

of the Interior of the Government of Canada, with the object of securing the appointment of some women inspectors to assist in the inspection of British immigrant children, and of receiving and distributing homes."

THE NEW L.G.B. ORDER.

Miss A. C. Gibson, as a matter of urgency, drew attention to the new Order issued by the Local Government Board relating to Poor Law Institutions, and said that it would have a disastrous effect upon nursing in rural workhouses.

THE REVISED CONSTITUTION.

On Thursday, October 9th, the day was devoted to receiving and considering the Report of the Special Sub-Committee for the revision of the Constitution. The National Union has now been in existence for 18 years and, although the original Constitution has worked excellently, it was felt by the Executive that there was need for revision "owing to the developments of the work of the National Council and National Union since the Constitution was framed."

The Sub-Committee made a number of suggestions, some of them for the better, but some so drastic that if adopted their effect must have been to deprive the National Council of any real power as the Governing Body, and to place this in the hands of the Executive Committee.

Notably amongst the suggestions of the Sub-Committee were:—

That in addition to the Annual Meeting of the National Council, it should hold a second meeting during the year in London.

That the Executive Committee should have power to summon Extraordinary Meetings of the Council, no provision being made for a similar right on the part of the members as heretofore.

That a Resolution, to be carried by the National Council, must be passed by three-fourths, instead of two-thirds of the members present and voting, as heretofore.

That the Council should not transact business unless one-third of the members were present.

That resolutions sent up for discussion must be supported by three affiliated societies and three branches instead of one.

In addition, the Shropshire Branch of the Union placed an amendment on the agenda: "That at Council Meetings, while any subject of public importance may be proposed for debate, there shall in future be no resolutions proposed and no votes taken."

This amendment was outvoted by an overwhelming majority.

It will be realized, therefore, that the National Council had come to a very crucial point in its history. Further, that had the amendment of the Shropshire Branch been passed, the Council would have deprived itself of its most effective means of influencing public opinion.

As the result of a very full and animated discussion the Council emphatically decided:—

1. Against holding a second meeting in London during the year.

2. That members of the National Council, as well as the Executive Committee, should have the right to summon an extraordinary meeting, though this must be on the requisition of eight Branches and eight affiliated Societies, instead of on that of twenty-five members.

3. That the two-thirds majority necessary to carry a resolution should be retained.

4. By a majority so narrow that the numbers of those voting had to be taken twice, it was decided to adopt the suggestion of the sub-committee that one-third of the members of the Council must be present when business was transacted.

The following amendment proposed by Mrs. Humphry Ward was lost by a large majority, the Council declining to deprive itself of the power of the vote:—

"That in the case of resolutions of a highly-controversial character it shall be possible for not less than five branches and five affiliated Societies to exercise a power of veto on their adoption by the National Council, the veto to mean that they may be discussed but not voted upon. Notice of the exercise of this power must be given not less than one month before the meeting of the National Council."

The results of the decisions of the Council were thus, on the whole, satisfactory; and the speeches, urging that it should not deprive itself of the power of recording its opinion by vote, at a high level, notably that of Mrs. Fawcett, who, on rising to speak, received an ovation.

That the decisions of the Council were displeasing to the members of the Society for Opposing Women's Suffrage and their protagonist (Mrs. Humphry Ward), was inevitable. They showed their disappointment by writing to the press, prophesying secessions, by placarding the city with anti-suffrage posters, and holding a protest meeting. In our view the Society should never have applied for membership of a Council which it well knew had already on two previous occasions passed resolutions in favour of women's suffrage—but, having done so, should have loyally acquiesced in the decision of the large majority of the members who passed a third resolution to the same effect last year.

We can only briefly refer to the delightful hospitality shown to the Council by the Mayor and Mayoress of Hull at the Reception in the City Hall; the noble address on "The Two-Mindedness of England," delivered by Dr. Michael E. Sadler, C.B. (Vice-Chancellor of Leeds University), at the Royal Institution on Thursday evening—the finest we have ever heard at any Conference of the Union; followed by an inspiring paper by Mrs. Creighton, on "How to Differ." These, as well as the sermon of the Bishop of Lichfield on the following day, in Holy Trinity Church, made the Hull Conference both memorable and delightful.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)