

THE WOMAN'S LEADER

AND THE COMMON CAUSE

Vol. XVI. No. 31. One Penny.

REGISTERED AS
A NEWSPAPER.

Friday, August 29, 1924.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
WOMEN POLICE—AFTER THE REPORT. By Edith Tancred	246
WHO PUT THE CLOCK BACK. By Mrs. Abbott	247
WHAT I REMEMBER. By Millicent Garrett Fawcett, J.P., LL.D.	248
PIONEER MEDICAL WOMEN: A POLISH MEDICAL WOMAN OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY (continued). By F. de G. Merrifield	249
MOTHERHOOD. By Naomi Mitchison	249
A CHOICE OF BOOKS	250
THE LAW AT WORK—HOME OFFICE REPORT ON CHILDREN'S BRANCH, HOME OFFICE. By C. D. Rackham, J.P.	251

Annual Subscription for Postal Subscribers: British Isles and Abroad, 6/6.
Common Cause Publishing Co., 15 Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W. 1.

NOTES AND NEWS.

Making History.

The events of the next few weeks will be of absorbing interest to all students of International affairs. The Council of the League meets on 29th August, and will consider the financial position of Austria in view of the fact that the control of the League terminates at the end of this year, and that unfortunately Austria is not yet capable of standing alone. The Assembly meets on 1st September, and its discussions will embrace many matters of interest to our readers, one of the most important of which will be the Treaty of Mutual Assistance which was debated in our pages recently as a "Burning Question". The London agreement has laid the foundation and prepared the right atmosphere, and it is impossible not to hope that the forthcoming meetings will produce permanent results for good in international peace.

An Australian Woman for Geneva.

For the third time the Australian Commonwealth Government has appointed a woman as substitute delegate to the League of Nations Assembly. Mrs. E. F. Allan, who began her career in New Zealand, was one of the pioneers who secured the opening of the New Zealand bar to women; she was also the first woman political correspondent appointed by a leading newspaper, though not without opposition from the correspondents of other papers, who objected to the presence of a woman in the Press gallery. Since then she has been engaged in press work and social work in Victoria, mostly in connexion with women's interests.

Women and Diet.

There has been a correspondence recently in *The Times* on the subject of the value of white bread as a foodstuff. Though there is a considerable variety of opinion amongst experts on the whole subject of diet, all those who have been writing to the Press agree in lamenting that women have shown such little interest in the subject. To some extent we agree with them. English cooking is notoriously bad, and much more teaching on domestic subjects is needed. But there has been for some time a movement in that direction, as the existence of a Household Science Department in the University of London, the Domestic Centres of the County Councils, and the teaching of cooking in many of the most up-to-date schools clearly shows. Granted that much remains to be done, it is an absurdity to say as one writer to *The Times* actually did, "that diet is entirely a matter for women." A study of diet is a scientific question, as much as the study of any other physiological

problem; it needs the best scientific minds, whether men or women. The application of their results is a question for women, but there have unfortunately been so few agreed results to apply. When the pundits agree whether white bread is good or injurious, it will be easier to teach women what kind of bread they should use.

Lord Lytton and Indian Womanhood.

We are unwilling to make any allusion at all to recent disturbing events in India which lie entirely outside our province, but we are glad to read in Monday's *Times* that the Indian poet, Sir Rabindranath Tagore has given Lord Lytton an opportunity of replying to the allegation that he had cast a slur on Indian womanhood. To those who know Lord Lytton's record in this country on questions affecting women, this suggestion seems preposterous. Lord Lytton was one of the small group of those whose advocacy of women's claims to citizenship was always wholehearted, courageous, and effective. Mrs. Fawcett, in her reminiscences, recently recalled the fact that Lord Lytton in 1910 became President of a Committee formed to promote the Conciliation Bill, which so nearly achieved success, and in her book *The Women's Victory—and After* she describes the effect of his "memorable and moving speech" when Lord Selborne introduced a Woman's Suffrage Bill into the House of Lords in the spring of 1914. "The House," she says, "so proverbially difficult to move in any emotional sense, was obviously and deeply moved by his earnestness, transparent sincerity, and closely reasoned argument. Gossip said that as he concluded Lord Curzon threw himself back in his seat and exclaimed, *sotto voce*, to his next neighbour: 'What a tragedy that such talent should be wasted upon women!'" Some of us will never forget a touching scene at the India Office when a little group of representatives of women's organizations, including Lady Constance Lytton a short time before her death, bearing only too plainly the marks of what she had suffered for the women's cause, went to say farewell to Lord Lytton on his departure to India and to express the hope that he would be able to do as much for the women of India as he had done for his own countrywomen. We are convinced that when the clamour of the present disturbances has subsided Indian women will appreciate that he is not only incapable of disrespect to womanhood, but is ready to serve their cause in any way within his reach.

Women Jurors and the Mahon Case.

It must have proved a matter of astonishment to many people that one of Mahon's grounds of appeal was that the Judge was wrong in directing that women should not serve on the jury. It was not clear at the time why the Judge exercised his discretion on this point, nor why it was raised on the appeal. But whatever the explanation, and regardless of whether the presence of women jurors would have affected the verdict, the whole episode shows the inadvisability of treating women other than as citizens on the same basis as men. The Judge, we assume, considered the details of the case too nauseating for women, but women have not asked to be excused a duty that is essential for justice, because at times it may prove deeply painful.

If we were to criticize the women of this country we would say not that they shrink from the horrors of such cases, but that they show too great an avidity in hearing of them. Though women did not predominate in the queues that waited for hours outside the Law Courts for the two recent murder appeals, there were a distressingly large number present. If anything will convince such women that crime is a disease of the community and not an opportunity for the exercise of a morbid love of sensation it is service on a jury, with the sense of responsibility. That is one of many reasons why we regret that women's presence on juries is still not taken as a matter of course.

A Step Forward at Cambridge.

The University of Cambridge Commissioners who have been considering the recommendations of the Royal Commission, have forwarded to the Vice-Chancellor a memorandum on "Faculty Organization," which contains some important proposals. The Commissioners state that they contemplate that the new Statutes for Cambridge University "will be so framed as to render women eligible for Professorships, Readerships, University Lectureships, and Examinerships, subject to the reservations recommended by the Royal Commission." They also propose that the various "Faculties" shall consist of (among others) professors, readers, lecturers, and fellows of colleges; and then they explain that "the term Fellows of Colleges includes the Fellows of Selwyn, Girton, and Newnham Colleges." From all which it will be perceived that women may be University professors and members of Cambridge University teaching faculties and yet *not*—? Well, one hardly knows how the actual membership of the University can possibly be withheld from them. The Commissioners apparently intend to leave the University to struggle out of the imbrolio which it has created for its own bewilderment; for they drily remark that they "have dealt with the position of women in the organization of teaching only. As at present advised, they propose to leave to the University itself questions relating to the admission of women to share in the government of the University." They do not explain how women can advise about the course of studies in the University and not very substantially direct the course of university life. But, clearly, the Commissioners have called on Cambridge University to move

WOMEN POLICE: AFTER THE REPORT.

The issue of the Report of the Departmental Committee on the employment of Policewomen has given great encouragement and publicity to the cause of policewomen—Metropolitans and Provincials. Listening to the chorus of approval that has greeted the appearance of the Report there is some danger of forgetting that until the recommendations are embodied in statutory Regulations Police Authorities can adopt or ignore them as they please.

The fate of the Baird Report on the Employment of Women on Police Duties, 1920, is a warning not to be disregarded in 1924. Presented to Parliament in August, 1920, this report was circulated to the Police Authorities in England and Wales on the 7th September, with a covering letter signed by the then Under Secretary of State advising Police Authorities that policewomen *should not be attested* and that standardization of pay on the report basis *should be deferred*. This covering letter was calculated to defeat the recommendations of the Baird Report, and it shows great faith in the value of the policewoman on the part of the Police Authorities employing them to find that, in spite of the covering letter, more than half attested their women and paid them on the report basis.

The first thing, therefore, to be done is to ensure that the present report is circulated with an endorsement by the Home Office of the recommendations.

To understand the next step to be taken it is necessary to go back to the passing of the Police Act, 1919. This Act was needed in order to constitute the Police Federation (section 1) and (by section 4) to empower the Secretary of State and the Secretary for Scotland "to make regulations as to the government, mutual aid, pay, allowances, pensions, clothing expenses, and conditions of service of all police forces within England, Wales, and Scotland, and every police authority shall comply with the regulations so made." Since the passing of the Act the *Police Chronicle* has recorded week by week the successful efforts of Borough and County Police Forces to give effect to the recommendations of the Desborough Committee's Report embodied in Regulations. The Desborough Report is known as the police charter, and one by one the police authorities who resisted the recommendations have been obliged to comply with the regulations stabilizing and standardizing the police service throughout Great Britain.

In the course of my evidence on Provincial Policewomen, for the National Council of Women, before the recent Committee on Women Police, I remarked that as the Desborough Committee's recommendations had been made operative for the men so we asked that the recommendations of the Baird Committee be made operative for the women. The Chairman, Mr. Bridgeman, asked H.M. Inspector of Constabulary, Sir Leonard Dunning, if it was a fact that *all* police authorities

forward, and the only question is whether it will now place itself abreast of Oxford by taking one logical step which will make everything simple.

Family Emigration.

An agreement has been signed between the British and Canadian Governments for the settlement of 3,000 British families on Canadian farms, which will be provided in settled districts by the Dominions Government. Each family will receive a loan of such sums as they require for the purchase of their farm. The adult male members of the families will acquire local farming experience by working for wages on the neighbouring farms, whilst the women will be taught to look after the cows and poultry. Whilst they are being trained and during the process of settlement, they will be under the direction and advice of an experienced farm supervisor. Families which come from the same district will as far as possible be settled in the same neighbourhood. We welcome this attempt to extend emigration on lines which recognize the claims of the family unit and which reduces as far as may be the risks and difficulties of a new life.

The New Governor of Texas.

It is probable that a woman will for the first time be elected to a governorship in the United States. Mrs. Ferguson has been nominated by the Democratic Party in the Primary Election, and this, with the existing conditions of the parties, implies her election. Mrs. Ferguson is the wife of a previous governor, and stood as the anti-Ku-Klux-Klan candidate.

had complied with the regulations issued by the Home Secretary, and his reply was "Yes, all."

The Report shows us very clearly what the women police are up against; the House of Commons and the Home Office are friendly, and, on the whole, informed; the general public, especially the women—who, after all, are those mainly concerned—are also friendly even if not fully informed, but the police service and the local police authorities, with some few enlightened exceptions, still have to be converted by the weight of public opinion backed by the operation of the law.

The voice of the local police authorities is heard in paragraph 3: "The representatives of the Police Committee of the Association of Municipal Corporations stated that, in the opinion of that Committee there was no general demand on the part of the public for . . . policewomen, and urged that the whole question be left to the discretion of the local authorities." The County Councils Association, in a letter addressed to the Committee, express the opinion that "so far as County areas are concerned the employment of women is unnecessary."

In paragraph 8: "Three representatives of the Police Federation expressed a general opposition to the employment of women in the Police Service; Sub-Divisional Inspector Varney (London) considered that the patrols employed in his Division during the war did no useful work whatever." The *Police Chronicle* in the leading article (22nd August) says that the reason for this opposition within the service arises from the fact that the "Women Police movement . . . originated outside the service" and "the suspicion that the Lady in Blue would be a meddlesome busybody . . . will not be removed until the women members are trained in the service for the service."

In other words the local police authorities resent any action of a compulsory nature being taken by the Home Office, and the Police Service are unwilling to admit that certain duties hitherto undertaken by men would be—and are—better performed by women. Much of the opposition to the employment of policewomen would cease if their organization and duties were clearly defined by statutory regulations in terms of section 4 Police Act, 1919; clause 2 provides, "A draft of any regulations proposed to be made shall be submitted to a Council consisting of . . . members of the Police Federation and representatives of the chief officers of police and police authorities selected by the Secretary of State—after consultation with the County Council's Association and the Association of Municipal Corporations, and before making the regulations the Secretary of State shall consider any representations made by such council."

The excellent recommendations of the Committee are concrete proposals affording a basis for draft regulations for policewomen, and it is to be hoped that the Home Secretary and the Secretary for Scotland will take this opportunity of arriving at a reasoned, agreed, and final settlement of this many sided controversy.

EDITH TANCRED

WHO PUTS THE CLOCK BACK?

It is quite true that the trend of social legislation is all in the same direction—the mitigation of bad conditions. But it is difficult to discover any definite indication of an intention to treat men and women alike in the matter of industrial regulations. The Factories Bill still retains all the old differential treatment for women. As for the hours of employment Bill—need we consider it seriously? As long as huge organizations such as the National Union of Railwaymen hold it up to derision as a Bill which would deprive them of some of their hardest-earned benefits, there need be neither hope nor fear that it will pass into law in its present state. The industrial man, in short, is safe to get what he wants. The industrial woman is safe to get what other people think good for her. Who are the "other people"? Let us be quite frank. They are the mass of the public, who because, presumably, they were forced to think practically about the work of women during the war, have, in relaxation, thought sloppily ever since: they are the big trade organizations—kind to sentimentality individually, but in the mass fearful of the unfettered competition of women: they are men—who look upon industry as their function and the well-paid occupations (whether light or heavy) as their sacred preserve: they are women who are obsessed by party views; and lastly, and most paradoxically, they are—or so we are told—the industrial women themselves. For as long as the industrial woman is dependent for her knowledge of the operation of differential legislation in industry on such statements as that recently issued by the Joint Standing Committee of Women's Industrial Organizations (*The Labour Woman*, 1st August), she too must rank among the "other people"—for she has not had the chance of coming to a balanced judgment.

What are the facts? War-time experience proved the capacity of women as skilled workers in a hundred and one occupations that had been closed to them; with restrictions as to overtime and night work removed they undertook work that had been looked upon as far too heavy for them, and their health improved rather than deteriorated; given adequate nutrition (which they had because for the first time their wages reached and passed subsistence level) they showed even better health and physical vigour in some of the more active occupations than in the sedentary ones. In some of the lighter work and in repetition work their skill and their output exceeded the men's. And yet that war-time experience seems to have been nothing but waste as far as any really substantial improvement in the position of women in industry is concerned. They are for the most part back in the old industrial cage—the ill-paid job, whether it is heavy or light.

There is no one-day cure for such a dismal position—and feminists do not offer one. But quite undeterred by silly gibes they ask that the industrial woman shall be treated as a complete and grown-up human being, not as a shuttlecock between the battledores of sentimentality and fear; that she shall have the same right as men to decide where, how, when, and why she shall work; that she shall be given equal opportunities of training, equal opportunities of advancement, and the same rate for the job as men receive. They believe that if the same energy that has been put in getting so-called "protection" for women in industry had been put into demanding equal opportunities and equal pay, the position of the industrial woman worker would not have fallen so far from its war-time plane.

The other view, as put forward by the Joint Committee of Women's Industrial Organizations in a statement called "Middle-class women and Industrial Legislation" is not very convincing. Its writer makes the amusing suggestions that the feminist opposition to differential legislation is founded on ignorance and fed by interested co-operation with the employers—both allegations so utterly unsupported by facts that we must conclude that they emanate, as the metaphysicians say, from the inner consciousness. What is really rather unfortunate is that the writer of the article quotes what Mrs. Sidney Webb wrote in the nineteenth century in favour of differential legislation for women, and not what she wrote in the twentieth against it. In her *Minority Report on Women in Industry*, written in 1919, Mrs. Webb rejects any and every kind of special "protection" for women. Here are some of her words:—

"The same argument" (against a male and female occupational rate) "in my opinion condemns the idea of differentiation in the prescribed conditions of employment, notably as regards sanitation, amenity, and hours of labour, between men and women as such. . . . I note with concern that my colleagues in their report advocate an extension and elaboration of the regulations of the Factory Act in the case of women only. . . . The employer's plea for permission to pay a lower occupational rate to women than to men is sometimes put in the more specious form of a claim to make, from an identical rate, particular deductions when women are the recipients on such grounds as . . . (c) having to meet Factory Act requirements or the cost of 'welfare work.'"

Mrs. Webb, indeed, expresses the complete and perfect feminist view: and it seems strange that the writer of the Joint Committee's statement should have recalled opinions expressed thirty years ago and entirely forgotten those very important ones of a quite recent date.

To defend "protective" legislation for women only in the past (the Factory Acts of 1874) on the ground that "in the then state of public opinion it was not a matter of practical politics to limit the work of hours of adult men" is equally misleading. What do these nebulous abstractions "state of public opinion" and "matter of practical politics" really mean? Mrs. Webb tells us with perfect frankness that "these special provisions arose during a period when the male Trade Unionists objected to having the conditions of their employment regulated by law." That objection has utterly vanished in this country. It is vanishing everywhere: and feminists are therefore on firmer ground than ever in urging that there should be no differentiation in legislation between the sexes. In so doing they are actuated by no arm-chair philosophy on the "iniquity of state interference with individual freedom" as some of their critics affect to suppose. Their opposition to laws applying only to their own sex, and particularly to the Draft Conventions of the International Labour Office concerning Maternity, Nightwork for Women, and the Recommendations concerning the Protection of Women against Lead Poisoning, and concerning the convention on the use of White Lead in Painting rests upon somewhat less aerial foundations.

ELIZABETH ABBOTT.

(This article will be concluded in the issue of 5th September.)

FRENCH WOMEN AND THE VOTE.

An interesting article by Miss Edith Sellers on the Voteless Women of France appears in the August number of the *National Review*. The main contention of the article is that the attitude of the different parties towards women's suffrage has entirely changed since the war. It used to be Progressives who supported it, now the bulk of the active support comes from the Conservative Right. The reason for the change is the increase in the influence of the Church amongst women as a result of the war. It is the fear of, or desire for, increasing clerical influence that is the deciding factor in determining the attitude of the different parties to the women's question. The women will vote according as the Curé tells them, is the cry. It must be remembered that the Frenchwoman has had far less political education than had the unfranchised Englishwomen, since she has not even got a vote for Municipal and Communal Councils, still less is she allowed to sit on such bodies. It is possible, therefore, that the women of France may at first be more swayed by outside influence in casting their vote than has been the case in England. But it is distressing to find that the question of women's enfranchisement is taken so little on its own merits. Party considerations affected, and still affect, the Parliamentary attitude on this question here, but certainly nothing like to the extent described by Miss Sellers. There is, of course, a section in France that regards the matter from a non-party standpoint. The audience at the Sorbonne was recently startled by a remark of the lecturer, M. Louis Martin—"either Frenchwomen are inferior to the women of other countries, or French legislation is inferior in justice to the legislation of other countries." One can only hope the pride of Frenchmen in their race and in their country will make them see that there is but one way out of this dilemma.

WHAT I REMEMBER. LI.

By MILLICENT GARRETT FAWCETT, J.P., LL.D.

CONTINUED PROGRESS (Continued).

I was sorry for Mrs. Humphry Ward. She had always been an honourable opponent and had restrained her followers when they were trying to hit below the belt. But she was intensely indignant with Lord Curzon for his part in the debate, and burst out in uncontrollable rage against him, quoting Browning's "Lost Leader" and other similar things. He was correspondingly angry with her, and the quarrel found expression in the *Morning Post*, 14th to 21st January, 1918. She accused Lord Curzon of keeping her in ignorance of the line he intended to pursue, and he, replying that he had given full information on this point to two members of her committee before Christmas, and also to her son, Mr. Arnold Ward, three weeks before the debate and division had taken place. Why none of these had passed on their information to Mrs. Ward, who was really their leader and chief, has not been explained, so far as I know. She certainly had a right to be angry with her colleagues for keeping her in the dark. The correspondence in the *Morning Post* ended with a letter from Mrs. Ward, conceived in a milder tone, and concluding, "I am glad to remember, with a friendly reference to myself. Amid my own disappointment," she wrote, "I could not help thinking of Mrs. Fawcett, who had been sitting beside me in the House of Lords, and feeling a sort of vicarious satisfaction that after her long fight she at least had gone home content." It was generously said, and when the end of her life came suddenly about two years later, I was glad to remember her words.

CELEBRATING OUR VICTORY.

We had held no great meetings in support of Woman's Suffrage during the Great War, for we were then concentrating on various activities, calculated, as we hoped, to bring the War to a victorious conclusion. But in March, 1918, we felt we must have one meeting of thanksgiving for the Parliamentary victory we had gained. This was fixed for the 13th March. Our desire was to assemble as many as possible of those who had been working for long years for the success of our cause, and to select our speakers from among the Members of Parliament who had effectively promoted it during the recent crisis which had ended in giving the franchise to about 8,000,000 women. I have already mentioned that our information was that the three men who had really won our cause for us in the Cabinet had been Mr. Lloyd George, Lord Robert Cecil, and Mr. Arthur Henderson. We did not succeed in getting all three, but among those who accepted our invitation to speak was Mr. Henderson, and it will be readily understood that I did not receive with any favour a protest from a "militant" clergyman of a City church against allowing him to appear on our platform. I supposed this to be a sort of echo of the futile suffragette attempt in February, 1914, to prevent Mr. Henderson from speaking for us. But my clerical friend was so persistent that at last I had to tell him plainly that the proposed meeting was ours, not his, and therefore the choice of speakers rested entirely with us. No repetition of the scene of 1914 was attempted. The meeting was equally harmonious and enthusiastic and we were glad to receive messages of congratulation and goodwill from a large number of distinguished men and women, and also from a considerable proportion of those members of the executive committee who had seceded from us and set up a Society of their own in 1915.

Years before victory was in sight, I had been accustomed to talk with my dear friend, the late Mrs. Arthur Lyttelton, about the best way of celebrating our triumph when it came. We had agreed that music alone could really convey what we should feel. Kathleen Lyttelton did not live to see our victory, but she and I had agreed that we must certainly have the Leonora Overture No. III, with its glorious burst of triumph when freedom displaces captivity and the overwhelming power of love overcomes the world of darkness. We had also hoped to have the last movement of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony, but that part of our dream never came true: there were difficulties which we had not foreseen. But our friends among the great musicians came splendidly to our help. Chief of them was Sir Hubert Parry. He was ready to be our conductor. We had for some years been using Blake's noble poem "Jerusalem" as our suffrage hymn. But there was no adequate music for it that matched in any sense with Blake's magical words, so we took this trouble to him, and asked him boldly to do the almost impossible, which he had done in his setting of Milton's "Blest Pair of Sirens." He most

graciously promised to do what we asked of him, and the result was his splendid setting of Blake's poem which is now known and sung wherever fine music and glorious words are wedded. Its first performance was at our Queen's Hall meeting in March, 1918. I had the joy of hearing it every evening during the Leith Hill musical festival at Dorking in 1924, and no one but myself and a few friends knew that the music had been composed at our request. This same hymn was also a very marked feature of the Children's Day at Wembley on 24th May, 1924.

And did those feet in ancient times
Walk upon England's mountains green?
And was the Holy Lamb of God
On England's pleasant pastures seen?

And did the Countenance Divine
Shine forth upon our clouded hills?
And was Jerusalem builded here
Among these dark Satanic mills?

Bring me my bow of burning gold!
Bring me my arrows of desire!
Bring me my spear: O clouds unfold!
Bring me my chariot of fire.

I will not cease from mental fight,
Nor shall my sword sleep in my hand,
Till I have built Jerusalem
In England's green and pleasant land.

Sir Hubert Parry was not the only great musician who befriended us and helped us with the musical part of our meeting. Mr. (now Sir Hugh) Allen, then Professor of Music at Oxford, made repeated journeys to and from London for the rehearsals; he often returned to Oxford in the middle of the night or in the early hours of the morning and was undaunted either by the severe cold of an inclement spring, or by the attentions of Zeppelins which from time to time held up his train. He was resolved to get the very best out of the orchestra, and I was told he would sometimes address them thus: "Of course you are all suffragists, and will play your best for love of suffrage; but if there are two or three who are not suffragists they will play their best for love of me."

We were very happy, and had cause to be. Things worked out even better and more rapidly than we had expected, though I had never had a moment's doubt of the final issue. When I was speaking almost perpetually all over the country in support of representative government and how it should include women, I was frequently asked if what the Suffrage Societies were aiming at was not "really and truly" to get women into Parliament. I said "No," the Suffrage Societies had but one aim, the vote for women on the same terms on which it was granted to men. The question of women in Parliament was one for constituencies to decide, and I cited the case of Jews in Parliament as an instance in point. I had not at all expected that the eligibility of women would follow as a matter of course immediately upon their enfranchisement. But this was the case; women had been on the Parliamentary register only a few months, before the House of Commons decided, without any outside pressure, that they ought also to be entitled to sit as members. The necessary legislation to effect this, however, did not get through both Houses until just three weeks before the Dissolution of December, 1918. It is not therefore very wonderful that no women were elected in that year, the wonder is that so many as sixteen were candidates. But 1919 saw the election of Viscountess Astor, who held the fort for us quite alone with a Joan of Arc gaiety and courage for which we can never be sufficiently grateful. Now, as everyone knows, she has seven women colleagues in the House, and the position is no longer so lonely and difficult.

I must now close my remembrances, and say good-bye to my kind readers who have followed my story in the *WOMAN'S LEADER* generally with every kind of encouragement; sometimes with welcome corrections, and occasionally with a metaphorical clout on the head. I have had a happy fifty years out of my seventy-seven working for women's suffrage, and a happy eight or nine months writing down "What I Remember" about it all.

AN END AND A BEGINNING.

Owing to some unexpected additional space in our last issue Mrs. Fawcett's reminiscences comes to an end in this issue, a week earlier than we had calculated. We imagine our readers will feel that the thanks of the last paragraph are due to her not to them, and we know that they will rejoice to hear that throughout the autumn and winter the welcome regular contact with Mrs. Fawcett will be resumed when her articles entitled "Two Spring Visits to Palestine, 1921, 1922" will appear.

A POLISH MEDICAL WOMAN OF THE 18th CENTURY (Continued).

The Maltese doctor was able to extend Madame Halpir's knowledge of medicine and to teach her the Latin needed for writing prescriptions, and after long years we find the willing pupil recording her gratitude. But, the Turks being inexorably opposed to their prisoners purchasing their freedom, he decided on an attempt at escape, and was soon on his way to Malta. Meanwhile, war had been declared with Austria, and, after witnessing heart-rending cruelties against the revolting Christians, Madame Halpir left Sofia, determined to brave all if she could but reach home.

A new kind of adventure next beset her. At Widin she was called in to treat a Transylvanian prince, Joseph Rakoezi, who was a pretender to the throne of Hungary. When recovered from his lung attack, he made her proposals which she declined on the ground that she was not of a station to marry him and would not be his mistress—to be given, perhaps, when he was tired of her, to one of his servants. The prince would have attempted force, but she escaped by boat to Rustchuk, a few miles down the Danube. He then denounced her to the Turks as a spy, and she was put in prison and condemned to death.

Here again we doubt whether we are not reading some Eastern romance. For behold, on the eve of the execution, the Treasurer of State sends for her out of prison to heal his son of an illness which the three doctors of the town have pronounced immediately fatal. While engaged in his treatment she is able to persuade the authorities that she has been unjustly accused, Rakoezi withdraws the charge, and patients flock to consult her before she leaves the country for Bar, on the way to Poland.

But the next page of her life has another excitement in store. While at Sofia she had generously lent money to pay the ransom of five Germans who had been taken prisoners by the Turks. Four of them repaid her honestly. The fifth, one Pilstein, continued living at her charges and accompanied her to Bar, revolving a scheme for ridding himself of the debt by the simple means of marrying his creditor. Unfortunately, she fell into the trap, married him, and divided with him the little fortune which she had accumulated by her profession.

Pilstein joined the Army of Lithuania, commanded by Prince Radziwill, and his wife, though offered the post of doctor to the prince's household, first undertook a journey to Russia in the interest of some worthy Turks whom she had known at Rustchuk and who had been carried off there as prisoners of war. She passed by slow stages, exercising her profession on the way, to Petersburg, and, having obtained the notice of the Tsarina by curing her laundress of cataract, was successful in begging the liberation of the Turkish prisoners. We learn, incidentally, and without surprise, that when the Empress ordered the court chemist to make up Madame Halpir's prescriptions, the court physicians were much disgusted!

Perhaps now she returned to Poland and lived thenceforward an uneventful existence? Not a bit of it. The poor woman found on her homecoming that her husband had spent and wasted all her property, and, moreover, had so changed to her that he treated her with insult and brutality. Determining to seek the help of his parents, she journeyed to Carniola. They proved to be good, honest people of small means, who had themselves ample reason to complain of their spendthrift son. So, with the prospect of motherhood before her, she left them for Vienna, and there, after her confinement, she met the Turkish ambassador Djaki Alibly Effendi, who, delighted to find a skilled physician with a knowledge of his language, gave her a post at the Embassy.

When the little Stanislaus was a few months old, his mother— anxious to see her husband again, and her elder child—returned to Poland. But it was only to find Pilstein imprisoned for indiscipline, and no trace of the little sum which she had placed in charge of a friend, but of which he had possessed himself. She now lived fifteen years in Poland, practising in many towns, but chiefly in Dubno. Then, the daughter being married and the boy at school, she set forth again for Constantinople, where she obtained a medical post in the family of the Sultan Mustapha whose two wives became her patients, as well as all the female members of the household.

But she was not quit of her husband. She tells of his occasional descents upon her after she had procured his release from prison, his extortions, even an attempt he made to poison her. Of her life after the time of her appointment at Constantinople we learn nothing; the autobiography ends with the year 1760, when she was forty-two.

Is her record true to fact? Is it coloured? Is it mixed with fiction? "Dichtung und Wahrheit" should perhaps be our verdict. F. DE G. M.

MOTHERHOOD.

One goes west from the Houses of Parliament and past the Tate Gallery, and then south over the river and under a railway bridge; at once the roads get worse and very crowded; even the air feels too much breathed. Anywhere off the main road there are quantities of children, mostly with colds, very often squinting a little, or touched with eczema, or perhaps a sore leg—something just a tiny bit wrong. And one knows they probably live four or five to a room, with the windows shut all night so as to keep warm, and of course hardly any chance of washing and mother too busy with looking after them all to look after any of them properly.

East Street is a little market crammed with stalls, fish and meat, and fruit and crockery; a pram is useful to hold what's bought, but only the lucky ones have them. Going through, it's like a foreign country, the clamouring, shrill-pitched voices beating on one, talking London, not English. But at 153a East Street, Walworth Road, is the Walworth Women's Welfare Centre, where any woman who chooses to take advantage of civilization can be taught to help herself. Three afternoons a week they come, sometimes from just round the corner, sometimes after an hour's walk and tram; usually they've been told by friends, and often the friend comes to do the talking. Most of them are youngish women, usually in their best clothes; they are trying hard to keep some life of their own. But if I'd been married at seventeen and had either a baby or a miscarriage pretty well every year, and all to be done out of £3 a week perhaps, then I'd think I was old at twenty-five. I'd begin to twist my hair up anyhow, and not brush my teeth or wash very much, my shoes would be the last to get mended, my skirt would get draggled and frayed at the bottom too. I'd begin to look on my body as a horrible beast, ready to betray me into misery and pain.

The Centre is run by two or three women. They seem endlessly kind, a kindness only matched by their splendid indignation against the way poor women—and men—must live, and against those who try to keep them ignorant of one way at least in which civilization can help them. They know that their teaching of birth control is not the beginning of the millennium, but that in every year it will certainly prevent a great deal of unnecessary suffering to some three or four thousand families.

The mothers take off their hats and leave the usual baby safe downstairs, and go in to the lady doctor; it is a decent, light room, smelling inevitably of disinfectant. They answer her questions in a half whisper mostly, very nervous, with shaking hands and nails bitten to the quick. They ask to be made safe, able to make plans for the future like human beings, instead of existing and letting things happen to them like beasts. Sometimes they are young enough to feel they might get back to an almost forgotten joy: "If we wasn't fretting ourselves so every time—not knowing it mightn't have happened" But for most of them that's a thing of the dim past: they've had eight or ten already, and there's no pleasure left in anything to do with child-getting; but still they must go on.

Very often the couple has tried something already, with more or less success; the wife may have gone to a chemist, but doesn't know how to use what she has bought—these things have to be taught. Many doctors cannot or will not help: "I 'ad my larst took away in 'orspital at seven months; something cruel it was; the doctor said as I didn't ought to 'ave no more, but 'e didn't tell me nothing 'bout 'ow to do it."

The mothers are all very friendly—that is the atmosphere of the place—and nice, and intelligent; they have a splendid, clear-sighted, northern bravery, and almost too much patience: "You're very nervous, Mrs. B—. When did you have a holiday last?" "Oh, I 'ad a 'oliday when I was at school, twelve years back." It takes a woman of character to bring up her children at all on a weekly wage of perhaps £1 10s. The highest I heard of was £5 a week, but nowadays many were doing what they could on the unemployment grant. There would be from one to three rooms for the family, never big, and a great shortage of beds. But beyond them one had glimpses of a horrible depth of ignorance that will not let itself be served by science—yet. "There's a woman down by my 'ome—not our street, the street we backs on to like—you wouldn't 'ardly believe the number she 'as, all the same age as you might say—and the dirt, somethin' disgraceful! I wonder it's allowed, I do!" There was one woman of twenty-three, her husband earning £2 4s. 10d. a week; she has been married eight years and has had five children; only three are alive. One can imagine what it would be in another ten years if she was not helped now. Another

woman is forty-four. She has been married twenty-two years; twelve children were born and there were five miscarriages; her husband's wages now are £2 a week.

The Walworth Women's Welfare Centre is not the only one; but it is the only one for many square miles of densely crowded city streets. It has only been working since November, 1921, and already the need is clear for more like it. Another will be started this Autumn in North Kensington; at least we hope so, it is needed badly enough. Every year more and more women are finding out that they can at last cry check to blind and cruel Nature working in slums just as though they were vast and grain-growing plains. Every year such clinics as exist find themselves more and more crowded—and yet they are only touching the edges of ignorance. Here, money given at once means money saved a generation hence; as it is, the women pay for what they get, and usually give a shilling consultation fee; but that, of course, is not enough to cover expenses.

The opposition to this work of civilization seems to me incredible. It is no excuse to shut one's eyes and run away. I doubt if the opposition is really large, but many people who know and are on our side might help and do not. If they went down there and saw for themselves I think they would; and they always can—they have only to write to the Hon. Secretary. It will be the same in North Kensington this winter if we get the money.

NAOMI MITCHISON.

[The WOMAN'S LEADER, as our readers know, takes up no official position either for or against the practice of birth control. Its policy is that of the National Union of Societies for Equal Citizenship as laid down in a Council Resolution which seeks to "promote the study of this question," since it is one which is "now widely discussed and one which very specially affects women." Accordingly we print this week an article by Mrs. Naomi Mitchison in appreciation of the Walworth Birth Control Clinic, and intend in our next issue to publish an article by Mrs. Sanderson Furniss, who represents the point of view of those who oppose birth control propaganda with a constructive programme of social reform. We hope that our readers will share our view that equal justice is being accorded to both sides.—ED.]

MISS BONDFIELD FOR CANADA.

Miss Bondfield sails for Canada on 13th September to conduct an inquiry into the case of child emigrants to the Dominion. Miss Bondfield will be accompanied by Mrs. Harrison Bell, who represents Labour on the Overseas Settlement Committee, and two other officials of the Committee.

OURSELVES.

We are grateful for the kind things some of our readers have said and written about some of our recent issues. Praise is, indeed, an excellent tonic. We cannot refrain from a little honest pride in the fare we are offering to our readers in the coming months. Some of the articles, as readers with insight will have already noticed, have been selected with the idea of helping our readers to study non-party political questions of special interest to women which will become practical politics when the House sits again after the Vacation. Mrs. Abbott's second article will deal with destructive legislation and will be followed by a short series on Social Insurance by Miss W. Elkin, which will explain the different schemes before the public and how they touch the question of Widows' Pensions. A bibliography will be attached to help Study Circles and groups of students. Next week Mrs. Sanderson Furniss will contribute a reply to advocates of Birth Control; Captain Ellis the second of our series on Rural Questions, and Miss Merrifield will tell the story of a Spanish woman of science in the sixteenth century. The following week our special correspondent in Geneva will contribute the first article on the work of the Assembly of the League of Nations. Later in the month, in addition to other interesting features, short articles on the work of women's non-party organizations will appear. Miss Merrifield's articles will be continued, and in October Mrs. Fawcett's new series will begin. Please help us by making this known and securing new subscribers.

A CHOICE OF BOOKS.

FORGOTTEN TALES OF LONG AGO. Edited by E. V. LUCAS.

RUNAWAYS AND CASTAWAYS. Edited by E. V. LUCAS.

SINTRAM AND HIS COMPANIONS AND UNDINE. By DE LA MOTTE FOUQUÉ. With an introduction by Miss CHARLOTTE YOUNG.

THE HISTORY OF THE FAIRCHILD FAMILY. By Mrs. SHERWOOD.

TALES FROM MARIA EDGEWORTH. With introduction by AUSTIN DOBSON, and illustrated by HUGH THOMSON. (Wells Gardner, Darton. 7s. 6d. each.)

Holiday weather is not always all it should be, and grown-ups are not infrequently pestered by demands for books. Satiated with stories of the impossibly good or bad schoolboys and girls in the impossibly perfect schools, of which the supply seems never to grow less, children may be glad to turn to the reprints of old books enumerated above. These include tales of adventure, the immortal romance of Sintram and his companions, too little known among the rising generation, and the equally immortal commonplaceness—wonderfully satisfying to the young—of Miss Edgeworth and Mrs. Sherwood. The books are all illustrated. Whether that is an advantage can always be argued, but few people would quarrel with the dainty pictures of Mr. Hugh Thomson.

THE SECRET OF THE COUP D'ETAT. Edited by the EARL OF KERRY, and a study by PHILIP GUEDALLA. (Constable, 18s.)

The book is compiled from recently discovered papers in the possession of the family of Lord Kerry, whose grandmother, Emily, Lady Lansdowne, was the daughter of the Comte Flahault, and one of the principal correspondents. The first letter is a note from Morny, written in November, 1848, on the eve of the election of Prince Louis Napoleon to the Presidency of the Second Republic. Events follow each other thick and fast, and are commented on in the letters from intimate knowledge and widely different political points of view. Among the papers is a confidential report on the casualties which occurred during the street fighting in Paris, drawn up by the Prefect of Police and sent to Flahault. This gives figures on a much smaller scale than those usually quoted from the estimates made of the "massacres" by Kinglake and Victor Hugo. A serious addition to the history of this period has been contributed by the publication of this interesting book.

A WOMAN ALONE IN KENYA, UGANDA, AND THE BELGIAN CONGO. By ETTA CLOSE. (Constable, 8s. 6d.)

Miss Close has all the qualities of coolness, curiosity, and sympathy which can stimulate the traveller in uncivilized regions to see all that is possible and make the most of what he sees. She accomplished two journeys, one with a Dutchman, hired with his ox-wagon as her escort, and the second time alone with her fifteen native porters. These she managed without any help at all, doing most of the marching at the tail of her small column, whence she could most easily frustrate any uncontrollable impulse on their part to bolt. Though she is unhampered by scientific equipment, Miss Close's book has the interest and value provided by intelligent first-hand observation.

PINK SUGAR. By O. DOUGLAS. (Hodder & Stoughton, 7s. 6d.)

The title hardly indicates the flavour of Miss Douglas's gay and placid tales of a Border village. There is little of the sugary and nothing verging on the crimson tinge about them. The author invites her critics to read the book in bed, as it can be safely prescribed as a prelude to pleasant dreams.

THE WOMAN'S LEADER

EVERY FRIDAY. ONE PENNY.

SPECIAL TERMS for SOCIETIES

Send 6/6 to the Office of the Paper, 15 DEAN'S YARD, WESTMINSTER, S.W. 1. :: :: 1/8 for Three Months.

SUBSCRIBE TO-DAY.

THE LAW AT WORK.¹ HOME OFFICE REPORT OF THE CHILDREN'S BRANCH.

Juvenile crime is on the decrease. There was a fall last year of 2,283 in the number of children appearing before the Juvenile Courts. This fall is accompanied by an increase in the use of Probation; 730 more children were placed upon Probation last year than in the previous year. The number bound over also increased by 99. The number fined decreased by 1,997, and the number sent to Industrial Schools by 12. There is an increase of one in those whipped and of 62 in those sent to Reformatories.

These figures tend to show that the modern practice of using Probation in place of fines or committal to an Institution is resulting in a reduction of crime, and if a comparison is made between this year and 1913, the tendency is still more marked. The percentage placed upon Probation has increased since 1913 from less than 12 to nearly 19, while committals to Institutions have decreased during that time from 6 per cent. to 3.81 per cent. In the same period the number of children charged has fallen from 37,000 to 28,000.

It is unfortunate (in view of these figures) that the Report should criticize the methods of those magistrates who make a practice of binding a child over or placing it upon Probation for its first offence. There are few rules in the world to which there are not exceptions, but most humane and progressive persons would consider this method a sound one. It is suggested that the practice of magistrates in only sending to the Schools children who have failed on Probation makes the task of the Schools more difficult than if better children, that is, first offenders, were sent. Mr. S. W. Harris, of the Home Office, speaking at the Annual Conference of the National Association of Probation Officers last May, said much the same thing, "they were bound to have schools, and if they kept from the schools the better boys it made their work all the harder. A Superintendent of a school the other day, pointing out a boy, said: 'He ought not to be here, but I cannot do without him because he exercises such a splendid influence on the others.'" This is surely a very questionable view to take. The schools are made for the children, and not the children for the schools, and the welfare of the individual child before them is the only thing that magistrates ought ever to consider.

Again, it is much to be regretted that the Report should state that committing a child to an Industrial School or a Reformatory is equivalent to sending him to "a boarding school run on public school lines." Even if the surroundings, curriculum, and régime of the average Reformatory made the comparison a fair one, the circumstances in the one case are so different from those in the other as to make it most misleading. A boy is sent to a Reformatory by order of the Court because he has been convicted of a crime; he goes against his own will and generally against that of his parents, who have no choice whatever in the matter. He is taken by a policeman, and he is obliged to remain at the school for as many years (it may be five or six) as may be determined by the authorities. While there he consorts entirely with boys who have had a like experience with his own, and he leaves at last branded as a Reformatory boy. Again, boarding school life is made possible for the public school boy because he has 14 weeks at home every year. Even in the model rules laid down by the Home Office for their Schools (and these have not yet been universally adopted) it is only stated that "as far as possible" the children should have a holiday and go home once a year. It is to be feared that a comparison of the kind quoted, made in an official report, may give rise to the impression that in these days an Industrial School or Reformatory is "just like a public school." The average working-class parent is not likely to be deceived, but those who are responsible for dealing with juvenile offenders perhaps may.

One can gladly acknowledge the immense improvement that has taken place in the Home Office Schools, the devoted work that is done by those in charge of them, and the good results which on the whole they achieve. But it is surely unnecessary that the Home Office should imply that magistrates should send first offenders to them in order that Superintendents should have better material to work upon, or to make a comparison which might lead a magistrate to believe that in sending a 14 years old lad to a Reformatory he is giving him just the same advantages as when he proudly sends his own boy off to his public school.

C. D. RACKHAM.

¹ Under the direction of Mrs. C. D. Rackham, J.P., Miss S. Margery Fry, J.P., with Mrs. Crofts, M.A., LL.B., as Hon. Solicitor.

NATIONAL UNION OF SOCIETIES FOR EQUAL CITIZENSHIP.

President: Miss ELEANOR RATHBONE, C.C., J.P. Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. SODDY.
Hon. Secretary: Miss E. MACADAM. Parliamentary Secretary: Mrs. HUBBACK.

Offices: 15 Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W. 1.
Telephone: Victoria 6188.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF POLICEWOMEN.

The attention of readers is particularly called to Miss Tancred's article on the above Report in this week's issue. Members of Societies are strongly advised to study the Report carefully with a view to meetings and action in the autumn. Copies may be obtained from the Secretary at Headquarters, price 6d. (post free 7d.).

PROTECTIVE LEGISLATION FOR WOMEN.

We also refer readers to Mrs. Abbott's two articles entitled "Who puts the Clock back?" in the issues of this and next week. Mrs. Abbott deals with the question of protective legislation for women, and as there are two Bills of this kind at present before Parliament which will probably be brought forward in the autumn, a careful study of the subject is very necessary. In connection with this, readers are referred back to two articles by Miss Escreet in our issues of 22nd August and 11th July.

LEAFLET ON GUARDIANSHIP OF INFANTS BILL, 1924.

A leaflet will shortly be issued describing concisely the Guardianship of Infants Bill (1924) and comparing it with the Bill previously brought before the House by Mrs. Wintringham. Advance orders should be sent to the Secretary, N.U.S.E.C. (price ½d. each, or 5d. per dozen, post free to affiliated Societies).

A RELIC OF THE PAST.

Mrs. Osler, for so many years closely associated with the fortunes of the National Union and still our Vice-President and one of our best friends, has sent the beautiful banner of the Birmingham Society for Women's Suffrage to Headquarters. We hope that it, with our other handsome and historic banners, will not be lost to posterity, but will often decorate great gatherings of women and recall the stirring times in which they took a prominent part in the past.

CORRESPONDENCE.

MADAM.—I should be glad if you would allow me to comment on three statements made by Mr. Graham in his reply to the Deputation from the Joint Committee on Women and the Civil Service published in your last issue.

The first is the statement that "the ideal reorganization scheme must not be confused with the application of such a scheme to existing staffs, and that, as vacancies cannot be artificially created, the result of the application of a reorganization scheme to existing personnel necessarily means that in many cases the allocation of branches as between men and women follows for the time being the arrangements previously in force."

This would be a perfectly legitimate excuse for failure to improve the position of women were it a fact, but in the most glaring instances quoted by the Deputation the arrangements previously in force were altered to the detriment of the women's prospects. The Superannuation Branch of the Board of Education was a woman's branch until it was graded as Executive work, when it was immediately thrown open to men. There were women in both the Housing Branch and the Approved Societies Branch of the Ministry of Health until, on Reorganization, the women were turned out, and in the latter case at any rate, men, and not necessarily ex-Service men, were transferred into the branch, the reason for the substitution being given that on Reorganization women were to be excluded from these particular branches.

The second statement on which I wish to comment is that which suggests that the final settlement of the ex-Service problem which it is hoped will be achieved by following the recommendations of the Southborough Committee will open the door to outside recruitment and a freer entry of women into the Service. We have made no complaint as to the exclusion of women from the lower grades, but the Southborough Report comments on the fact that there are 900 redundant Junior Executive men awaiting absorption and states:—"We have reason to believe that the existing redundant personnel will not be absorbed for some years yet." So that this Grade, where one would have expected to find a large percentage of women training for the higher posts in the Service, will be apparently completely closed to women for many years to come.

The statement that "the obligations of the Government to ex-Service men and the demands for reduction of the public expenditure since 1920 have both militated against the employment of women" hardly needs comment to anyone who knows the Service from inside. With the present scales of pay it is unfortunately cheaper to employ women than men, and as an example of how far the ex-Service man has taken the posts the women were claiming, in one of the newly created Ministries, almost entirely staffed by women during the war, the Higher Executive posts at present are allocated as follows:—Non-Service men 53, Ex-Service men 10, women 6.

D. SMYTH.

Hon. Secretary, Federation of Women Civil Servants.

COMING EVENTS.

ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS FOR PEACE.

SEPT. 18. 8 p.m. Central Hall, Westminster. Public Meeting. Subject: "The Contributions towards Peace in different Countries." Chair: The Rt. Hon. Viscount Gladstone, G.C.B., etc. Speakers: M. Sanguier (Paris), George Lansbury, M.P., Dr. Quidde (Munich), Rt. Hon. H. A. L. Fisher, M.P. Admission free (collection). A few reserved tickets (2s. 6d.) to be had on application to Milbank House, Wood Street, Westminster, or to League of Nations Union, 15 Grosvenor Crescent, S.W.

NATIONAL UNION OF SOCIETIES FOR EQUAL CITIZENSHIP.

GLASGOW S.E.C. and W.C.A., Waverley Hydropathic, Melrose. OCT. 9-OCT. 13. Autumn School. Inclusive terms for Board-residence (single room): Registration and Lecture Fees £3; for part-time attendance 15s. per day. Applications for membership of the School not later than 15th September, to be made to Hon. Secretaries, 172 Bath Street, Glasgow.

TYPEWRITING AND PRINTING, Etc.

M. McLACHLAN and N. WHITWHAM—TYPISTS.—4 Chapel Walks, Manchester. Tel.: 3402 City.

TYPEWRITING executed promptly. Careful, intelligent work by expert lady. Very reasonable terms.—Box 1,082, WOMAN'S LEADER, 15 Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W. 1.

TEMPLAR PRINTING WORKS, BIRMINGHAM.
SPECIALISTS IN WORK FOR NATIONAL SOCIETIES.

ENQUIRIES SOLICITED.

TO LET AND WANTED.

TO LET (furnished) for a few weeks, HOUSE in Chiltern Hills; 7 bedrooms, bathroom (h. and c.), 2 reception rooms; easy journey to Wembley.—Write, Peyton Jones, Wendover Dean Farm, Wendover.

LADY, Professional Musician, requires two unfurnished sunny ROOMS, one large, one small; use of bath; 15s. to 20s. p.w.; W. or S.W. district; references exchanged.—Box 1,085, WOMAN'S LEADER, 15 Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W. 1.

KENSINGTON.—Residential Chamber for gentlewoman (furnished); gas-stoves, ring, and own meter; near District Railway, Tube and buses. Telephone, Western 1201.—Box 1,086, WOMAN'S LEADER, 15 Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W. 1.

CHILTERN HILLS.—Cottage home (bath). Miss Taylor, 98 Cheyne Walk, S.W., recommends Board-residence, 2 gns. a week each. Free FROM 15th September.—Mrs. Clare, 6 Station Road, Chinnor, Oxon.

THE ISIS CLUB (15 minutes Oxford Street).—Holiday visitors and permanent residents. Large garden; beautiful situation, sandy soil. Magnificent reception rooms. Central heating; electric fires. Excellent cuisine. Lectures, dancing, wireless, tennis. From 2½ guineas.—79 Fitzjohn's Avenue. Telephone: Hampstead 2869.

LOW GREEN HOUSE, Thoraby, Aysgarth, Yorks.—Comfortable BOARD-RESIDENCE. Good centre, moors and dales. Three guineas per week.

PROFESSIONAL.

PUBLIC SPEAKING.—Miss Geraldine Cooke, 2 George Street, Portman Square, W. 1, is free to address meetings on Citizenship and kindred subjects. Terms on application.

LEARN TO KEEP ACCOUNTS.—There are especially good lessons in book-keeping at Miss Blakeney's School of Typewriting and Shorthand, Wentworth House, Mauresa Road, Chelsea, S.W. 3. "I learnt more there in a week," says an old pupil, "than I learnt elsewhere in a month." Pupils prepared for every kind of secretarial post.

INCOME TAX RECOVERED AND ADJUSTED. Consult Miss H. M. Baker, 275 High Holborn, W.C. 1. Income Tax Returns, Super Tax Returns, Repayment Claims of all descriptions. Telephone: Holborn 377.

POST VACANT.

PRIVATE SECRETARY required (previous secretary resigned after 12 years). Must be thoroughly trained and experienced; preference given to one who is also musical.—Apply, Hon. Mrs. Franklin, 50 Porchester Terrace, W.

CANNING TOWN WOMEN'S SETTLEMENT, LONDON, E. 16.—Full-time Voluntary Workers Wanted in the Autumn for all departments of Settlement Work. Vacancy for student to train in social work.—Full particulars from the Warden.

FOR SALE AND WANTED.

HUCKABACK TOWELLING.—Remnant bundles of Irish huckaback linen towelling, very superior quality, for bedroom towels, sufficient to make 6 full-size towels, 12s. 6d. per bundle, postage 9d. Write for Bargain List—TO-DAY.—HUTTON'S, 41 Main Street, Larne, Ireland.

SECOND-HAND CLOTHING wanted to buy for cash; costumes, skirts, boots, underclothes, curtains, lounge suits, trousers, and children's clothing of every description; parcels sent will be valued and cash sent by return.—Mrs. Russell, 100 Raby Street, Newcastle-on-Tyne. (Stamped addressed envelope for reply.)

DRESS.

MISS MALCOLM'S DRESS ASSOCIATION, 239 Fulham Road, London, S.W. 3. Bargain Gowns, Evening and Afternoon, at 21s.

"FROCKLETS." Mrs. Elborough, c/o Madame Sara, 163 Ebury Street (5 min. Victoria Station). Tel., Ken. 3947. Children's Dresses of original and practical design, Coats, Caps, etc., etc. Smocks a speciality. Fancy Dresses. Open daily (Saturdays excepted) to a.m.—4 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS.

LONDON SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SERVICE, 35 Marsham Street, Westminster. Secretary, Miss P. Strachey. Information Bureau. Interviews, 10 to 1, except Saturdays. Members' Centre open daily. Restaurant open to 7.30 (not Saturdays).

THE PIONEER CLUB has reopened at 12 Cavendish Place, Town Members £5 5s.; Country and Professional Members £4 4s. Entrance fee in abeyance (*pro tem.*).

FELLOWSHIP SERVICES, Guildhouse, Eccleston Square, S.W. 1. Sunday, 31st August, 7 p.m., Maude Royden: "St. Joan," by Bernard Shaw.

THE HOUSE ASSISTANTS' CENTRE, 510 King's Road, Chelsea, S.W. 10, is now definitely CLOSED, as Ann Pope has, by medical advice, had to discontinue all active participation in social work. An article on the work of the Centre (which is being carried on as a fresh undertaking at Ealing) will appear shortly in the WOMAN'S LEADER.

THE WOMAN'S LEADER can be supplied direct from this Office for 1½d. including postage. Send 6/6 to the Manager, WOMAN'S LEADER, 15 Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W. 1, and the paper will be sent to you at any address for a whole year. Persuade your friends to do the same.

Please send THE WOMAN'S LEADER to me for twelve months. I enclose 6/6.

Name

Address

PREPAID CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS 1d. a WORD, 6d. EXTRA FOR BOX NUMBER.