

THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW.

The ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW is published by the National League for Opposing Woman Suffrage, and can be obtained through any bookseller or news-agent. Annual Subscription, 1/6, post free.

The OFFICES of the LEAGUE are at 39, Victoria Street, S.W.1.
Telegraphic Address: "Adversaria, London."
Telephone No.:

No. 106

LONDON, AUGUST, 1917.

PRICE 1d.

THE NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR OPPOSING WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Executive Committee :

Presidents: THE EARL CURZON OF KEDLESTON, K.G.; LORD WEARDALE.

Deputy-Presidents: THE DOWAGER COUNTESS OF JERSEY; LADY ROBSON.

Chairman of Executive Committee: E. A. MITCHELL INNES, Esq., K.C. *Hon. Treasurer*: J. MASSIE, Esq.

Honorary Vice-Presidents: Mrs. Moberly Bell, Mrs. Burgwin, Mrs. Greatbatch, Lady George Hamilton, Mrs. (Colquhoun) Jollie, Miss G. S. Pott, Miss Ermine Taylor, The Hon. Charles Lyell, M.P., Earl Percy.

Hon. Secretary: MRS. JEYES. *Assistant Secretary*: MISS NORA GARLAND.

MISS G. LOWTHIAN BELL
LADY CRAIK
MRS. LAURENCE CURRIE
MRS. GAMBLE

MRS. G. MACMILLAN
MRS. MASSIE
MRS. HUMPHRY WARD
KENNETH CHALMERS, Esq.

LORD CHARNWOOD
HEBER HART, Esq., K.C.
W. G. W. HASTINGS, Esq.

A. MACCALLUM SCOTT, Esq.
[M.P.]
A. MACONACHIE, Esq.
ARNOLD WARD, Esq., M.P.

SUFFRAGE AND DEMOCRACY.

The proverbial visitor from Mars would experience considerable difficulty these days in discovering evidence of that great volume of public opinion which is alleged to be wholly devoted to the cause of Woman Suffrage. On the morrow of the passage through the House of Commons of the famous clause in the Representation of the People Bill the subject seemed to drop, as if by general consent, from the national ken. Had the people been so stirred on its behalf, as we were confidently assured that they were, some practical demonstration of the fact must have followed the great "victory." Not only was there none, but the marked silence with which the country as a whole has received the verdict of the Lower and unrepresentative House suggested to the Suffragist Societies the advisability of singing their paeans behind closed doors. The most boring host is entitled to derive pleasure from the smiling countenances of his guests; he becomes an object of sympathy when he is unlucky enough to overhear the expressions of relief at the close of the entertainment. Something in the nature of this experience would seem to have befallen the professional Suffragists. It is at least more charitable to suppose that they are disappointed with the indifference with which their strenuous efforts have been received than to imagine them, as one of their own supporters in the Press does, much exercised in mind over their own future. "A vast question," we are gravely informed, "is now arising: What will happen to feminist energy now that Woman Suffrage is won? Suffrage societies are multitudinous . . . and they have employed considerable numbers of paid officials. . . . However, paid officials and the honorary leaders habituated to the delights of command now find themselves irremediably arrived (at the goal), and it is improbable that they will submit to the process of disintegration." The suggestion raises an aspect of the Suffrage movement which politicians and others have recently chosen to ignore—that is, its artificiality. Before the war it was not difficult to distinguish the shouting of the few from the silence and indifference of the many. Now

that the country has been turned into a hive of industry, it seemed as if any sound or any representations made must come from the working bees, and so be worthy of attention. Parliament, however, had overlooked the "paid officials and the honorary leaders habituated to the delights of command." It is these who have been using Suffrage megaphones and, profiting by the preoccupation of the workers, have claimed to speak on behalf of the nation. They have had their say. The House of Commons has listened, and granted them their demands. But as they had nothing to do with the national work before, so the nation carries on in the same way without them, and no one turns a head to pay attention to their claims, or to the concessions that they have won.

This is an aspect of the situation that can hardly fail to impress itself upon the House of Lords. When the Bill comes up before it in the autumn, the nation will look to it to exercise its powers of revision in an impartial and judicial spirit. There are certain outstanding features of the measure as it leaves the Lower House. It owes its origin to a laudable desire on the part of the different political parties to arrive at an agreement on the subject of electoral reform. Such an agreement was reached by the Speaker's Conference, but a certain number of the members travelled beyond their terms of reference and added to their recommendations matters which could never secure unanimous assent. The House took note of two of these additional recommendations—Woman Suffrage and Proportional Representation. It accepted the former and rejected the latter. Its action in allowing these two matters to be attached robbed the Bill completely of any claim to be an agreed measure. The Representation of the People Bill became an ordinary item of contentious legislation with the widest possible scope for all the multifarious considerations which determine the attitude of the individual Member of Parliament. Whether the House on technical grounds had ceased to be representative of the nation or Members could make no claim to represent their constituents on such questions as Proportional Representation and Women's Suffrage. In regard to the former, as the Prime Minister

mitted that he had made no attempt to master its details, it may be taken for granted that the subject was a sealed book to most Members and to the vast bulk of the electorate. Woman Suffrage, too, if not a sealed book, was a chapter hastily skimmed, turned down, and forgotten, more than two years previously. There had been no discussion of it between the Members and their constituents since the war broke out. The most that could be claimed in favour of Woman Suffrage by its advocates was that no organised opposition to it had made itself felt in the country during the war. It may be that the principle of "Silence gives consent" holds good at times, but no one would dream of applying it to political questions during the present crisis. In any case, the Constitution of the country is too vital a subject to allow fundamental alterations of it to be introduced merely by default. If they are in the interests of the nation, then let the nation understand them sufficiently to pronounce judgment on them, one way or the other.

The House of Lords is not likely at this stage to have any desire to thwart the wishes of the people. If it is satisfied that the Woman Suffrage clause comes up to it supported by the clearly expressed wish of the majority of the electorate, the only course it can adopt is to pass the clause as an integral part of the Bill. On the other hand, if it is not satisfied that the nation has had adequate opportunity to express its views on the subject, the Upper House will be justified in referring it to the judgment of the people. The one fear of Suffragists is that the Woman Suffrage clause should be submitted as a clear issue to the country. All manner of arguments are marshalled against the proposal. The Referendum, we are assured, is a revolutionary change in the constitutional machinery; it is "totally new"—as if such expressions could by no manner of means be applied to Woman Suffrage itself. It is true that the Referendum would be an innovation in this country; but so are many other things to which we have no difficulty in becoming accustomed, and it would be introduced to solve a problem also without precedent in the national history. These are days when much stress is laid on the principles of democracy, on the rights of the people to choose their own Government. The Referendum is a method of submitting to the judgment of the people a question upon which it has been found difficult to determine their opinion, or the opinion of the majority. That it is a natural concomitant of democracy is shown by the fact that it has been unquestioningly accepted as the very essence of popular government by the countries which started to build up a State from the very beginning according to democratic principles. The need of the Referendum has not been felt in Great Britain until lately, because the veto of the House of Lords and the Party system supplied all the legislative checks that the Constitution required. But the vote of the House of Lords has been virtually taken from it, or for the moment so threatened that its power has been weakened, while all the advantages of the Party system have been swallowed up in the tyranny of the Party caucus. The nation needs to get back to first principles, and foremost among these is the right of the people themselves to decide their own government. Hitherto the government of the country has been vested in the male electorate. If the time has come when it wishes to share its responsibilities with the women of the country, by all means let it take the necessary steps, give effect to its decision. There are difficult times ahead for this country; tempers are strained by the long duration of the war, and will be still further strained during the period of reconstruction after the war. That there will be one very strong line of cleavage in the nation is evident to all those

who are keeping in touch with industrial questions these days. It is not wise gratuitously to promote a second line of cleavage. But if Woman Suffrage is passed without reference to the electorate, it is bound to be fastened upon as a scapegoat for much that may go wrong, and to class hatred will be added sex hatred. We do not subscribe to the belief that "Woman Suffrage must come," but if it does come, then common sense and patriotism require that it should be introduced with the minimum amount of friction, with the maximum of good will. The British Government and its Allies have declared it to be repugnant to them that Poles, Armenians, Slovenes, or others should be compelled to serve under a régime with which they are not in sympathy. At least some precautions should be taken to ensure that a similar injustice should not be perpetrated at home. Suffragists have an unbounded belief in Woman Suffrage and in the advantages that will accrue from its adoption in Great Britain. They may be right; but as they happen to be human, they may equally be wrong. Other Suffragists have held the same views in the United States and in Australia before votes were given to women, but some have lived to change their opinion, and to regret the day when Woman Suffrage was introduced. Some of those who now support the movement in this country may pass through the same experience. Their remorse and their responsibility will be lessened, if they can reflect that the nation deliberately adopted the change with its eyes open. Effect to these considerations can now only be given by the House of Lords, and to that body the country will assuredly turn to save it from being committed to an experiment before it has had opportunity to pass judgment upon it.

NOTES AND NEWS.

The Foundations of Reconstruction.

It is well that attention should be given to the problem of reconstruction after the war, and provided the best man available has been chosen for the post of Minister, there is much to be said for according the subject the prestige of a special Department of State. The war has proved a drastic warning against the policy of *laissez aller*. It has opened the eyes of the nation to the importance of many things which formerly we were accustomed to take for granted, and to think of no importance. We must see to it that the lessons of the war are duly applied, but without the assistance of the Government, which is able to co-ordinate effort and to give it continuity, mere national good will is almost bound to prove unavailing. The chief asset in the new order that it is hoped to establish in the future should be the awakened conscience of the people. No Government Department, therefore, is likely to prove of much use, unless it drops the old traditions and allows itself to be inspired by the new spirit. Perhaps two of the most essential foundations for an official policy of reconstruction are moral honesty and a disposition which combines service with sympathy. A Department of Reconstruction must primarily be actuated with a zeal for rendering service. Bureaucracy too often considers its chief function to be the cult of blocking tactics.

The Spirit of Deception.

By moral honesty is implied the opposite to the spirit of deception that has been so sedulously cultivated in the past. The whole nation has become so accustomed to deceiving

itself and to being deceived, that the art of deception has come to be regarded as the essence of statesmanship. Our political system before the war was based on such deception. We prided ourselves on being democratic, but endured the tyranny of the political caucus. A Member of Parliament liked to regard himself as the representative of his constituency, but the last thing he would think of doing, when once elected, would be to consult its views on any question, for the purpose of giving expression to them in the House of Commons. To-day an attempt is being made to affect the belief that the country as a whole is in favour of Woman Suffrage, when it is well known that no one is in a position to say what the views of the majority of the people are. Mrs. Pankhurst goes to Russia, and a number of other worthy aspirants to fame try to follow her thither. They deceive themselves into believing that, without speaking a word of Russian (in Mrs. Pankhurst's case without even speaking French), they are able to influence profoundly the course of events in Russia. On their return they will claim to have done so, whereas in fact they have been merely an embarrassment to the Russians, who have also deceived themselves into imagining that they ought to tolerate such people. Hundreds of illustrations of the spirit of deception might be cited, the most serious instance of all being the wilful deception that brought us all unprepared into war with Germany. Is this spirit to continue when peace returns? Little hope of a change, it must be confessed, can be derived from recent proceedings in Parliament. It is, however, open to the House of Lords to point to a new order of things, and when the Representation of the People Bill comes before it, to stipulate that no clause shall find its way into the Act, unless it clearly has the support of the majority of the people.

The Woman Worker.

Something of the spirit of deception has entered into the general attitude towards the question of women in industry. Quite apart from deliberate misrepresentations, to which attention has been called from time to time in these pages, it is evident that the official utterance on the subject has been based more on wishes than on facts. The intention was no doubt good, but the effect has been undoubtedly bad. Much of the unrest in the labour world at the present time is due more to uncertainty regarding the future of the male workers after the war than to wages questions or mere war-strain. Inasmuch as Government and Press went out of their way to declare that not only were women ideal workers, but also that the work was ideal for them; that they were doing as much as and more than men ever did, and that they would continue to be as indispensable as workers after the war as they have been during its progress. Women, as we know, would have come forward to work without these eulogies. Suffragist propaganda, however, had not been abandoned, and it had long battened on misrepresentations. Women's work was worthy of the highest praise, but the exaggerated statements were based on a desire either to cover up possible deficiencies, or to disguise the fact that industrial labour is not woman's highest mission in life. A Committee of the British Association in 1916 threw down the first challenge to the official attitude towards women's work. It is now generally recognised that the work women have done in industry has not been equal to that done by men, and—more important still—that it is most undesirable that it should be equal; further, it is admitted that the woman worker requires and ought to be hedged round with more safeguards against strain

CHANGE OF ADDRESS.

As Palace Chambers have been taken over by the Government, the Headquarters of the National League for Opposing Woman Suffrage have been transferred until further notice to 39, Victoria Street, S.W.1.

and over-work than men. Finally, to cope with signs of unrest, it becomes necessary to reassure male workers that all their places will not be taken by women after the war. Needless to say there can be no disparagement of the work done by women. An honest appraisement of their splendid services gives them ample justice, and at the same time serves the true interests of the women themselves and of the State.

Women in Local Government.

The Woman Suffrage clause in the Representation of the People Bill is officially estimated to add about 6,000,000 women to the Register. Official estimates of this nature have a habit of falsifying themselves, as in the case of old age pensions and the Land Value Tax. There will, therefore, be no occasion for surprise, if the Bill should ever become law, to find the number of women voters much higher. Be that as it may, not the least incongruity in the whole matter is the proposal to enable six million to vote for Parliament on the top of the little interest shown by women in local government questions. The following statistics of local government work afford a clear insight into the use women have made of their opportunities to look after local administration, education and sanitation:—

	WITH WOMEN MEMBERS.	WITHOUT WOMEN MEMBERS
62 County Councils	4 (8 women)	58
80 County Borough Councils	12 (15 ..)	68
245 Non - County Borough Councils	10 (10 ..)	235
28 Metropolitan Borough Councils	11 (24 ..)	17
639 Poor Law Boards of Guardians	454 (1585 ..)	185
803 Urban District Councils	14 (19 ..)	789
652 Rural District Councils	141 (206 ..)	511
7205 Parish Councils	unknown	unknown
9714 Local Authorities.. ..	646 (1867 ..)	1863

Excluding, therefore, the parish councils, out of 2,509 local authorities that are directly elected, only 646, or 25.7 per cent., possess women members. It will be observed that 71 per cent. of the Boards of Guardians have women members. As the *Local Government Chronicle* shrewdly points out, it ought to be 100 per cent., and the percentage in the non-county borough councils and urban district councils should be much larger than now, in view of the vast amount of social work that lies ready for women to do.

DOES THE COUNTRY WANT WOMAN SUFFRAGE?

By LADY SIMON.

The English temperament sometimes shows itself impervious to any reasoning, however logical or even conclusive, which runs counter either to its prejudices or to its impulses, whichever of the two happens to hold the field at the moment. At the present tide of affairs a wave of impulse has swayed the bulk of our legislators towards Woman Suffrage, and the arguments which have hitherto held their ground as pointing to the possible—some say the certain—dangers which attend its adoption at the headquarters of a world-wide great Power, are swept on one side as though of no further value or significance in their relation to the question. For the moment it is the industrial aspect of the woman question which is paramount in a Parliament that has not only been “peptonised,” but hypnotised by the Speaker’s Conference. The fact that, considered from the point of view of ultimate values, woman’s primary function is not industrial and political, but maternal, is now, apparently, little accounted of at Westminster. That the vote should be offered to women as a prize for patriotic war work is an idea which is repudiated by Suffragists themselves as unworthy of consideration. As well might it be argued that the vote should be withheld from them in recognition of the war work of Anti-Suffragists.

There is a saying that bad cases make bad law, and, if this is true, it applies no less to the affairs of a nation than to those of an individual. The national “case” just now is a bad one. Could a worse time be chosen for deciding upon the political status of women than when all the normal conditions of national and home life are in suspense, held up, as it were, by the war; and when, too, the best of the manhood of the nation, instead of being engaged in productive work, is perforce turning all its powers to the work of destruction, and perishing largely in the process? Nothing is more abnormal and less likely to last than the industrial conditions now prevailing, and yet the swing of the Parliamentary pendulum towards Woman Suffrage is largely due to the position at present occupied by women in our national life.

This brings us to the question, how far does opinion inside the House reflect that of the country as a whole? The answer to this depends upon its representative character, and this is admittedly in the worst possible plight. So much has been said upon this aspect of the case that it seems unnecessary to insist further upon it. But bad as the situation is for the consideration of electoral reform of a revolutionary kind on the existing male basis, it is infinitely worse when a House of Commons which has ceased to be representative claims the right to settle, over the heads of the Constituencies, the case for Woman Suffrage.

The situation is aggravated by the fact that at the beginning of the war a truce, to last for the period of the war, was entered into by the National Union of Women’s Suffrage Societies and the National League for Opposing Woman Suffrage, by which both parties pledged themselves to abandon political propaganda, in order to leave their members free to engage in work of more pressing national importance. This truce, it may be observed in passing, has from the first not been loyally observed by many individual members of the

Suffragist Union, who have not failed to take advantage of the opportunity that their war work has afforded them of pushing their cause with the men. It was not, however, till the Speaker’s Conference was instituted to deal with the whole question of electoral reform that the National Union officially threw over the compact made with its opponents. It was perhaps quite natural that the Suffragist party should yield to the temptation offered it of engineering an active policy by means of a majority recommendation made by a totally unrepresentative body of men to an almost equally unrepresentative House. “Here,” its leaders must have said, “is an opportunity which it would be madness to neglect, of getting a Woman Suffrage Bill through without an appeal to the country.”

In introducing the “Representation of the People” Bill to the House, Mr. Long contended that a “dying Parliament” was quite justified in passing such a Bill, because every Reform Bill, with one exception, had been passed at “the end of Parliament,” just before it died. Even as regards the one exception it might surely be argued that a Bill of so wide a scope as the one in question might well follow that precedent rather than the rule which Mr. Long was upholding. But leaving that argument on one side, Mr. Long forgot that the “dying Parliament” theory does not apply in the present instance. The Parliament to which he introduced the Bill is already constitutionally dead. Its existence as the nation’s legislative and representative body, as apart from the exigencies of war, terminated a year-and-a-half ago. Therefore it is difficult to understand what justification any Government—Liberal, Coalition, National, or what not—can plead for using a deceased Parliament as a lever for legislation on a question such as Woman Suffrage, on which the electorate has every right to be directly consulted.

Legislation is, however, proceeding apace, and the Woman Suffrage Clause of the Reform Bill has been passed by a House of Commons pledged, by the very conditions which prolong its existence, to abstain from legislation on controversial subjects.* It only remains for Anti-Suffragists to emphasise their protest—which they hope to hear strongly echoed in the House of Lords—against methods of legislation which are no less undemocratic than unconstitutional, and which in the long run cannot fail to bring our Constitution into disrespect.

Those who believe that the extension of the Parliamentary franchise to the women of the United Kingdom is fraught with national danger make no claim to impose their convictions upon the electorate. If the nation wants Female Suffrage, it must have it. There is, however, no proof of this, as regards either the male population or women themselves. Anti-Suffragists have every right to demand a fair fight, and this can take place, not in the present House of Commons, but only in the country. No measure for the introduction of Woman Suffrage, whether on a large or a limited scale, ought to be proceeded with by the Government, until the question has been brought home to the constituencies by a General Election, or by a Referendum.

* The opposition which Proportional Representation has met with in the Commons is probably due in part to the uncertainty of many members as to how this would affect their seats. In the case of Woman Suffrage the incentive was of just the opposite kind. Those who opposed it stood to run the risk of losing the support of new voters if the measure became law.

A LESSON IN OBJECTIVES.

By GWLADYS GLADSTONE SOLOMON.

There is one strong argument in favour of Woman Suffrage, which, strangely enough, is never used by Suffragists, though it is continually supplied by them. It lies in the amazing stupidity of some men. One can hardly help arguing, “If men are so utterly and hopelessly illogical, could women be more so?”

A very good example of this lack of power to think logically was provided by Lord Hugh Cecil in the debate on Woman Suffrage in the House of Commons on May 22nd, 1917, when the noble lord argued that because women could cast a vote on one subject, they could, therefore, vote equally well on a totally different subject. That is to say, given the same subject and the same verb, you can alter the object without altering the truth of the statement.

One can do “a,”
Therefore one can do “b.”

Let us see how this works out. I can mix a pudding, therefore, according to the noble lord, I can mix a prescription! Would the noble lord take my prescription with as good faith as he would eat my pudding? Again, no doubt the noble lord can digest a speech. Does it follow that he can digest a hay-stack? He can swallow a cherry; can he therefore swallow an insult, or an opponent’s argument? Is it all one to him what he swallows?

What a good thing it is that everyone does not argue like Lord Hugh Cecil. Suppose the man who controlled a newspaper were considered fit to control an Empire? Suppose we had to allow men to make laws because they can make roads? Suppose we had to acknowledge that men who have “done time” have “done their bit”!

These examples are exactly on parallel lines with the argument in question, that because women are qualified to look after such matters as education, housing, workhouses, etc., they are therefore qualified to control the Army, Navy and business problems of a vast Empire, or, in other words, because women have the Municipal vote they must have the Parliamentary vote.

AMERICAN SUFFRAGISM AND THE WAR.

By MRS. A. J. GEORGE.

The demand of the Suffragists for the ballot as a reward for their loyalty to the nation in its hour of greatest peril, is the crowning evidence of their failure to appreciate the meaning of government, and their utter unfitness to assume the political burdens they would force upon their unwilling sisters.

They claim to speak for the women of America, and the corollary of their extraordinary demand is that, if they do not get their price, the women of the nation will refuse to do their duty; that if they are not given the ballot, their answer will be treason.

It is difficult to imagine a more outrageous insult to the women of the United States.

The Suffragists represent, fortunately, a very small minority of their sex, and the great majority of women, who realise the futility and the menace of Woman Suffrage, resent with all their power the base imputation that their loyalty is contingent upon any reward except the reward for which every man and woman who is opposing Prussianism is contending—the consciousness of having given their all in the battle for democracy.

Woman Suffrage is a sweeping revolutionary doctrine, that must not be decided from notions of chivalry, or, as Mrs. Funk, of the Women’s Council of National Defence, says, “in desperation or in self-defence.” The question is not what some women want and other women do not want, but what is best for the State. And until the Suffragists can convince us that it will not weaken the State to dilute its electorate with an element whose decisions in crises affecting the life of the State are determined by emotion and sentiment and treason, they cannot expect us to take their demands seriously.

When Miss Rankin* stood on the floor of the National House of Representatives, she said, “I want to stand by my country, but I cannot vote for war.” She showed conclusively what the nation might expect from a Congress of women. It was her woman’s heart that spoke, and not her head, for what she meant was, “I want to stand by my country; my reason tells me that to do so I must vote for war, but my heart refuses to permit me.” She preferred disloyalty to patriotism, because her heart’s promptings overbalanced her reasoning faculties in the contemplation of war.

If the men of Congress had been as weak as the woman of Congress in that moment of trial, how abject would be our position to-day in the world conflict of democracy against autocracy, of civilisation against barbarism!

Government, as Calhoun so tersely defined it, is protection, and protection is the business of man. Woman’s inherent incapacity for self-defence, her absolute need of protection as the mother of the race, place her inevitably behind the firing line. There her heart, her emotions, her sentiments, may play their part, and it is an important part. But the State does not rest upon these elements, necessary as they are to the happiness and well-being of the race. It rests in the final analysis—much as we would have it otherwise—upon brute force; and the burden of that force must continue to fall, as it has always fallen, upon the shoulders of men.

“But,” it is argued, “see what women are doing to-day to aid the nation. Surely the service they are rendering is as necessary to the successful prosecution of the war as is the service of men?”

It is no part of my purpose to try to minimise the importance of women’s service to the nation. I wish to point out, however, that the men of this nation could carry on the war without the assistance of their women, if, unfortunately, they were forced to do so; but without the aid of their men, the women would be hopeless. Men can take the place of women in every war activity in which women are now engaged, but women cannot take the place of men upon the firing line, where the supreme sacrifice must be made, and it would not be desirable that they should do so.

In considering this question, however, we must be guided not by what women are doing and can do under a Government controlled by men, but by what they would be likely to do under a Government in which they had an equal voice with men. The war decision was made by men, and is being enforced by men. The only woman who had a voice in the making of that decision proved unequal to her trust. She proved herself unfit to participate in the government of a great nation when the ultimate test came.

But how about her Suffragist sisters? What would they have done in her place? Their utterances and affiliations supply the answer, and as I read it, it is that they would have deserted the nation as did Miss Rankin, in its hour of

* Miss Rankin is one of the representatives of Montana in the House of Representatives.

need. Most of them are peace-at-any-price propagandists. All of them put Suffrage first, the nation's welfare second. They refused to agree to a truce on the Suffrage question during the war, a truce proposed so that all the women of the nation might give themselves unreservedly to patriotic work. They are now bartering Suffrage for loyalty.

Before the war they were opposed to preparedness for national defence. Suffragists organised the ridiculous Ford Peace Party. Suffragists organised and Suffragists compose the Woman's Peace Party, with its farcical declaration that "wars will cease when women get the vote." To-day they have their Anti-enlistment Leagues, designed to prevent young men from joining the Army and Navy, and are engaged in various pacifist activities, some of them coming dangerously near to the line of treason, and all tending to discourage the growth of the spirit of patriotism, which is essential to the life of the nation.

The "American Union Against Militarism" is a national organisation the purpose of which is to oppose the efforts of the Government to raise an Army by conscription, and the efforts of patriotic men and women to safeguard the nation's future by providing for universal military training and service. The officers of this organisation are all Suffragists, among them being such prominent workers in the "cause," as Miss Jane Addams, Sophonisba T. Breckinridge, Mrs. Glendower Evans, Zona Gale, and Crystal Eastman.

In recent addresses Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, President of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, has told the people of this country that the Suffragists are "growing rebellious." This statement, made by Mrs. Catt in Columbus, Ohio, on May 13th, sounds very much like a threat of disloyalty.

"Women are asked to mobilise their forces in aid of a Government which has wronged them. . . . We have been patient, ineffably patient, but we grow rebellious because the wrong done to the women of the United States is rendered more conspicuous by contrast with other lands."

It would be interesting to know where Mrs. Catt got her right to speak for the "women of the United States." She is entitled without doubt to speak for the Suffragists. These women may be, as she says, in a rebellious mood because of a fancied wrong, but I make free to say that the mass of our women are not rebels, but patriots, and that the wrong which they fear is that Mrs. Catt's demands will be granted.

Mrs. Catt says the lack of the vote hampers woman's efficiency in this crisis. When the war broke out, women wrote to Washington to know how they could help, and they were told that they could best serve, as Anti-Suffragists have always contended, by practising thrift and economy in their households, where, according to the Secretary of Agriculture, the waste each year amounts to 700,000,000 dollars. Certainly this would buy a good many Liberty Bonds, and maintain a good many boys in the trenches, and it is a kind of service that I believe even Mrs. Catt could perform without the aid of the ballot.

It must be clear to all who are familiar with the Suffragist-Pacifist propaganda, that the Suffragists are opposed to war in any circumstances. That in their opinion our greatest chance of happiness would be in maintaining a state of helplessness akin to that of China, and in protesting against repeated violations of our most sacred rights with a display of the white feather.

"We had better blot the mote from our own eyes before we go forth to blot it from the Prussian eyes," says Mrs. Catt. In other words, we should not go to war until we

have enfranchised the Suffragists. Here, then, we have the Suffragist position in a nutshell: "We should not fight until Suffragists get the vote, and we would not fight, if the Suffragists had the vote." You pay your money, and you take your choice.

The Suffragists are protesting a belated loyalty, but let us not forget that they place a price upon it, and that that price would not only constitute an intolerable injustice to the great majority of women, but would create an element of weakness in the nation that would menace its very life. It is indeed a deplorable situation if the contingent patriots must be rewarded at the expense, not only of the nation, but of the mass of women whose patriotism is the very fibre of their being. I know of nothing that would be more distasteful to these women than being forced into politics, and it would surely be a poor return for their patriotic services to saddle them with this burden, in order that the disloyal members of their sex might be satisfied.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

A PLEA FOR A CONSTITUTIONAL DECISION:

A Declaration under the above heading, to which over 200 signatures were appended, appeared in *The Times* during June, and was published in the July issue of THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW. Owing to the shortness of the time that elapsed between the drafting of the Declaration and its publication, the names of all those who wished to sign it could not be incorporated. The following are among the numerous signatures that have since been received:—Arthur Balfour, Esq. (Sheffield), Miss Jessie Burnet, Mrs. Lawrence Buxton, George Cowell, Esq., F.R.C.S., Mrs. Cowell, Sir Stuart Coats, Bart., M.P., Lady Coats, Lord Eustace Cecil, Earl of Devon, Miss Beatrice H. Dent, Miss Mary Dimsdale, Sir George Errington, Bart., Miss Elizabeth Edsley, Miss Gabrielle Festing, Brig.-General Flint, Mrs. Bruce Gardyne, Earl of Gainsborough, Colonel F. W. Graham, Mrs. Graham, Lady Jephson, Mrs. Hamilton King, H. Knatchbull-Hugesson, Esq., Colonel S. E. G. Lawless, The Lady Mowbray and Stourton, The Lord Bishop of Manchester, James McDougal, Esq., F.R.G.S., Mrs. James McDougal, Miss Edith Milner, Miss M. Morgan, Mrs. Macklethwait, C. W. L. Machin, Esq., Mrs. Chesshyre Molyneux, Miss Mowbray, Miss A. M. Mure, Earl of Northbrook, Charles Copland Perry, Esq., M.A., Ph.D., Mrs. C. Copland Perry, Mrs. Parkinson, Mrs. J. Caldwell Penman, Miss Margaret Prothero, Edward Pagden, Esq., Arthur Pott, Esq., Mrs. Pott, Lord Robson, G.C.M.G., Miss Kathleen S. Stewart, Professor George Saintsbury, F.B.A., Mrs. George Saintsbury, J. P. Grace Smith, Esq., Miss Scholes, Dr. Alexander Scott, F.R.S., Lord Somers, Mrs. E. B. Sharp, The Lady Susan Trueman, Miss Margaret I. Turner, Mrs. Thornton, Mrs. Wauchope of Niddrie, the Rev. F. M. Wethered, Mrs. F. M. Wethered, Colonel Hope Willis.

SUBSTITUTION LABOUR.

In a recent discussion in the Sheffield City Council it was stated that the General Manager of the Municipal Tramways had estimated that it took 700 women to do the same amount of work that 550 men could do. A local economist writing to the Sheffield Press explains the significance of this feature as follows:—"The women are given the same rate as the men, who averaged about 32s. a week, though they are only worth on this basis, about 25s. a week. This means that in this case, to do the same work with women instead of men costs the citizens about £240 a week more, or over £12,000 a year. This is equivalent to nearly a 2d. rate."

MEMBERS of the N.L.O.W.S. learned with great gratification that the London County Council had given expression to its appreciation of Mrs. Burgwin's work as Superintendent of its Special Schools by presenting her on her retirement from the Council's service with £1,000 in War Loan Stock and War Savings Certificates, together with a purse containing £70. Mrs. Burgwin was elected an Honorary Vice-President of the League on her retirement from the Executive.

AUGUST, 1917.

THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW.

63

THE WOMAN WORKER.

The following article is taken from the Manchester *Sunday Chronicle*, and merits consideration, not for the sake of matching one generalisation against another, but because the subject is an important one, and the more thought devoted to it the better. Everyone who has tried to investigate the problem knows that there are more aspects to it than might be inferred from the eulogies of the Government and of those who seek to make political capital out of woman's labour:—

Is woman a failure in industry?

The mere question is staggering, isn't it? Everybody, or nearly everybody, who is not in industry, believes that woman has "made good"; that she has demonstrated her ability to carry on the industry of the country efficiently and economically. Gentlemen with well-known pen-names have gone round the engineering centres at the invitation of the Ministry of Munitions to write up the patriotism, the self-sacrifice, the endurance, and the skill of the woman war worker. Her photograph has appeared in every paper. I myself have paid the most eloquent tribute my pen was capable of to the girls in the brown and blue overalls.

And now I ask, is the woman worker a failure? Is she what our graphic soldiers would call "a washout"? Is it a fact that when the war is over and the men return the employers of labour will welcome them back to the benches and tell the women once more that her proper place is at home or in something different? I am not going to answer those questions. I have not sufficient data upon which to make a dogmatic assertion that woman is everything the Press Bureau's fancy painted her, or that, on the other hand, she is as disappointing as the question suggests. But I am going to repeat the opinions of several men who employ men and women, and whose interests it is to employ people profitably.

One of them is the manager of a large engineering firm which is exclusively engaged in Government work. I shall not give his name, because he does not wish to have his eyes torn out. He started—and rather startled me—with the sweeping but confidential statement that woman labour is not a commercial proposition in engineering works.

"It's this way," he said. "A woman gets four-fifths of the wages of a man, and she produces as much as a man—sometimes a bit more. But for every six women we employ we must have one man to look after them, to set their tools, adjust the driving belt, and keep everything running smoothly. So six women means four-fifths of the wages of six men, plus the wages of one male supervisor and plus the wages of an extra tool maker. Oh, yes, that's what I said—an extra tool maker. The reason? Well, women are not as careful in the use of tools as men. If a man breaks a tool he takes jolly good care he doesn't break another for a long time. But a woman—bless her!—will break one and say, 'Why, it's broke,' and perhaps weep a little. Half an hour later she will break another, and merely say, 'Well, if it hasn't broken again!' And then, because she's superstitious, and believes that if you break one thing you must break three, she does break a third. Again, the woman makes more rejected articles—shells, etc.—than a man. So when you come to reckon it all up you find that while woman labour is superficially as productive as man's, and one-fifth cheaper, it is actually a good deal dearer. The trouble with women is that they do need over-looking. They are not as handy as men. We have to simplify every job for a woman. When she has learned it she can do it all right except for the tool breaking. Now, this is a significant fact. The men who supervise the women workers and set their tools are themselves unskilled. I mean they are not men who have served their time to the trade. They started with the women, but they learn quicker, and have a better grasp of general principles, so to speak."

I asked this manager woman critic if the women were doing as well now as in the early days when they came into the shops on a wave of patriotic fervour.

"No, they are not," he replied. "There's not so much patriotism of that sort left. It's purely a business transaction now. The women have learned all the tricks that the men used to play on us. They can 'ca' cannie' as well as anyone, and they are doing it every time they are put on a new job. They simply won't do their best unless the price is right from their point of view. A little time ago one of my foremen gave a woman a new job. It took her four minutes to do it. And she declared she couldn't do it in less. Yet when the foreman took the trouble to stand by she was able to do it in less than two minutes. So far as 'doing' me is concerned, they have the trade union spirit all right. But when it comes to their relationship to each other they are—well, almost any woman will try to sneak the place of any other woman who

happens to be getting a couple of bob a week more than she gets. She doesn't mind if the other woman gets sacked."

From this misogynist I went to seek refutation from another engineer, only to find that in the main he agreed with his controlled brother.

"The reports I receive from my manager and foremen," he said, "are certainly not favourable to women as compared with men. Mind, I believe that the women have done the nation a service which cannot be measured or praised too highly. The readiness with which they entered upon the work, and the determination they put into it saved the Empire. We must never forget that. But neither must we who have to run businesses on business lines forget that it was not a commercial situation that had to be saved; not an economic rival who had to be beaten. When it comes to that I am afraid women will find that they are scarcely fitted for engineering. With the best will in the world they have not the endurance or the strength of men. We have had to make special machines to enable women to do certain things which men can do quicker and better with their hands. Yes, it is perfectly true that women are learning to limit output until the prices are fixed to suit them. I do not say that they have had this method suggested to them. But there are certain things that are significant. For instance, a job was given to my women a few months ago, and every one produced exactly the same number of articles in the hour. That could not have happened except by arrangement, especially as some of them were new hands and others were experienced. It is now evident to me that if ever we had hopes that women would solve the labour troubles for us those hopes are doomed to disappointment."

THE CHAIN GUILD MONTHLY REPORT.

The child world is woman's domain, and we are at a critical time. Every true follower of Christ is making a citizen, and not only a citizen of this world, but for the next. This month we have heard that a lad we helped into the Navy through Dr. Barnardo's is doing well. We have sent him a Bible. A little lad and lass are doing well at Aberlour. Another lad is getting on at Baldovern. We are sending £1 to the Polish Relief Fund and £1 to Serbian children; £1 to Dr. Barnardo's to help another boy; £2 to the Coal Fund at Aberlour; 5s. 6d. to the St. Mary's Home, Broadstairs; £1 to Quarrier; £2 to Sunnybank for the invalid children; £1 to the Royal Waterloo Hospital for Women and Children; and £1 for Miss McClean's Home in Edinburgh. Mrs. Edge, 10, Comberton Hill, Kidderminster, is very glad of orders for her invalid children, whose work is lovely. May I urge all who can to join the Mothers' Union, the G.F.S., or the Y.M.C.A. The harvest is ready, but the workers are few.

Any questions regarding the Chain Guild will be most gladly answered. All are asked to join. Subscription (to include subscription with the REVIEW), 2s. a year. Next month we are collecting for disabled soldiers and sailors.—LADY GRISELDA CHEAPE, Strathyrum, Fife.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE QUEEN'S HOSPITAL.

The Editor THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW.

SIR,—May we earnestly appeal to the generosity of the public for donations in support of this new Hospital and Training School (with the gracious approval of Her Majesty the Queen, and with the consent of the Directors-General of the Navy and Army Medical Services), at Froginal, Sidcup, Kent, for the treatment of many of our most grievously wounded men?

This model institution, with its Plastic and Dental Operating Theatres, erected and equipped on the most scientific principles, will fill a great need, the chief among its objects being to remove acute cases of facial and jaw injuries from the atmosphere of crowded hospitals into fresh country air and delightful surroundings, and so give these terrible wounds every chance to heal more rapidly after the frequent operations which are necessary.

Donations should be sent addressed to C. H. Kenderdine, Esq., Hon. Secretary and Treasurer, St. Stephen's House, Westminster, S.W.1, marked "The Queen's Hospital." Cheques should be crossed "Lloyd's Bank."

Yours obediently,

FRENCH, F.M.,
CLARENDON,
CORISANDE RODNEY,
ROSAMOND CORBET,

HEATH HARRISON.
HUGH W. DRUMMOND,
WALTER PEACOCK,
GEO. J. WARDLE.

IMPERIAL CONFEDERATION.*

Two main schools of thought hold the field at present for the organic unity of the British Empire: one would have an Imperial or Pan-Britannic Parliament for Imperial affairs, and leave the existing Parliaments to deal with their own local affairs; the other wishes to see things evolve more gradually and would begin by providing for Imperial representation or co-operation in some adaptation of the British Cabinet. The bearing of the policy of the former school on the Suffrage question is by no means remote, as with local Parliaments restricted to local affairs one of the objections to Woman Suffrage in Great Britain would be in part eliminated, and a ground for compromise opened up, if, as the result of a Referendum, there were shown to be any strong feeling in favour of Woman Suffrage.

The Canadian author of "Pan-Britannic Confederation" is a vigorous spokesman, with special ideas of his own, of the first-named school. He advocates the development of a confederation as distinct from the text-book ideas of "Federalism" often urged by other writers. He does not wish to destroy the British principle of government, but to eradicate the faulty excrescences which dull-witted statesmen and party-mad politicians have grafted upon that system. Imperialism, he says, has been obscured by Provincialism, and even by Nationalism, than which it is far greater. But there must be a quicker spirit of "give and take" between the Mother country and the Dominions than he, as a Canadian, has found in the past. The fear of British ascendancy on the one part and Colonial ascendancy on the other must be blotted out, for "in the immediate past it has been a powerful reality blocking every effort to secure any form of closer Imperial union." The important contrast between the system of Federal Government adopted by the United States and that in vogue in Canada is clearly brought out. By the American constitution each of the United States surrendered to the National Federal Government some of its powers, reserving to itself every power not specifically surrendered. In Canada each Province surrendered the whole of its powers of government to the National Dominion Government, and received back certain of such powers. The Canadian Parliament is, therefore, the supreme authority in the Dominion with regard to every affair other than those mentioned in the constitution of each Province. The jurisdiction of the Federal Government in the U.S.A. is strictly confined to specific areas of authority; any point of government not mentioned in the constitution being in the hands of the individual State concerned. This is an important distinction. In the one case the National Government is the "residuary legatee" of all authority not specifically vested in a subordinate province. In the other case the individual State is the "residuary legatee" of all authority not specifically vested in the National Government.

Mr. Wismer recommends the development of the Canadian system as a guiding principle for Imperial government; and he believes it is possible to avoid setting up a written constitution, the necessity of which often raises serious objection to proposals of this nature. Home Rule all round must be granted, he says, and the present British Parliament resolve itself into an Imperial Parliament ready to receive representatives from the three or four home kingdoms thus created, and from the Dominions. Clauses inserted into the constitutions of the new kingdoms could refer to and thus create a method of representation in the Imperial Parliament. To ensure more complete standardisation of government in the various parts of the Empire, it is suggested that in the new kingdoms Provincial Councils should be established on the lines of the Ontario Provincial Legislature. Such Councils would be of the nature of glorified London County Councils presiding over the local conditions of their respective districts. England should be divided into seven areas for this purpose, every area having approximately an equal population. Thus each portion of the Empire sending representatives to the Imperial Parliament would possess three Parliaments—Imperial, National, and Provincial.

The Imperial Government would consist of—

- (a) An Imperial House of Lords.
- (b) An Imperial House of Commons.
- (c) An Imperial Advisory Council.

The Cabinet being composed in the same way as at present, its members being drawn from and having seats in the Imperial Houses of Parliament. Mr. Wismer considers direct Dominion representation in the Cabinet unnecessary, but advocates a General and Inner Cabinet on the lines of our present War Cabinet.

The exact powers to be conferred upon the Imperial Houses of Parliament are acknowledged to be difficult of decision. Questions of foreign relationships and of naval and military defence must be

**Pan-Britannic Confederation*, by Walter Eves Wismer. Edinburgh: T. and A. Constable.

dealt with by the Imperial and not local Legislatures. But defence entails finance, and finance taxation. This presents, as Mr. Wismer perceives, one of the main obstacles to be overcome. No self-governing Province, Kingdom, or Dominion will consent to surrender its right to settle its own taxes. But he suggests that a system of subsidies voted by each to an Imperial fund might prove possible, the expenditure from which would be in the hands of the Imperial House of Commons, and the control of which would, therefore, be shared by the representatives of each contributing area.

As regards "Home Rule all round" in the United Kingdom, Mr. Wismer's plan would admit of either of two alternatives—either that each portion should have a legislative constitution and form a separate unit, sending representatives to the Imperial Government on the same system as would each Dominion; or that by mutual agreement Great Britain should become an autonomous Home Rule unit possessing one Parliament for the united England, Wales, and Scotland. Dual Chamber government is considered essential, the tyranny of a single Chamber being fully recognised.

The tyranny of party politics as shown in the party caucus, lobbying, and party funds, is also denounced by Mr. Wismer, who shows that what he terms the despotism of democracy is evident not only in England, but in Australia and the United States. The danger and stupidity of our Naturalisation laws, the glaring faults of our electoral system, which encourages bribery by means of patronage and social advantages, the folly of "One Man One Vote" Suffrage (as pointed out many years ago by J. S. Mill), the increasing want of political morality amongst all party politicians during the past fifty years, the passionate desire for the Suffrage in order to secure sex or trade advantages—these and other evils of present conditions all come under the lash of Mr. Wismer's criticism. And he is careful to point out that amongst the many reformers and others who recognise the unsatisfactory conditions around them, few, if any, are ready to throw the blame towards those upon whom it should properly be cast, namely, themselves. "Every individual suspects and blames others; nobody suspects himself, or accuses himself." We all know Mr. Wismer's reformer, who desires to reform everyone except himself, and who throws upon the shoulders of the Government the responsibility of financing and organising every scheme for correcting defective, corrupt, or unsatisfactory conditions; and we are reminded that, too often, "Reforms are gauged by their vote-producing value, not by their health-producing virtues."

Land Reform in Great Britain is strongly urged as preliminary to a better system of politics. But it is encouraging to find the author recognising the special difficulties in re-adjustment of rental, and agricultural labour, and wage questions. He remarks that "it must be kept in mind that agriculture is dependent upon the weather . . . and to try to place weather conditions under the control of the law is a dubious experiment." He further warns the English Land Reformer not to imagine that to the nobility as such belongs the "infamy of land possession," for in "the U.S.A. there is no such thing as a peerage, yet its history is full of the most infamous land-stealing in the West." And in our own Dominions the massing of great tracts of land under one ownership has not been due to an aristocracy. "When an English commoner makes sufficient money to buy out a noble, has he yet distinguished himself by offering to give up the perquisites that went with the land?" pertinently inquires our author.

Perhaps Mr. Wismer underrates the gravity of the obstacle to centralisation of Imperial Government raised by the immense distances which exist between the various Dominions and England. And possibly he is too sanguine of the reception his or any like scheme of Imperial unity may encounter in each or any of the self-governing Dominions.

Difficulties are many; but none are insurmountable, if all parties concerned honestly intend to overcome them; and Mr. Wismer himself refers to "the traditional British policy of never altering a working arrangement, however illogical, as long as it, in fact, works." The Empire now demands some departure from the old loosely-hung-together policy. Patience and forbearance are essential, as is also the willingness to accept an imperfect beginning, if based on sound Imperialistic principles. No conceivable system is perfect; that which may fit our demand to-day will not, if we progress, fit the wants of our descendants in the 21st century. But if the British race makes up its mind to draw closer in the bond of government, we can devise a workable system of Pan-Britannic Confederation.

G. S. P.

Recalled to Life is a new periodical devoted to the interests of disabled sailors and soldiers. It emphasises the possibilities of hope and usefulness that are opened up to them by the new methods provided for their care, re-education, and return to civil life. Lord Charnwood is the editor.