South Wales, Victoria, and Queensland, 1890–1921' (unpublished MA thesis, University of Melbourne, 1957): iii.
- 13 Ronald Lawson, 'The Political Influence of the Churches in Brisbane in the 1890s', *Journal of Religious History*, 7(2) (1972): 158–60.
- 14 Hamilton, 'Irish-Australian Catholics and the Labour Party': 6.
- 15 Pam Goring, 'The Political Development of the Women's Movement in Queensland' (Unpublished BA Hons thesis, University of Queensland, 1978), cited in Gail Reekie, *On the Edge: Women's Experiences of Queensland* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1994): 22.
- 16 See *Census of the Colony of Queensland/Registrar General's Office* (Brisbane: Government Printer, 1881), Part 1, Table no. XIV: 11.
- 17 See *Census of the Colony of Queensland/Registrar General's Office* (Brisbane: Government Printer, 1891), Part 1, Table no. XIV: 14.
- 18 For example, in Brisbane in 1891 there were 15,204 adult men and 14,169 adult women, whilst during the same year in Darling Downs Central there were 2,072 men and 1,317 women, in Burke 2,675 men and 708 women, and in Mackay 4,223 men and 1641 women. See *Census of the Colony of Queensland/Registrar General's Office* (Brisbane: Government Printer, 1891), Part 1, Table no. XIV: 14.
- 19 Katie Spearritt, 'The Poverty of Protection: Women and Marriage in Colonial Queensland' (BA Hons thesis, University of Queensland, 1988): v.
- 20 Spearritt, 'The Poverty of Protection': v.
- 21 See Katie Spearritt, 'The Market for Marriage in Colonial Queensland,' *Hecate* 16(1/2) (1990): 23.
- 22 See John Stuart Mill to Archibald Michie, 7 December 1868, reproduced in Francis E. Mineka

- and Dwight N. Lindley (eds), *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill: 1849–1873, Vol. xvi* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972): 1515–16.
- ²³ John Stuart Mill to Catherine Helen Spence, 28 November 1869, reproduced in Mineka and Lindley, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill*: 2016.
- ²⁴ Katie Spearritt has estimated that about half of all ‘first wave’ feminists in the colonies were widows or spinsters. See ‘New Dawns: First Wave Feminism, 1880–1914’, in Kay Saunders and Raymond Evans (eds), *Gender Relations in Australia: Domination and Negotiation* (Sydney: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1992), p. 325.
- ²⁵ *Boomerang* (Brisbane), 8 December 1888: 12.
- ²⁶ *Boomerang*, 8 December 1888: 12.
- ²⁷ *Boomerang*, 24 December 1887: 13.
- ²⁸ *Dawn* (Sydney), March 1890: 1.
- ²⁹ According to William Blackstone, the great British jurist of the eighteenth century, this involved the suspension of a woman’s being or legal existence during marriage. William Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, 14th edn, with notes by Edward Christian, Esq. (London: A. Strahan, 1803): 442.
- ³⁰ John Mackinolty, ‘The *Married Women’s Property Acts*’, in Judy Mackinolty and Heather Radi (eds), *In Pursuit of Justice: Australian Women and the Law 1788–1979* (Sydney: Hale and Iremonger, 1979): 68.
- ³¹ This observation was made by ‘Warra’ in the ‘Queensland Notes’ section of Sydney suffragist Louisa Lawson’s journal, the *Dawn*, October 1897: 10.
- ³² Legislation which recognised the right of a woman to retain property upon marriage was passed first in England in 1882, in Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania in 1884, Queensland in 1891, Western Australia in 1892 and New South Wales in 1893.
- ³³ The married woman’s legal status was discussed by the *Boomerang*, 29 September 1890: 5.
- ³⁴ *Matrimonial Causes Jurisdiction Act*, No. 29, 28 Vic. (1864–65).
- ³⁵ See section 21 of the *Matrimonial Causes Jurisdiction Act* (1864–65), Queensland State Archives, Brisbane, Papers and Correspondence Regarding Proposed Acts and Amendments to Various Acts, Series PRV8739, COL/234.
- ³⁶ Legal divorce on the basis of cruelty alone was not accepted into the common law until the *Clark Case* of 1900. See *Worker*, 30 June 1900: 6.
- ³⁷ *Boomerang*, 20 July 1889: 5.
- ³⁸ *Boomerang*, 3 August 1889: 5.
- ³⁹ *Married Women’s Property Act*, No. 9, 54 Vic (1890), enabled married women to acquire, hold and dispose of any real or personal property as her separate property (s. 3(1)). See Queensland State Archives, Brisbane, Papers and Correspondence Regarding Proposed Acts and Amendments to Various Acts, Series PRV8739, COL/234. The *Guardianship and Custody of Infants Act*, No. 3, 55 Vic. (1891–92) was passed the following year. This piece of legislation ensured that a woman became the sole legal guardian of her children upon the death of her husband. The *Criminal Law Amendment Act*, No. 24, 55 Vic (1891–92) raised the age of consent to ‘twelve and fourteen’ from ‘ten and twelve’, which it had been. This meant it was a felony to have carnal knowledge of a girl under 12 and a misdemeanour to have carnal knowledge of a girl under 14.
- ⁴⁰ Dianne Scott, ‘Woman Suffrage: The Movement in Australia’, *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society* 53(4) (1967): 301.
- ⁴¹ Like Chinese workers, women were excluded from many trade unions because economic necessity and the prevailing social doctrines had forced them to accept considerably lower rates of pay than the union-agreed standards. Rather than sympathising with the plight of the poorly paid female workers, many unions perceived women to be undercutting all that had been achieved for the male labour force — in particular, the achievement of the ‘family wage’.

- 42 Spearritt, 'The Poverty of Protection': 8.
- 43 Spearritt, 'The Poverty of Protection': 8.
- 44 Spearritt, 'The Poverty of Protection': 8.
- 45 Spearritt, 'The Poverty of Protection': 5. Although this census data indicate that a significant number of women (21.5 per cent) were engaged in pastoral or agricultural work, this work was largely undertaken on family selections, and so it is not as relevant when considering women's position within the public sphere. The figure for the numbers of women engaged in textile manufacturing is most likely significantly higher than the census data indicate. In the clothing industry, *most* production was done by outworkers who came from a wide range of social backgrounds and who often took on such work in order to remain within their homes in order to care for children. See Ann Marie Lynzaat, 'Respectability and the Outworker: Victorian Acts 1885–1903', in Mackinolty and Radi, *In Pursuit of Justice*: 85.
- 46 The working conditions of Aboriginal women were especially bad. Jackie Huggins has discussed how many Aboriginal women were contracted out to white people 'in need' of domestic help. These women rarely had a choice about which people they were sent to work for and were often paid in provisions rather than money. See 'White Aprons, Black Hands: Aboriginal Women Domestic Servants in Queensland', *Labour History* 69 (1995): 188–95.
- 47 *Boomerang*, 7 January 1888: 7.
- 48 This Royal Commission is discussed in detail by Kath Thomas in 'Queensland Women at Work in the 1890s', in *Second Women and Labour Conference Papers* (Bundoora: Convenors of the Second Women and Labour Conference, Department of History, La Trobe University, 1980): 32–40.
- 49 See Pam Young, *Proud to Be a Rebel: The Life and Times of Emma Miller* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1991): 59.
- 50 *Dawn*, April 1891: 7.
- 51 This meeting took place on 4 February 1889. It was reported in the *Brisbane Courier*, 29 July 1890: 6.
- 52 Jewellers, printers, tailors, chemists, and furniture polishers all refused to admit women into their unions, even when women were being paid the same rates of wages. See *Dawn*, June 1891: 9.
- 53 *Worker*, 4 June 1890: 7.
- 54 Helen Hamley has noted how the formation of this union went unreported by the labour press, despite the fact that it was the first distinctively female union to be registered under the *Trade Unions Act*. See, 'Class War or Sex War? White Women and Labour Activism in Queensland 1890s to 1920,' in Melanie Oppenheimer and Maree Murray (eds), *Proceedings of the 5th Women and Labour Conference: 29 September–1 October 1995*, Macquarie University (North Ryde: Organising Committee of the Fifth Women and Labour Conference, 1997): 255.
- 55 This section was established at the suggestion of W.G. Spence: *Boomerang* 16 August 1890: 7.
- 56 The formation of these women's unions was reported by Mr C. McDonald, the president of the Labour Federation, at the first Social of the Brisbane Women's Union. See *Dawn*, November 1890: 8. The president of the Charters Towers Union later complained of the difficulty involved in organising women, as 'our women throughout the colony are sadly wanting in public spirit'. See *Dawn*, June 1891: 9.
- 57 The Blackall Woman's Union began with 22 members. See *Dawn*, April 1891: 7.
- 58 At the first meeting of the Hughendon Servant Girls' Union, the Chairman, Mr McDonald Jnr, warned the women that: 'The Press would probably attempt to block the formation of their union, but they must not be discouraged, but stick close together.' See *Western Star* (Roma), 20 September 1890: 2.
- 59 *Worker*, 16 May 1891: 2.
- 60 Robin Gollan, *Radical and Working Class Politics: A Study of Eastern Australia, 1850–1910*

- (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1960): 178.
- 61 *Dawn*, April 1891: 7.
- 62 *Prevention of Contagious Diseases Act*, No. 40, 31 Vic. (1868).
- 63 The only other Australian colony to introduce such legislation was Tasmania, in 1879. See Kay Saunders, 'Controlling (Hetero) Sexuality: The Implementation and Operation of Contagious Diseases Legislation in Australia, 1868–1945', in Diane Kirkby (ed.), *Sex, Power and Justice: Historical Perspectives of Law in Australia* (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1995): 8.
- 64 *Woman's Voice*, July 1895, cited in Oldfield, *Woman Suffrage in Australia*: 116.
- 65 See *Telegraph* (Brisbane), 29 September 1894: 2. At the 1896 Annual Convention of the WCTU, the Queensland president reported in her address that: 'Our petitions to the House of Assembly re granting the franchise to women and repealing the *Contagious Diseases Act* are being largely signed, and will be presented in a very short time.' See A.E. Lather, *A Glorious Heritage: A History of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Queensland* (Brisbane: Abell, 1966): 11.
- 66 *Brisbane Courier*, 29 July 1890: 6.
- 67 This change in the organisation's name was reported in the 'Brisbane Notes' section of the *Dawn*, August 1890: 10.
- 68 Oldfield, *Woman Suffrage in Australia*: 116.
- 69 At a meeting of the League on 9 September 1890 in the mayor's room of the Town Hall, a motion was put forward to present a petition to MLC A.J. Thynne concerning the *Married Women's Property Act*, which had already been introduced into the Legislative Council. See *Brisbane Courier*, 10 September 1890: 4.
- 70 At the first annual meeting of the organisation in July 1890 (what would appear to be the last of its kind), the following officers were elected: Mrs Reading as president; Mrs Drew, Mrs Clark (wife of an alderman) and Mrs S.W. Brooks (wife of an MLA) as vice presidents; Mrs Keith as secretary; Mrs Channing Neill as assistant secretary; Mrs J.H. Smith as treasurer; and Mrs Leontine Cooper (journalist), Mrs Dyne, Mrs Chalk, Mrs Wells, Mrs Willmore and Miss Jordan (trade unionist) as committee members.
- 71 The *Dawn*, September 1890: 25. Whilst there was no mention by the women of the plural vote at this early stage, it is quite clear that there were already rumblings within colony concerning the basis of the female franchise. The colony's first woman's magazine, which claimed to be 'under the patronage of the Gentlewomen of Australia', clearly stated in an article on womanhood suffrage that: 'Property is to be the basis on which the right of women to the possession of a vote is to depend.' See *Princess: A Lady's Newspaper*, 21 May 1889, 1(8): 1, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, Rare Books Collection, RBF 994.3 PRI C1.
- 72 *Boomerang*, 9 August 1890: 5.
- 73 *Boomerang*, 9 August 1890: 5.
- 74 *Minutes of the Sixth Annual Convention of the Queensland Women's Christian Temperance Union, held in Rockhampton, 22nd, 23rd, 24th & 25th September* (Brisbane: 'Joy Bells' Steam Printing Works, 1891): 22. This department continued its work for 27 years, whereupon it merged with the Legislation Department. See Judith Pargeter, *'For God, Home and Humanity': National Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Australia, Centenary History 1891–1991* (Golden Grove, SA: National Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Australia, 1995): 7.
- 75 This Bill was presented on 31 July 1890 by MLA Richard Hyne.
- 76 *Dawn*, May 1891: 14.
- 77 *Boomerang*, 18 July 1891: 4.
- 78 The government's close alliance with capitalist interests was demonstrated by its invocation of an antiquated piece of legislation, commonly referred to as the 'Intimidation Act', which made the combination of workmen unlawful unless the combinations were aimed solely at determining wages, prices and hours of work. A breach of this Act was interpreted as criminal conspiracy.

- The Shearers' Strike of 1894 later saw the government enact the extremely repressive *Peace Preservation Act*, No. 3, 58 Vic. (1894). Included among the provisions of this Act was the empowerment of police officers to arrest and detain people suspected of an 'act of violence or intimidation' without trial for a period of seven months. See Jenny Fleming, 'In the Name of Peace: The Enactment of the *Peace Preservation Act*, 1894,' in *Royal Historical Society of Queensland Journal* 16(3) (1996): 118, 125.
- 79 Oldfield, *Woman Suffrage in Australia*: 116. This view is also shared by Kirsten Lees, *Votes for Women: The Australian Story* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1995): 97–98.
- 80 *Dawn*, May 1891: 14.
- 81 At the Seventh Annual Convention of the WCTU, it was agreed: 'Every Union should do all that is possible in that [suffrage] department.' See *Minutes of the Seventh Annual Convention of the Queensland Women's Christian Temperance Union*: 17. The next year it was reported that whilst no other union within the colony had formed a Suffrage Department of their own, many had had the matter under consideration and were distributing literature. See *Minutes of the Eighth Annual Convention of the Queensland Women's Christian Temperance Union*: 37.
- 82 The *Married Women's Property Act*, No. 9, 54 Vic (1890); The *Guardianship and Custody of Infants Act*, No. 3, 55 Vic (1891–92); the age of consent was raised by the *Criminal Law Amendment Act*, No. 24, 55 Vic (1891–92).
- 83 See *Worker*, 24 February 1894: 2.
- 84 At this meeting, a resolution was passed which read: 'That this meeting views with pleasure the results of the operation of womanhood suffrage in New Zealand, and hopes that this desirable reform will soon be extended to this colony.' See *Brisbane Courier*, 18 December 1893: 4.
- 85 The only resolutions that were agreed to at this initial meeting were as follows: '1. That this meeting of Brisbane citizens are of opinion that the time has come when the electoral laws of the colony should be so altered so as to extend to women the privilege of a political vote' and '2. That, in the opinion of this meeting, it is desirable to form an association to be called the Woman's Franchise Association.' See *Brisbane Courier*, 18 December 1893: 4.
- 86 *Telegraph*, 1 March 1894: 5.
- 87 He was accompanied on the platform by Sir Charles Lilley, Lady Lilley, Alderman J.A. Clark, Dr Little, Leontine Cooper, Emma Miller, Mrs Trimble, Mrs G. Harris and Mrs Moginie. See *Brisbane Courier*, 1 March 1894: 5.
- 88 See note 85.
- 89 *Telegraph*, 1 March 1894: 5.
- 90 For instance, Mr W.G. Higgs and Mr J. Willard objected to the wording of the resolution as it made no mention of abolishing the plural vote. In addition, Mrs Sarah Bailey — who at the beginning of the evening had been distributing slips of paper notifying her intention — moved a motion that the proposed to embody the principal of one-woman-one-vote. *Queenslander* (Brisbane), 10 March 1894: 473.
- 91 *Brisbane Courier*, 1 March 1894: 6.
- 92 *Telegraph*, 1 March 1894: 5.
- 93 *Telegraph*, 5 March 1894: 4.
- 94 The *Telegraph* claimed that there were 130 ladies present with 110 qualifying to vote — and that there were 50 men present. This figure differs from that reported by the *Queenslander*, which claimed that 350 people attended. See *Telegraph*, 6 March 1894: 5, and the *Queenslander*, 10 March 1894: 473.
- 95 *Worker*, 10 March 1894: 2.
- 96 See *Queenslander*, 10 March 1894: 473.
- 97 *Queenslander*, 10 March 1894: 473.
- 98 The following officers were elected: president, Mrs J. Donaldson; vice-presidents, Mesdames Cooper, McFie, Moginie; treasurer, Mrs D.R. McConnel Jr; committee, Mesdames J.A. Clark, Reading Miller, Culpin, G. King, Swanwick, Levy, Addison, A.M. Francis, Shelton, McConnel

- Sr, Higgs, Banks, Snow, Fairman, and Miss Glassey. The women elected did indeed represent a very broad cross-section of political interests. See *Queenslander*, 10 March 1894: 473. Note that the treasurer, Mrs McConnell Jr (nee Jordan) was a committed Labor advocate, and Mrs McConnell Sr was a member of the influential McConnell family, and her mother-in-law. See Mary McLeod Banks' (a descendant) account of the family, *Memories of Pioneer Days in Queensland* (London: Heath Cranton, 1931).
- ⁹⁹ This is extracted from Cooper's letter of resignation, copies of which were also sent to the *Queenslander* and the *Telegraph*. See *Brisbane Courier*, 7 March 1894: 4.
- ¹⁰⁰ *Brisbane Courier*, 23 March 1894: 4.
- ¹⁰¹ Forty persons attended this first meeting, and 29 ladies were signed as members. See *Brisbane Courier*, 4 April 1894: 4. The election of officers were as follows: president, Mrs Leontine Cooper; vice-presidents, Mesdames Shelton, Pope, Swanwick and Kingsbury; secretary, Mrs Preston; treasurer, Mrs Buttlery; council, Mesdames Alcott, Richardson, Sankey, Clough, Austin, Proctor, Bryce, Yorkston and Xenos. See *Queenslander*, 21 April 1894: 724.
- ¹⁰² These elections were held on 27 April. Both Mrs Miller and Mrs Trundle were nominated for the presidency; however, Mrs Miller was voted in by a large majority. See *Brisbane Courier*, 28 April 1894: 6. Mrs Trundle was then elected to the position of the colonial superintendent of the WCTU's Suffrage Department. See *Telegraph*, 29 September 1894: 4.
- ¹⁰³ *Queenslander*, 21 April 1894: 734.
- ¹⁰⁴ *Brisbane Courier*, 23 April 1894: 4.
- ¹⁰⁵ *Brisbane Courier*, 24 April 1894: 7. She rightly commented that the original motion which was adopted by the meeting read: 'that the object of this association be to secure every adult woman the right of the franchise'.
- ¹⁰⁶ This decision was made at a meeting that was held in Temperance Hall on 27 May. See *Brisbane Courier*, 28 April 1894: 6. This principle was formally adopted as the organisation's platform at its third general meeting which was held on 25 May. Here it was reported that the organisation now had 256 members. See *Brisbane Courier*, 26 May 1894: 5.
- ¹⁰⁷ *Brisbane Courier*, 28 April 1894: 3. McConnell claimed that, despite the decision to seek one-woman-one-vote, theirs was a platform on which 'all women, of whatever political party, might without violation of their principles have enrolled themselves under'.
- ¹⁰⁸ See *Brisbane Courier*, 30 April 1894: 4; and 1 May 1894: 7.
- ¹⁰⁹ In 1894, Eleanor Trundle reported that suffrage societies had been formed in Maryborough, Gympie, Bundaberg, Townsville and Charters Towers at the instigation of the WCTU. She noted: 'We have cause to feel hopeful for success, and may this year not close without Queensland placing her daughters politically free with her sons.' See *Minutes of the Ninth Annual Convention of the Queensland Woman's Christian Temperance Union*: 65.
- ¹¹⁰ Glassey tabled one petition in Parliament that had the signatures of 7,781 women and 3,575 men on the second reading of his Electoral Reform Bill on 6 September 1894. See *Queensland Parliamentary Debates (QPD)*, Legislative Assembly (LA), Vol. LXXI (1894): 464. The petition was most likely organised by the WEFA, which had included a copy of their 'One Woman One Vote Coupon' in the *Worker* on 7 July 1894: 2. The presenting of this petition was also reported in the Minutes of the WEFA on 4 September 1894, in *Women's Equal Franchise Association Papers 1893-99 (2 Sheets)*, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, Manuscripts and Records Collection, OM 87-19.
- ¹¹¹ The second reading of Powers' *Elections Act* Amendment Bill was on 28 September 1894. See *QPD* (LA), Vol. LXXI (1894): 716.
- ¹¹² Premier Nelson informed the ladies that, whilst he would not actively oppose the deputation, he would also not support them in their quest for womanhood suffrage, as he was totally against the principle. See *Queenslander*, 27 October 1894: 772-73.
- ¹¹³ It was later reported in the *Brisbane Courier* that Cooper had written the original letter to Emma Miller on 13 March and that the president of the WEFA responded immediately, yet both

- women claimed that their respective organisations would not move from their stated platforms. See *Brisbane Courier*, 3 April 1896: 6, where Cooper's original letter is reproduced.
- 114 *Brisbane Courier*, 1 April 1896: 7.
- 115 *Brisbane Courier*, 2 April 1896: 7.
- 116 *Brisbane Courier*, 1 April 1896: 7.
- 117 Oldfield, *Woman Suffrage in Australia*: 120.
- 118 *Minutes of the Annual Convention of the Queensland Woman's Christian Temperance Union, held in Bundaberg, September 30 to October 6* (Brisbane: Outridge Printing Co., 1897): 84.
- 119 The WEFA's attitude to the WCTU's stance on class issues was clearly demonstrated by a pamphlet that the organisation (under the auspices of the WWPO) produced, entitled 'Why Miss Willard was a Socialist: Will the WCTU Please Note?' See Women Worker's Political Organisation, Women's Equal Franchise Association Papers, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, Manuscripts and Records Collection, VF 320.531 WIL C1.
- 120 *Brisbane Courier*, 20 February 1899: 6. In their suffrage report for 1899, Trundle and Williams reported that the Union of the Darling Downs District refused to support this apolitical circular, preferring instead to send an independent circular — most probably seeking support for the Labour principle of one-woman-one-vote. See *Minutes of the Fourteenth Annual Convention of the Queensland Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Held in Rockhampton, 25th September to 3rd October* (Brisbane: Outridge Printing Co., 1899): 64.
- 121 *Brisbane Courier*, 20 February 1899: 6.
- 122 See Alcazar Press, *Queensland, 1900: A Narrative of Her Past Together with Biographies of her Leading Men* (Brisbane: Alcazar, 1900): 155. This short, yet glowing biography of Byrnes also noted that '[b]itterness was an alien whom he never naturalised'.
- 123 *Minutes of the Thirteenth Annual Convention of the Queensland Woman's Christian Temperance Union*: 80.
- 124 See *Brisbane Courier*, 20 February 1889: 6.
- 125 *Brisbane Courier*, 21 February 1899: 6. This was part of Dickson's policy speech, which was presented on 20 February at the Bulimba School of Arts.
- 126 *Brisbane Courier*, 24 February 1899: 6.
- 127 This deputation was in response to claims that one person, one vote was part of the premier's platform. This deputation was headed by Emma Miller, Leontine Cooper and Agnes Williams. See *Worker*, 21 July 1900: 6.
- 128 *Commonwealth Franchise Act*, No. 8, 2 Edw. VII (1902).
- 129 See *Worker*, 6 June 1903: 5.
- 130 *Brisbane Courier*, 3 July 1903: 2.
- 131 *Worker*, 11 July 1903: 11. Original emphasis.
- 132 The Pioneer Club was an association that was founded in 1894. It was purely social in nature, and was formed in order to provide opportunities for social intercourse amongst women. See Anne Wood, 'The Evolution and Growth of Women's Organisations in Queensland, 1859–1958', *Journal of the Royal Historical Society of Queensland* 6(1) (1959): 189.
- 133 *Worker*, 18 July 1903: 5.
- 134 *Worker*, 18 July 1903: 5.
- 135 *Worker*, 18 July 1903: 5.
- 136 *Worker*, 18 July 1903: 5.
- 137 *Worker*, 18 July 1903: 5.
- 138 At the first meeting of the QWEL, held on 29 July, the following were elected to positions within the organisation: president, Mrs Corrie; vice-presidents, Mrs Edwyn Lilley, Mrs Edgar B. Harris and Miss Fox; treasurer, Miss M.S. Dods; secretary, Miss M.A. Ogg. See QWEL, 'Minute Book — Executive Committee, 29 July 1903–29 June 1911', 29 July 1903: 1, Queensland Women's Electoral League Papers, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, Manuscripts and Records Collection, OM71-47.

- 139 *Worker*, 11 July 1903: 4.
- 140 *Worker*, 26 September 1903: 5. Original emphasis.
- 141 *Worker*, 15 August 1903: 5.
- 142 The close linkage between the QWEL and the NLU was clear. When discussing the formation of QWEL branches in the south of the state, 'Mrs Lilley explained that it should be clearly understood that these Branches be Branches of the QWE League & not the National Liberal Union *although both organisations are working side by side.*' See QWEL, 'Minute Book', 3 September 1903: 7-8. Emphasis added.
- 143 See Margaret Ann Ogg, *Memories of Early Brisbane, As Sketched and Told to Ernest Briggs* (Unpublished Manuscript, 1953), John Oxley Library, Brisbane, Records and Manuscripts Collection, OM 83-1.
- 144 See the chapter on Cooper in Susanna De Vries, *Strength of Purpose: Australian Women of Achievement From Federation to the Mid-20th Century* (Sydney: Harper Collins, 1998).
- 145 See 'Emma Miller and the Campaign for Women's Suffrage in Queensland, 1894-1905', *Memoirs of the Queensland Museum, Cultural Heritage Series* 2(2) (2002): 228. The history of the QWEL supports Young's contention. It claims that, in its first decade, the QWEL 'did not regard the women's vote as an active political force, but merely as a reinforcement of the male vote'. See Dr Eveleen Ahsworth, *Summary of the History of the QWEL* (1959), Queensland Women's Electoral League Papers, cited in Kay Daniels, et al. (eds), *Women in Australia: An Annotated Guide to Records, Volume 2* (Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1977): 17.
- 146 MLA John Cameron, who had been elected to the committee of the League, claimed that he was glad that women had the vote. The *Worker* was quick to highlight the ingenuousness of this statement, stating that the ghost from *Hansard* had come back to haunt the MLA, who had clearly stated in parliament: 'I do not believe in woman suffrage.' See *Worker*, 25 July 1903: 3.
- 147 *Worker*, 18 July 1903: 5.
- 148 *Worker*, 12 September 1903: 10.
- 149 *Worker*, 12 September 1903: 11.
- 150 *Worker*, 19 September 1903: 5.
- 151 *Worker*, 12 September 1903: 5.
- 152 QWEL, 'Minute Book', 3 September 1903: 7.
- 153 Undated newspaper clipping from the *Daily Telegraph*, Women's Political and Educational League of New South Wales: Papers, 1902-1903, ML: NSW, MSS 38/43, item 93, cited in Oldfield, *Woman Suffrage in Australia*: 126.
- 154 In the aftermath of her visit, Scott received letters of thanks from the QWEL, the WEFA and the WCTU. (Note: Although the WEFA had apparently already reformed as the WWPO, the letter that was written to Scott was done so under the auspices of the franchise association.) See Rose Scott Papers, *Correspondence: Womanhood Suffrage, 1877-1920* (Sydney: Mitchell Library), held on Microfilm in Fryer Memorial Library, Brisbane. See vols 2 and 3.
- 155 *Bundaberg Mail and Burnett Advertiser* (Bundaberg), 16 October 1903: 3. This would have perhaps annoyed the leadership of the QWEL, who had earlier sent a telegraph message to Scott whilst she was in Bundaberg, requesting that she influence the Bundaberg woman's suffrage organisation to align with the QWEL. See electric telegraph message from Margaret Ogg to Rose Scott, dated 14 October 1903, *Correspondence: Womanhood Suffrage*, vol. 3.
- 156 See Letter from Margaret Ogg, dated 30 November 1903.
- 157 Flora B. Harris, the Queensland president of the WCTU, stated that the Union simply wanted women to exercise their franchise at the impending federal election 'for the protection of our children and the safe-guarding of our homes and home-life'. See *New Idea* (Melbourne), 5 December 1903: 527.
- 158 See *Minutes of the Eighteenth Annual Convention of the Queensland Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Held in Brisbane, 21st to 25th September* (Brisbane: Outridge Printing Co., 1903): 39.

Queensland Review

- 159 See *Minutes of the Seventeenth Annual Convention of the Queensland Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Held in Brisbane, 27th September to 4th October* (Brisbane: Outridge Printing Co., 1902): 53.
- 160 At the 1895 annual convention, it was claimed that very little could be done to help the female factory workers until the franchise had been obtained. Then, it was claimed, women inspectors would be appointed and would not be satisfied with less than personal and complete inspections. See *Minutes of the Tenth Annual Convention of the Queensland Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Held in Brisbane, 17th, 18th, 19th and 20th September* (Brisbane: Muir and Morcom, 1895): 36.
- 161 *Worker*, 15 August 1903: 5.
- 162 In order: Boyd Dunlop Morehead (1888–90); Samuel Walker Griffith (1890–93); Thomas McIlwraith (1893); Hugh Muir Nelson (1893–98); Thomas Joseph Byrnes (1898); James Robert Dickson (1898–99); Anderson Dawson (1899); Robert Philp (1899–1903); Arthur Morgan (1903–06). See Dennis Murphy et al. (eds), *The Premiers of Queensland*, rev. edn (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1990).
- 163 B.A. Knox, 'The Honourable Sir Arthur Morgan, Kt: His Public Life and Work' (Unpublished BA Thesis, University of Queensland, 1956): 49.
- 164 *QPD* (LA), Vol. XCIII, 29 September 1904: 121.
- 165 *QPD* (LA), Vol. XCIII, 29 September 1904: 158.
- 166 *QPD* (LA), vol. LXXXVIII, 13 November 1901: 1821. This idea was derived from the Belgium model where up to two additional votes could be granted to persons with higher education. As one letter to the *Brisbane Courier* pointed out, however, the inequity of this system had led to great riots in Belgium by the unrepresented workers. See 20 November 1901: 7.
- 167 Mr Turley, per *QPD* (LA), Vol. LXXXVIII, 13 November 1901: 1965.
- 168 William Pember Reeves, *State Experiments in Australia and New Zealand: Volume One* (London: Grant Richards, 1902): 137.
- 169 *Brisbane Courier*, 28 July 1900: 8.
- 170 *QPD* (LA), Vol. LXXI, 28 September 1894: 718.
- 171 See *Queenslander*, 27 October 1894: 772. The *Maryvale Gazette* (Maryvale) provided the following argument against the extension of the political franchise to women: 'The more practical and independent women become, the more will man tend to relieve himself of the sense of protection which fortunately most of them have towards the softer sex, and as a result, as men saw more and more that women were able to look after themselves, so would they more and more leave them to look after themselves, until at last the once 'weak sex' would find that they were expected to hold their own in the walks of life ... [robbing] women of the refinement which ease and culture begets, and exert in all a most baneful influence on our civilization.' See 12 November 1892: 1, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, Records and Manuscripts Collection, OM 78-92/32.
- 172 *Queenslander*, 29 September 1894: 581. An article written by M.L. Manning in *Centennial Magazine* (Sydney) strongly refuted this claim, justifying that 'difference of religious opinion is not conducive to greater family discord than other tolerated causes, not the result of conviction, but of temper or ignorance; as no one can deny that religion is the greatest motive power in man's nature, and least amenable to outside influence'. See *Queenslander* 1(6) (1889): 410.
- 173 See *Brisbane Courier*, 1 August 1890: 4.
- 174 This concern was expressed by the Home Secretary, Foxton, when he received a deputation of WCTU suffragists. See *Worker*, 4 November 1899: 7.
- 175 *Brisbane Courier*, 27 August 1900: 4.
- 176 See *Boomerang*, 31 January 1891: 2.
- 177 *Telegraph*, 29 June 1894: 5.
- 178 See *Brisbane Courier*, 1 August 1890: 4.

- 179 It was thrown out of the council on a vote of 19–12. See *QPD (LA)*, Vol. XCIII, 29 September 1904: 502.
- 180 *Worker*, 29 October 1904: 2.
- 181 *Worker*, 12 November 1904: 5.
- 182 *QPD (LC)*, Vol. XCIV, 10 January 1905: 84, per A.T. Annear. Frederick Brentnall complained that the council chose to postpone its consideration of the Electoral Franchise Bill so that the members could have a holiday for a change. Instead, he remarked, they had been treated by the ‘great pedagogue who has the control of our political destiny ... like a lot of naughty school-boys’, *QPD (LC)*, Vol. XCIV, 12 January 1905: 122.
- 183 The *Daily Mail* announced that it was ‘very disappointing to some of our country cousins, who stayed in town for the occasion’. See *Daily Mail (Brisbane)*, 5 January 1905: 2.
- 184 This Bill was the *Elections Act* Amendment Bill.
- 185 This was the terminology employed by the *Worker*, 14 January 1905: 8. The passage of the Bill was reported in *QPD (LA)*, Vol. XCIV, 5 January 1905: 31; *QPD (LC)*, Vol. XCIV, 5 January 1905: 78.
- 186 *Worker*, 29 October 1904: 2.
- 187 The Council agreed to go into Committee on the Bill on 17 January, yet agreed not to go beyond the second reading until the Machinery Bill had been passed. See *QPD (LC)*, Vol. XCIV, 17 January 1905: 152. The Machinery Bill was passed on 20 January. See, *QPD (LC)*, Vol. XCIV, 17 January 1905: 188. The minor amendments included changes to the lodging of a postal vote so that women in remote areas could more easily exercise their franchise.
- 188 This Bill only required a 12-month residency within the state in order to have one’s name on an electoral roll. It was no longer necessary to have resided in an electorate for six months. This had been the factor that had disenfranchised many itinerant workers.
- 189 This right was granted in 1915 through the amendment of the *Elections Act*, under the leadership of T.J. Ryan. See *Elections Act*, No. 13, 6 Geo. 5 (1915).
- 190 This right was extended in 1965 by the *Elections Act Amendment Act*, No. 59.
- 191 *QPD (LA)*, Vol. XCIV, 24 January 1905: 228.
- 192 The women reported to have attended were Mesdames Higgs, Adler, Culpin and Kate Collings. Emma Miller was unable to attend as she was at the bedside of a sick friend. *Worker*, 28 January 1905: 12.
- 193 *Worker*, 28 January 1905: 12.
- 194 See *QPD (LA)*, Vol. XCIV, 26 January 1905: 230. *Elections Acts Amendment Act*, No. 1, 5 Edw. 7 (1905).
- 195 *Daily Mail*, 26 January 1905: 2.
- 196 *Worker*, 28 January 1905: 5.