White Men's Fears and White Women's Hopes
The 1908 Victorian Adult Suffrage Act

Patricia Grimshaw

THE PASSAGE IN 1908 OF THE ADULT SUFFRAGE ACT that enfranchised women for Victoria's state elections was the culmination of a lengthy history of settler women's activism. This activism stretched back to the 1860s, when women ratepayers, already enfranchised for municipal elections, gladly utilised a loophole in a new electoral act to vote in the colony's 1864 election.[1] The loophole was swiftly closed but the issue simmered away until the newly formed Victorian Women's Suffrage Society began a concerted suffrage campaign in 1884. At an international level, women's suffrage in Victoria shares Australia's fame as a site of early enfranchisement, most commonly recognised at the national level. The Commonwealth Franchise Act of 1902 conferred on women the right to vote and stand for parliament at the federal level, recognition of the existing rights of women in South Australia and Western Australia, who received the colonial vote in 1894 and 1899 respectively.[2] Outside of Australia, only in New Zealand and four western states of the United States of America had women also been enfranchised by 1902. Most women in the western world awaited the conclusion of the first or second world wars for the same rights.[3]

Within the Australian context, however, a concentration on the Commonwealth Franchise Act could obscure the further events subsequent to this Act that brought about a fuller democracy within the separate colonies and states; it could also conceal the prolonged fragile status of Indigenous voters at state and federal level. In the case of the women's vote in Victoria, dominant arrangements of power and authority came to the fore overtly during the debates over electoral provisions. New South Wales in 1902, Tasmania in 1903, and Queensland in 1905 all enacted women's right to vote, leaving Victoria to a further three years' deliberation. Victoria thus extended the right to vote a full 14 years (15 if we count from 1909, the year the governor signed the Victorian legislation) after South Australia did, and six years after Victorian women became political citizens in the Commonwealth. The longevity of the campaign enables close scrutiny of crucial elements of contestation over rights that were played out in particular ways in every state, and federally, to reveal more clearly the slow progress towards full democracy in Australia.[4]

This article examines the many legislative attempts to extend to women a share of political power, from the first bill introduced by Dr William Maloney in 1889 to the success of the Adult Suffrage Act in 1908, in order to consider the shifting boundaries of class and race that characterised this episode in democracy in Victoria. Class interests in Victoria became visible as politicians faced a potentially radical reshaping of electoral arrangements in the state, just as they were being drawn into the vagaries of a new federal political structure. Conversely, while protagonists for and against the women's vote were almost silent on Victorian Aborigines, nevertheless racial concerns led—in fact if not in law—to a denial of Indigenous rights through legal manoeuvring at the federal level. First, the article examines the political context of the Victorian women's movement that brought a robust activism to prominence. Second, it traces conservative politicians' manipulation of their constitutional privileges to delay the women's vote. Third, it indicates how, despite the inclusive terms of the Victorian Act, Indigenous Victorian women and previously enfranchised Indigenous men were effectively denied political citizenship.

Before dealing with these three themes, however, we should review the conditions of the Victorian constitution and electoral arrangements within which this extension of democracy to women occurred. Regarded globally, women's suffrage was enacted earliest in sites of early extension of political rights to men. When the British established constitutions for

their Australian colonies in the mid-1850s, these new constitutions reserved political rights for well-off men, enshrining property qualifications for voting at elections and for holding office. There was no colour bar. Within a few brief years, the British conceded responsible government, passing most of the internal affairs to settler legislatures. Quite quickly, these settler governments moved to widen the electorate and introduced almost complete adult male suffrage for the lower house, in which substantial power was invested. As with the initial British constitutions, the new provisions were colour blind; politicians did not debate the implications of enfranchising Aboriginal men and, technically at least, they too benefited from the legislation. There were, however, restrictions on the rights of men who did not own property within this apparently democratic narrative, the attempted resolution of which became closely intertwined with the debates about suffrage for women. Other inequalities also remained as checks to a fuller democracy. Men who did not meet specified residential demands were excluded from registering, along with those who were in gaol, in receipt of charity, or residents in asylums. Above all, men of wealth were in a privileged position. In Victoria, the new electoral provisions offered plural voting, enabling men to vote in every electorate where they owned property. Moreover these electoral arrangements maintained the privileges of wealth through the qualifications for election to the upper house, the house of review.[5]

Politicians, split widely by divergent economic and social aspirations, approached women's suffrage with pragmatic considerations of class and racial interests in mind, given the separate historical development of the colonies and differences in their constitutions. Thus, from the 1850s, women's political citizenship in each colony, and then in the early Commonwealth, was closely intertwined with male political efforts to eradicate or sustain privileges of wealth, or to institute barriers to groups of men on the basis of race.[6]

The Colonial Context

The features of colonial Victoria that affected political development were fourfold. First, the colony's advanced economic development led to strong liberalism; second, its industries fostered waged work for women outside domestic service; third, it saw the emergence of an organised labour movement; and, finally, a critical minority of women became willing to support women-only lobbying organisations that incorporated women's political

rights on their platforms.

Economic progress following the gold rushes promoted commerce and the growth of towns, and the sizeable metropolis of Melbourne itself fostered a strain of liberalism that was for the most part sympathetic to the views of the eminent British liberal philosopher, John Stuart Mill, in *The Subjection of Women*.[7] Women were inherently the equals of men in talents and capacities, said the reformers, and should be admitted to all the rights and obligations of citizens in a fast-changing world. The progressive path to women's political citizenship found a voice in every avenue of communication, including the press, the pulpit and the halls of the universities. The Honourable William Edgar's comment on the Adult Suffrage Act in 1908 that womanhood was at the very foundation of national life was a frequently heard liberal justification:

> A woman had to stand by her home and brave many dangers of life, and it was really she who built up the nation, and performed many important duties which went to make up the strength of the nation's manhood … At this particular juncture, when it was so important to save the lives and protect the interests of the children who were being brought up to a state of maturity, why should women be debarred from taking any part in the duty of legislation, by refusing them the right to say who should sit in the Legislative Assembly or in the Legislative Council?[8]

In the last decades of the 19th century, the emerging labour movement enhanced a progressive trend on women's political rights. This was uneven. As Frank Bongiorno has shown, there was not inconsiderable apprehension among unions, and from its birth in 1891 within the Labor Party, about the impact of the women's vote.[9] Labour men were dedicated to the family wage, to raising men's wages to cover their dependants rather than supporting higher wages for men and women alike. As a commentator wrote in the pro-labour paper, *Tocsin*: given the power to maintain and educate a family decently, 'men will so perform their natural duties to women that very few women will need to come into the outside world of competition at all. And the TOCSIN believes very strongly that that's how it should be'.[10] However differently some labour feminists viewed women's access to waged work, male speakers and writers usually kept the two questions separate.

Other labour men feared that—in the absence of compulsory voting—more middle-class than working-class women would vote, and that they would back their own representatives. Labour men urged labour women

to form associations among themselves and to stay loyal to the shared working-class struggles. Since most suffragists were well-off women, they would, perhaps, not vote for 'progress'.[11] All labour men adamantly opposed any suggestion of a partial franchise for female property holders. Through the 1890s, labour men campaigned intensively for the end of the plural vote and feared coupling it with women's suffrage in the same bill. With the ending of plural voting in 1899, by which time it was clear that there would be no such provisions in the Commonwealth electoral arrangements, the labour movement loyally endorsed votes for women.

The degree of support for the suffrage among liberal and labour adherents nurtured the growth of a vigorous women's movement that was larger and socially more diverse than in other states. As elsewhere, relatively small but influential groups of middle-class women formed suffrage lobby associations. Often they were educated married women whose husbands were also protagonists for reform. In Victoria, a notable number of wage-earning women, such as schoolteachers, joined the suffrage ranks. Many working-class women were quick to become aware of the suffrage question, and found routes to register their interest within male-dominated labour organisations and through alliances with the middle-class feminists.[12] In South Australia, where there were also strong individual suffragists, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) was a major player at the organisational level in the success of the suffrage campaign in 1894, as was also the case in New Zealand the previous year, and would be in Western Australia and Tasmania in 1899 and 1903 respectively.[13] The message of the World's WCTU that United States speakers brought to the colonies in the mid-1880s made sense to progressive evangelical women with an outreach into rural areas, and made women's suffrage central to their public lobbying. Victoria was also fertile soil for the WCTU, which, with effective leaders, vigorously promoted women's rights alongside temperance.

If the Victorian suffrage campaign lasted so many decades, then, it was not for a lack of enthusiasts of talent or substantial male support. The female protagonists for women's rights were remarkable for their resourcefulness, tenacity and resilience. Their ranks included Henrietta Dugdale, author of the 1883 feminist publication, *A Few Hours in a Far-off Age*, a migrant who had witnessed Chartist riots, become a free thinker, wore the bloomer costume, and combined concerns for the suffrage with outspoken advocacy for women on property issues and education.[14] Her co-founder in the Victoria Women's Suffrage Society, the Australian-born

Annie Lowe, whose grandfather had been one of the early settlers on the Hawkesbury, and whose father entertained liberal views on girls, had lived her early married life on land 'beyond the frontier' in New South Wales. She combined efforts to highlight the plague of male assaults on women with a stress on the female disadvantage that flowed from exclusion from the political system.[15] North Melbourne widow Brettena Smyth, founder of the Australian Women's Suffrage Society, another free thinker, a draper and apothecary, was a pioneer of fertility control, selling contraceptives along with baby charms, comforters, and silk stockings.[16] Bessie Harrison Lee, the charismatic itinerant temperance lecturer, combined eccentric views on fertility control with a conviction that women would be empowered through political rights. After her second marriage, she lived in New Zealand and became a founding member of the New Zealand Labour Party.[17] Annette Bear-Crawford, like Lee and Vida Goldstein Victorian born and bred, was a devout Anglican who worked with the Bishop of London in the East End slums, met Sidney and Beatrice Webb, became active in the suffrage movement under Millicent Garrett Fawcett, returned to Melbourne to promote the shilling fund for a woman-run hospital for women, and established the United Council for Woman Suffrage, which purportedly embraced no fewer than 32 separate women's organisations.[18] Lilian Locke, a wage earner and compelling speaker, was labour organiser for the Women's Social and Political Reform League and subsequently recruiter of women for the Victorian Labour Councils.[19] Above all, Vida Goldstein, a canvasser for the 1891 petition, was smart, articulate and innovative. She edited the journal the *Australian Woman's Sphere,* founded the Women's Political Association and, in 1903, became the first woman to register to stand for the Senate.[20]

Conservative Delaying Tactics

If, despite a relatively sympathetic social context and activist organisations notable for their strength and diversity, the suffrage did not pass into law before 1908, the reason lay in the capacity of Victorian conservatives to obstruct the measure in the Victorian parliament. While the deep-seated conservatism of Britain had not been replicated in the Australasian colonies, Victorian conservatives in parliament utilised effectively those structural barriers that had been erected in the 1850s to protect their class from the adverse effects of an unrestrained male democracy. The numerous men of property, with wealth derived from pastoralism and finance, fought

assiduously to sustain their advantages in colonial and then state political institutions.[21] As well as the plural vote in the years prior to 1899 and the property qualifications for voting and standing for election for the Legislative Council (modified since the 1850s but never abandoned), these advantages included electorates firmly weighted in favour of rural electors. Visiting social critic Beatrice Webb declared in 1898 that the Victorian Council was 'perhaps the most reactionary in the British Empire'.[22]

Thus the parliamentary system was biased towards conservatives, who, from the first bill up to 1908 (the successful bill was the second of the year), stalled the measure in the Legislative Assembly and repeatedly voted down bills in the Legislative Council. Even as, after the turn of the century, nascent parties emerged to impose formal party discipline, conservatives manipulated party caucuses to prevent suffrage bills from becoming government measures: Council felt freer to reject private members' bills than government initiatives from the lower house. Indeed this might have continued considerably longer had not an ardent opponent of the suffrage, the conservative premier, Sir Thomas Bent, made an opportunistic about-face over a second bill in 1908 that finally passed both houses after he made it a government measure and applied pressure to upper house colleagues.[23]

Conservatives' opposition to the suffrage was grounded, not in liberal or labour references to individual rights or social justice, but in a God-given natural order that attributed to women a domestically oriented nature, dedicated to home and family, while men trod the difficult, manly path of defending and providing for them. Women were above politics, asserted the member for Mornington in a lengthy debate in 1894. Echoing John Ruskin's famous essay, *Sesame and Lilies*, he asserted women's significance lay in the very special influence they sustained as moral leaders of men. Woman was associated with the highest ideals of purity and love:

> I do not wish to see woman unsexed. I believe in the idea, which almost all men possess, of woman being the weaker vessel and dependent on man; and I believe that she could not make laws for the country better than we can make them ourselves, subject, as we are, to the influence of woman in her highest and her noblest sphere of life.[24]

It was an argument that could have been made by conservatives anywhere. But note that the speaker continued in far from chivalrous mode. In almost the same breath he warned: 'If she meets us in this House, if she meets us in politics, we shall immediately be constrained to alter all that and

say—"You are trying to fight against us, and we must therefore fight against you." And what will that lead to?'

Chivalry depended on women's willingness to stay in the home, it appeared. It could not be countenanced that women would speak at public meetings, a fellow conservative declared, 'upon subjects that are certainly not sentimental or connected with any of the finer feelings in life, unconnected with the greatest matter on which women could associate—charity'.[25] Conservatives saw no need to be polite to the women who left their homes to campaign for the vote and whom they portrayed as ugly old maids, as women of doubtful gender, or as mentally unstable and out of control. There were also the 'dangerous' women who might have a sorely negative influence if enfranchised, women who included prostitutes, 'moral degenerates', and those married women who emasculated their husbands and made family life miserable.

In the 1890s, the conservative tactic of denigrating suffragists, male or female, as deliverers of an unwelcome message, rather than facing the suffragists' arguments, dominated discussion. In the Legislative Assembly debate on the 1895 suffrage bill, unkind words poured forth: 'As for the shrieking platform women who do advocate it, I would as soon give votes to cockatoos',[26] declared one conservative member. The demand for woman franchise, said another, principally arose from 'those societies which are formed of so-called strong-minded women, who in a measure have unsexed themselves; and the support they receive from the opposite sex is, generally speaking, only from the weak-kneed and weak-headed members of that sex'.[27] A country member added his concerns about the 10,000, perhaps 20,000, prostitutes let loose in the city: 'Just fancy a polling day in the city of Melbourne with that class of women turned out into the streets to vote. They would carry on all sorts of disgraceful conduct before the respectable people of that colony'.[28] Yet another—after a personal disclaimer that no man had a greater regard for the opposite sex than he: 'no man loves his mother or his wife more than I love mine'—declared that he had never found a woman who desired the franchise: 'I mean real women. I have met he-women—who ought to have been born men, but nature made a mistake'.[29]

In 1900, Robert Reid, whose daughter Carrie Reid in the same year was co-organiser of the short-lived Women's Anti-Franchise League,[30] told the Legislative Council that: 'Where you find the English-speaking race, there you find women at the highest pinnacle of civilization, esteemed,

respected, and beloved'. Never had woman stood so high as now in Great Britain and America, and that was a result of denying these suffragists' demands.[31] Then came the personal touch. Weary politicians like himself would return home at night, not to peace, sympathy and comfort, but to face a wife 'anxiously intent upon the results of the last division'.[32] A colleague thought it a disgrace to the manhood of the country that the women's vote should even be proposed. 'Born a man, I mean to die a man', he declared. 'I mean to preserve my masculinity, and so long as I am a man, I will never do anything … which will have the effect of putting women in the position of rulers of the country'. If they had arrived at such a state of imbecility as to allow women to vote, why not go further and let the children be rulers too? After all, children would be easier to bribe because they would be satisfied with lollies.[33]

Many of the epithets thrown at politically active women indicated a good deal more than outraged masculinity. Conservatives harboured anxieties that women sustaining a public presence in their own right were, if not totally naïve about the ways of the world, disturbingly radical in a political sense. One member divided the suffragists into two distinct classes. He had been to a meeting of mature, cultured matrons, which convinced him, if he needed further convincing, that the suffrage would be a terrible mistake: 'These ladies have not commenced to understand what a wicked world we live in'. And the other type?

> These are the worst form of socialists. Their idea of freedom is polyandry, free love, lease marriages, and so on … Are we to allow women who would sap the very foundation of a nation to have votes? Are we going to allow women who do not understand the meaning of the holy word "Home" to have a voice in the government of the country? NO.[34]

The latter group no doubt caricatured working-class activists. By the turn of the century, it had become increasingly clear that, beyond an ideological revulsion for feminism, what was at stake was conservative anxiety about women's capacity to challenge the balance of Victoria's politics. And this was occurring just as conservatives saw their dominance at risk in the face of the rise of organised labour. Many conservatives would have conceded the vote if it went solely to women ratepayers: 'I attach no importance to the mere possession of property, but do attach importance to the ratepayers' roll, as embracing the stable staunch backbone of this colony', said one.[35]

The entrance of the mass of women into the electoral system would jeopardise conservatives' pre-eminence in Victorian politics, on which their privileges and prosperity depended. Some referred hopefully, but not confidently, to women's alleged innate conservatism. Many more conservatives asked whether suffragists were essentially socialists, or at least being manipulated by unnamed left-wing political forces. Their concerns were encapsulated in a preoccupation with their working-class maids. What if the mistresses of households, alert to the impropriety of political involvement, stayed home on polling day, while their servants, with no such qualms, raced to the polls to outvote their masters?[36] A great majority of his lady friends opposed the suffrage, one conservative reported, 'because they are afraid of the result of enfranchising their servants and of the influence of the Trades Hall'.[37] In future, they could look forward to women 'going to the Yarra bank and preaching all sorts of socialism under the guidance of our worthy Mr. Tucker and Dr. Strong'.[38]

To add to conservatives' anxieties, the suffrage was not the only democratic change that radicals sought; for example, there was a cry for equally sized electorates. There were double the number of women in the towns compared with the country, one conservative pointed out, and 'when equal electorates are obtained what are these radical members going to do? Equal electorates would mean nothing but dictatorship, and a tyranny too great to be borne. Equal electorates would be most unjust to the country constituencies'.[39] These representations, they had every reason to believe, fell on deaf ears outside of their own circles.

Given the WCTU's enthusiastic endorsement of the suffrage, conservatives representing brewing interests nourished particular hostility to the suffrage, fearing the banning of alcohol, possibly along with cigarettes. In 1905, one Legislative Councillor reported hearing a woman at a meeting say that, as soon as the franchise was carried, brewery shares would fall 20 per cent. What did these heartless women care about the economy and the women and children dependent on brewery shares for their livelihood?[40] Not that the liquor lobby viewed the use of alcohol as unproblematic: 'If ladies had seats in the Assembly we should have to get rid of the refreshment-room', one member maintained: 'What fearful scenes would occur in the refreshment-room if the stronger sex had spirits infused into them in the shape of a nobbler'.[41] Another politician retorted to these fears: 'Women were keeping the religion of Jesus Christ alive in Victoria while the men were spending their time in all kinds of athletics and all kinds of

debauchery and gambling'.[42]

Before Australian Federation became a reality, some conservatives pondered enfranchised women's probable baleful influence on the proposed future Commonwealth. One member of the Legislative Council in 1900, who saw himself belonging to the British Empire rather than Australia, was nevertheless unable to ignore the likelihood that the new nation would become part of an Imperial Council or Federation. Enfranchised Australian women would expect to take part. 'Now, I do not think that it would be good for any country if the women had to deal with questions say, of foreign policy—questions of really great magnitude.'[43] But, even after Federation, conservatives worried mostly about Victorian politics, seeing the state parliament as determining the key areas of importance for the elite—the management of land, business and finance—despite the declared demarcation of powers that allocated significant economic areas to the federal government. What if women voted as a bloc? 'I am sorry to say that at present there are more women than men in Victoria', announced one conservative. Therefore, if women had the vote, Victoria would be governed with women holding more than equal say on policy, while men still carried on all the responsible work of government: 'the control of the police, the custody of criminals, the maintenance of public peace, the exploration of distant bush country, manning the fleet, and even going to war'.[44] If war was declared, perhaps the men should pack up shiploads of women and send them off overseas to fight it!

Retaining control of the Legislative Council remained crucial. One Councillor reported:

> This Chamber has been threatened, sometimes in a direct and sometimes in an indirect manner, that, unless we bow to the will of the people, something emphatic will happen. A few days ago, one of the ladies who is most prominent in carrying on this agitation, and who is as glib as any male orator could be, talked of the Council being brought to its duty unless it bowed to the will of the people, and she said the House must be "mended or ended".[45]

He did not believe this emanated from the women, but from 'persons who talk and write in their name',[46] adding, to conjure an even worse scenario, that in New Zealand 'the emancipated womanhood was developing a deep-seated sentiment against maternity'.[47]

After the 1902 Act gave political citizenship to Australian women, Victorian conservatives persisted in their opposition to women's suffrage, even as their counterparts in New South Wales, Tasmania and Queensland conceded

failure. Conservatives continued to insist that respectable Victorian women had not expressed any wish for the vote, despite the obvious evidence that women readily enrolled and voted in the first and subsequent federal elections. Conservatives declared women in the state did not want the vote, nor did their own wives and daughters, nor indeed any woman they knew. As late as 1906, the member for St Kilda could say that there was not an atom of evidence that the women of this country wanted the franchise: 'The women who do not say anything about the matter are, in my opinion, in a majority, and it is those who are anxious and noisy—something like the suffragettes in England, although the ladies here have a greater sense of decency—who are really asking for this Bill'.[48]

Victorian conservatives' special concern about the women's vote, compared with their counterparts in other states, centred on a key issue: the unprecedented influx of women into public waged work in the state that led the nation's industrial development. Near to one quarter of women aged 15 years and over, some estimated, participated in the labour force in some way. Whereas once wage-earning women were concentrated in domestic service, now they also sought new jobs in the multiplying factories and shops of the towns and cities. The gender order at home and work seemed under particular threat and, with the right to vote, this would extend to the balance of political power. Direct access to an income suggested independence not only from the family but from men's political authority. The threat to the family involved more than the over-cited fear of hard-working men forced to stay home to fry the chops and nurse the baby while wives flounced out to public meetings. More menacingly, women—in time it might be more and more married women—would edge men out of work and thus gain social power. One conservative suggested taking all women out of factories. Then all the men could marry because they would have jobs, and there would be no worrying single women out and about. Shouted one interjector: Did he want the men to make shirts? No, the member replied, he wanted women to devote themselves to their homes and educate their children from whom would come the politicians of the future.[49]

In the final debate in 1908, conservatives complained yet again that women's public employment would increase if the bill passed, with the result that, 'instead of women being content to allow the other [sex] to represent them they are to be a separate entity with separate aims and ambitions … I prefer that women should link their fortunes with men'.

Another conservative reinforced his colleague's opinion: 'At present, under our existing laws, it was found that women were encroaching on men's dominions, and were shutting men out of the factories and offices', he complained, with the result that some men had become 'street loafers', while the women whom the men 'should protect and earn bread for had become the breadwinners'. The result was a class of 'bachelor women' who were not fulfilling the high duties for which they were intended. The women of the state surely had 'something higher and nobler to contend for than the franchise. They had their homes to look after, and the rearing of their children'.[50] Soon, said another, they would see women expecting 'equal pay for their work'. Another rebutted him: 'Yes. No one will say that doing the same work they are not rightly entitled to the same pay'.[51]

But there were signs early in the new century that a few conservatives were beginning to accept the inevitable. In 1906, the Labor member for Carlton accused the conservative member for St Kilda of educating women against socialism. The gentleman in question represented his efforts as chivalry; he arranged afternoon tea meetings merely to 'educate' women about politics.[52] Sir Thomas Bent had continually declared that most women did not want to be bothered with the franchise. 'Fancy women having to go to the polling booths in the constituency of Villiers and Heytesbury', he once joked: 'Why, many of them would get lost in the bush'.[53] Late in 1908, Bent, motivated by concerns for his own political survival, switched from his stance as arch opponent of the suffrage to bring down a government bill and persuade sufficient conservatives in the Council to follow his lead. Councillors had seen hopeful signs. Their fears that conservative women would prove reluctant to engage with politics, and would in any case be grossly outvoted by working-class women, were alleviated by the results of the federal elections in Victoria. They observed with approval the robust anti-Labor Australian Women's National League that flourished under Janet Lady Clarke's management. William Baillieu was one member of the Legislative Council who switched his allegiance in the crucial last debate for this reason. Although he had previously voted against women's suffrage, he now declared himself satisfied that 'the majority of women would vote in the same way as their husbands and that the balance of the political parties would remain very much as it was at present'.[54]

Historian of Victoria's parliament Raymond Wright has shown that by 1911, the year of the first election in which women participated, voters increased in number from 263,876 to 701,451 (the three-year gap was

because an election had taken place a few months prior to the successful 1908 Act). There was a voter turnout of 56 per cent of those registered, with more women than men overall, a majority more pronounced in the metropolitan electorates.[55] There was no bloc women's vote: voters in traditional Labor districts returned Labor members and liberal electorates returned liberals.[56] While they found it difficult to rise to prominence in mainstream politics,[57] the new women citizens were highly active. Victoria was home to an increasing number of women's organisations, and continued thereby to contribute strongly to discussion of public policy.[58]

This Act was far from an end to the journey to equal political rights for Victorians. It marked just one step, albeit a very important step, in that direction. In the first place, although women now voted, they could not stand for election for either house until 1924. Second, the ratepayers' roll was brought across as a register for the elections for state parliament, a decision that favoured affluent women; others had to make the effort to enrol. And only rate-paying women could vote in the Legislative Council. All other women were excluded, as were men in the same position, until property qualifications for the Council in Victoria were finally removed in 1950.[59] Third, failure to ensure access to the vote for Indigenous women constituted a blatant denial of political rights to a group of Victorian women: the Victorian parliament showed little concern about the exclusion of Indigenous Victorians from federal, then state, political rights that occurred virtually by stealth, following the Commonwealth Franchise Act. While this complex matter has been aired elsewhere, it warrants analysis in the context of the Victorian Act of 1908.[60]

Exclusion of Indigenous Women

The 1908 Adult Suffrage Act did not explicitly debar Victorian Aboriginal women from voting, just as the 1855 constitution had not barred Aboriginal men. But, from 1901, Victoria was an integral component of a national political structure, and decisions made at a federal level influenced policies within the state. In this instance, a legal interpretation of the 1901 Commonwealth Constitution protected political rights solely for those Aboriginal men who already had their names on the state electoral roll. This decision put in jeopardy the political rights of Indigenous Victorian men who turned 21 years of age after 1 January 1901, a debarment that flowed on to Indigenous women despite the apparent inclusiveness of the 1908 Act. How this came about is a complex story.

Given the heavily compromised civil rights of Aborigines in Victoria in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, it is perhaps not surprising that a settler government that finally enacted votes for women should disregard the seeping away of the formal state political rights of Aborigines. Yet this is still a story that needs unpacking if we are to understand further the continuing obstacles to democracy in the state, as well as respond accurately to the frequently asked question: did Aboriginal women also receive the right to vote in Victoria in 1908? Indigenous people of the colony were by the turn of the century very few in number; reduced by killing and introduced diseases, they now constituted an impoverished minority. Many lived on reserves and missions, or in makeshift dwellings on the outskirts of country towns. They posed numerically no political threat, even if they voted as a bloc. Despite these handicaps to active citizenship, men were, however, legally enfranchised, and anecdotal evidence suggests that some mission-educated Aboriginal men registered and cast their votes.[61]

While Aborigines seldom figured in the public and parliamentary discussion of the women's vote, the debate was racialised. Whiteness pervaded the parliamentary debates, as politicians represented the normative woman and her rights and duties in recognisably western terms. Pro-suffrage parliamentarians clearly indicated that they assumed a white western woman when they referred to the ideal Victorian woman citizen as part of the wider Anglo-Saxon community and capable of exercising the franchise.[62] One politician who had travelled in Africa and observed Zulu society declared: 'From the cradle upwards women tend to improve men. If men got away from womankind they would develop the habits of blackfellows, and they would gradually become brutes'. [63] Notwithstanding, there were indications that the majority of politicians, if they knew that Aboriginal men were enfranchised, were not bothered. During a suffrage bill debate in the Legislative Assembly in 1895, the member for Ballarat West refuted the argument that women were physically disabled and hence unable to be political citizens. Do we disqualify the maimed, blind, or undersized men? 'The element of sex has been introduced. I submit that that element is entitled to no greater consideration than the element of skin. Do we disqualify a man because he happens to be born with a skin of a certain colour?' An interjector shouted that they did exclude the Chinese, but no mention was made of Aborigines.[64]

Understanding how the exclusion of Victorian Aborigines from the state vote came about requires a national explanation. In new white societies, a

key factor in the fortunes of women's suffrage was fears of admission of indigenous voters or migrants of colour, since the debate on the political rights of women inevitably stimulated discussion of the rights of minority groups whose rights could also destabilise prevailing regimes of dominance. In ex-British settler societies such as South Africa and New Zealand, the passage of political citizenship for indigenous peoples in the history of settler paths to democracy has a prominent role. While Victoria was home to a very small Aboriginal community, descendants of the survivors of the original invasion of their lands, this was not the case in the north and west of Australia. As Victoria entered a national political system, anxieties and actions flowing from federal decisions shaped its own practices. The Aboriginal male voters in these states, and the prospect of doubling their ranks by enfranchising the women, did not concern white South Australian, New South Wales and Tasmanian politicians when these states enfranchised women in 1894, 1902 and 1903 respectively; nor was it an issue for white Victorians.

As John Chesterman and Brian Galligan showed in *Citizens Without Rights,* it was otherwise in Queensland and Western Australia where Aborigines were comparatively far more numerous and concentrated in certain electorates. In addition to the symbolic challenge to white supremacy that political citizenship for Aborigines posed, if Aborigines voted as a bloc, with their numbers swelled by Aboriginal women, they could potentially affect the balance of power between white political parties that were emerging from differing economic interests within the states. Thus, in the west and north, concerns to do with race took a higher profile in the paths to women's suffrage. It was a racism that in some ways favoured the white women's cause, as it intensified in the 1890s with the campaign to exclude further migrants of colour. White women were part of the 'Anglo-Saxon race' that the colonies celebrated as they congratulated themselves on pioneering a new land and creating prosperous and progressive societies.

Queensland was the first colony to trial a means of restricting the Aboriginal male vote while keeping the trappings of liberalism. The Queensland parliament introduced in the 1885 Elections Act a racial clause that restricted the political rights of Aboriginal, Asian and Pacific island men to those who were freeholders. The clause ran: 'No aboriginal native of Australia, India, China, or of the South Sea islands shall be entitled to be entered on the roll except in respect of a freehold qualification'. The property hurdle was high at £100. Given that colonial authorities had denied Aborigines

recognition as landowners, and few earned sufficient income even to rent houses in country townships or Brisbane, the property qualification almost eliminated Aboriginal men's political rights.[65]

In the 1890 constitution for Western Australia, as also for the other Australian colonies, the British Colonial Office preserved political rights for men of property, settler or Indigenous—there was no colour bar.[66] If at some stage Aboriginal men met the property qualifications, then they would have earned the right to vote, as had propertied white men. The settler government feared that white workers from other colonies would avoid shifting to Western Australia if they were denied a right that was offered in other colonies. Pressure for widening the electorate for the lower house intensified when over 100,000 people, predominantly men, entered the colony in the wake of the gold strikes in Coolgardie and Kalgoorlie in 1893.[67] Neither Aboriginal men nor migrant men of colour were included in the provisions for manhood suffrage for the Legislative Assembly in the 1893 Constitution Amendment Act. For these men, the property qualification was maintained and, for this purpose, the definition of an Aborigine was extended to men of mixed European and Aboriginal descent. The exclusion was spelt out as Queensland had pioneered. Section 21 ran: 'No aboriginal native of Australia, Asia, or Africa shall be entitled to be registered, except in respect of a freehold qualification'. Section 26 declared: 'In this Act the words "aboriginal native" shall include persons of the half-blood'.[68]

Women's suffrage in Western Australia was included in another Act in 1899 that extended the vote to 'every person' 21 years and over who had resided in the colony and in the electorate for six months. 'Persons' included white women. 'Persons' did not include Aboriginal women. The exclusion of Aborigines remained untouched, except for property holders.[69] In effect this Act enfranchised Aboriginal women who were property holders as the 1893 Act had done for property-holding Indigenous men. Given how few Aborigines met the property qualification, or were likely to in the foreseeable future, this all but wiped out the Indigenous vote.

The debate on white women's political citizenship and the rights of Aboriginal Australians in the proposed new Commonwealth arose during the meetings in the 1890s to decide on the electoral clauses in the Constitution. That South Australia women were enfranchised in 1894 was crucial in the decision to give women the vote in the new Commonwealth of Australia. When senior politicians from the six colonies met during the

1890s to draft the federal Constitution, they intended to make the provisions for voting rights for the new Commonwealth parliament the same that currently held good in each colony. Some objected, however, that since women could vote in South Australia and nowhere else, this one new state would have an unfair advantage. The writers of the Constitution compromised by protecting South Australian women's voting rights under Section 41, and foreshadowing swift legislation in the new parliament to enfranchise women in all other states.[70]

On the matter of the vote for Indigenous women and men, the generosity tilted in the other direction. Queensland and Western Australian delegates voiced their anxieties, which those from the south-eastern states had now also to face, as members of parliament met in the new federal legislature. In the Australian Constitution that came into effect in January 1901, federal political rights were declared identical with those already in existence in the separate states: for South Australia, this meant women could vote, and white women could vote in Western Australia. For Queensland and Western Australia, this meant the maintenance of property rights qualifications for Aborigines at federal level. The women's vote and the Indigenous vote were considered together on a nation-wide basis in the 1902 Commonwealth Franchise Act, one of the first major pieces of legislation of the new federal parliament, which the new government initially hoped would strike a uniform franchise including all women and all Aborigines.[71] To a large extent, anxieties about migrants of colour had been allayed with the 1901 Immigration Restriction Act all but blocking entry to Asians and Africans and legalising the repatriation of South Sea islanders.

The women's vote was generally well received and was poised to pass easily, but clearly on the supposition of many representatives that the clause would apply to white women only. Many did not even know that Aboriginal men had the vote in the south-eastern states under existing manhood suffrage and hence that this clause would also apply to Aboriginal women. The addition of women to the ranks of political citizenship initially passed. The news spread that not only Aboriginal men but Aboriginal women also were now potential citizens. The reaction of Queensland and Western Australian senators to the possible enfranchisement of their Indigenous populations was profoundly racist: a Western Australian senator argued that the bill 'would be all right for Tasmania, where there are no blacks, and probably all right for such states as New South Wales or Victoria; but to give the vote to most of the aboriginals in Western Australia would be

a very serious matter indeed'.[72] It was all very well for senators to be benevolently inclined towards Aborigines and coloured aliens, complained a senator from Queensland, but that would let loose 'a large numbers of persons who will be able to affect our elections in Queensland in a manner that will be detrimental to the interests of that state and of the whole Commonwealth'.[73]

The Victorians lined up on either side of the debate. Senator Barrett reversed his earlier position after hearing the Western Australians: 'I am going to reverse my vote', he said, 'because the position is altogether different from what I understood it to be previously. I did not know that in some of the constituencies of Western Australia the blacks outnumber the whites'.[74] Henry Bournes Higgins, five years later to become president of the Conciliation and Arbitration Court, declared the Aboriginal vote 'utterly inappropriate'.[75] But Victorians were also in the ranks of those who defended Indigenous rights. As the member for Southern Melbourne, James Ronald, declared: 'To draw a "colour line" and say that because a man's face is black he therefore is not able to understand the principles of civilisation, is misanthropic, inhumane and unchristian'. Finally the racist views prevailed. The crucial clause read in similar style to those already passed in Queensland and Western Australia: 'No aboriginal native of Australia, Asia, Africa or the islands of the Pacific, except New Zealand, shall be entitled to have his name placed on the electoral roll, unless so entitled under Section 41 of the Constitution'.[76] Section 41 of the Constitution enshrined federal voting rights for those who legally had the vote in the states.

Thus the 1902 Act, like the Commonwealth Constitution, ostensibly protected the federal political rights of Aborigines in Victoria (as in the other south-eastern states). As Pat Stretton and Christine Finnimore have shown, however, this was not to last. Administrators interpreted Section 41 of the Constitution in ways that removed protection of the political rights even of those Aborigines already on state electoral rolls on 1 January 1901. No further potential Indigenous voters who turned 21 years of age subsequently could register.[77] 'Individual bureaucratic whim', the writers say, 'rather than legal consistency seems to have determined who was barred'.[78] The entire question of the status of Victorian Aborigines within their own state was already ambiguous. They were defined as people of full descent; officially those of mixed European and Indigenous descent were white and, by 1908, many were of mixed descent. The Constitution excluded from political rights those living in receipt of charity—and, in

some definitions, those living on reserves or stations were so called. Now confusion abounded further with the flow-on from the legal decision. Victorian electoral officers used the state registration as a basis for the federal roll. Because Aborigines might not, it appeared, be registered for federal elections, officials generally believed that they also could not be entered on the state roll. This is not to deny that some mixed-descent Aborigines very possibly did register for state elections despite these uncertainties.

It was not until 1949 that the federal vote for Aborigines in the south-eastern states was reinstated by Prime Minister Ben Chifley's Australian Labor Party government. It needed no legislation to return the state vote to Aborigines because formally it had always existed. Robert Menzies' government extended the federal vote to Aborigines in Queensland and Western Australia in 1962. But it was not until the successful Commonwealth referendum of 1967 that most indigenous Victorians were alerted to their rights, or that the officials who administered elections acted on them.[79]

Conclusion

The focus of this article on the path to democracy in one crucial state has highlighted remaining privileges of class in the upper house, and newly imposed exclusions on the basis of race in the electoral system, along with the inequalities that white women overcame only in a limited way. In part because the achievement of suffrage was delayed in Victoria, the story adds complexity to an understanding of the development of democracy in the late colonial and early national period. An examination of the relation of gender to concerns of class and race points to an interpretation of the arrival of democracy in Australia as problematic and contested. In Australia as a whole, also, it was an uneven and halting process, a fact that tends to be obscured by general acknowledgement of the early embarkation on the path to male democracy in the south-east in the 1850s.

NOTES

I thank Fiona Davis and Nell Musgrove for research assistance for this paper, and Stuart Macintyre, Brian Costar, John Chesterman, Jackie Dickenson, Sean Scalmer and Joanna Cruickshank for reading and commenting on it.

1. Audrey Oldfield, *Woman's Suffrage in Australia: A Gift or a Struggle?* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1992, p. 131. See *Victorian Parliamentary Debates* (*VPD*), Assembly, vol. 79, 26 November 1895, p. 3573, for a politician's allusion to this event.
2. Patricia Grimshaw, 'White Women as "Nation Builders": Gender, Colonialism and the Federal Vote', in John Chesterman and David Philips (eds), *Selective Democracy: Race, Gender and the Australian Vote*, Melbourne, Circa, 2003, pp. 1–20; Patricia Grimshaw, 'A White Woman's Suffrage', in Helen Irving (ed.), *A Woman's Constitution? Gender and History in the Australian Commonwealth*, Sydney, Hale and Iremonger, 1996, pp. 77–99.
3. See Caroline Daley and Melanie Nolan (eds), *Suffrage and Beyond: International Feminist Perspectives,* Auckland, Auckland University Press, 1994, for chapters dealing with the passage of the suffrage across the western world.
4. For a detailed account of the Victorian suffrage campaign, see chapter 8 of Oldfield, pp. 131–71. Other recent studies include: Suffrage City Press, *'They Are But Women': The Road to Female Suffrage in Victoria,* Melbourne, School of Historical Studies, University of Melbourne, 2007; Phyllis King, 'Male Opponents of Women's Franchise in Victoria, 1888–1908', BA Hons thesis, History Department, University of Melbourne, 1999.
5. John Chesterman and Brian Galligan, *Citizens Without Rights: Aborigines and Australian Citizenship,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp. 14–15. For background on the Colony of Victoria, see Geoffrey Serle, *The Golden Age*: *A History of the Colony of Victoria, 1851–1861,* Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, 1963; Geoffrey Serle, *The Rush to be Rich*: *A History of the Colony of Victoria, 1883–1889*, Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, 1971.
6. This chapter draws upon my own and collaborative research with colleagues on the suffrage across the colonies and states of Australia: Patricia Grimshaw, 'Comparative Perspectives on White and Indigenous Women's Political Citizenship in Queensland: The 1905 *Act to Amend the Elections Acts, 1885 to 1899*', *Queensland Review,* vol. 12 no. 2, 2005, pp. 9–22; Patricia Grimshaw, 'Settler Anxieties, Race and the Women's Vote in Pacific Settler Communities, 1888 to 1902', in Louise Edwards and Mina Roces (eds), *Women's Suffrage in Asia,* London, Routledge, 2004, pp. 220–35; Patricia Grimshaw, 'Reading the Silences: Suffrage Activists and Race in Nineteenth Century Settler Societies', in Patricia Grimshaw, Katie Holmes and Marilyn Lake (eds), *Women's Rights and Human Rights: International Historical Perspectives*, Basingstoke, Palgrave/ Macmillan, 2001, pp. 31–48; Patricia Grimshaw and Katherine Ellinghaus, 'White Women, Aboriginal Women and the Vote in Western Australia', *Studies in Western Australian History*, no. 20, 1999, pp. 1–19; Patricia Grimshaw and Sharon Low, 'Looking again at the Women's Vote in Tasmania', *Tasmanian Historical Studies*, vol. 9, 2004, pp. 21–33.

7. For liberalism in Victoria, see Stuart Macintyre, *A Colonial Liberalism: The Lost World of Three Victorian Visionaries,* Melbourne, Oxford University Press, 1991. For the growth of the colony, see Graeme Davison, *The Rise and Fall of Marvellous Melbourne*, Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, 1978.
8. *VPD*, Council, vol. 119, 18 November 1908, p. 1411. For individual members of parliament, see: Kathleen Thomson and Geoffrey Serle, *A Biographical Register of the Victorian Parliament, 1859–1900,* Canberra, ANU Press, 1972.
9. Frank Bongiorno, *The People's Party: Victorian Labor and the Radical Tradition, 1875–1914*, Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, 1996, pp. 115–34.
10. Patricia Grimshaw, 'The "Equals and Comrades of Men"? *Tocsin* and the Woman Question', in Susan Magarey, Susan Rowley and Susan Sheridan (eds), *Debutante Nation: Feminism Contests the 1890s,* Sydney, Allen and Unwin, 1993, p. 106.
11. Bongiorno, p. 120.
12. See Marilyn Lake, *Getting Equal: The History of Australian Feminism,* Sydney, Allen and Unwin, 1999. For New South Wales and South Australia, see Judith Allen, *Rose Scott: Vision and Revision in Feminism*, Melbourne, Oxford University Press, 1994; Susan Magarey, *Unbridling the Tongues of Women: A Biography of Catherine Helen Spence*, Sydney, Hale and Iremonger, 1985, pp. 165–94; Susan Magarey, *The Passions of the First Wave Feminists,* Sydney, UNSW Press, 2001.
13. Anthea Hyslop, 'Temperance, Christianity and Feminism: The Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Victoria, 1887–1897', *Historical Studies*, vol. 17, no. 66, April 1976, pp. 27–49; Patricia Grimshaw and Elizabeth Nelson, 'Empire, the "Civilising Mission" and Indigenous Christian Women in Colonial Victoria', *Australian Feminist Studies*, vol. 16, no. 36, 2001, pp. 295–309; Patricia Grimshaw, 'Colonising Motherhood: Evangelical Reformers and Koorie Women in Victoria, Australia, 1880s to the Early 1900s', *Women's History Review*, vol. 8, no. 2, June 1999, pp. 329–46; Patricia Grimshaw, 'Gender, Citizenship and Race in the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Australia, 1890 to the 1930s', *Australian Feminist Studies*, vol. 13, no. 28, September 1998, pp. 199–214.
14. Katherine O'Donnell, 'Henrietta Dugdale: He-Woman or Pioneer Suffragist?', in Suffrage City Press, *'They Are But Women',* pp. 15–28.
15. Oldfield, pp. 135–6.
16. Kathryn Sutherland, ''Brettena Smyth: Sex and Politics', in Suffrage City Press, *'They Are But Women',* pp. 50–66.
17. Catherine McLennan, 'Bessie Harrison Lee: Victoria's Temperate Suffragist', in Suffrage City Press, *'They Are But Women',* pp. 29–49; Patricia Grimshaw, 'Bessie Harrison Lee and the Fight for Birth Control', in Marilyn Lake and Farley Kelly (eds), *Double Time: Women in Victoria: 150 Years,* Melbourne, Penguin, 1985, pp. 139–47.
18. Raymond Wright, *A People's Counsel: A History of the Parliament of Victoria 1856–1990,* Melbourne, Oxford University Press, 1992, p. 20.
19. Bongiorno, pp. 125–6.
20. For biographical details, see Janette Bomford, *That Dangerous and Persuasive Woman: Vida Goldstein*, Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, 1993.

21. For changing configurations of political alignment across the period, see Paul Strangio and Brian Costar (eds), *The Victorian Premiers 1856–2006*, Sydney, Federation Press, 2006, pp. 94–136.
22. Cited in Paul Strangio, 'Labor and Reform of the Victorian Legislative Council, 1950–2003', *Labour History*, May 2004, pp. 33–52.
23. Margaret Glass, *Tommy Bent: Bent by Name, Bent by Nature*, Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, 1993, Chapter 9, pp. 163–88; Pete Minard, 'Sir Thomas Bent and Women's Franchise: Damascus Conversion or Cold Calculation', in Suffrage City Press, *'They Are But Women',* pp. 175–90.
24. *VPD*, Assembly, vol. 74, 19 July 1894, p. 914.
25. *VPD*, Council, vol. 95, 26 September 1900, p. 1645.
26. *VPD*, Assembly, vol. 74, 19 July 1894, p. 919.
27. *VPD*, Assembly, vol. 74, 19 July 1894, p. 921.
28. *VPD*, Assembly, vol. 74, 19 July 1894, p. 924.
29. *VPD*, Assembly, vol. 74, 19 July 1894, pp. 930–1.
30. See Elizabeth Coady, 'The Vote for Victoria's Women: Other Points of View', in Suffrage City Press, *'They Are But Women',* pp. 137–54.
31. *VPD,* Council, vol. 95, 25 September 1900, p. 1580.
32. *VPD,* Council, vol. 95, 25 September 1900, p. 1583.
33. *VPD*, Assembly, vol. 95, 3 October 1900, p. 1847.
34. *VPD*, Assembly, vol. 79, 26 November 1895, pp. 3496–7.
35. *VPD,* Council, vol. 95, 26 September 1900, p. 1641.
36. *VPD*, Assembly, vol. 79, 26 November 1895, p. 3484.
37. *VPD,* Council, vol. 95, 26 September 1900, p. 1590.
38. *VPD*, Assembly, vol. 74, 19 July 1894, p. 3531.
39. *VPD*, Assembly, vol. 79, 26 November 1895, p. 3530.
40. *VPD* Council, vol. 110, 15 August 1905, p. 929.
41. In the *Woman's Sphere* in August 1901, Vida Goldstein wrote that there was always a close connection between anti-suffrage and the liquor traffic. At the bottom of many politicians' hostility to women's suffrage were men 'who are largely interested in breweries and hotels', who feared if women voted, 'prohibition will rule the land'. Cited in Oldfield, p. 181.
42. *VPD,* Council, vol. 110, 15 August 1905, p. 932.
43. *VPD,* Council, vol. 95, 3 October 1900, p. 1646.
44. *VPD,* Council, vol. 95, 3 October 1900, p. 1649.
45. *VPD,* Council, vol. 95, 3 October 1900, p. 1573.
46. *VPD,* Council, vol. 95, 3 October 1900, p. 1575.
47. *VPD* Council vol. 119, 18 November 1908, p. 1399.
48. *VPD*, Council, vol. 119, 18 November 1908, pp. 1278–9.

49. *VPD,* Council, vol. 95, 3 October 1900, p. 1643.
50. *VPD*, Council, vol. 119, 18 November 1908, p. 1423.
51. *VPD*, Council, vol. 119**,** 20 October 1908, p.1279.
52. *VPD*, Assembly, vol. 113, 15 August 1906, p. 929.
53. *VPD*, Assembly, vol. 96, 11 December 1900, p. 126.
54. *VPD*, Council, vol. 119, 18 November 1908, p. 1421.
55. Wright, p. 137.
56. Wright, p. 171. See also Jennifer Curtin, 'White Women and the Federal Vote, 1902–1949: Challenging the Idea of Women's Conservatism', in Chesterman and Philips (eds), pp. 112–26.
57. See, for women in Victorian parliaments, Madeline Grey, 'Second-Wave Feminism and Women's Political Representation in Victoria, 1972–1997', PhD thesis, University of Melbourne, 2004.
58. See extensive discussion of women's organisations in Lake.
59. Strangio, pp. 33–52.
60. See Chesterman and Galligan, pp. 122–5; Patricia Grimshaw, 'Colonialism, Power and Women's Political Citizenship in Australia, 1894–1908', in Seija-Leena Nevala-Nurmi, Pirjo Markkola and Irma Sulkunen (eds), *Suffrage, Gender and Citizenship: International Perspectives on Parliamentary Reform,* Cambridge, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, (forthcoming 2009).
61. See Julie Evans, Patricia Grimshaw, David Philips and Shurlee Swain, *Equal Subjects, Unequal Rights: Indigenous Peoples in British Settler Colonies, 1830–1910,* Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2003, especially Chapter 3, 'The Exterminating Politician', pp. 63–87.
62. *VPD*, Assembly, vol. 79, 26 November 1895, p. 3493.
63. *VPD*, Assembly, vol. 119, 18 November 1908, p. 1286.
64. *VPD*, Assembly, vol. 79, 26 November 1895, p. 3493.
65. Chesterman and Galligan, p. 36; Evans, Grimshaw, Philips and Swain, p. 185.
66. Anna Haebich, *For their own Good: Aborigines and Government in the Southwest of Western Australia, 1900–1940*, Perth, University of Western Australia Press, 1988, p. 51.
67. R.T. Appleyard, 'Western Australia: Economic & Demographic Growth, 1850–1914', in C.T. Stannage (ed.), *A New History of Western Australia*, Perth, University of Western Australia Press, 1981, p. 211.
68. Constitution (Amendment) Act, 1893 (WA).
69. Constitution (Amendment) Act, 1899 (WA).
70. For fuller details, see Grimshaw, 'White Women as "Nation Builders"'; Grimshaw, 'A White Woman's Suffrage'.
71. For fuller details, see Grimshaw, 'White Women as "Nation Builders"'; Grimshaw, 'A White Woman's Suffrage'.

72. *Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates (CPD)*, vol. 10, 29 May 1902, p. 13003.
73. *CPD*, 10 April, vol. 10, 1902, p. 11596.
74. John Chesterman, '"An Unheard Piece of Savagery": Indigenous Australians and the Federal Vote', in Chesterman and Philips (eds), p. 25.
75. Chesterman, '"An Unheard Piece of Savagery"', p. 25.
76. See Chesterman and Galligan, p. 89.
77. See Chesterman and Galligan, p. 89; Pat Stretton and Christine Finnimore, 'Black Fellow Citizens: Aborigines and the Commonwealth Franchise', *Australian Historical Studies,* vol. 25, no. 101, October 1993, pp. 521–35. Both Western Australia and Queensland subsequently removed even the ratepayer qualification for Aborigines, the latter in 1905 in the Act that conferred women's suffrage, as a side effect of the complete elimination of the plural vote.
78. Stretton and Finnimore, p. 530.
79. See Bain Attwood and Andrew Markus with Dale Edwards and Kath Schilling, *The 1967 Referendum, or, When Aborigines Didn't Get the Vote,* Canberra, Aboriginal Studies Press, 1997.