

Men's League for Women's Suffrage

No. 41.

Office: 136, ST. STEPHEN'S HOUSE,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.
Telephone: 4276 VICTORIA.
Hon. Sec: Dr. C. V. DRYSDALE.
Secretary: GEORGE E. STARTUP.

Monthly Paper.

ONE PENNY.

President: THE RT. HON. THE EARL OF LYTTON.
Chairman: HERBERT JACOBS.
Hon. Treas.: REGD. H. POTT.
Hon. Political Sec.: J. M. MITCHELL.
Assistant Organiser: R. de MARIA.

Feb., 1913

THE POLITICAL SITUATION.

THE MOVEMENT UNANIMOUS.

The Executive Committee of the Men's League for Women's Suffrage records its emphatic condemnation of the Parliamentary mismanagement of the Franchise question. It holds that experience has proved that under a divided Cabinet no free vote can be obtained on the merits of Women's Suffrage. It recalls the fact that the Conciliation Bill was destroyed by Liberal and Irish members of the Coalition, who feared the splitting of the Cabinet and the embarrassment of the Prime Minister. It sees no reason to anticipate a better fate for another private member's Bill, and pledges itself to do its utmost to obtain a Government measure, and in particular to oppose any future extension of the vote to men until the claims of women are met.

The above resolution was passed without opposition by a special executive committee held on Tuesday, January 28, and thus, once more, we return to our old demand for a Government measure. In making this demand we are fortunately in line with all the other societies, which have passed strong resolutions in almost the same terms. Whatever may have been in the past the possibility of success by a private member's measure, it is clear that no serious suffragist can accept at this stage the offer which the Prime Minister made upon the withdrawal of the Reform Bill.

DANGERS OF A PRIVATE BILL.

In the first place, such a measure would not have the protection of the Parliament Act in the full sense, as upon its third re-appearance it would have to rely upon the support of a new House of Commons. In the second place, it is difficult to see why those Liberals who had threatened to withdraw their support from the Reform Bill Amendments lest they should embarrass the Prime Minister, should not display the same cynical indifference to principle in the case of a private member's Bill.

We are told by apologists for the Prime Minister's offer that the new Bill will have the advantage of a non-party committee—styled the "Cabinette." No doubt! But, as Mr. Brailsford has well shown, this advantage was possessed in a remarkable degree by the Conciliation Bill, upon which in the early stages even Mr. Winston Churchill pretended to smile. Yet Mr. Lloyd George openly boasted of having successfully torpedoed it, and it is difficult to see why under the even less favourable auspices of next session the "Cabinette" would have a real prospect of better success. Why, for example, should the Nationalists

abandon the standpoint that their own Bill would be jeopardised by Government embarrassment over the Franchise Bill? The Home Rule Bill has still to be sent twice more to the House of Lords in the remaining sessions of this Government's life before it can become law. Will not Mr. Redmond become more and more jealous of its safety as he approaches nearer to the goal?

A GOVERNMENT MEASURE.

These and many other considerations make it clear that we must press for a Government measure, and concentrate on the process of getting into the House men who, without party bias, will make it clear to Mr. Asquith that until women are enfranchised there can be no other franchise reform. Even Mr. Acland, who spoke by his own request at Paddington Town Hall on January 28, admitted that under present circumstances he could not blame suffragists for taking this line, though he did his best to justify his own hopes of the private member's Bill. To say that his justification was a lame one would be untrue; in point of fact his argument did not attempt to show more than that for this Parliament at least the Prime Minister's promise is the best we are likely to get. He did not dwell upon any special grounds for hope.

It is not always a profitable proceeding to look back upon a wasted year. Still, those who care for the dignity of our parliamentary system must feel, on mature consideration, that the Mother of Parliaments has exhibited herself in a truly pitiful rôle. Since November, 1911, in spite of warnings from many quarters, the House has taken it for granted that the Government's Franchise Bill was susceptible of amendment in certain well-understood directions. Anti-suffragists and suffragists alike have been led to believe that our amendments were in order. Even Sir John Simon, who is a genuine suffragist and a lawyer, stated emphatically that there was no ground for apprehension. Then, after all the time and thought that had been spent, the Speaker, on the eve of the crisis, announces that he expects to rule the Bill out of order when it leaves the Committee! It would be difficult to conceive mismanagement of a more ridiculous and contemptible character.

In many quarters there is, quite naturally, a feeling that there was collusion in high places, and assuredly, had the House of Commons desired to justify all the forecasts made in "Votes for Women" and the "Suffragette," no better way could have been chosen. From the very beginning the Women's Social and Political Union has scouted the idea that the Reform Bill would provide the opportunity which the Government promised, and once again those very persons who have most violently denounced the Union have gone out of their way to show that its prevision was sound. However, whether there was collusion or not matters little; there is no conclusive evidence, and we shall be wise on the whole to accept the situation, bad as it is, and to use our

THE PRESENT POSITION OF WOMEN'S FRANCHISE.

BY SIR W. CHANCE, BART.

The ruling of the Speaker of the House of Commons has upset the calculations of the Government and of the supporters and opponents of Women's Suffrage alike. It is a question, however, whether what has happened may not be for the best. It was always very doubtful whether the Grey amendment to the Franchise Bill would have been carried had it been put to the vote. The influence of the Prime Minister, the most pronounced opponent of the grant of the Parliamentary vote to women, whether actively exerted or not, must have caused a considerable number of Liberal M.P.'s to hesitate before giving their vote for this amendment, a hesitation which might have been converted into abstention altogether. The Irish vote, too, was a most uncertain factor in the case. What I can gather from those whose opinions carry weight is that the amendment would have been lost by a small majority against it. However this may be, the Bill has been dropped, and the suffragist position may be shortly described as one of "As you were." The pity is that this check which the cause has sustained has resulted in a fresh outbreak of militancy. This is much to be regretted, because I am convinced that the sympathy which has been evoked for the cause by what has occurred in Parliament may again be turned to antipathy. . . . The English people will never be persuaded by violence, but they are open to argument, and the suffragist cause is such a good one that it would soon prevail with the electorate if its work of conversion were carried on upon constitutional lines. However, while disclaiming responsibility for the action of others, we must persevere to get at least some measure of women's suffrage through Parliament. Even if this were only the Conciliation Bill—which is by no means undemocratic, inasmuch as some 80 per cent. of the women voters established by it would belong to the wage-earning classes—at least the first step would be won and the principle of woman's right to have a say in the election of members of Parliament admitted. What then should be our policy? I think that it should be to bring all the pressure they can upon the Government to redeem Mr. Asquith's pledge given in very clear terms. This pledge was:—(1) That if a private Bill upon that amendment were introduced into Parliament the Government would give its supporters a free hand to vote as they liked on its second reading in the House of Commons; and (2) that if it passed a second reading the Government would give it the same support during its further progress through the Parliament as if it were a Government Bill.

That was the pledge given, and nothing less can possibly be accepted by suffragists. If the Government do not promise to fulfil it, then only a frankly anti-Government policy remains to be adopted. A false friend is always more dangerous than an open foe, and the Government will show themselves in the former light if they hesitate about making such a promise.

It may be said, Why not press for a Government Bill? The answer seems to be that a Cabinet, equally divided as it is known to be on the subject, cannot possibly accede to such a request without breaking up the Government altogether. This, however, may prove to be the only solution of the present *impasse*.

[An error unfortunately crept into the letter published last month from Mrs. Stobart about the Convoy Corps. It was the British Red Cross who thought their work too heavy for women.—Ed.]

THE WORK THAT LIES BEFORE US.

A FIRST IMPRESSION.

The Secretary's first work in coming into this office three weeks ago was to receive and answer letters that were arriving in response to the Treasurer's appeal for funds. It has taken a great deal of time, for every letter has been replied to individually, whether the writer sent donations needing acknowledgments or not; we are anxious to establish, as far as possible, personal relationship with all our members in the provinces.

The correspondence has been very interesting and instructive. Many who are unable to send large gifts of money, and some who can send none at all, are rendering the cause splendid service, often keeping the flag flying in hostile country with very little support from those around them. Private advocacy in the home, in the club, and in all the social circles in which men move is often the most useful that can be rendered in the movement; and those of our members who are doing it are to be reckoned active, though they never appear upon a public platform, indoors or outdoors, and are never able to contribute a cheque. May we say to such that we rely upon them in utmost confidence for their share in this campaign?

If the women are to have the vote, the men must give it, for they are the electorate. It is conceivable that the House of Commons might concede the franchise apart from any evidence of a convinced electorate, but it is not at all likely. The men, therefore, have to be convinced, and now is the time when the electorate throughout the country who believe that women are entitled to a vote for exactly the same reason as the man is, should rally together and concentrate their political influence. Our business is to convince them as to the justice of women's claim. Whether the campaign for Women's Suffrage is destined to be long or short no one knows. What we do know is that we cannot afford to take anything for granted. We must prepare for all contingencies, but he would indeed be a rash man who dared to predict the course of evidence. So many electors are involved, and so many intricate applications have arisen, that it is idle to speculate as to whether victory is near or distant. It will come sooner or later. It may be delayed for many years, or, on the other hand, some sudden turn of the political kaleidoscope may change the scene completely, and the women suddenly and dramatically enter into their heritage. It is not the business of this office to solve that riddle. Our business is to go straight ahead and to lay our plans as though a long and arduous campaign of persuasion and education were in front of us. Amongst others we have to capture, as the "Observer" says of another campaign, the "quiet man"; and this will be done by personal influence and by literature rather than by public meetings and demonstrations. For this we need a well-equipped, well-informed central organisation, a good supply of suitable literature, a close touch with all Suffragists throughout the country, men in every town willing to keep us in touch with the members in their immediate neighbourhood. All this means personal service, for where personal service is given money will be given also if there is any to give. This column is not written for the Anti-Suffragist, or one might remind the reader of the great issues that are at stake in this claim of the women for the vote. This political demand is but a detail in a mighty movement, which is gathering force daily in all parts of the world, and which will produce incalculable changes in civilisation. The vote is for women what it is for men—a weapon of defence on the one hand, and on the other a recognition of their individual place and worth in the community. Such a cause as this is worth sacrifices as great as our forefathers made in their struggles for freedom. The women are making them. What are the men going to do? This leads me to speak of a matter that has cropped up many times in the correspondence of the past week, and that we must face frankly and courageously. What is the attitude of the Men's League to the lawless methods adopted by the so-called militant section of the Suffrage party? The position of the League on this question has

been clear and straightforward from the beginning: "The League is non-party and non-militant, but contains sympathisers with all phases of the Women's Suffrage movement, and it gives help in all constitutional ways to Women's Suffrage societies of every kind." Such is the declaration on every form of membership. We never join in any unlawful enterprise. On the other hand, we resolutely refuse to pronounce judgment or express any opinion at all upon the methods that other people and other societies are constrained to follow. We cannot forget that militant methods were the direct outcome of the brutal treatment meted out to Annie Kenney and to Christabel Pankhurst five years ago. Since then the violence suffered by the women has been ten times greater than that committed by them. They have made extraordinary sacrifices for what they believe, and we believe, to be a righteous cause. When we remember the perfidy of some politicians and the apathy of others, resulting in the disappointment of the women's hopes, it is easy to understand their action however much we may or may not deplore it. In any case, the logic of the controversy is not touched. If these women are a handful of misguided fanatics as their opponents allege, it is foolish as well as wicked to refuse justice to all the rest. I am not concerned to defend them—that is not my business, and certainly not the League's. I only want to make it quite clear why our own policy, which has never wavered, is one refusing to enter into the merits of what we feel to be an entirely side issue—a red herring drawn across the path of controversy to pursue which would waste our time and strength, and serve only to delight the hearts of Anti-Suffragists.

I do hope this explanation will be satisfactory to those who have raised this question in their letters to the office this month. Many of our members feel as strongly as anyone can about this matter, and regard the recent outbreaks with the deepest regret. On the other hand, we have some amongst us who sympathise with them. We should be very sorry indeed to lose any of our members. Men of conviction and of ability and of willingness to work are not too numerous, and we need all the help we can get at this crisis. The League, however, cannot depart from the attitude it took up at the outset, and now more than ever must maintain.

GEO. E. STARTUP.

THE AMAZING "WESTMINSTER."

In a short editorial note headed "A Blow to the Government," the "Westminster Gazette" touches its high water mark. It says: "The Prime Minister's view undoubtedly was that the Government occupied a stronger position if it paid the full forfeit for itself as well as for the women after the Speaker's ruling" (*i.e.*, by not proceeding with Mr. Baker's Plural Voting Bill). "There is perhaps a touch of the quixotic in this conclusion, but at all events it should dispose of all charges of sharp practice" (the italics are, of course, ours).

Readers of the "Westminster Gazette" are not blind to the fact that, by a steady course of combining the very faintest possible support of our cause with frank and full statements of all the difficulties which our success would entail, it has done much to alarm wavering Liberals on the score of party interest. But to find it editorially accusing Mr. Asquith of a quixotic sense of honour in a case where any other action not only would have been the grossest effrontery, but also would have imperilled the Government's very life! The shade of Mr. Pecksniff must writhe with jealousy.

It would be difficult to imagine a more cunning device for stirring up Radical hostility to women's suffrage at this moment than the "Westminster's" caricature of Burne Jones's picture, "The Depths of the Sea." It shows a hideous mermaid called "Women's Suffrage" dragging down the lifeless body of the "Franchise Bill." Surely to an honest supporter the case is the reverse!

In conclusion, the "Westminster" described Mr. Harcourt's speech against the Grey amendment as "brilliant." Mr. Mas-

ingham, whose Liberalism can hardly be questioned, in the "Daily News" described it as "vulgar and futile"! The speech was, indeed, in some portions merely silly; in others—especially in the carefully worded reference to the attack upon the "children's wing of my house"—it was subtly malignant. We don't wonder that the "Westminster" almost fretfully records Mr. Asquith's "quixotic" uprightness in not trampling under foot the last shred of decency.

J. M. M.

THE CURSE OF PARTY.

"ASQUITH IS GREAT, AND SIR RYLAND IS HIS PROPHET."

Mr. S. D. Acland, speaking at Paddington Town Hall on January 26, said that he would take no public part in pushing the Government's programme until the Second Reading of the promised private member's Bill is safely through. We should have thought that, for any honest suffragist, such action should be at least intelligible. But no! Sir Ryland Adkins, writing in the "Westminster Gazette" of January 31, says that the statement "strikes one as odd." He says, "Nor can it signify that a non-party question is to determine the action of a member of the Government towards his leader and his party. So it leaves one puzzled and surprised."

The virtuous astonishment of Sir Ryland is pathetic, but characteristic. The idea that a member of a Liberal Ministry should put conscience before party leaves him "puzzled." And then we are promised a "free vote" (!) on a private member's Bill. It is as bad as though a Pharisee (with an official salary) should shake hands with a Sinner!

MR. SIMPSON'S PROTEST.

It is not so many years ago that Mr. John Burns, now a Minister and a pattern of propriety, came into collision with the police in connection with an unauthorised assembly in Trafalgar Square. On January 26 Mr. John Simpson, a member of the Men's League Committee, found himself in much the same position, because he aided Mrs. Despard and others to hold a meeting of indignation. The President of the Local Government Board has no doubt forgotten how to be indignant; it is a good thing for the world that such indignation should exist. Resentment against the Parliamentary mismanagement of the whole suffrage question is growing apace, and it will be surprising if we do not find men ready not only to make allowance for lawbreaking, but also to join in the big attempt which will be made to get the question settled by a Government measure.

A reception has been arranged in honour of Mrs. Despard, Dr. Ethel Knight, Mr. Simpson, and others in the Caxton Hall on Monday, February 10, at 8 o'clock. Admission 1s.

UNIVERSITY SUPPORT.

A meeting of the East London College Debating Society of more than usual interest was held on January 23, when the question of "Woman Suffrage" was discussed. The problematical fate of the Government Franchise Bill made the subject a topical one, and there was no lack of speakers. Miss Pearn opened the discussion, and the following resolution was carried by a large majority:—"That this meeting is in favour of the extension of the franchise to women."

The growth of opinion in Universities where both sexes study for the same degrees and the same professions is steady and continuous. Gradually men are coming to see that political equality is the first step to economic equilibrium.

LABOUR PARTY CONFERENCE.

MR. SNOWDEN'S TRIUMPH.

On Thursday, January 30, at the resumption of the Labour Party Conference, most important speeches were made on the suffrage question, and a resolution of great significance was passed. We cannot do better than quote from the "Manchester Guardian" report:—

The Suffrage Amendment.

The discipline resolutions with their implied censure cannot have been pleasant to the distinguished visitor from Bow and Bromley, but the suffrage discussion a little later brought consolation to him and his fellow-suffragists. The party, after a short and sharp debate, vitally altered the suffrage feeling that they have followed for the last six years, and definitely instructed the Labour members "to oppose any Franchise Bill in which women are not included." This is a startling departure. Last year, for example, the suffrage resolution was simply a declaration in favour of adult suffrage as part of the Reform Bill; and as to women's suffrage, the Labour members were told to make it clear to the Government that a Bill not including women "cannot be acceptable to the Labour movement." This morning's decision, which binds the Labour members to vote against the Government's franchise proposals unless women are included, was carried in the form of an amendment to a resolution in the name of the East Ham Labour Representative Committee. This resolution was mildly worded, and merely pledged the Parliamentary party "to do all in its power to expedite the passage of a Bill during the coming session giving votes to women on a broad and democratic basis." The Prime Minister's new offer of facilities for a private Bill was accepted as meeting the needs of the case.

The opposition was led by the Independent Labour Party, the Women's Labour League, and the Fabian Society. Mr. Keir Hardie made his first appearance to vote for the drastic amendment. A vigorous speech in favour of the more drastic attitude was made by Alderman Sanders. Owing to the mismanagement of the Government, he said, the women had been "sold." The Government must make good its promise to them, and that could be done only by putting women in a Government measure. Therefore, the argument ran, the Labour Party, "the only party which has never deceived the women," must help to force the Government to redeem its pledge in the only effective way. This brought up Mr. Stephen Walsh, who made a forceful appeal to the Conference which might be paraphrased thus: Don't embarrass the Labour members by forcing them to take up an entirely new policy inconsistent with the pledges given by the M.P.'s to their constituents. Were they to be compelled to oppose a Franchise Bill from which working men might derive great benefits simply because it did nothing for the women?

A Memorable Speech.

Mr. Philip Snowden sprang to his feet at the back of the hall, and surrounded by suffragist men and women he made a memorable speech. Mr. Snowden swept the Conference away with him. Before he spoke everyone said that the resolution would be carried. When he sat down it was felt that the Walsh party had lost the day. He spoke with passionate earnestness and with driving force. Turning fiercely on Mr. Walsh, he accused him of being willing to allow the Labour members "to steal more votes for men at the expense of the women." Did anyone suppose that there was really the least chance of enfranchising six or eight million women by a private member's Bill? Would trade unionists rely on a private Bill to redress one of their grievances? No, the women were in an infinitely worse position than before the disaster to the Franchise Bill, "and," said Mr. Snowden with energy, "we must tell the Government that the whole force of the Labour movement will now be on the side of the women in demanding that women's suffrage shall be made a Government measure." As to Cabinet divisions, "if the Cabinet stands in the way of the will of the people the

Cabinet must go," and so on with increasing emphasis. As Mr. Snowden hammered his points home, every sentence full on the bull's eye, the hum of conversation ceased, and everyone in the big room turned towards the speaker. Here was an effort out of the ordinary run. The vote was taken amid unusual excitement. It was a "card" vote, each delegate having one vote for each thousand members in his society or union. Usually on a card vote the miners and textile workers, if united, can carry any question, but on this occasion, while many of the textile workers followed Mr. Walsh against the amendment, the miners for the most part refrained from voting. The amendment was carried by a large majority. The suffragists in the Conference and in the galleries raised a joyous cheer when the result was announced. Later in the day the Conference received congratulations on their "fine policy" from the leading non-militant suffrage organisation: "Women's faith in the Labour movement is justified and hope is restored."

LITERATURE DEPARTMENT.

The League Handbook has been in great demand. We regret exceedingly that we have been obliged to refuse orders for more copies every day. We have called them in from the bookstalls, and hope to have a few for disposal in two or three weeks' time. Those who have asked for them shall then have them.

Equally valuable, on a smaller scale, is Dr. Drysdale's pamphlet "Why Men Should Work for Women's Suffrage," and we strongly urge our members to secure copies for themselves and for distribution.

We would also call attention to the new pamphlet issued from the office and written by Mr. Prelooker under the title of "More Light on the Woman Question." This pamphlet is a record of the proceedings of the first Congress of the Men's International Alliance for Woman Suffrage held in London last October. Its price is twopence.

SYLVESTER SPARROW.

"THE POODLE WOMAN."

In spite of certain obvious faults Miss Annesley Kenealey has achieved distinct success in her new novel, "The Poodle Woman" (Stanley Paul and Co.). Adjectives are piled up rather too freely, and the authoress occasionally seems in danger of surrendering to that anti-man spirit which marks a certain section, though by no means a large one, of the more vehement advocates of Women's Suffrage. Apart from these blemishes the book is clever and moving. It is a story of the restitution of conjugal rights. The author rarely fails to hold one's interest from beginning to end, the plot is good, the characters are alive and human, and stand out well; but we confess it difficult to believe that Archie Cockspur, M.P., represents a type. There may be a few solitary specimens of his kind, but he is too much out of the normal, too consummate a blackguard to impress us as an artistic creation. The letter written by Cockspur to his wife shortly after their marriage, and upon which the tragedy of the book hinges, seems to us to lack reality. Lady Susan, Bidy and David Maclean, and the Poodle Woman herself, are much better drawn. Miss Kenealey has found some extremely effective quotations for the heading of her chapters. We strongly recommend this story to our readers not only as a clever novel of profound interest, but as a powerful putting of the women's case to-day.

"FROM THE POODLE WOMAN."

"A marriage dowry is like the bail a prisoner pays to prevent him from running away."

"Bidy was to be married in a couple of months, and she was going to marry the wrong man. Archie was tough-fibred and unimaginative. He had no fixed moral code—only habits. He needed a well-ordered home, meals to the minute, and a good

serviceable, world-crafty wife with no nonsense about her, who would act as his unpaid housekeeper, and as general manager of affairs which bored and bothered him."

"If I wanted to dispose of a stray cat I should find her a warm place by a comfortable hearth, where she would be sure of an abundance of milk without mewing for it. I would demand a good deal more for my daughter. For instance, I should ask a few questions about the man!"

"It's no longer each for herself and the devil take the weakest. Women at last are learning to work in teams."

"Matrimonial explosions are not uncommon at breakfast. Our national habit of meeting daily on such a dangerous battlefield is evidence that we are a race fearless to rashness. The breakfast table is the breeding ground of half the divorces and nine-tenths of the domestic disunions in the happy homes of England. The French attain a high ideal of connubial content, because they tactfully avoid the nerve-strain of eating their first meal in snappy concert."

"Scandal comes out with tea as sure as rash with measles."

"I belong to an earlier generation—the generation that was brought up in the fear of the Lord—but a much greater fear of the birch-rod."

"'But we could do nothing to save her,' she said, sadly. 'Girls and boys are not allowed to control their money and property until they are twenty-one. But in England a girl can squander herself and her entire life on a man when she is sixteen. And those who love her must look on helplessly. They can do nothing.'

"'Unless she's a ward in Chancery. In that case she cannot marry without the consent of the Lord Chancellor. But this isn't done to save the girl from mistake and misery. It's merely to protect her property from a fortune-hunter. Morals and happiness don't count in English law. But property is absolutely sacred. It's punishable by law to send betting circulars to a boy under twenty-one. But a man may utterly ruin a girl the day she is sixteen, and the laws of England stamp his criminal act as perfectly justifiable.'

"The self-forgetfulness of the mother is the eternal chink in a woman's armour, the one vulnerable spot through which she may be vanquished and taken prisoner."

"A baby's strength is no stronger than a flower, yet it holds the womanhood of the world in close and unbreakable fetters."

BRANCH NOTES.

With the object of initiating a branch at Eastbourne Mr. Jaakoff Prelooker, the well-known editor of the "Anglo-Russian," is organising an exhibition in the Town Hall to be held on Saturday, February 8, from 12 noon to 10 p.m. The Men's League is fortunate in having the services of Mr. Prelooker, whose success in organising exhibitions on behalf of the oppressed Russian peasant is so well known. A poster parade with banners and band will start (wet or fine) on Friday, February 7, at 11 a.m., from the Town Hall front, and all sympathisers with the cause are urged to march. It is intended that the exhibition will convey an idea of the innumerable journalistic, literary, artistic, and other productions illustrating the need of women's political enfranchisement and the justice of their claim to full citizenship. No efforts or expense are being spared to make this a most conspicuous event in the present history of the movement, and the Men's League are having the

assistance of eight of the women's societies. The speakers will include, besides influential local supporters, Messrs. Herbert Jacobs, J. Malcolm Mitchell, G. E. Startup, and Dr. C. V. Drysdale.

Mr. Startup has on two occasions recently addressed meetings in the house of Mr. Ebenezer Howard at Letchworth, the Garden City. We are glad to state that as a result a branch has started. Mr. Ebenezer Howard, the founder of the Garden City, has himself joined, and Mr. H. C. Lauder has kindly consented to act as Hon. Secretary.

The public meeting arranged by the Bournemouth branch will be held in the St. Peter's Hall on Friday, February 14, at 8 p.m. The Hon. Rev. R. E. Adderley, the well-known Vicar of St. Peter's, Parkstone, will preside, and the meeting will be addressed by Earl Russell, Mr. Laurence Housman, and other well-known speakers. Mr. R. H. Longson, Hon. Sec. of the Bournemouth branch, will welcome applications for tickets—1s. 6d. (reserved), 1s., and 6d. each.

An Anti-Suffrage meeting has lately been held at East Grinstead, and a most excellent result has followed. One at least who was present at the meeting has become a convinced Suffragist, and we have good reason to believe that the nucleus of a strong branch is already formed.

F. N. SARGEANT.

FROM LETTERS THAT REACH US.

"I may say that this subscription would have gone in the ordinary course of events, as it has gone in the past, to a Liberal Association. But I am so tired of Liberal refusals to deal with this question, and so annoyed and disappointed with the results of the position taken up by the Government, that I propose to send my subscription to you instead until the women get the vote, or, at any rate, until the Liberal party seem to get some glimpse of true Liberal principles and policy on the matter."

One generous member, enclosing a cheque for £7 10s., writes:—"To my mind more result ought to have been obtained for the enormous output of enthusiasm, energy, spirit mind, and money, and I cannot help feeling that the reason why it has not been more definitely productive is the entire lack of unity and common purpose and method amongst suffragists. . . . If the amendments fail a great conference of all suffrage societies should be summoned to consider the future policy and action of suffragists as a body. It should take two or three days, and not rest until it has found some common ground of agreement. It will mean subordination and sacrifice of individuality, but it would mean success."

"I often wish I could join you in the fighting line, but my infirmities (which do not decrease) make it impossible for me to do anything more than to deliver more or less academic discourses to more or less sympathetic audiences. That I do as often as I get the chance, and shall continue to do as long as there is need.

"I cannot believe that we are going to fail, but if we do my blood will be up, and I shall be ready to sacrifice all my other causes, except . . . , to this one.

"My position here is such that I cannot get away from—where I have a full life, but I lose no opportunity in doing all I can for suffrage in this place.

"When are subscriptions due for renewal, and when does the financial year of the League end? The only thing I can suggest is that when the time comes for me to renew my subscription I shall try to increase it. I daresay many members would do this if only they could be 'got at.'

"I enclose a donation of £1, and propose to send similar donations as far as I can if such donations are unfortunately necessary.

"I shall be glad if you will kindly add my name to the membership of the League. I enclose cheque for one guinea as my subscription for 1913.

"Failure is Impossible."

Women's Suffrage Exhibition

of Art, Literature, and Sweated Industries

ORGANISED BY

The Men's League for Women's Suffrage

(NON-PARTY, CONSTITUTIONAL)

President, The Rt. Hon. The Earl of Lytton,

ASSISTED BY

The National Union for Women's Suffrage; The Church League for Women's Suffrage; The Catholic Women's Suffrage Society; The Women's Social and Political Union; The Women's Freedom League; Women's Tax-Resistance League; The Suffrage Atelier.

TOWN HALL, EASTBOURNE

ON

Saturday, February 8th, 1913,

FROM 12 NOON TO 10 P.M.

OBJECT.—To convey an idea of the extent of the Women's Suffrage Movement, the magnitude of its organisations, and of the innumerable journalistic, literary, artistic, and other productions illustrating the need of Women's political enfranchisement and the justice of their claim to full citizenship.

This Exhibition is a first experiment, and is far from doing full justice to the subject; yet it is hoped that it will prove interesting, entertaining, and of high educational value as an object lesson of Women's talent, erudition, wisdom, wit and humour.

CENTRAL LONDON COMMITTEE.

136, St. Stephen's House, Westminster, S.W.

Chairman, HERBERT JACOBS.

Hon. Secs., Dr. C. V. DRYSDALE and J. MALCOLM MITCHELL.

Hon. Treasurer, REGINALD H. POTT.

EASTBOURNE ORGANISING COMMITTEE.

Chairman - - - JAAKOFF PRELOOKER.

(Of the Men's League for Women's Suffrage.)

Mrs. FRED ALLEN.
Miss M. S. ALLEN.
Mrs. ARTHUR BECKETT.
Miss M. BOLDERO, M.A.
Mr. ADRIAN BRUNEL.
Mr. W. E. BURTON.

Mrs. CHEETHAM.
Mr. R. COPLESTON.
Mr. C. C. COTTERILL.
Miss B. GOLDINGHAM.
Miss M. HALL.
Mr. G. W. JAMES.

Miss BERTRAM JONES.
Miss SIBELLA JONES.
Miss PEACEY.
Miss PYPER.
Miss E. REID.
Miss C. F. STEWART.

Mrs. H. R. STRACEY.

Councillor J. C. WRIGHT.

Hon. Treasurer, Rev. F. W. ORDE WARD, B.A., 4, Milnthorpe Road, Eastbourne.

By whom all contributions will be gratefully acknowledged.

Hon. Secretaries { Rev. John Clennell.
Lieut.-Col. R. W. Nicholson.

OFFICE

38, GROVE ROAD, EASTBOURNE.