

THE WOMAN'S LEADER

AND THE COMMON CAUSE

Vol. XVI. No. 9. One Penny.

REGISTERED AS
A NEWSPAPER.

Friday, March 28, 1924.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
PLEDGES AND PERSECUTION	67
NEWS FROM WESTMINSTER	67
WHAT I REMEMBER. By Millicent Garrett Fawcett, J.P., LL.D.	68
SEPARATE TAXATION OF MARRIED PERSONS. By W. A. Elkin	69
WOMEN "VAGRANTS." By Mary Higgs	69
PUT NOT YOUR TRUST IN PARTIES. By Eleanor Rathbone, J.P., M.A.	70
"THE DISINHERITED FAMILY"	72
REVIEWS: "INIGO SANDYS." By I. B. O'Malley	72
OLIVE SHREINER. By Mrs. Oliver Strachey	73

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.

Representation of the People Act (1918) Amendment Bill.

At the time of going to press we are distressed to find that Mr. Gardner's Rent Restrictions Bill, which it was thought might be withdrawn, owing to the Government's intention to introduce a Bill dealing with Evictions, is to continue its progress—inevitably tortoise-like—in Standing Committee A. This involves the prospect of making any satisfactory progress this Session with the Representation of the People Act (1918) Amendment Bill (which our readers will remember has been referred to this same Standing Committee) very slight. In fact if it proves impossible to have the Bill transferred to another Standing Committee there is little chance of the Bill's coming to a satisfactory conclusion this Session. We have always in these columns deplored the fact that the Government did not introduce an Equal Franchise Bill of its own. Unless it does this or unless the Bill is transferred to another Committee, we shall inevitably have the mournful satisfaction of saying "We told you so."

Peeresses in their Own Right.

On Tuesday, Mr. Briant, Liberal M.P. for North Lambeth, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to enable peeresses in their own right to sit and vote in the House of Lords. The motion was opposed by Mr. Jack Jones (Silverdown, Lab.) on the ground of general opposition to the principle of a hereditary chamber. On a division the motion was carried by 313 votes to 45, and the Bill read a first time.

Well Done, Mysore!

Mysore is in process of carrying through widespread constitutional reforms. Prominent among them is the removal of all sex disqualifications for the Franchise. Mysore has a population of six million persons, and as the first Indian State to adopt a full measure of Women's Suffrage it has taken an important pioneer step. After Russia—Germany and Austria. After Germany and Austria—Turkey. After Turkey—Mysore. Some day no doubt this country will regain its high place in the annals of representative democracy. Meanwhile, "How long, oh Lord, how long . . . ?"

The Guildhouse Conference on Housing in Greater London.

In view of the great urgency of the subject, we call the special attention of our readers to a letter from Miss Helen Ward, on page 75, dealing with a Conference on Housing in Greater London, announced for 5th April, at the Guildhouse, Eccleston Square. Miss Maude Royden will preside, and the list of speakers who hope to be present is a sufficient guarantee that the aim of the Guildhouse Fellowship in summoning this conference—to secure an accurate knowledge of possibilities as well as difficulties in the way of progress—will be attained.

The Professional and Business Women's Hospital League.

We have been asked to call the attention of our readers to the Professional and Business Women's Hospital League, founded to make provision in time of severe sickness for women who earn their living. Many a worker falls ill while living in a tiny flat or at a hostel, where she cannot possibly be properly nursed; or perhaps discovers that an operation is necessary. Though unable to provide the necessary money, she is reluctant to become a patient in the general ward of a hospital. If she is a member of the League, however, she can obtain skilled treatment in a private ward, and for the small sum of 5s. per annum. Other advantages are offered by the League, and one of them is that members can obtain Surgical Instruments and Appliances at a greatly reduced figure, owing to the generosity of a firm of Instrument Makers. Special arrangements for Hospital treatment are made for Provincial members, by which they obtain all benefits. All women under 55 years of age who work for their living in a profession or a business are eligible for membership. The subscription for the first year is 5s. 6d. and 5s. for every succeeding year (payable on January 1st). The League has been incorporated as a Friendly Society, and the Public Trustee is one of the Trustees. Information can be obtained from the Secretary, Professional and Business Women's Hospital League, 197 Edgware Road, London, W 2.

Many are Called, but few are Chosen.

Attention was called in the House of Commons the other day to the case of a (man) Juror who was summoned to attend a Jury for a whole week in the course of which he was only in the box for two hours, thereby losing £5 in wages. We are glad that the matter was raised, though in this particular case no satisfaction could be given. Both men and women are, with good grace or with bad grace, reconciled to accepting the responsibilities of citizenship and to taking their turn in the Jury Box. The way, however, in which Jury Lists are compiled and the circumstances under which far larger numbers are summoned than are ever required, constitute a real grievance for the busy man or woman. We heard last week of the case of a woman who has been summoned three times in four years, for a week each time, to serve as a special Juror in the King's Bench Division, and though she had to be present four mornings on each of the last two occasions she was not called into the box once; at least five times as many jurors were summoned as were needed, and it is safe to say that over half were in the same position as our unfortunate correspondent. This great waste of time should and could be avoided.

Medical Examination in Factories.

The Home Secretary has appointed a Committee to inquire into the working of the provisions of the Factory and Workshops Acts for the medical examination of young persons. Mr. Rhys J. Davies, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, is Chairman,

and Miss Rose Squire, of the Home Office, whose fine record of service to women in industry requires no comment, is Secretary. Mrs. Rackham, J.P., who needs no introduction to our readers, is the only woman on the Committee. Mrs. Rackham has peculiar qualifications for this appointment, as in addition to wide experience in public and social work in other directions, she was one of a staff of temporary Inspectors of Factories appointed during the war. We welcome this important inquiry, and note with satisfaction that the terms of reference include the co-ordination of the various medical inspection services and the provision of special medical supervision of those engaged in processes unfavourable to health.

A Unique Summer School.

The Save the Children Fund is organizing a Summer School, to be held in Geneva from 2nd August to 16th August, which will give an opportunity to combine a visit to the Headquarters of the League of Nations under guidance with a delightful Riviera holiday at comparatively small cost. Full particulars may be had at 72 Langham Place, W. 1.

1923 The Professional Year.

In connexion with our article on this subject in a recent issue it is interesting to note that the first licence to practise taken out by a woman solicitor was dated January, 1923. Although she had passed her finals the previous Autumn, Mrs. Crofts was therefore not eligible to practise until the first week in January of last year, when she was also duly enrolled the first woman member of the Law Society.

Saint Joan.

By the time this issue is in the hands of its readers, Mr. Bernard Shaw's new play *Saint Joan* will have been acted for the first time in this country at the New Theatre. We have awaited its production with keen interest and high hopes. Mr. Shaw has shown his capacity for handling, in grim earnestness, the theme of religious belief, and its reaction on human conduct. Meanwhile, Miss Sybil Thorndike, who plays the part of Joan of Arc, has shown her capacity for handling any part which comes her way. We believe that between them they will make a fine thing of an almost untranslatable fine theme, and we hope to give some account of their results in a later issue.

Oxford and the Old Vic.

Oxford University has decided to confer an Honorary Degree upon Miss Lilian Bayliss, in recognition of her dramatic and educational work as Manager of the Old Vic Theatre. Under her auspices, month in, month out, the London public is assured of a continuous supply of Shakespeare and grand opera, at prices which make both available to the great mass of people who live within reach of the Waterloo Road. Thanks to the Old Vic the present generation of Londoners has had the opportunity of hearing Mozart's "Don Giovanni" and Ibsen's "Peer Gynt"—masterpieces whose existence, for one reason or another, is habitually ignored by West End theatrical enterprise. In recognizing the work of this most energetic, able, and public-spirited woman, Oxford University shows both sound sense and artistic feeling. We congratulate both the givers and the recipient of the honorary degree.

Women Police.

On Thursday, 20th March, in reply to a question by Mrs. Wintingham, the Home Secretary stated that Miss Clayden has been appointed as senior woman police officer for London, to whom matters affecting the welfare and conditions of service of women police in the Metropolis can be brought, and that she has been given the rank of inspector. To those who are conversant with the organization of the police force, this answer is far from satisfactory. An inspector is not of sufficiently high rank to meet the situation; what is needed is the appointment of a woman Superintendent and women officers. The root of the trouble is that the recommendations of the Home Office Committee on women police have never been put into force, and as we have pointed out before now, the position of the women police is on a thoroughly unsound basis. A deputation to discuss the whole question has been organized by the National Council of Women, and will be received at the Home Office whilst this paragraph is in the press. We will hope to have more satisfactory information on this subject to give next week.

Married Women Teachers.

We learn with regret that the Norfolk Education Committee have decided to follow in the footsteps of the L.C.C. and to discontinue their present practice of employing married women

teachers. The resolutions passed, however, give some loophole for exceptional cases. Women on marriage will be required to resign, and their reappointment will be considered "in view of all the circumstances relating to the particular school"—not apparently in view of their personal circumstances. No further appointments of women assistants will be made except in special cases. Married women teachers now in the Committee's employ may be allowed to remain so long as their work is reported upon as efficient. The amendment to continue the present system was only defeated by eight votes to six.

A Eugenic Experiment.

Those interested in eugenics should follow with interest the work of an office established in Vienna some eighteen months ago by Professor Tandler for the purpose of giving advice to persons about to marry. The intention of the office is to preach the necessity for avoiding the production of diseased and unsound children, to stimulate the conscience (as well as the knowledge) of the public in this respect. Professor Tandler appears to be well satisfied with the success of his office, which is kept fully employed, most of its clients being tuberculous or otherwise unsound persons.

What Public Opinion can do.

A correspondent writes:—

Some little time ago it was reported in the papers that at the next meeting of the City Licensing Bench in Liverpool two leading caterers were about to apply for licences to sell drink on the premises of their cafés. Steps were immediately taken to present a petition against the granting of such an application. Many organizations, such as the National Council of Women, Mothers' Union, Girls' Friendly Societies, as well as the more strictly temperance organizations, uniting in the efforts. An influential petition was signed by 33,800 people, including the Bishop of Liverpool, the Archbishop of Liverpool, Liverpool Members of Parliament, over 2,000 schoolteachers, and many private citizens. In view of this evidence of public opinion, one caterer withdrew his application and the Justices, without leaving the Bench, unanimously rejected the application of the other.

Hospital Treatment and Women Workers.

A conference was organized recently by the Hospital Saving Association at 3 Grosvenor Place, by invitation of Viscount Hambleden, Chairman of the Association, with Lady Emmott in the chair, to consider the proposed scheme with special reference to women workers. The object of this scheme, on which we hope shortly to secure an article, is to enable men and women of limited incomes by means of a small fixed weekly payment to secure free treatment in hospital for themselves and their dependents. Hitherto the scheme has spread mainly among men workers, and proposals are on foot to popularize it among women.

Women on Hospital Committees.

At the recent annual meeting of the Elizabeth Garrett Anderson Hospital, Mrs. Fawcett referred to the spirit of courage and adventure which had characterized her sister, its founder. Mrs. Fawcett thought that the possession of the same qualities which make for success on the Committee of Management might be due to the fact that there was an equal number of men and women on the Committee. She considered such an arrangement so "sensible and natural" that she wondered why it was not adopted in all hospitals.

Women in Medicine.

In October of this year the London (Royal Free Hospital) School of Medicine for women celebrates its Jubilee. On Saturday, 25th October, a thanksgiving service will be held in St. Paul's Cathedral. The most recent addition to some notable books dealing with the pioneer work of women in medicine, Mrs. Scharlieb's book *Reminiscences*,¹ which we will review at an early issue, makes a timely appearance in this Jubilee year, and we recommend our readers to include it in their list of books for Easter holiday reading.

POLICY.—The sole policy of THE WOMAN'S LEADER is to advocate a real equality of liberties, status and opportunities between men and women. So far as space permits, however, it will offer an impartial platform for topics not directly included in the objects of the women's movement, but of special interest to women. Articles on these subjects will always be signed, at least by initials or a pseudonym, and for the opinions expressed in them the Editor accepts no responsibility.

¹ *Reminiscences*—Mary Scharlieb, M.D.M.S. Williams and Norgate, 12s. 6d.

PLEDGES AND PERSECUTION.

Notice was given in the House of Commons the other day of a resolution to be moved in a fortnight "to call attention to the increasing habit of the persecution of Members and candidates by means of questionnaires," and in the course of the debate on Ranker Officers the Prime Minister spoke with some asperity of the "growing custom of throwing long questionnaires at candidates." We will await the debate with interest, if it ever comes off, and in the meantime it may be useful to consider the use and abuse of questionnaires both from the angle of the candidate—more especially the successful candidate—as well as from the angle of the elector or organized group of electors.

The case against questionnaires was stated in an article by a Member of Parliament entitled "The Gentle Art of Pledge Extraction," which appeared in a widely read contemporary during the week. Even *The Observer* yesterday devoted a few contemptuous lines to what it calls "officious interrogatories," and remarks that if all Members of Parliament had the courage, like Mr. Baldwin, to throw them in the wastepaper basket, they would save themselves both trouble and mortification. We join issue with this view; we make a distinction between "pledge extractions," as described in the article alluded to, and the legitimate request for pledges from candidates by voters desirous of knowing whether they can count on their support on certain questions. We think it is absurd to talk of "the wholly undemocratic and immoral theory of government by questionnaires." Westminster has occupied such a prominent place in the eyes of the public lately that it is interesting in this connection to recall that when John Stuart Mill came forward as a candidate for Westminster, in the 'sixties, he circulated a lengthy and elaborate statement of his own personal opinions to the electors, who were expected to elect or reject him on those terms. The average candidate is no John Stuart Mill, with a reasoned political philosophy of his own. He adopts a much humbler policy; he accepts the programme of his party, and is very properly quite prepared to state his opinions in response to inquiries on matters not specifically dealt with in his election address. Moreover, he not unnaturally assumes that matters which are not brought before his attention in this way do not specially concern or interest his constituents, and this assumption is reflected in his future speeches in the House of Commons. We cannot see a shred of reason in a case against the reasonable use of questionnaires or requests for pledges, though like everything else in this mortal life they are liable to abuse and misuse.

NEWS FROM WESTMINSTER.

By OUR PARLIAMENTARY CORRESPONDENT.

Writing in London it is perhaps natural to begin with what is exercising the minds of all Londoners, namely, the bus and tram strike. The press is full of photographs and articles all emphasizing the good-humoured way in which the public is taking the situation, but though there are episodes which may provide opportunity for journalistic wit and complacency, the fact remains that thousands of people are enduring most serious inconvenience and unnecessary fatigue. The Government have been faced with a difficult situation. The companies declared that higher wages were a financial impossibility without higher fares, but any rise in fares would be most unwelcome to what one may call the non-motoring section of the community, above all to the working classes. It seemed as if there were a real cleavage of interest between the transport workers and the rest of the workers of London, which would produce an unpleasant problem for any Labour Government to solve. The situation, however, has been improved, and the way for the Government made much easier by Lord Ashfield's announcement that he believed the financial situation of the bus and tram companies would be materially altered if the passenger services were co-ordinated, and that he would be prepared to enter into negotiations with the men if the Government promised legislation to introduce a centralized system of public control. Mr. Bevin was hopeful that Lord Ashfield's pronouncement would open the way not only to the granting of higher wages, but also to the ending of the chaotic condition of London's public transport services. The Government is already producing a Bill, but meanwhile the strike continues. In the general hope that some way out of the impasse may be found, it is important not to lose sight of one important statement made by Mr. Bevin, namely, that the men's claim could not be qualified by the ability of the undertakings to pay. This really raises one of the most important questions which sooner or later the Government will have to

We do, however, consider forcing pledges out of members at the point of the pistol a most objectionable practice and a method of bringing pressure to bear on candidates which is liable to defeat its own ends. Possibly some electors, or groups of electors, representing that very small section of the community whose "trade is its politics" prefer to vote for a puppet who can be pulled by strings, and who will glibly answer "yes" or "no" as may be desired to every question, however complicated or technical in character. We think, however, that the vast majority of the electorate will not be imposed upon by dictated pledges. Further, it appears to us utter folly to talk of "Members going to Parliament having sworn away their reason, bound hand and foot to every petty section and interest, to every crank and enthusiast, to every class or breed." We are convinced that the majority of questioners, or organized groups of questioners, respect honest uncertainty or a frank avowal of ignorance, especially when, as is so often the case, it is accompanied by a genuine readiness to discuss the matter fully, should need arise, with those who advocate it, and we are further convinced that the majority of candidates appreciate this and approach their questioners with no craven fears of the disastrous results of honesty on their part.

From the point of view of the candidate we should imagine there is a great deal to be said for the questionnaire. We recall one candidate who printed at his own expense a list of questions sent him by a non-party woman's organization, with his replies, and distributed it throughout the whole constituency during the election. We can imagine a methodical candidate filing and indexing all the questionnaires he has received under subject headings, and when a particular subject on which he has been questioned is to be dealt with in Parliament taking the opportunity of getting in touch with the organization which has approached him. Questionnaires received from genuine constituents—we sympathize with the candidate who refuses to deal with any others—are a guide to their interests and concerns which a good Member cannot afford to ignore. Surely all that is necessary is moral courage, not to throw the questionnaire into the wastepaper basket but to deal with it frankly, giving affirmative or negative replies if convinced, and qualifying other promises of support or opposition on points on which more knowledge is required by some proviso which will guarantee his freedom of action in the future. We have, however, admitted that the questionnaire habit is liable to abuse; the discussion of this must, however, be held over for a future issue.

This is not the first occasion on which the Trade Union leaders have made it clear that they consider the payment of a standard of wages to be more important than the maintenance of an industry on an economically self-supporting basis. Recent governments have also had to deal with the problem in certain cases, but as the result of war conditions. Mr. Bevin, apparently, would apply the subsidy principle to normal conditions—if our present conditions can be called normal. The Government for the moment is saved from having to decide whether all industries shall be self-supporting or whether certain of the stronger unions shall be allowed to override this principle. It is possible, as we suggested last week, that the question may still arise in connexion with the coal mining industry.

During last week questions connected with Wembley have figured largely in the House. There was again discussion on the much discussed question of Sunday opening, but the chief point was the question of Lord Parmoor's letter with regard to a Free Trade exhibit. It is clear from the Prime Minister's statement that as a matter of fact Lord Parmoor did not even see the letter that was sent out in his name by the North-Western Free Trade Union, but that hardly affects the general question. There can be little criticism of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald's contention that any member of the Government has a perfect right to hold office in a society for the furtherance or protection of such an object as Free Trade, seeing that it is one of the chief planks of the Government's policy, and if one of the committees of the exhibition is prepared to allot space for a Free Trade exhibit really very little can be said. The Conservatives, however, said a good deal, chiefly through Sir Philip Lloyd-Greame, and said it with some acidity.

[The views expressed in this column are those of our Parliamentary correspondent, and are not our editorial opinion. Like so many other things in this paper they are expressly controversial, and comment upon them will be welcomed.—Ed.]

WHAT I REMEMBER.¹ XXIX.

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

1883 and 1885 (continued).

Mrs. Butler's victory was an immense encouragement to us; for her task had been immeasurably more difficult than ours, and her triumph helped us to believe that all things were possible. I think her victory also had its part in promoting the success of Mr. W. T. Stead's crusade in 1885. In the summer of that year the whole world was thrilled and shaken by the publication in the *Pall Mall Gazette* of a series of articles called *The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon*. They were written by the Editor, Mr. Stead, and with all the skill and force of an accomplished journalist exposed the horrors which were then daily and nightly taking place in London; the sale of young girls for the purposes of prostitution. There was a howl of rage from some sections of Society, and a cry of thankfulness and hope from others, which perceived that if these horrors were to be coped with successfully they must first be made known. Stead was an Imperialist, but, as he defined the term himself, his Imperialism was an Imperialism of responsibility, an Imperialism, as he phrased it, based on common sense and the Ten Commandments.

Now for several years good men in both Houses of Parliament had been trying to pass a Criminal Law Amendment Bill, giving additional protection to young children. The age of consent at that time was only 13, one of the infamous facilities for wrong doing allowed by the existing law. Lord Shaftesbury was the moving spirit in the committee of the House of Lords which had considered the subject and had drafted an amending Bill. He had successfully piloted this Bill through all its stages in the Upper House in 1884, only to see it wrecked in the House of Commons, where it was talked out, counted out, and finally destroyed. The same process appeared to be imminent in 1885. The then City Chamberlain, Mr. Benjamin Scott, accompanied by Mrs. Josephine Butler, went to Mr. Stead and implored his help. He said he would inquire into the facts and see what could be done. Mr. Gladstone's Government had just been defeated, and a new Conservative Government was in power. It so happened that Mr. Stead had a personal friend in this Government. He consulted this friend, and asked, "Was there any chance of the new Government taking up the Bill and carrying it?" The answer was decisive and emphatic, "Not the slightest."

Then Stead went to the head of the Criminal Investigation Department, Sir Howard Vincent, and inquired about the facts. Was it possible, he said, that wretched parents should sell their girl children when turned 13 for the express purpose of prostitution, and that there was nothing in the law to prevent it? Sir Howard replied that it was perfectly possible and of frequent occurrence. Stead burst out, "It is enough to rouse Hell," to which Sir Howard replied, "It does not even rouse the neighbours." Stead there and then determined it should rouse all England, and he himself undertook to simulate the purchaser of such a child, protecting himself and the child by the presence of witnesses of unimpeachable character who were able to prove that the child had been cared for and her safety protected all through, and then to tell her story, as perhaps only he could tell it, of how a little girl just turned 13, could be bought and sold for prostitution in Christian England without let or hindrance from the law. This narrative he published in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, the story came out daily from 6th to 12th July, 1885. The effect was instantaneous and world wide. The articles set all London and the whole country in a blaze of indignation. The Bill, which a few weeks previously the Government had said they could not touch, and was consequently regarded as hopeless, was now revised and strengthened and passed into law with the utmost dispatch. One man, single handed, had coerced an unwilling legislature and a reluctant Ministry. But Stead's enemies, and they were many, were determined on revenge. In the course of his crusade he had withdrawn a little girl from her home without her father's consent, the mother's consent did not count; the father's consent had never been asked. It mattered nothing that the child had been protected and sheltered at every turn from any possible evil befalling her. Stead was believed to have broken the law, and could, and should bear the penalty. The jury found Stead guilty, but on pronouncing their verdict, added that they recommended him to mercy, as they wished to put on record their high appreciation of the services he had rendered the nation by securing the passage of a much needed law for the protection of young girls. This also availed

¹ This article is one of a series which will extend over several weeks.

nothing; he was sentenced to three months' imprisonment as an ordinary criminal. [It was afterwards proved that the child in question had been born out of wedlock, and that, therefore, whoever her father was, he had no legal rights over her.] There was a tremendous outburst of public indignation at this outrageous sentence. Stead alone was tranquil and happy. He wrote to Dr. Clifford from prison, "I am full of joy as to the present, and of hope and confidence as to the future." He sent out Christmas cards bearing the words, "God, even my God, hath anointed me with the oil of gladness above my fellows." All the details of this wonderful series of events should be read in Miss Estelle Stead's little book, entitled *My Father* (Nelson & Sons). In the meantime, Stead's friends were not idle. A defence fund of several thousand pounds was raised. Public meetings of protest against the sentence were held. I took the unusual step of writing to Sir Henry Ponsonby, Queen Victoria's Private Secretary, asking that Her Majesty should give orders that while Stead was in prison he should receive the treatment of a first class misdemeanant. In the course of my letter I said, "I yesterday saw the Rev. B. Waugh, after he had had an interview with Mr. Stead in prison. Mr. Stead was in the ordinary cotton prison dress, and appeared to be extremely cold (the date was 12th November, 1885). His cell is very dark; it contains a Bible, but the cell is so dark it is impossible to read it. . . . He was very cheerful when Mr. Waugh saw him, and complains of nothing and desires his friends not to complain for him. The warder treats him with respect and kindness. His being thus subjected to ordinary prison discipline will be the more noticeable because Mr. Valentine Baker and Mr. Edmund Yates during their terms of imprisonment were treated as first class misdemeanants."

Sir Henry Ponsonby replied from Balmoral without delay, "I was certainly surprised to read in the newspapers the statements relating to Mr. Stead's imprisonment, and I can understand your writing on the subject." He then proceeded to explain to me the Constitutional position (of which I was not ignorant), namely, that Her Majesty could take no political action without the advice of her Secretary of State. But his letter continued, "As soon as I received your letter, I telegraphed to the Secretary of State, and was glad to receive a reply from him this evening that Mr. Stead had been placed in a higher class and would therefore be saved from the severe treatment he at first received." I felt deeply thankful for this friendly and prompt action.

The deep interest and the intense indignation aroused by what we all believed to be a plot against Stead, intended to penalize him for one of the best actions which a man could perform, did not die down because the intended victim had become a first class misdemeanant. Indignation meetings were held which Mrs. Josephine Butler and Mrs. Booth, wife of General Booth of the Salvation Army, addressed, and at which I took a subordinate part. On the afternoon of a day fixed for a Stead Defence Meeting in Exeter Hall, at which I had promised to speak, I had a call from an old friend, Mr. Auberon Herbert. I did not see him, for it was the late afternoon, and I had gone to lie down in preparation for the evening meeting. He apparently feared that this meant that I was not coming, and he sent me up an urgent message. I scribbled a note, "Dear Mr. Herbert, if I am alive I shall be there." Though he probably did not know it, this was an exact reproduction of his own reply a few years earlier to my husband, who was urging him not to risk his life by facing the jingo crowd in Hyde Park, which was then, 1877, backing the Turk against the Russian. He had already had one marvellous escape from the mob, which had chased him down to the Serpentine and would have had great pleasure in drowning him in it. His wife and sister had been quite unsuccessful in urging him not to risk his life by repeating the experiment. These ladies thought my husband might succeed where they had failed, so Harry got Mr. Herbert into a quiet corner and poured out every argument at his command to induce him to desist, pointing out that a man with a wife and young children should not expose himself to assault and possible death where no practical good was likely to result. Mr. Herbert listened in silence, and when my husband paused for a moment, said in the quietest, gentlest voice, "Dear Fawcett, if I am alive I shall be there."

The enthusiasm roused by Stead's revelations did not burn itself out in empty denunciations, whether of rage or vengeance. It had permanent results. The National Vigilance Association

(Continued on foot of next page).

SEPARATE TAXATION OF MARRIED PERSONS.

The principle underlying the plea that married persons should be separately taxed is too clear to need any elaborate discussion here. At present the incomes of husband and wife are regarded as one and taxed accordingly, with the result that in many cases married couples pay more income tax than two single persons with the same income. It is a manifest anomaly that a married woman's income should be regarded as part of her husband's, since the absorption of the two incomes is in direct contradiction of the ideas involved in the Married Woman's Property Act. Moreover, it is both unjust and socially inexpedient that married persons should pay more than their due share of taxation. It is not a sufficient argument to say that a joint household lends to certain economies, and that therefore married persons can bear extra taxation, since this would apply equally to other joint households, as for example when a mother and daughter live together. In point of fact, the expenses of married couples on the whole are greater than that of other persons living together, owing to the cost of rearing and educating a family; yet in spite of this added cost, and in spite of the importance of the family in the life of the nation, it is the married couples who pay additional taxation. At present the state allows abatements for income tax purposes for all children under 16 years of age, but in reality the apparent benefit of these abatements may be partially, or even wholly, wiped out by the extra burden of taxation already placed on the couple by the existing methods of taxation.

The application of the principle of separate taxation involves certain difficulties. At present a marriage allowance of £90 is made, that is to say, a married man whose wife has an unearned income deducts £90 from the total sum on which he would otherwise be liable to pay income tax. The question then arises, what would be the combined effect of taxing husband and wife separately, and abolishing the marriage allowance? A little consideration will show that the couple might be worse off than under the present system by which they are jointly taxed. If the wife's income were under £90 it would not be liable to income tax at all,¹ were she separately taxed; but the fact that it would be tax free would not compensate for the loss of the marriage allowance. The present system is therefore the more profitable. In cases where the wife is earning, an additional allowance is made of nine-tenths of her earnings, up to a maximum of £45, and 10 per cent of the earnings are exempted as earned income relief. This means that if she were earning £150 the whole of it, under the present system, would be covered by the allowances (i.e. £90 plus £45 plus £15 earned income relief). Consequently the present system with its allowances is preferable to separate taxation, when the wife is earning under £150, since here also the total exemption of the wife's income would not suffice to make good the loss of these allowances. In other words the rigid application of the principle of separate taxation would involve higher taxation for all couples where the wife has an unearned income under £90, or an earned income under £150. It seems highly undesirable to introduce a change which would involve higher payments in income tax in the many cases where the wife's income falls below these limits, especially as they are the cases where any addition to the income tax would be most severely felt. Consequently the Sub-Committee that has been considering the question has recommended a scheme which would allow all married couples the choice of being either jointly or separately taxed.

The proposal has been made that instead of giving married couples the choice of being jointly or separately taxed they should in all cases be separately taxed, but that the marriage allowance of £90 should in all cases be continued, as an assistance to an all-important section of the community. This scheme may seem to many people to put married couples in an unduly favourable position compared with single persons. It would seem to imply that marriage in itself is an expense which needs pecuniary compensation in the form of decreased taxation. But the existence of a wife as unpaid housekeeper in many cases reduces, rather than increases, the cost of living for a man, especially when she has some income of her own, as is here assumed. The question of the cost of a family does not arise here, as this is taken into account in the allowances for children.

W. A. ELKIN.

¹ Unearned incomes under £135 and earned incomes under £150 are tax free.

WOMEN "VAGRANTS."

On 5th October there appeared in the *WOMAN'S LEADER* an article by Theodore Dodd, J.P., stating that a re-codification of Vagrancy Law is going forward, and that women's organizations should press for certain reforms.

It is not generally known that the word "vagrant" is a most unfair description of those making use of what is known as the "Tramp Ward"—especially in the case of women. The Law of Settlement created an artificial distinction between the pauper with a "settlement"—and therefore entitled to "in"-relief or "out"-relief; and the "casual pauper." The usual method of application for relief, namely application to a Relieving Officer, and then appearance before the Board of Guardians, at an interval of a day or two, often automatically places a homeless person among "Casual Paupers." Of course, in cases of great hardship the Master has power of admission, as, for example, in the case of a pregnant woman. But as the Vagrancy Law was put in force in 1824, and the last century has been one which has seen all the development of industrial migration, it is evident that the class of paupers without a settlement has increased. To acquire a settlement, a year of residence is required. Large sums of public money are still spent on transferring paupers to their "place of settlement."

It is evident that not all "Casual Paupers" are "vagrants", and also that since a woman often marries a man who is not a native of her Union, she loses her own settlement and may not acquire one for some little time. But besides this, since 1824, a number of offences have been placed under the Vagrancy Law, and a man or woman may become "an idle and disorderly person," a "rogue and a vagabond," and an "incorrigible rogue" on the third offence. Meanwhile, the whole apparatus of "Casual Wards" has arisen to deal with "Casual Paupers." The Interdepartmental Committee on Vagrancy condemned the whole system in 1906 as "neither deterrent nor reformatory." Yet in the re-codification now going forward the system is left intact!

It is, perhaps, too much to hope for radical reformation, which would require legislation, though as an integral part of the problem of unemployment it is much to be desired. But I would urge a very simple reform, namely, that in the re-codification, the regulations for women should be codified separately from the regulations for men. Their problems are not the same. Few women are voluntarily "Vagrants" or "Tramps." The "homeless woman" may fall into the Tramp Ward through misfortune—lodging accommodation for women is lamentably deficient. While in the Ward, nine hours' scrubbing and cleaning (a charwoman's day's work) may be required of her. She is only entitled to the very meagre diet of a vagrant, whatever work she does. She may be dismissed at an hour at which she cannot look for work. Yet, if she claims another night's shelter, she is liable to four days' detention and hard work on the meagre diet. Old women "wandering to their own hurt" are also technically "vagrants." So are little children.

The simple reform of a separate codification of males and females (with children) might lead in time to better knowledge of the real needs of these unfortunates, compelled by sheer necessity to take refuge in the Female Tramp Ward or forced into the vagrant life by the necessity of "tramping" to another Ward for the next night's shelter.

MARY HIGGS.

Author of *Glimpses into the Abyss*.

WHAT I REMEMBER.

(Continued from previous page).

was formed and practically led for the rest of its life by a very remarkable man, Mr. W. A. Coote, formerly a compositor on *The Standard* newspaper. He had extraordinary gifts for the work he had undertaken, an unbounded faith in goodness, unflinching good manners, making his appeal always to what was highest and best in men and women. He was as wonderful in his way as Stead was in his. His organization, national at first, gradually became international, and much of the good work now being done internationally through the League of Nations in restricting and preventing the Traffic in Women and Children had its root and origin in the work done by W. A. Coote and the Association of which he was the life and soul.²

² For up-to-date information on this point see *The Vigilance Record* for article by the present Secretary of the V.A., Miss A. Baker.

PUT NOT YOUR TRUST IN PARTIES.

Presidential Address given at the Annual Council Meeting of The National Union for Equal Citizenship, on 26th March, 1924, by Miss Eleanor Rathbone.

Those of us who were engaged in the Suffrage Movement had a long training in the part of Sisyphus. Over and over again we rolled our great measure of enfranchisement very nearly to the top of the hill, only to see it slip from our grasp and roll to the bottom again. Hence of all the excellent cartoons which appeared from time to time in *Punch* dealing with the suffrage issue, none went home to us so much as one which depicted the Woman Suffragist after one of these mishaps, surveying her precious barrel and exclaiming ruefully, "Don't talk to me of Sisyphus! he wasn't a woman." When we gained our votes, some of us thought we had done playing that part for ever. But experience soon taught us that it has only changed its character a little. Instead of our efforts being concentrated on one great big measure of enfranchisement, we have found ourselves in charge of some half a dozen smaller measures, each containing a separate brand of the precious elixir of Equal Citizenship. All these have got somehow to be safely lodged on the top of Constitution Hill. Sometimes a small measure has got to the top after the first effort. More often after a measure has been slowly and painfully pushed up part of the way, the end of the Session has found it stuck fast, or a premature dissolution of Parliament has dashed it to the bottom again, and in either case, all our work has to begin afresh.

We have now had six years of this sort of experience, and it is time to take stock of our gains. During the first year we had behind us the strong wind of the Reconstruction Spirit, and our measures were fairly blown to the top of the hill with scarcely any effort on our part. By the end of it women were already eligible to sit in the House of Commons. In the pre-war days it used to be prophesied that at least a generation would intervene between the granting of votes to women and this reform. During the same year the University of Oxford, with a magnificently large and generous gesture, threw its gates wide open to women. During 1919, the Reconstruction Spirit was still blowing, but counter currents had begun to make themselves felt. The Women's Emancipation Bill introduced by the Labour Party, besides granting the franchise to women on the same terms as to men, would have given to Peeresses the right to sit in the House of Lords and have opened to women all civil and judicial offices and posts under the Crown and both the legal professions. The history of the Bill showed the favourable state of public opinion. It passed through Committee without a single amendment being raised, and was given a third reading in the teeth of the Government's opposition. After its first reading in the House of Lords, it was side-tracked by the introduction into that House of a Government measure—The Sex Disqualification (Removal) Act. This was a much smaller measure, but nevertheless it secured one substantial advance—the admission of women to all branches of the legal profession and to jury service which did not involve membership of the House of Lords. The same year saw the election of Lady Astor as the first Woman Member of Parliament. On the other hand, there was evidence of a growing wave of opposition to the employment of women in industry and the professions, and through the Pre-War Practices Act a legal bar was for the first time placed against the employment of women in many industries. Though a temporary measure made in fulfilment of a war-time pledge, and therefore not resisted by women's organizations, this was said by many to be a dangerous innovation.

During 1920 the period of trade depression and unemployment began, and we found ourselves full in the midst of reaction. The glow of enthusiasm that had burned in men's hearts had faded away, leaving only grey cinders—excellent material for the paving-stones out of which the road to a certain place is said to be made. From then onward very little actual progress has been made. The forces of the woman's movement have been strong enough to resist any tendency to take away privileges once definitely given, but not strong enough to secure fresh instalments of justice, except in very small fragments. In the N.U.S.E.C. Report of 1919, one finds the very same reforms under discussion for which we are now struggling—equal franchise, equal guardianship, widows' pensions. With the addition of the reform of the Separation and Maintenance Orders system, which we embodied in a Bill in 1920, these are the Bills at which we have been working ever since, and we have been back again at our old task, rolling our barrels up the hill and seeing them roll down again at the end of each Session. Nevertheless, there

has been one reform, important in principle though not perhaps affecting a very large number of cases, which achieved an easy and speedy victory through the Matrimonial Causes Amendment Act of last year. We owe that specially to the presence of our Parliamentary Secretary, Mrs. Hubback, who suggested the idea to our Executive and with some legal assistance drafted the Bill and succeeded in inducing Major Entwistle to become its sponsor in the House. There have also been the small Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1922, and the Bastardy Act of 1923. But perhaps the greatest achievement of last year was the return to Parliament of our eight women M.P.s, which has put the question of women in Parliament on quite a new footing in the eyes of the Party organizers and wire-pullers, who are convinced by nothing but accomplished facts.

When the present Government came into power at the beginning of this year our hopes ran high. Whatever our party sympathies might be individually, we must all have felt that for the cause of equal citizenship, the return of a Labour Government to office should presage great things. Was not the Labour Party pledged, not only by the explicit terms of its Election programme (we all know that election programmes are written not in marking ink, but in a fluid warranted to fade in the shortest possible time after the election is over), but by everything that can or should bind a party—its fundamental principles and traditions, its declarations individual and collective in Parliament, and from a thousand platforms—to nearly every item in our programme. We have by no means given up hope yet that this first view may prove the true one, and no one will wish to form too hasty a judgment on a Party taking office under such exceptional circumstances, a minority party dependent on the support of others and bound therefore to move with even greater caution than other Governments new to office. But the events of the last few weeks have certainly given us qualms and have sometimes caused us to rub our eyes in astonishment.

The greatest surprise has been the Government's attitude on the question of equal franchise. Instead of the Government measure which we had reason confidently to expect (were it not that old suffragists have learnt to expect nothing), we found ourselves confronted with a debate on a Private Members' Bill, moved by a supporter of the Government, and doubtless consequently in that well-disciplined Party, with the Government's consent. Yet the first speech in the debate by a Minister was that of Mr. Rhys Davies who "could give no indication now as to what the attitude of the Government would be if the Bill is sent to a Committee upstairs," and further drew attention to the fact (as though warning the House of an unforeseen danger) that it would involve the enfranchisement of a large number of domestic servants and placed the women voters in a majority in the country. Then followed Mr. Clynes with the assurance that "if the Committee genuinely wishes to extend these rights to the women of the country, the Government will not be behind in endeavouring to find time to pass the Bill into law." If the Committee genuinely wishes! Has the Government then no mind of its own on this question? One's mind flashes back to the days of the Conciliation Bill, and again to the months that preceded the passage of the Representation of the People Act, when it was brought home to us that it was only at a considerable sacrifice that the Labour Party could bring itself to accept anything less than complete adult suffrage, and again to the Party's own Women's Emancipation Bill which passed through the House of Commons in the teeth of the Government's Whips. We have not forgotten the reminder which speakers from the front bench so frequently give the House, and especially their own followers in it, that a party in office must speak with a new sense of responsibility. But has a party in office no responsibility towards its principles and past professions and pledges? Are its members expected to quaff the waters of Lethe before kissing hands? Here is a measure which, so far as the woman's part of it is concerned, would undoubtedly command a majority in the House, would take very little Parliamentary time, and involve the country in no considerable expenditure. If the Government lets "I dare not wait upon I would" with regard to such a measure, what have they courage for?

Then again, there is our Equal Guardianship Bill, involving some technically difficult points and incurring some opposition, mainly from permanent officials wedded to Conservative traditions, but embodying a principle so unquestionably just that it

has more than once received a second reading without a division. What are the Government going to do about that? Hitherto there have been no signs that they are going to do anything.

Then there is the cause of Widows' Pensions, which the Labour Party claims to have made peculiarly its own. A measure, it is true, will cost the country money, possibly from £10,000,000 to £20,000,000 per annum, according to its scope. But are we going to hear from a Labour Chancellor of the Exchequer that the country can afford to strengthen its Air Force and build five new cruisers but cannot afford, in spite of an unexpectedly satisfactory surplus, to find bread for its widowed mothers and fatherless children? One can imagine the scorn which our old and true friend Mr. Snowden—one of the best friends women have ever had in Parliament—would in his private capacity have poured on such an estimate of relative values. It is true that the Government has definitely promised to deal with this reform—some time. But knowing the precariousness of their own tenure, might we not have expected them to show a noble impatience, a determination that though it would be their last act they would make this reform once for all safe from the changes and chances of political strife?

We do not make these criticisms in a cynical or pessimistic spirit. We still hope. But it is our duty at this Annual Council meeting not only to take stock of our past gains and of our internal equipment but to make a sober and impartial survey of future prospects, and if we seem to see weaknesses or dangers—whether on the surface or hidden, whether due to our own defects or those of others—we must speak plainly about these things and consider how they can be remedied. All I have been saying merely confirms a truth which past experience has repeatedly brought home to us, that while our cause may have more affinity with some forms of political belief than with others, it cannot really be identified with any political party, since it here appeals to sympathies, and there arouses prejudices, which are independent of party of class or time, and lie very deep down in masculine human nature. Therefore we would do well, while showing gratitude to our supporters and trust in our tried friends, not to let either emotion lull us into over confidence. Let us keep our political armour bright and our powder dry. We are a long way from the Millennium yet.

STANDING COMMITTEE A.

We give below the list of names of the Standing Committee of the House of Commons which will be considering the Representation of the People Act (1918) Amendment Bill. The Legitimacy and Summary Jurisdiction Separation and Maintenance Bills have been transferred to Standing Committee B.

Name of Member.	Party.	Constituency.
Allen, R. W.	L.	Leicester, S.
Allen, Sir W.	U.U.	Armagh (Ireland).
Atholl, Duchess of	U.	Kinross and W. Perth.
Ayles, W. H.	Lab.	Bristol, N.
Birchall, Major J. D.	U.	Leeds, N.E.
Brown, A. E.	L.	Rugby.
Buchanan, G.	Lab.	Gorbals.
Buckle, J.	Lab.	Eccles.
Burnie, Major	L.	Bootle.
Chapman, Sir S.	U.	Edinburgh, S.
Colfox, Major	U.	Dorset, W.
Davies, E.	L.	Denbigh.
Davies, T.	U.	Cirencester and Tewkesbury.
Dickson, T.	Lab.	Lanark.
Dixey, A. C.	U.	Penrith and Cockermouth.
Eden, Capt.	U.	Warwick and Leamington.
Emlyn-Jones, J. E.	L.	Dorset, N.
Fremantle, Col.	U.	St. Albans.
Groves, T. E.	Lab.	Stratford.
Grundy, T. W.	Lab.	Rother Valley.
Harris, P. A.	L.	Bethnal Green.
Hobhouse, A. L.	L.	Wells.
Hopkinson, A.	I.L.	Mossley.
Jackson, R. F.	Lab.	Ipswich.
Johastone, H.	L.	Willesden.
Jones, T. J. Maedy	Lab.	Pontypridd.
Kay, Sir R.	L.	Elland.
Lamb, J. Q.	U.	Stone.
Law, A.	Lab.	Bolton.
McEntee, V. L.	Lab.	Walthamstow.
Marley, J.	Lab.	St. Pancras.
Meller, R. J.	U.	Mitcham.
Millar, J. D.	L.	Fife, E.
Mitchell, R. M.	L.	Perth.
Morrison, H.	Lab.	Hackney, S.
Pease, Ald. W. F.	U.	Darlington.
Percy, Lord E.	U.	Hastings.
Pilditch, Sir P.	U.	Spelthorne.
Roberts, S.	U.	Hereford.

Name of Member.	Party.	Constituency.
Scott, Sir Leslie	U.	Liverpool Exchange.
Sheffield, Sir B.	U.	Brigg.
Smith, B.	Lab.	Rotherhithe.
Spence, R.	Lab.	Berwick and Haddington.
Sullivan, I.	Lab.	Lanark, N.
Sunlight, J.	L.	Shrewsbury.
Thomson, F. C.	U.	Aberdeen, S.
Warrender, Sir V.	U.	Grantham.
Williams, Major R.	L.	Sevenoaks.
Windsor-Clive, Col.	U.	Ludlow.
Wood, Sir K.	U.	Woolwich, W.
Yerburgh, Major R. D. T.	U.	Dorset, S.

Members added in respect of the Representation of the People Act (1918) Amendment Bill.

Name of Member.	Party.	Constituency.
Adamson, W. M.	Lab.	Cannock.
Bull, Sir W.	U.	Hammersmith.
Butler, Sir G.	U.	Cambridge University.
Cecil, Lord H.	U.	Oxford University.
Davies, Rhys	Lab.	Westthorpe.
Foot, Isaac	L.	Bodmin.
Henderson, Right Hon. A.	Lab.	Burnley.
Howard, G.	L.	Luton.
Jewson, Miss	Lab.	Norwich.
Joynson-Hicks, Rt. Hon.	U.	Twickenham.
Oliver, P.	L.	Blackley.
Somerville, A. A.	U.	Windsor.
Turner, B.	Lab.	Batley and Morley.
Wintringham, Mrs.	L.	Louth.

QUESTIONS IN PARLIAMENT.

MATERNITY WARDS.—Attention was drawn by Commander Bellairs to the overcrowding of the maternity wards. In reply to his question on this point Mr. Wheatley stated the Government would be prepared to give grants up to 50 per cent of approved capital and annual maintenance expenditure, where there is need for further accommodation.

LUNACY LAWS.—Mrs. Wintringham asked whether the Government would include a medical woman and a woman with special knowledge of asylums visiting committees on the Committee of Inquiry into the Lunacy Laws. No definite reply beyond a promise of careful consideration of the suggestion was forthcoming.

MOTHERS' PENSIONS.—Mr. Simon asked whether the 5s. pension given to the fathers of sons killed in action, could not be transferred to the mother in the event of the father's death. Mr. Roberts pointed out that if the mother is in need it is open to her to claim a pension based on need and incapacity, which might be more to her advantage than the flat rate. He did not allude to the point that the father gets the pension automatically, the mother only in case of proved need.

HONG KONG (TREATMENT OF CHILDREN).—This is the somewhat euphemistic heading given in the official report to a question by Mr. John Harris on the Government control of prostitution in Hong Kong. His question was whether the Secretary for Chinese affairs in Hong Kong is informed prior to his appointment that his duties will include the examination of girls as to their suitability for brothels, and the passing of them into brothels. Mr. Thomas in his reply said these duties are "purely protective" and that it is only in Hong Kong and the Malay Peninsula that there is "a large number of Chinese women requiring protection of this nature." The only satisfactory remark in the answers to this and several supplementary questions was that Mr. Thomas was meeting a deputation on the subject the next day (25th March).

OUR WOMEN M.P.s.

A question from Mrs. Wintringham produced some interesting information with regard to the settlement of the Memel question. Mr. Ponsonby informed her that the question had been under consideration by the Conference of Ambassadors from the time of the ratification of the Versailles treaty until September last, when having failed to reach any result, the Conference referred the matter to the League of Nations. In less than six months the League produced a solution which has already been signed by the representatives of this country and of Lithuania, and is now awaiting the signatures of France, Italy, and Japan. All who are anxious for the increased power of the League will be grateful to Mrs. Wintringham for eliciting this public statement as to its success where the Conference of Ambassadors had so signally failed.

Miss Margaret Bondfield, in speaking at the annual meeting of the National League for Health, Maternity, and Child Welfare, dealt with the need for pensions for Civilian Widows.

"THE DISINHERITED FAMILY."

Miss Eleanor Rathbone's book, *The Disinherited Family*, published last week by Edward Arnold & Co. (price 7s. 6d.), is perhaps the most important contribution to the literature of Feminism since the publication, in 1869, of J. S. Mills' *Subjection of Women*, and its coming is a portent of some significance. It means that women, having successfully challenged the social arrangements which deny them political citizenship, are about to challenge the social arrangements which deny them economic individuality, and in so doing fail to make adequate provision for the great majority of women in the satisfactory discharge of their peculiar and primary function of motherhood.

Miss Rathbone's sounds her note of challenge in the first paragraph of her introduction. "Of the family as an economic unit," she writes, "something which has its own claim, based on its own value to the nation, to its own share in the nation's wealth—there has been next to no consideration at all. The claim has been not so much disparaged or negated as ignored." This is no idle accusation. The author supports it with a wealth of analytical treatment, both contemporary and historical, of the place occupied by the family both in the minds of economic writers and in the practical arrangements of society. Quite adequately, not to say remorselessly, does she "put the present method of providing for families on the dissecting table and subject it to a thorough examination," tracing out its effects on the wage-earner as producer, husband and father, on the children, and (in the most vivid and haunting section of the book) on the woman as wife and mother.

From the destructive analysis of Part I, "The Present Economic Status of the Family," Miss Rathbone moves forward to the practical construction of Part II, "The Restitution of the Family." In principle, her plea is for a drastic revision of our present wage system in the direction of direct provision for the family—such direct provision as shall secure to the mother, in her own right and for the proper discharge of her recognized duties, an income leaving some rational proportion to her needs and responsibilities. This involves a detailed examination of such experiments in this direction as have already been made in France, Germany, Belgium, and Holland (and the reader will be surprised, both by their magnitude and their success). It involves, in addition a searching criticism of objections which have been, and may be directed against such an arrangement. It is here, in a section entitled "The Turk Complex," that we find the author's most ruthless analysis and exposure of the half-conscious, but none the less deeply rooted masculine prejudices which are so largely responsible for the present economic dependence of the woman and her children.

So far we have spoken of Miss Rathbone's book as a feminist challenge, believing that it is this particular aspect of it which will be of primary interest to our readers. It is however something more—as those who have kept their eyes on the correspondence columns of *The Times* will have already divined. It is an immensely important contribution to the literature of the "living wage". Unlike other contributions to that most burning practical question of our time, it reconciles a recognition of the economic and ethical necessity of decent material subsistence for every human being, with a recognition of certain disturbing industrial facts, among them the undeniable tightness of our present productive resources in relation to the reasonable needs of those dependent upon them.

We are conscious that, with the limited space at our disposal, we have not done justice to this very remarkable book. We have spoken of it as a feminist challenge to the existing arrangements of society. It is something more. It is a challenge delivered with such power—power of practical and theoretical knowledge, power of human sympathy, power of original thought, power of brilliant and vivid exposition—as to raise it on to a level enjoyed by very few outstanding books of our generation. Without hesitation we clear an inch and a half of space for our review copy on a certain exclusive bookshelf in our social-economic library. And with unquestioned self-confidence *The Disinherited Family* slips into its place beside Mr. and Mrs. Webb's *Industrial Democracy*, Tawney's *Acquisitive Society*, Keynes's *Economic Consequences of the Peace*, and a few—but a very few—others. We have sometimes wondered what particular contribution women, self-assertive and newly armed with knowledge, experience, political force, and unashamed courage, would make on behalf of women to the man-made science of Economics. Now we know.

[Further criticisms of this book, representing different points of view, will appear in future issues.]

A CHOICE OF BOOKS.

RELIGIOUS LYRICS OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY. Edited by CARLETON BROWN. (Milford. 10s. 6d.)

These lyrics are archaic in form, but the small effort needed to overcome this difficulty is amply repaid by the beauty, variety, and lively human interest in which they abound, indeed the quaintness of their form really increases their readability. The editor has added full notes and a glossary.

JUDGMENT OF DEATH. By E. BOWEN-ROWLANDS. (Collins. 15s.)

This book contains a general survey of the much discussed question of the death penalty and its justification. Mr. Bowen-Rowlands describes the attitude of society toward capital punishment in different parts of the world from the most ancient time, with a summing up of the arguments for and against, based on results observed in countries where it is no longer in force as well as in our own.

REMINISCENCES. By MARY SCHARLIEB. (Williams and Norgate. 12s. 6d.)

An inspiring and deeply interesting little book, in which Mrs. Scharlieb tells with the utmost economy of words the story of her medical career. One does not know what to admire most, her technical accomplishment or the determination with which she pursued her studies under every difficulty of climate and surroundings. Not the least valuable part of her book is the last chapter, in which she sounds a note of warning to her young successors.

INIGO SANDYS. By E. B. C. JONES. (Chatto & Windas. 7s. 6d.)

Miss Jones deals with her hero after the modern style. We watch him think and we see his life divided into three parts, each part taken up with the shock of his contact with a different personality, which is in its turn delicately laid bare to us. Miss Jones does this very well, and in each of her books she has stretched a larger canvas without lessening the security and minuteness of her work.

REVIEWS.

"INIGO SANDYS."¹

Inigo Sandys is the inner history of a very young man during three emotional crises of his life. Like many modern writers, Miss Jones is not primarily concerned with outward events, or with character as it shows itself in speech and action. Her interest is in the inward life from which these things spring, and in which they are again reflected. "Reflected" is, perhaps, not quite the right word, for there is more a vital relation between the doings and sayings of her characters and their inward life than that between the swan and the swan's shadow, and the swan itself is to her incontestably the less important of the two. She tells us, indeed, so little of its movements that careless readers may very easily lose track of them. If, however, they turn back for a chapter or two, they will easily realize what has happened between the chapters, and it is not much effort to do this, as the said chapters are very short, some of them only about a page long, and the English in which they are written is as lucid as clear water. The author's method is not a Proustian accumulation of detail, but a delicate economy which she has never practised with so much success as in this book.

It is a beautiful piece of writing, and will be praised by many on that account, but, for full appreciation, it is probably necessary that the reader should not only be interested in the pursuit of the swan's shadow in literature, but should also have a certain temperamental sympathy with Inigo himself and with the view of life that his creator has embodied, or perhaps it would be better to say, has enshadowed, in him. Inigo is one of those extraordinarily sensitive and yet, in a sense, impersonal people, who are all the time enchanted by the magic beauty of life, and oppressed by its doom. He is not an egoist, for although he longs for sympathy, he does not claim it, and is not only as ready to give as to receive, but is more oppressed by the fact that he is not able to give exactly what is asked than by the fact that he does not get what he wants. In the last of the three relations described here there is no failure on either side, but the element of tragedy which has been introduced into his relation with his Cambridge friend, and with his wife, by his and their failure, is here supplied by the intolerable pressure of external life. Even if Henrietta (the same Henrietta who appeared in *Quiet Interior*), had not been already dying when he got to know her, they could

¹ *Inigo Sandys*. By E. B. C. Jones. Chatto & Windas. 7s. 6d. net.

hardly have been happy together in the ordinary sense. They are too terribly conscious of the reiterated misery of the world. Looking at the hideous things people do, and at the hideous things that happen to them they cannot believe that life is ever anything but cruel; if there is any temporary escape from the cruelty for some, it is only by a blind chance. It is not necessary to accept this theory of life in order to enjoy the book, but it probably is necessary to have felt at times that the suffering in life, not in one's own life only but in all that exists, is intolerable, and that any way of escape is preferable to acquiescence. Inigo feels this when Henrietta dies, and Chance, blind Chance, puts the pistol into his hand. It is a violent ending; in the first shock one is inclined to complain that it is too violent for the subdued and delicate texture of the book, but in a moment one realizes that if the emotion has throughout been quietly portrayed, it has been deep and deepening, and that, whatever one thinks of the author's doctrine as a whole, such chances as those which made this suicide do happen in life. It should be added that, in spite of the sadness contained in *Inigo Sandys*, it is never at all gloomy; the author, like her hero, has a passionate delight in beauty, which she conveys in her exquisite descriptions. She has also a delicate wit, which she expresses through Henrietta; there are not many conversations, but the few in the last part of the book are full of gleams. *Inigo Sandys* is not a novel for all, or even for all moderns, to some it probably will not convey any meaning at all; but to those who find something in it which echoes their own experience, it will give a rare delight: it is sincere and beautiful, and quite distinct from anything that has been done before, even by the author herself. I. B. O. M.

OLIVE SCHREINER.¹

If one were looking for a woman as unlike as possible to the correct late Victorian pattern, I do not think one could find a better example than Olive Schreiner. And yet she was equally unlike a late Victorian, or indeed any other kind of woman. She was in fact unique, and the life of her which her husband has just published reveals with a good deal of clearness how strange she was. As a young girl, living very lonely in the wilds of South Africa, without books or friends, or any opportunities for learning, she wrote one very remarkable work, *The Story of an African Farm*, and then after she wrote nothing much more. But she grew professionally stronger as her life went on, and the inner flame which had inspired her first book only blazed higher and fiercer with the years.

She was one of those who cared passionately for politics: an extreme pro-Boer, a violent pacifist, and all the time a stormy passionate creature, she would sometimes fall into such rages of fury at public events that she would bruise herself severely by dashing against the furniture in her rapid unconscious striding to and fro. Like many other South Africans, Cecil Rhodes loomed large in her life, and her early admiration for him turned into bitter distrust, as the trend of his policy grew clear. It is reported that in one of her stormy encounters with him she beat her head upon the dinner table, until the guests were all thoroughly alarmed.

In her private life she was no less difficult and strange, though with it all, as her many friends aver, brilliantly charming and exhilarating. But she was nervously excitable and cursed with a devastating asthma, and the almost frantic way in which she rushed from county to county and from place to place, must be set down to that reason. The turmoil in which she lived, both inward and outward, even if it was partly caused by the intensity of her imagination, was enough to destroy her literary work, and although, in her mind, she wrote many wonderful books, they did not find their way on to paper. The strangest evidence of this is given in this biography, and concerns the most directly "feminist" book, *Woman and Labour*. Some readers of this paper will probably remember the strange interest attaching to this book when it appeared, and how Olive Schreiner herself in the Preface told the story of its production. She had written, she said, a very much more comprehensive book on the subject, a book dealing with women from prehistoric ages, examining physiologically and psychologically the position and development of the female sex. It was finished, she said, typed out and bound up, and only waiting a final revision, when it was wantonly destroyed in an attack on her house in Johannesburg by British soldiers during the Boer War.

¹ *Life of Olive Schreiner*. By S. C. Cronwright-Schreiner. T. Fisher Unwin. 21s.

Now, all this tale, circumstantially told, and fully believed, was untrue. There was no such book, and never had been, outside of the author's own imagination. She had thought of the subject, presumably, all her life; she had talked of it endlessly, and had planned it out, chapter by chapter. And then she had overlooked the fact that it was not written, and when she came to search for the MS. and found it gone she assumed that the war which she so hated had destroyed it.

It is comforting to have this fable explained, and to know that the book never was. Somehow, reading Olive Schreiner's later *Dreams and Allegories*, even reading *Woman and Labour* itself, one does not regret the absence of the greater work. It was, and is, a portentous subject, and if treated at all would need a steadier hand and head than hers. And yet undeniably she had great gifts, and was a very remarkable, interesting, and important woman. R. STRACHEY.

THE RUHR.

We have received from the British Bureau for Ruhr Information, 17 Mecklenburgh Square, a pamphlet by Mr. Joseph King ("The Ruhr" price 6d.), with a foreword by Mr. A. G. Gardiner, which sets forth in bare outline the cause, nature, and effects of this latest development of Reparation politics. It is a useful and effective document, packed with accurate information of the kind which any controversialist who wishes to argue the pros and cons of the matter will be glad to put his hand on. But we do not feel that its very real and practical value is enhanced by Mr. Gardiner's fierce little foreword—not because we disagree with the sentiments which he has expressed, but because we believe that its presence is likely to prejudice those who start with a very understandable predisposition to sympathize with the French case. The facts cited by Mr. King carry with them certain inevitable and obvious conclusions. It is unnecessary to anticipate these in a foreword which may prevent susceptible persons from reading further. Nor does that foreword sufficiently emphasize the last and most important conclusion drawn by Mr. King. "France is not alone responsible for the ruin she has caused. . . . The ruin of the Ruhr would not be facing men to-day if the other nations of the world had learned to practice justice, conciliation, and patience in international affairs. In a peaceful world a single militarist power would be so morally isolated that its menace would be impossible."

COPEC.

A correspondent writes, "Many readers of this paper are looking forward to the great Conference on Christian Politics, Economics, and Citizenship, which is to meet in Birmingham from 5th to 12th April. But to quote the Chairman of the Copec Executive Committee, 'Copec is much more than the Conference, important as that will be; it is a movement of penitence and redemption expressive of the awakening of the Churches to a too-much neglected aspect of the Christian Gospel.' Arrangements have already been made for regional conferences throughout the country, after the Conference is over, to spread the message of Birmingham over a wider area, and printed reports of the various Commissions which will be submitted at the Conference will be available afterwards at a very low price. It is hoped that Copec will be a beginning, not an end, and that the work of investigation into modern social problems from a Christian point of view will be continued and developed."

COMMUNITY CENTRES.

Two schemes for the provision of centres for professional and business women workers have recently been developed in London. The London Society for Women's Service has discovered admirable premises in Westminster, close to the House of Commons, which will be known as the Women's Service House and which will become a centre for those interested in the problems of women's employment. A reading room and library will be provided, with facilities for meetings and conferences, and the Information Bureau on training and careers established in 1914 will be continued. The Young Women's Christian Association is completing plans for a centre on a large scale for London business girls, and a Central Committee, on which girls and women represent different kinds of business, has been formed to inaugurate the scheme under the presidency of H.R.H. The Duchess of York.

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.

NEW LEAFLETS.

Two new editions of leaflets have been issued—"What the Vote has Done," by Mrs. Henry Fawcett, has been brought up to date, and is invaluable for all those who wish to speak or write on the subject. (Price 1d.)

"The Summary Jurisdiction (Separation and Maintenance) Bill, 1924," by Mrs. Hubback. This pamphlet describes the provisions of this Sessions' Bill on the subject of Separation and Maintenance Orders.

BILLS BEFORE STANDING COMMITTEES.

The Legitimacy Bill and the Summary Jurisdiction (Separation and Maintenance) Bill, which were originally to have come up before Standing Committee A, have been transferred to Standing Committee B.

ANNUAL COUNCIL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL UNION OF SOCIETIES FOR EQUAL CITIZENSHIP.

COMMUNICATED BY A DELEGATE.

Early Impressions.

At the time of writing, the first Session of the Council of the National Union of Societies is in progress. Though numbers are small compared with pre-war days it is gratifying to see Societies from so many different parts of the country represented, including several Societies from Scotland and Wales, and to find such an interested body of Delegates. The Annual Report for the year has been ably presented by the Honorary Secretary, Miss Macadam, and shows a fine record of work. Never, she pointed out, had the Parliamentary Department of the National Union been so busy as during last Session, when not only did it have four Bills of its own before Parliament at the same time, but was also taking an active part in supporting and amending many other measures affecting women and children. The move of Headquarters to its new office in Dean's Yard had been a very decided change for the better. The record of Election Work done by its Societies has never been surpassed.

The following Urgency Resolutions have been passed by the Council:—

The International Situation.

"That this Council of the N.U.S.E.C. welcomes the Government's strong declaration in favour of conducting its foreign policy in close co-operation with the League of Nations, and urges it to put this declaration into immediate practical effect and to sign the compulsory clause with respect to the International Court of Justice."

Equal Franchise.

"That this Council of the N.U.S.E.C. calls upon the Government to show itself true to its pre-election pledge by making itself responsible for a measure giving Equal Franchise rights to men and women, and so enabling women workers who are disqualified under the present law to exercise their full weight in the councils of the nation."

The Representation of the People Act (1918) Amendment Bill.

"That this Council of the N.U.S.E.C. notes with indignation and alarm that the only measure so far before Parliament dealing with Equal Franchise is a Private Members' Bill—The Representation of the People Act (1918) Amendment Bill—and that there appears no immediate prospect of giving this measure a share of Parliamentary time in proportion to its importance. It calls upon the Government either to replace this measure by one of its own, giving Equal Franchise rights to men and women uncomplicated by other provisions for Electoral Reform, or to give such facilities to the above Bill as shall secure its passage into law this Session."

NEWS FROM SOCIETIES.

NORTH-WESTERN GROUP.

Preston W.C.A.

Three interesting meetings have been held during the past few weeks. Following a reception at the house of the Chairman (Mrs. Todd), a meeting was addressed by Miss Macadam on "Widows' Pensions" and questions of general interest. A large audience met to hear Miss Burstall, M.A., J.P. (Headmistress of the Manchester High School), on "Retrospect and Prospect in the Education of Girls," who gave a lucid and entertaining account of the beginnings of schools for girls, and indicated some lines

on which more freedom might be introduced into the educational system of to-day. She anticipated very real benefit from the participation of women in the law and in the public administration of justice. At a later meeting Miss M. Fitzgerald addressed an interested audience on "Smoke Prevention," illustrated by lantern slides, and mentioned the arrangements for heating and cooking in the new houses now building under the Manchester Corporation Scheme.

A meeting of the officers of Societies in this Group was held at Liverpool on 29th February, and was attended by representatives of seven Societies. Interesting discussions on various matters, such as Parliamentary affairs, and Social Reform, resulted in the suggestion of "The Scope of Societies' Work" as a suitable subject for the next Conference. A Speakers' Tour was suggested for the first week in October. Mrs. Robertson was appointed as delegate to the Annual Council Meeting to represent the North-Western Group. The next Conference was fixed to be held at Rochdale early in May.

THE WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE AND THE DRAFT TREATY OF MUTUAL ASSISTANCE.

(W.I.L., 55 Gower Street, W.C.1.)

The Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance has been criticized from various standpoints, but an answer frequently returned to its critics is:—"Well, what would you put in its place?" Leaving aside the fact that if it would not fulfil its objects of security coupled with disarmament, its reason for existence disappears, we suggest that there is one alternative which, if agreed to sincerely by the nations, would both give security and allow of disarmament.

The optional clause of the Protocol to the Statute establishing the Permanent Court of International Justice, binds the nations to submit all disputes either to that or to some other form of arbitration, and (unlike the Covenant of the League) it also binds them to abide by the award.

No great Power has yet ratified this clause of the Protocol. For the Powers to do so would give evidence of an honest desire to substitute reasonable settlement for settlement by force, and would be a great step towards secure disarmament. The W.I.L. is urging our own Government to lead the way.

ST. JOAN'S SOCIAL AND POLITICAL ALLIANCE.

A public meeting under the auspices of St. Joan's Social and Political Alliance was held on 15th March at Bedford College, by kind permission of the Principal and Council of the College. Miss Kathleen Fitzgerald, B.A., was in the chair.

Mr. Mitchell Banks, K.C., M.P., sent apologies for absence, as he had been kept in his constituency on urgent business, and was unable to return in time for the meeting.

The following resolution was moved by the Hon. E. A. St. Aubyn Harney, K.C., M.P., and seconded by Mr. F. W. Sherwood, Recorder of Worcester:—

"This meeting calls upon the Government to adopt and pass through all its stages, a Bill to legitimate children on the subsequent marriage of their parents, and welcomes the fact that thereby, after 600 years' divergence, it will bring the law of the land into harmony with the Canon Law."

Mr. Harney said that he was whole-heartedly in favour of the legitimization of children wherever possible, but confessed that his enthusiasm had been damped by the insertion of the proviso in the House of Lords, and that for his part he would do all he could in the House of Commons to drive it out of the Bill. At the same time, if not successful in this he would vote for the measure as it stood.

Mr. Sherwood said that he had taken much interest in the question for many years past, and intended to speak on it from a non-party point of view in keeping with the spirit of St. Joan's Social and Political Alliance. The question had been a burning one for at least 600 years, and since the Council of Merton in the 13th century there had been a "bifurcation" between Church and State upon it. By the customs of England children born out of wedlock were deprived of all title to inheritance—by the Canon Law they were legitimized by the subsequent marriage of the parents, and this the present Bill was an attempt to restore. The Bishops in 1296 attempted to bring the Civil Law into line with the Canon Law, but the Barons made the famous answer, "We will not change the old and approved laws of England." Thus Austin Harrison was quite wrong when in 1916 he denounced the rule "Once a bastard always a bastard," as the creation of narrow-minded ecclesiastical superstition. The Church was, in fact, always more liberal than the Bill as it left the House of Lords; it objected to the term "Nobody's child," and always deemed legitimate the children of putative marriages, even of those subsequently annulled. Scotland preserved the old Canon Law, and now perhaps the wrong will be righted after 600 years.

As regards the proviso, he sympathized with both points of view, but would not go so far as Mr. Harney. He particularly sympathized with those people who drew the line at legitimating the children of a rival household, and said that one must recognize that there is a strong body of opinion in favour of having a proviso. If it should be found that the House of Commons was determined to have a proviso, it would be well to see whether the Canon Law did not provide a much more liberal form than that brought forward in the House of Lords. In the Inns of Court, Canon Law has been totally ignored and neglected. This should be remedied, and the Scotch Law on the question which differs from it in some respects should also be studied.

Mr. Turrell, Recorder of Banbury, also spoke, and the resolution was carried.

CORRESPONDENCE.

HOUSING FINANCE.

Our replies to Miss Neilans' questions of last week are as follows:—The test of inflation is the general level of prices. You can inflate a gold currency with gold, or a paper currency with paper—though it is cheaper and therefore easier to do the latter. Mr. McKenna's test (as quoted by Miss Neilans) is a question-begging one, for it assumes that there is a recognizable and determinate "full volume of production of which the nation is capable." When banks "create credits" the result, other things being equal, is likely to be as inflationary as when the Government "creates credits." Both represent an addition to purchasing power unaccompanied by an immediate proportionate addition to purchasable goods and services. Their tendency will be to bring about a rise in prices, and where this happens inflation may be said to have taken place. But when a Housing scheme is financed by a genuine loan, the increased purchasing power in the hands of those who spend the money borrowed is exactly offset by the diminished purchasing power of those who lend it. No addition is therefore made to the effective currency of the country, and no inflation results. Mr. McKenna's views on the subject of monetary policy and its bearing on unemployment are worthy of consideration, but they are highly controversial views, and do not command the confidence of many of his equally distinguished colleagues. Meanwhile, we suggest that the maintenance of an unchanging level of prices (involving neither inflation nor deflation) is an object good in itself, because conducive to financial security and to the maintenance of just and stable economic relations between individuals.

GUILDHOUSE FELLOWSHIP CONFERENCE ON HOUSING.

MADAM,—I have been much interested in the discussion in your columns on the financial question in relation to Housing. It is futile to deny that, if we are to build the houses the nation needs, public opinion must be both more enlightened on the subject and far more pertinacious than it is at present. May I venture to call the attention of your readers to one effort to help towards this, namely the All Day Housing Conference arranged by the Fellowship Guild, to take place at the Guildhouse, Eccleston Square, on Saturday, 5th April, Miss Maude Royden in the Chair. Questions that worry people like "Ca' canny," "Dilution," "The ring round the house," are to be dealt with, as well as the thing so close to the hearts of some of us—*beauty in building*.

Nearly all the most authoritative organizations and speakers are giving us their support. Just a few speakers, taken at random, are Colonel Levita, Chairman of the L.C.C. Committee, Miss Bushell, Miss Jeffery, Mr. Coppock, General Secretary of the National Federation of Building Trade Operatives, Mr. J. C. Squire, Chairman of the Architecture Club, Mr. Raymond Unwin, and Captain Richard Reiss. Both halls are to be used, the upper for the Conference and the lower for an exhibition of plans, designs, etc. Also, in the Lower Hall, meals (luncheon and tea) will be served so attractive and so cheap that no excuse will remain for those who do not spend 5th April at the Guildhouse, paying only 1s. for the whole Conference.

A. HELEN WARD, Conference Hon. Sec.

"THE COMPLEAT CHILD."

MADAM,—With reference to the correspondence I would like to point out two facts:—

- (1) Truth is objective, not subjective.
- (2) Parents usually bring up their children or have them brought up in their own faith, which they imagine is subjective. It is up to parents and children when old enough to seek and find.

A. MUSSON.

THE LEGITIMACY BILL.

MADAM,—I strongly oppose Miss Picton-Turbervill's article in THE WOMAN'S LEADER.

As for the Archbishop of Canterbury's Resolution, well! he is a Priest, and Priests are always the same, whether Priests of Isis, Priests of Rome, Priests of Buddha, or Priests of the Church of England. They always want to tyrannize over somebody or something, in the name of their religion.

An illegitimate child of any kind is a child, not a devil, and I maintain that to differentiate between these unhappy, handicapped children and punish some more than ever for the wrong-doings of others is devilish. It is not religion, it is merely "priestly." It would produce jealousy, evil spirit, and a feeling of bitter injustice of the very worst kind by such differentiation. As a lifelong Churchwoman I protest.

The child is the thing. Its helplessness and position should appeal to all if they are really Christians who desire to help forlorn humanity.

As a body, the Church has done nothing for such children all along the ages. It has been left to high-minded women to fight for the child, and Right.

M. DALE.

MADAM,—I have read with much interest in your recent issues, the article by Miss Picton-Turbervill and Mrs. Normanton's letter on the contentious proviso in the Legitimacy Bills. I cannot presume to argue on points of ancient law with Mrs. Normanton, but I should like to say that my own article recently published in THE WOMAN'S LEADER, to which she referred, was written in a very short space of time under great stress of work. For that reason I had to rely for historical data on information given to me by friends who belong to the same learned profession as Mrs. Normanton. Presumably their knowledge of history is not so sound as their law! Although I much regret that the error to which Mrs. Normanton draws attention should have gone out over my signature, I should like to point out that fortunately this mis-statement as to the origin of English illegitimacy law does not affect the point under discussion, which is whether modern legislation shall or shall not include the limiting proviso.

Susan Musson.

EQUAL FRANCHISE.

MADAM,—Mrs. Hubback's letter in the Times some days ago replying to Lady Frances Balfour contained the remark that Lady Frances, "herself safe in the possession of a vote," objects to the enfranchisement of girls of 21. I expected to find in the next WOMAN'S LEADER a protest against this insinuation, but to my surprise it is endorsed in an editorial note! Lady Frances Balfour's long, arduous, and disinterested public work should have saved her from such a sneer. Is it not widely known to the public, and in particular to the readers of the WOMAN'S LEADER? To suggest that a smug satisfaction with her own vote influences her opinion as to the proposed enlargement of the electorate is not a high form of argument.

Lady Frances' record is such that her views deserve consideration. There are many suffragists of the rank and file who agree with her, and who may also claim to look at the question in a disinterested light whatever their own voting power may be. Mrs. Hubback's very letter provides arguments on their side. She shows that in 1918 over 8 million women were enfranchised. This is a far larger addition than was ever before made at one time to the British electorate. The great Reform Bill of 1832 only added some million and a half, while the Acts of 1867-84 each added much less than eight millions. There are only six years since women have voted, and only three elections.

Mrs. Hubback states that 70 per cent of women wage-earners are under 30, as if that were an argument. Of these probably more than 50 per cent are under 21, for, I suppose "women wage-earner" includes all wage-earning girls over 14. So that if wage-earning justified a vote, all boys and girls over 14 should vote. So the wage-earning argument vanishes. Further, girls of 21 all too soon become 30, and they can then vote with the experience the nine years have given them. Lastly, one does not find masses of girls of 21 crowding to meetings on public questions, whether of local or national interest. There are, no doubt, exceptions, but the rule is utter indifference. Young women's leisure is devoted to amusement. For the matter of that so is the young men's. The conclusion many observers draw is that it would be better to raise the age for men to 25, leaving that of women as it is.

Considering the enormous number of women now enfranchised, suffragists would surely do better to devote themselves to the tremendous national and international questions in the decision of which they now have a large voice. To want so soon to change the franchise seems to me as if one who had become possessed of a new and wonderful tool, instead of using it and learning what it could do, concentrated himself on pulling it to pieces and altering it before properly testing the tool as it is.

S. M. PILCHER.

[We had not space to quote the whole of Mrs. Hubback's letter, and our correspondent may be glad to know that she opened by the following reference to Lady Frances Balfour's work: "The women of this country owe a debt of gratitude to Lady Frances Balfour, not only for the work for women, to which as president of the National Council of Women and in many other capacities she has devotedly given so much of her life, but also for the energy and fine fighting spirit with which she played a leading part in the campaign for women's suffrage before 1918." The fact, however, remains that Lady Frances does not apparently wish to extend the vote which women with her qualifications possess to large numbers of women workers whose need is very great.—Ed.]

THE LADY CHICHESTER HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

MADAM,—At a time when public attention is directed to the vital importance of providing accommodation for Borderland Cases, may I bring before your readers the work done in this respect by the Lady Chichester Hospital for Women and Children?

To prevent Insanity and Incurable Nervous Breakdowns has been the aim of the Hospital since it started its pioneer work eighteen years ago with just £200, eleven beds, a paid cook, and chiefly voluntary nurses. Those with experience of pioneer work can best realize the endless difficulties that cropped up daily—lack of money, staff, accommodation, attitude, and hundreds of applications from all over the country to be taken in "before it is too late." Gradually as the hospital became known a little more money was collected until it became possible to take larger premises, and in spite of the struggle to keep open during the war it is now able to take thirty-nine patients and has an Out-patients' Department.

The out-patients show only too clearly that no effort must be spared to increase the number of beds in the Hospital. Take the case of a gentlewoman, who, struggling bravely against adverse circumstances and financial worries for many years, not daring to stop work, and at last worn out mentally and physically, breaks down. Will a bottle of medicine with a return to the same worrying conditions cure her? What she needs is a bed in the Hospital, absolute rest, with change of surroundings. The Hospital is especially for business, professional, and domestic women who cannot possibly afford the high fees of nursing homes, many patients having exhausted their resources and not daring to give up their work until after an endless struggle of "trying to keep things going" they collapse. Patients are under no restraint, they are free to attend their own churches, receive visitors, and, if well enough, visit their friends in the town. They pay what they can afford, but some are destitute, and it is for these we must keep our free beds.

Perhaps some of your readers have experienced the tragedies involved in a nervous breakdown or have seen the sufferings of those dear to them, and to such we appeal more especially for help, while those with no knowledge of it might care to send a thank-offering.

Is this work of restoring women and children to mental and physical health to stop for the want of £3,000? Will you help us to raise this amount which is so urgently needed?

Contributions will be gratefully received by me at Aldington House, New Church Road, Hove.

RUTH CHICHESTER.

COMING EVENTS.

GUILDHOUSE, ECCLESTON SQUARE, S.W. 1.

APRIL 5. All day Conference on "Housing in Greater London." Chairman: Miss Maude Royden. 1st session, 10.45 a.m. to 1.15 p.m.; 2nd session, 2.45 to 4.30 p.m.; 3rd session, 5.15 p.m.; lantern lecture, 6.30 p.m. Luncheon (1s. 4d.) and tea (6d.) can be obtained in Lower Hall.

GUILDHOUSE W.C.S.

MARCH 31. 3-4.30 p.m. The Guildhouse, Eccleston Square, S.W. 1. "The Future of the Backward Races." Mr. F. W. Walker, Managing Director of the Papuan Industries, Ltd.

INTERNATIONAL HOUSE CLUB, 55 GOWER STREET, W.C. 1.

APRIL 3. 8 p.m. Madame Dank-Werner (Austria).

INTERNATIONAL WOMAN SUFFRAGE ALLIANCE.

APRIL 7. Jumble Sale to be held at Bosworth Hall, Bosworth Road, Kensal Road, N. Kensington, W. 10, in aid of funds of British Overseas Committee at British Empire Exhibition. Parcels, marked B.O.C. Jumble Sale, to be sent to Miss Hoe, 75 Hereford Road, Westbourne Grove, W. 2.

LEAGUE OF THE CHURCH MILITANT.

APRIL 5. 2.30-5.45. Quiet afternoon, St. George's Church, Hart Street, Bloomsbury. Evensong at 6 p.m. Conductor: Mrs. Porter. Non-members of the League will be welcomed.

NATIONAL UNION OF SOCIETIES FOR EQUAL CITIZENSHIP.

CHELSEA STANDING COMMITTEE FOR EQUAL CITIZENSHIP. APRIL 1. 8 p.m. 55 Glebe Place, Chelsea. Lady Pares on "The Education of the Woman Voter."

IPSWICH W.C.A. APRIL 3. 3 p.m. Mrs. Berry on "The Endowment of Motherhood."

HARPENDEN N.C.W. APRIL 8. 4.30 p.m. Miss Rathbone on "Wages plus Family Allowances."

LEEDS S.E.C. APRIL 7. 5.30 p.m. 18 Park Row. "What is an Educated Man?" Opener: Mr. A. W. Hodgson (Head Master, St. Mark's Schools).

SIX POINT GROUP.

MARCH 31. 7 p.m. Committee of Six Point Group at Home at 62 Victoria Street, S.W. 1. Miss House, of West London Children's Rescue Committee will speak on "Assaults on Children."

TYPEWRITING AND PRINTING, Etc.

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

TEMPLAR PRINTING WORKS, BIRMINGHAM.

SPECIALISTS IN WORK FOR NATIONAL SOCIETIES.

ENQUIRIES SOLICITED.

TO LET AND WANTED.

NORTH DEVON.—Guests received beautiful old manor house; special terms workers. In reach all noted beauty spots. Farm produce.—Tabor, Lee House, Marwood, N. Devon.

COMFORTABLE BOARD RESIDENCE, lady's own house, near New Cross; terms moderate.—H., 1 Shandon Place, Vesta Road, Brockley, S.E. 4.

PICTURESQUE BRITANNY.—Comfortable home for paying guests or children. Beautiful country, quaint costumes and customs; good French, good schools. English, Scotch, French references. Terms from 10 gns. monthly.—Address, Madame E. Masson, Route de Talcoët, Pontivy, Morbihan, France.

WENSLEYDALE.—Comfortable BOARD-RESIDENCE in quiet house; electric light. No motor dust. Moors, waterfalls, ruins. A few vacancies for Easter.—Smith, Low Green House, Thoraby, Aysgarth, Yorks.

PROFESSIONAL.

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 H. M. Baker, 275 High Holborn, W.C. 1, the only Income Tax Agency owned and managed by a woman. Telephone: Holborn 377.

MADAME FLORENCE DUNN (late pupil of Mr. Charles Tree, London), Contralto Vocalist, Teacher of Singing. At Messrs. Forrest & Co.'s Studio, Shrewsbury.—For terms, apply, 40 Sandford Avenue, Church Stretton, Salop.

FOR SALE AND WANTED.

KITCHEN CLOTHS.—Bundles of Kitchen and Lavatory cloths, strong durable quality. 12 cloths in a bundle, 10 kitchen and 2 lavatory. Only 7s. 6d. per bundle. Write for Bargain List—TO-DAY.—HUTTON'S, 41 Main Street, Larne, Ireland.

SECOND-HAND CLOTHING wanted to buy for cash; costumes, skirts, hoots, 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.)

THE HAT DOCTOR, removed to 52 James Street, Oxford Street, W. 1, cleans, reblocks and copies hats at lowest possible price. Renovates furs. Covers satin or canvas shoes or thin kid with brocade or velvet. Materials and post, 13s. 6d.; toe-caps, 8s. 6d.; your own materials, work and post, 8s. 6d., in three days.

LACE.—All kinds mended, cleaned and restored, embroidery undertaken; church work, monograms, initials.—Beatrice, Box 1,017, WOMAN'S LEADER, 15 Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W. 1.

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) 10 a.m.-4 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS.

LONDON SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SERVICE, 1 Wellington House, Buckingham Gate, S.W. 1. Office closed March 21st-31st. Then address: 16 Marsham Street, Westminster. Opening of Members' Centre to be announced later.

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.*).

THE FELLOWSHIP SERVICES, Eccleston Guild House, Eccleston Square, S.W. 1. Sunday, 30th March, 6.30, Miss Maude Royden.

LONELY? Then send stamped addressed envelope to Secretary, U.C.C., 16L, Cambridge Street, S.W. 1.

JOIN INTERNATIONAL HOUSE CLUB, 55 Gower Street, W.C. 1. Subscription, 7s. 6d. per annum. Luncheons, and Teas in the Cafeteria. Thursday Club Suppers 7 p.m., and Discussion Meetings 8 p.m. 3rd April: Madame Dank-Werner (Austria).

HOUSE ASSISTANTS' CENTRE

510 King's Road, Chelsea, S.W. 10.
Tel.: Kensington 5213.

On and after December 14th, 1923, the Employment Registers of the Centre will be closed and work will be concentrated on its second and third objects:

"(a) To encourage training and interest in Domestic occupations."

"(b) To do everything possible to raise the status of Domestic Service, as Florence Nightingale did that of Sick-Nursing."

As this will entail much outside work the office will only be open for interviews once a week—on Fridays from 3 p.m. to 8 p.m., except by special appointment.

ANN POPE, HON. SECRETARY.
(Member of the American Home Economics Association.)

HOME-MADE CAKES, made with butter and eggs (no substitutes), can be obtained from Nan's Kitchen, 15 Furnival Street, Holborn, London, W.C. Layer cakes, éclairs, meringues, etc. Regular orders undertaken. A room for tea and light luncheons. Recommended by Ann Pope.

THE SHIELD CO-OPERATIVE RESTAURANT, 1 Marsham Street, Westminster, S.W. 1, has an excellent French cook. After 3 o'clock there are two rooms on the 1st floor which can be engaged for private tea parties. Tea and lunch served daily in the restaurant. Smoking-room.

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.