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Introduction

In a thumbnail sketch of Queensland's first female parliamentarian, Irene Longman, in 1931, the Clerk of Parliament Charles Bernays commented on the novelty of a woman in Queensland's Legislative Assembly. 'The innovation,' he averred, 'takes long to convert itself into a common-place. The public are slow to acquire a habit.' Bernays' comment was apposite. Although the *Elections Act* of 1915 enabled non-Indigenous women as well as men to stand as candidates for Queensland's Lower House, no woman took up this opportunity until Longman's successful bid for the seat of Bulimba in 1929. In the 31 Queensland elections held from 1918 to 2004, women were, until very recently, a tiny minority when compared to the thousands of examples of male candidates for the same period.

This paper examines the promise of the 1915 *Elections Act*, its position as part of the legislative framework that recognised political rights for women as well as men, and its reception in Parliament and the community. It also offers an overview of the subsequent history of women's attempts to stand for Queensland's Parliament. While other articles in this collection detail the successes of individual outstanding women, this paper adopts a rather glummer approach, focusing instead on why there have been so few female candidates. At the same time, we seek to acknowledge those women who did nominate as candidates at state elections, particularly the 10 women who unsuccessfully sought election to Queensland's Parliament in the 1930s and 1940s, and whose names are all but forgotten in the histories of this state.
Queensland Women’s Enfranchisement and the Right to Stand for Parliament

The enactment of legislation enabling women in Queensland to vote and stand for election at all levels of government began in 1879 with the right of white women who owned property to vote in local government elections. It was finally completed almost 90 years later when, on 1 February 1966, the **Elections Act Amendment Act 1965** came into effect, enabling Indigenous Queenslanders to vote in state elections and, by extension, to stand as candidates. Having secured the right to vote and stand for federal Parliament in 1902 and the right to vote in state elections in 1905, white women in Queensland became eligible to stand for their state’s Lower House with the passage of the **Elections Act of 1915**, a piece of legislation that explicitly continued the practice of denying the franchise to Aboriginal people. White women’s right to participate as electors and candidates for all levels of government was completed with the removal in 1920 of the property qualification for men and women voting in local government elections and the establishment of the right of women to stand for council positions in 1920 and 1924.

Two crucial clauses in the 1915 Act established the right of women to become candidates for Queensland’s Lower House. Section 9 declared that, providing certain citizenship and residency requirements were met and that the disqualifications listed in the Act were not applicable, ‘every person, whether male or female, not under twenty-one years of age … shall be qualified as an elector under this Act’. Section 39 stated: ‘Any person, whether male or female, who under this Act is qualified to be enrolled for any electoral district in Queensland, shall be qualified to be nominated as a candidate and to be elected a member of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland for any electoral district in Queensland.’

From today’s perspective, it is tempting to identify section 39 as the most important element of the Act. However, discussions about the Bill in 1915, both within and outside Parliament, suggest that this clause did not generate excitement at the time. The deliberations about the Bill by the state Parliamentary Labor Party caucus, for example, reflected the wartime context, with debates about whether the legislation should refer to the soldiers’ vote and whether persons of German birth should be disqualified from voting under the Act. The caucus also paid particular attention to the arrangements for postal voting and the system of imposing penalties on voters who made false declarations and on returning officers who were remiss in their duties. The local media demonstrated little interest in 1915 in the possibility of women becoming parliamentarians.

The Elections Bill was one of 47 Bills introduced during the 1915 parliamentary session by T.J. Ryan’s Labor government, and one of the 36 which had been approved by session’s end. The Governor’s opening speech on 13 July 1915 referred to the Elections Bill with the statement that:

> The existing electoral laws are unsatisfactory, and the late elections revealed the disquieting fact that under present circumstances persons
who have an undisputed electoral qualification may find it exceedingly
difficult, if not impossible, to secure enrolment, or, if enrolled, to
exercise the suffrage on polling-day. A Bill will be introduced at an
early date to repeal the existing Electoral Acts, and to provide for adult
franchise and a simplification of the electoral machinery.6

The proposed extension to women of the right to stand as candidates to Parliament
was not mentioned in either the governor’s speech or in Minister Without Portfolio
John Huxham’s speech when he introduced the Elections Bill into Parliament some
seven weeks later. The government’s emphasis was on achieving what it described
as a ‘liberal franchise’, in which ‘every adult member of the community should
have the fullest right to express his or her opinion in deciding the great political
questions of the day, and in deciding what representative they shall have’.7 This
attractive rhetoric, of course, was to apply only to non-Indigenous Queenslanders.
The government was especially concerned to ensure that itinerant workers were not
denied the vote, and that no eligible elector lost their right to vote due to ‘trivial
objections’.8

The clause enabling women to become parliamentary candidates attracted some
interest in both the Lower and Upper Houses, but that interest should not be
overstated. Far more attention and heat were generated over the adequacy of
provisions for soldiers to retain their electoral rights, the reduction of the length of
residency requirements for electors, changes to the factors that disqualified individuals
from voting, and the quality of the mechanisms for ensuring that the electoral rolls
were complete and accurate and that individuals could exercise the franchise. In
general, the government’s and opposition’s view seemed to be that the right of
women to stand for Parliament was ‘the corollary of the extension of the franchise
to women’.9 There was also recognition that legislation passed in Parliament was
of direct relevance to women, that women were participating in all aspects of
society, and that the devastation of the Great War might require women to take a
major role in public and political life.

The humour with which section 39 was introduced in both the Lower and Upper
Houses suggests some sense of unease about how the change would be regarded.
In the Legislative Assembly, Huxham stated that it was ‘an innovation at which
hon. Members may demur’, and then sought to dispel any anxiety about the measure
with his joking aside that the measure was not completely to his liking, for he
suspected that his own wife ‘may aspire to a seat, and I may tell you that one
Huxham in the House at a time is quite enough for me’. More seriously, Huxham
pointed out that women’s duties as citizens should be accompanied by the right to
stand for Parliament, and that in some countries women had become ‘active factors’
in the development of legislation.10 In the Legislative Council, Secretary for Mines
William Hamilton lightheartedly chastised the Lower House for being ‘selfish’ in
restricting the right of women to be candidates to the Assembly only, and added:
‘Take a lady like Daisy Jerome. If she chose to throw up vaudeville and go into
politics, why should she not do so? If we had a Daisy Jerome in this Chamber, I
am sure we would never want a quorum.’ He offered to accept an amendment to
that effect.11
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During the debate on the Elections Bill, only one parliamentarian from either House spoke explicitly against the right of women to become political candidates and, apart from Huxham’s gently deprecating remarks when he introduced the Bill, just three other Members of Parliament offered comments that indicated some concern about the measure. In the Legislative Assembly, James Forsyth offered a detailed critique of the Bill in which he stated: ‘I do not think myself that this is a place for a woman at all, and I hope that when we get into Committee we shall be able to have that innovation knocked out.’ Member for Cunningham Francis Grayson questioned the residency provisions of the Bill, under which an elector who had moved to Queensland from another state and had resided in Queensland for three months could stand for Parliament; his specific concern was about female rather than male candidates. While hastening to explain that he had ‘always found that the women of Queensland exercise the franchise in a most intelligent manner’, he sought an amendment that would prevent any women who had lived in Queensland for less than a year from standing for Parliament. James Tolmie, who declared his support for the right of women to stand as candidates, indicated that the measure had not been introduced by the previous government because ‘there is a limitation so far as the quality of the women is concerned’. In the Legislative Council, Frederick Brentnall asked, in relation to the right of women to stand for the federal Parliament: ‘Does not the fact that the electors have not yet elected one show that they are wiser than the men who passed the Act?’ The Secretary for Mines’ response to Brentnall was prophetic. He remarked: ‘I am not one of those who think that men have a monopoly of all the common sense in the community. Neither am I one of those who think that the millennium will arrive when women are allowed to sit in Parliament.’ The Elections Act 1915 was a necessary but not sufficient condition to ensure female candidates at Queensland elections, let alone female parliamentarians. As political scientists Marian Sawyer and Marian Simms note, ‘women found that the formal rights they had obtained did not in fact bring access to the parliamentary sphere.’

Female Candidates

Female candidates were a rarity in Queensland politics for much of the twentieth century. Combining Colin Hughes’ listings of candidates for the Queensland Parliament from 1918, the year of the first state election in which women were eligible to stand as candidates, until 1984, the last year for which Hughes published his figures, with the work on women candidates undertaken by Janice Williams in the 1970s and more recently by John McCulloch reveals that there were 4,717 male candidates and 140 female candidates in this period. Women constituted just under 3 per cent of all candidates at these state elections and by-elections.

Among this tiny proportion of female candidates, Irene Longman holds the dual honour of being the first female candidate and the first female parliamentarian in Queensland, achieving both feats in 1929 when she won the Brisbane seat of Bulimba. While Longman secured the endorsement of Queensland’s major...
conservative party, the Country and Progressive National Party, in 1929, and again in 1932 when her bid to retain her seat failed, the majority of female candidates lacked the backing of a major party until the 1950s. Longman also enjoyed endorsement from the Queensland Women's Electoral League (QWEL).

Of the four other female candidates in the 1930s, Marion Steel and Mary De Mattos stood as Independents, Alice Chambers represented the Queensland Party and Nora Solly represented the Queensland Women's Parliamentary Association, an organisation that sought — very unsuccessfully — to stand female candidates in all state electorates. Steel, De Mattos and Chambers each received less than 3 per cent of the votes in their electorates. Solly, by contrast, received a respectable 53 per cent of the votes cast in the two-way contest for the seat of Cooroora in 1935 against the successful Country and Progressive National Party candidate H.F. Walker.

In a campaign speech at Nambour, Solly presented herself as a feminist who was particularly concerned about rural women. She explained that 'at one time she had thought that the women's cause would be better helped outside Parliament, but her opinion had changed, and she felt that after many years, there was little hope of conditions being improved unless by women members of the legislature'. She advocated 'new thoughts, new viewpoints, and new ideals', expressed her concerns about the incomes of farmers and their families in the dairy industry in particular, and declared that 'all persons who worked [including farmers] should receive equal to the basic wage standard'. In a year marked by attacks from several trade unions and some prominent women against the right of women, especially married women,
to employment, Solly — like Irene Longman — defended that right. In reply to a question about the basic wage, Solly stated: 'My policy is equal work for equal pay every time, and I don’t think that women have usurped men’s jobs either.'

During the 1940s, seven women stood for the Queensland Parliament. Mabel Matyer, Ruby McGrorty and Mary De Mattos stood as independents, while Florence Milburn stood for the Communist Party. Three women, Mrs A.E. Tipper, A. Deane and Hilda Brotherton, represented the Queensland People’s Party, forerunner of the Queensland Division of the Liberal Party. The Labor Party, which faced media criticism during the 1944 election campaign for its refusal to stand female candidates, responded that the People’s Party endorsed female candidates only for unwinnable seats. However, the People’s Party candidate, Mrs Tipper, who stood at the 1944 election for the safe Labor seat of Fortitude Valley, secured an impressive 40 per cent of the vote.

The 1950s was the first decade in which the number of female candidates endorsed by major parties exceeded — if only just — female independents and representatives of minor parties. Of the 13 female candidates, six were endorsed by the Liberal Party and a seventh received joint endorsement from the Liberal and Country Parties. The Communist Party stood three female candidates and there were three Independents. The candidates endorsed by the Liberal and Country Parties far outstripped the other women in terms of percentages of votes, with the Liberal and Country Party women each securing between 20 and 44 per cent. In 1960, the Labor Party finally began to endorse female candidates and in 1966 the ALP’s Vi Jordan became the second woman to secure a seat in the Queensland Parliament.

Three years later, Oodgeroo Noonucal became the first Indigenous candidate for the Queensland Parliament, standing unsuccessfully as the ALP’s candidate for Greenslopes. From the 1970s onwards, there was a steady increase in the number of female candidates and 1977 was the first state election in Queensland in which two women contested the same seat: Labor’s Helen Jeffrey and the Progress Party’s Kelly Crombie stood unsuccessfully against the Liberal Party’s N.R. Scott-Young.

The number of women standing for election to the state Parliament increased in the following decades, as did the number of women who won seats, but they remain in a minority. In 2004, a total of 100 women contested the state election (out of 353 candidates) and secured 30 of the 89 seats in state Parliament.

Explaining Women’s Lack of Representation

Especially since the 1980s, feminist historians and political scientists and female politicians — some, though not all, of whom identify themselves as feminists — have offered explanations for women’s lack of representation in Australian Parliaments. Explaining why something did not happen is often more difficult than explaining why something did. With some important exceptions, there has been a tendency to offer general explanations that define women, or white women, as an homogenous group and that assume the factors discouraging female participation
in Parliament were constant and enduring for most of the twentieth century. This approach has produced useful findings, which we summarise below, but risks ignoring any variations in the relative importance of those factors in different periods. It also largely avoids consideration of whether the factors explaining white women’s lack of participation are applicable to Indigenous women. Only occasionally has the literature focused on a more specific group of women, those individuals who were already politically active, who we might expect to have stood for Parliament in greater numbers.

Former leader of the Democrats Janine Haines offered a concise summary of factors that historically mitigated against female representatives in Australian Parliaments and which she identified as still relevant when her book, *Suffrage to Sufferance*, was published in 1992: ‘Part of the answer lay with the attitude of political parties to women; part with the attitude of women to political parties; part with society’s attitude to the role of women in the community; and part with the size of the country.’ Sawyer and Simms have emphasised the history and nature of the modern party system. ‘The keys [to securing election] were to be firmly in the hands of the parties except in a few exceptional cases, and the parties were in the hands of the men, who had got there first.’

Preselection arrangements in the major parties were generally hostile to female candidates; women often lacked access to patronage networks on both the conservative and labour sides of politics; and into the 1980s, influential men in the major parties claimed — without evidence — that female candidates were liabilities because, for example, female voters would not vote for them. The reluctance of major political parties to endorse female candidates for most of the twentieth century offers a demand-side explanation for the lack of female parliamentarians.

A supply-side analysis requires that we consider women’s willingness to stand for preselection or as Independents. Nora Solly’s comment in 1935 that she had previously regarded extra-parliamentary activities as the best way to secure change is an important reminder that, for female activists as for some male activists, a seat in Parliament was not always the ultimate prize. In her exploration of why two of South Australia’s most important early feminists, Catherine Spence and Mary Lee, refused invitations to stand for that colony’s Parliament in 1896, Susan Magarey points out that both women ‘had experience and faith in other non-parliamentary means of bringing about change leading to greater social justice’.

Sawer and Simms note that some politically active women spurned involvement in the major parties: ‘The feminists who fought for women’s political rights had no illusions about the existing parties.’ As well, recognition of the factors operating against women achieving preselection or electoral success may have discouraged some individuals.

Several other factors reduced the pool of potential female candidates. Political scientist Elizabeth van Acker writes that ‘women have historically had less opportunity to discuss and learn about political issues and less time and freedom to undertake political work’, and argues that women contemplating political life have been less likely than men to have that ‘beneficial political resource’, a spouse who is fully focused on supporting their partner’s political career. The difficulty
of combining the demands of public life with family responsibilities, strongly held beliefs about women’s versus men’s roles in Australian society, and the notion that politics was incompatible with women’s — and especially mothers’ — traditional responsibilities, were other factors discouraging women’s participation in formal party politics. The strength of assumptions in Australia that politics was exclusively or primarily a male domain, and the consequences for potential female candidates of those assumptions, should not be under-estimated. As late as 1999, van Acker could write that ‘typically, people think of men when they think about politics: male is the norm’.26

Although analyses of women’s under-representation at all levels of government in Australia have become more detailed in the last two decades, individuals proffered explanations for this under-representation in Queensland from as early as the 1910s. During the debate on the 1915 Elections Bill, for example, Queensland parliamentarian Grayson suggested that the failure of female candidates in federal elections indicated that the electors had not taken them seriously.27

Available evidence is scanty, but perhaps the election of the state’s first female local government representative in 1923 prompted some Queenslanders to reflect on the absence of women from other levels of government. In that year, the Queensland Society Magazine columnist ‘H.A.T.’ featured the achievements of Doctor Mrs Kent Watson (Dr Ellen Kent-Hughes), following her election to the Kingaroy Shire Council. Hughes had graduated in medicine from the University of Melbourne in 1917 and then worked in Brisbane, combining her private practice with family duties. ‘H.A.T.’ described her as ‘a bright conversationalist, an intensely womanly and charming personality [and] a good all round citizen’. The magazine welcomed the ‘new departure’ in Queensland politics and noted that ‘Queensland women have so far refrained from trying to enter Parliament, although all parties have here women highly qualified for Parliamentary honours’.28

The near absence of women on ballot papers attracted some interest from labour and feminist organisations in interwar Queensland. In 1924, the President and Honorary Secretary of the Blackall Branch of the ALP submitted a letter to The Worker on behalf of that branch. They wrote: ‘Hitherto women seemed satisfied to be nothing more than electors. Surely it is time that they decided to take a hand by electing some of their own sex as legislators, in making and administering the laws they have to obey.’ The Blackall branch proposed Lily Ryan, widow of Queensland labour hero and Premier T.J. Ryan, as a possible candidate in the federal elections, describing her as ‘quite competent to fill the highest and most dignified position her country could bestow’ and praising her ‘political education ... her record and her talents’.29 In 1929, a ‘worker’s wife’ of Longreach proposed a Queensland Women’s Labor League, the objects of which would include ‘to try, by every effort to combat the evil influence of the various Nationalist Women’s Organisations’. The writer urged the wives of Labor politicians to play a prominent role for, unlike the wives of basic wage earners, these privileged women had ‘more leisure time, and little or no financial worry, as to how they are going to manage for the upkeep of their children’.30
In 1934, the *Australian Women’s Weekly* assessed the chances of the six female candidates across Australia standing for that year’s federal election. One of the candidates, Mrs J. Helbach, stood on the Douglas Credit Party’s Queensland Senate ticket. The *Weekly* concluded that ‘masculine chivalry in Australia has not yet reached the point of endorsing women candidates for easily-won seats’.

After noting that no woman had yet achieved a seat in the federal Parliament, and emphasising the rarity of success for female candidates at state level, the author asked: ‘How comes it that the path of the woman aspirant to political success, as represented by a seat in Parliament, is harder in this country than it is in England?’ Rejecting the claim that women themselves were not interested in politics, the *Weekly* declared that: ‘A more potent obstacle to the progress of the feminine aspirant to Parliament is the strength of the party machines, coupled with the ingrained habit of those in control of endorsing only male candidates when there is a seat likely to be won.’ The magazine concluded: ‘That there is theoretical equality of men and women in politics we know, but in this pre-selection business it has not yet managed to display itself.’

Women had little influence in those party machines. The Queensland Women’s Electoral League expended considerable energy from the 1910s onwards in its attempts to secure equal preselection rights with the male leagues that were active in conservative politics. Commenting on its decision to endorse Irene Longman in 1929, Margaret Fitzherbert describes QWEL as being ‘incensed after years of exclusion from preselections’. The situation on the Labor side was equally grim. While there were occasional calls in the 1920s for greater organisation of women in the labour movement and a keen awareness in the interwar period of the importance of appealing to female voters, the Queensland branch of the ALP remained a male bastion. The sole female delegate to the 1932 State Labor-in-Politics Triennial Convention, Mrs A.J. Heaton, appears to have been selected by the Longreach branch of the ALP as its representative because, at the time, she happened to be in Brisbane, the site of the convention. Her selection was therefore ‘convenient for the Longreach branch’.

Heaton was one of the delegates who spoke in favour of a successful motion to establish women’s committees within local branches. The impetus for this motion was growing concern within the labour movement over the Queensland Women’s Electoral League and its alleged capacity to deliver votes to the Nationalist Party. As a result of the convention, the amended constitution and rules of the Queensland branch of the ALP provided for the establishment of Women’s Local Committees. Their objects demonstrate that, when Queensland labour considered women in this period, it focused on the need to secure the women’s vote, identified women primarily as homemakers with specific interests, and recognised their potential to undertake fundraising and social activities. None of the seven objects identified women as potential election candidates. The Queensland branch of the Labor Party continued to regard women almost exclusively as ‘unseen workers and helpmates’ until the late 1970s.
Conclusion

The story of Queensland women’s efforts to take their place in the state Parliament has, until very recently, been almost entirely about absences. While it is important to recognise and celebrate the achievements of those women who have enjoyed electoral success, starting with Irene Longman in 1929, it is even more important to appreciate how rare such success was for most of the twentieth century. The 1915 Elections Act was a necessary but not sufficient step in enabling non-Indigenous women to enter Queensland’s Parliament, while Indigenous women and men were denied basic political rights until the 1960s. The limited interest which initially greeted the Act’s provision for female candidates was mirrored in the limited response to that provision by individuals and political parties across subsequent decades. The factors that hampered white women’s full participation in the political process after 1915 proved tenacious and, although now diminished, their influence lingers. As Bernays recognised almost 75 years ago, the ‘innovation’ of women in Parliament would certainly take ‘long to convert itself into a common-place’.
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