

# THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW.

The ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW is published by the Women's National Anti-Suffrage League, and can be obtained through any bookseller or newsagent. Annual Subscription, 1/6, post free.

The OFFICES of the LEAGUE are at 515, Caxton House, Tothill Street, Westminster, S.W. Telegraphic Address: "Adversaria, London." Telephone Number: 8472 Gerrard.

No. 20.

LONDON, JULY, 1910.

PRICE 1d.

## THE WOMEN'S NATIONAL ANTI-SUFFRAGE LEAGUE.

**Executive Committee:** *Chairman:* THE COUNTESS OF JERSEY; *Vice-Chairman:* MRS. MASSIE;

LADY HAVERSHAM,	MISS GERTRUDE LOWTHIAN BELL,	ELLEN COUNTESS OF DESART,	LADY SIMON,
MRS. HUMPHRY WARD,	LADY WEARDALE,	MRS. ARTHUR SOMERVELL,	LADY ROBSON,
MRS. FREDERIC HARRISON,	MISS JANET HOGARTH,	MR. HEBER HART,	MRS. ARCHIBALD COLQUHOUN,
LADY GEORGE HAMILTON,	HON. NINA KAY SHUTTLEWORTH,	MRS. BURGWIN,	MRS. GEORGE MACMILLAN.
MRS. CHARLES TENNYSON,	LADY BIDDULPH OF LEDBURY,		

*Hon. Treasurers:* J. MASSIE, ESQ. LORD ASHBY ST. LEDGERS.

*Secretary:* MISS L. TERRY LEWIS.

The terms of Membership are:—Members of Council, £1 1s.; Members of the League, 5s.; Associates, 1s.; Membership of Branches, 1s. to 5s. (Branches can arrange for the collection of smaller subscriptions.) Men are admitted as subscribing or affiliated members.

The Men's League for Opposing Women's Suffrage (*President:* THE EARL OF CROMER) invites all men who are opposed to Woman Suffrage to enrol themselves as members. For full particulars apply to the Hon. Sec., Palace Chambers, Bridge St., S.W.

### PROMINENT ANTI-SUFFRAGISTS.

THE name of Mrs. Humphry Ward stands pre-eminent on the long list of intellectual men and women whose sound arguments, and reputations as social reformers, have made them valued leaders in the Anti-Suffrage movement. We claim Mrs. Ward, with pride, as one of our intimate workers, whose constant personal interest in everything connected with the inner workings of the Women's National Anti-Suffrage League since its foundation, has done so much to make it, in two short years, a powerful organisation. It is to Mrs. Ward that our "Review" owes its existence—surely a great honour for a little magazine to have as sponsor one of the foremost of living women novelists!

Mrs. Ward is not only known to the public as the writer of "Robert Elsmere," "David Grieve," "Marcella," "Helbeck of Bannisdale," and other books, but she has always taken a great interest in intellectual and social reform. She was one of the founders of the system of lectures for women, which preceded the establishment of the Women's Colleges in Oxford, and as a member of the first Council of Somerville Hall, watched and helped in the first years of the College with the keenest interest. Her



Photo. H. Waller Barnett, Knightsbridge.

*Mary A. Ward*

MRS. HUMPHRY WARD.

connection with the Passmore Edwards Settlement, founded under the name of University Hall in 1890, is well known, and through the Settlement, she was concerned in the starting of the Cripple Schools, and the Vacation School and Play Centre movement, which is now spreading so widely. Through the joint action of the Settlement and the London School Board in 1899 the first public Invalid School was opened. There are now 32 of these Invalid Schools under the L.C.C., with a total roll of over 2,500 children. From the Dinners and After-Training Committee, has sprung the large and successful Dinners organisation which now supplies the needs of all the Cripple Schools, as well as the After-Care Committee for Physically Defective Children. The Holiday Schools, started by Mrs. Ward, and now being taken up by the London County Council, have cheered year by year forlorn London children whose only summer playground is a dingy court or dirty street, and the 13 Play Centres in the crowded districts of London have shewn what the systematic use of the primary school buildings and playgrounds can do to bring delight and discipline to thousands of London's little ones. L.V.M.

### LETTER FROM THE QUEEN-MOTHER.

IN reply to a letter of condolence bearing the signatures of Lady Jersey, the Duchess of Montrose, and Lord Cromer, we have received the following:—

Buckingham Palace,  
June 23rd, 1910.

DEAR LORD CROMER,—I am desired by Queen Alexandra to acknowledge the receipt of an address of condolence on behalf of the Women's Anti-Suffrage League, the Scottish National Anti-Suffrage League, and the Men's League for Opposing Woman's Suffrage.

Her Majesty wishes me to ask you, as President, to kindly convey her heartfelt thanks to all those who have shared in sending this address, and to say how deeply touched she is at their kind thought of her in her terrible bereavement.—Believe me, yours sincerely,

(Signed) SIDNEY GREVILLE.

The Earl of Cromer.

### THE PRINCIPLES OF OUR LEAGUE.

THREE weeks ago the Executive Committee of the League passed the following resolutions on the motion of Mrs. Humphry Ward, seconded by Miss Hogarth:—

(1) That the League should endeavour (a) to promote a better understanding among women, of their present powers, privileges, and duties under various Local Government Acts; (b) to secure that the opinion of women opposed to the extension of the Parliamentary Suffrage to their sex should be adequately represented among those appointed to important Public Commissions and Committees.

(2) That the Executive Committee should appoint a Local Government Sub-Committee to consider the best means of attaining these objects, and report to this Committee.

Since these resolutions were passed, we have had the annual meeting of the League in Caxton Hall, and the all but unanimous passage of a resolution, proposed and seconded by

speakers representing two of our most important branches in the country, which lends strong support to the resolutions of the Executive quoted above. The interesting speech of the Duchess of Montrose, as representing the Scottish League, was also in the same direction. There could be no doubt indeed as to the feeling of the Council, and measures will at once be taken to give it effect.

Meanwhile the acceptance of these Resolutions by the Executive and the Council, and the appointment of a Local Government Sub-Committee, which will shortly hold its first meetings, mark, no doubt, a certain new and definite stage in the progress of our League. By some, perhaps, that stage will be watched with a certain anxiety; while others will see in it the fulfilment—so far as it goes—of delayed hopes, and the promise of new strength. The anxiety is natural. For the task before the League is long and strenuous, and that task in its first and most essential aspect is a task of fight, a task of opposition. We came into being as an Association primarily to resist the imposition on women of the burden of the Parliamentary vote. And it is easily intelligible that those who realise keenly the struggle before us may feel some alarm lest anything should divert the energies of the League from its first object, or lest those who are already hotly engaged in the fight against the franchise should find themselves expected to throw themselves willy nilly into work for which they are less fitted, or for which they care less, and should be thereby chilled in their devotion to the cause of the League.

But if the anxiety is natural, the hope is natural too. Many members of the League believe that there are not one, but two ways of fighting the franchise—a negative and a positive way. They hold that while the pronounced and bigoted Suffragist can only be met by an attitude of resolute and direct opposition to an unpatriotic demand, there are in this country thousands of women, anti-Suffragist at heart, or still undecided, who may be attracted to a positive and alterna-

tive programme, while they shrink from meeting the Suffragist claim with a simple "No." Their mind and judgment tell them that there are many things still to be done, both for women and the country, that women ought to be doing, and if they are asked merely to acquiesce in present conditions, they rebel, and will in the end rather listen to Suffragist persuasion and adopt Suffragist methods. But the recent action of the Executive opens to such women a new field of positive action within our League—without any interference with the old. "How immeasurably would the strength of the League be increased"—said the advocates of what has been called "the forward policy"—"if in every town or district, where we have a branch, we had also a Women's Local Government Committee, affiliated not to the present Women's Local Government Society, which is a simple branch of the Suffragist propaganda, but to the National Anti-Suffrage League! The Women's Local Government movement, which has been all but killed in the last two years by Suffragist excesses, and the wrath provoked by them in the nation, would thus pass into the hands of those better able to use without abusing it. The Anti-Suffrage cause would profit, and the nation also."

These things are for the future to show, and the Executive to deal with.

Meanwhile no one need feel called upon to undertake work uncongenial or unfamiliar to them, because of the League's new departure. "Many women, many minds." There is work for all, and what we have to do is to gather into the League as many enthusiasms and as many points of view as possible, with the one common object of checking the present course of the Suffrage movement.

For the month before us, the policy of stout and uncompromising resistance holds the field. The so-called Conciliation Bill is still before the House of Commons; Mr. Asquith has ceded the second reading, but the opponents of Woman Suffrage have to see to it that the Bill goes no further. If the Bill obtains a majority on the

second reading, while yet that majority falls below the majorities recorded in previous debates on the various abortive second readings of the past, that will be, so far, victory for the Anti-Suffrage cause. It will mean that the Suffrage cause is declining in the country, that the counter movement has checked it, and that, given time, the counter movement will win. Let us then consecrate all our energies for the next few weeks on the pressing forward of resistance inside and outside the House of Commons to Lord Lytton's Bill; and when that resistance, as we hope, has done its work, let us then turn with renewed hope and zeal to the development of the further tasks of the League.

### DEPUTATION TO THE PRIME MINISTER.

JUNE 21ST, 1910.

THE Prime Minister, Mr. Asquith, received a deputation from the Women's National Anti-Suffrage Leagues of England and Scotland, and from the Men's League for Opposing Women's Suffrage, at Downing Street, on June 21st.

The deputation comprised the Countess of Jersey (Chairman W.N.A.S.L.), Mrs. Humphry Ward, Mrs. Burgwin (Superintendent Special Schools, L.C.C.), Lady Sheffield (representing Northern Branches), the Duchess of Montrose, LL.D. (President, Scottish A.S.L.), Mrs. Wilton Phipps (Education Committee, L.C.C.), Lady Wantage, Mrs. Arnold Toynbee (Treasurer, Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford, Guardian of the Poor), Mrs. Max Müller (one of the pioneers of Women's Education in Oxford), Mrs. Austen Leigh (representing the Cambridge Branch of the W.N.A.S.L.), Lord Haversham, Mr. John Massie, Sir Alfred Lyall, Mr. Heber Hart, Mr. St. Loe Strachey, Mr. Godfrey Benson, Professor Dicey, Sir Edward O'Malley, Lord Edmund Talbot, and Lord Ronaldshay.

Mr. Massie read the names of the deputation members and the following letter from Mr. Austen Chamberlain to the League:—

"Confirming my telegram, I am sorry to say that it is not possible for me to accompany the Anti-Suffrage deputation to the Prime Minister on Tuesday.

"I presume that the object of the

deputation is to express our opposition to the movement for woman suffrage, and to urge that no special facilities ought to be given by Government for the passage of the very contentious Bill introduced into Parliament the other day by Mr. Shackleton. If I am right you are at liberty if you think fit to express my entire concurrence in these views, and my regret that an engagement over which I have no control makes it impossible for me to accompany the deputation."

Mr. MASSIE added that Lord Cromer and Sir Edward Clarke had fully intended to be present, but had been prevented.

THE COUNTESS OF JERSEY, addressing the Premier, said: With regard to the so-called Conciliation Bill, it is unnecessary for us to repeat that it is not a Conciliation Bill so far as we are concerned, and possessing the views we do. Whether it passes or not, it cannot be final. Supposing that it should be passed, from our point of view it must inevitably entail more legislation. We cannot possibly understand how a number of ladies, widows and spinsters, should be taken to represent their whole sex, and yet if they had the vote denied to mothers and wives, they would not only represent us, but they would be able to misrepresent us as they would easily be able to gather meetings in which they would claim to represent our sex, whereas from our point of view they would do nothing of the sort. We think, should this Bill be adopted, it must lead to adult suffrage in the long run. You, sir, are better able to judge whether adult suffrage is a good thing or not. But although it may be a good thing for men, it is not a good thing for women, for the reason that the women would far outnumber the men, and therefore the balance of power would pass from those hands which have held it so long to others which in our humble opinion are not capable of utilising it properly. We do not regard the franchise as a privilege, but as a power, and it is not a power which we desire for ourselves, or desire to confide to every woman. It is all very well for them to say that we should not be obliged to vote if we had the franchise. We do not want to pursue a dog-in-the-manger policy, but I am far from being convinced that that would be the case. In the first place, should we obtain the vote, there would soon be a moral compulsion to vote, because supposing the other women started some movement

we should be obliged to enter the lists. It is not at all certain that we should not be in the end compelled to vote. In Australia and New Zealand, where both sexes have a vote, but where the conditions are absolutely different from our own, there is already talk of obliging people to go to the poll, and in Belgium there is already a penalty for those who refrain from voting. Certainly we should be morally compelled to vote. There are two main points to be considered. One is the home legislation, and the other the foreign and Imperial legislation. As far as I have been able to hear or to read, those who demand the suffrage for women invariably base their claim on the home legislation. The Duchess of Montrose, President of the Scottish League, has asked me to represent their views, as well as those of our Irish members, but while I leave home legislation to Mrs. Burgwin, I appeal to you, sir, most strongly on the plea of the Imperial and foreign interests of our great Empire. Those of us who, like myself, have been able to see something of the extent of that Empire, and have known the vast and complicated issues at stake, and seen something of foreign lands and diplomacy, cannot but regard with positive terror the idea that this great Imperial power, this great power of negotiating with other countries, is to be placed in the hands of a majority composed of women. It may sound a platitude to say that a woman's first duty is at home, but that is a point, which I think scarcely admits of contradiction. We know there is a very large sphere for her in the matter of social improvement, the improvement of schools, and in municipal affairs, and in all kinds of matters in which her opinion is absolutely invaluable. Why transfer the power from the hands of a man to the hands of a woman? I know very well that it has been said that men are often ignorant, but I would use the words of Mrs. Humphry Ward when she said: "Then, why add to the ignorance of men the ignorance of women?" Men acquire a large amount of political information to enable them to form their judgment, as women cannot. I appeal to you, for the sake of the absolute security of the race. After all, it is our first duty, and must be our duty, to rear a race and to rear an Imperial race, and how are we going to do it if our nerves are overstrained, if our bodies are overwrought, and our tongues are fully occupied in the concerns which

we so gladly, with all our hearts, leave in the hands of men? Sir, it is on this account that we beg you most earnestly not to allow this Conciliation Bill to pass, or at all events that it should not pass until the country has had an opportunity of passing an opinion upon it.

Mrs. BURGWIN said: We are here to protest in the name of the vast majority of Englishwomen against any support being given by your Government to the Woman Suffrage Bill. As far as our information goes—and our League has now been in existence for two years, and its branches are spreading rapidly over the country—the mass of Englishwomen do not desire to assume the responsibilities of the Parliamentary Suffrage; they believe that their proper work for the nation is of another kind, and that the work which they ought to do, and which is crying to be done, would be only injured by the concession of the Suffrage, and by the demand that women should take an equal share in party politics with men. The fact that women now stand outside the ordinary struggles of party gives them a special claim to be heard in matters where the nation seeks their advice and co-operation. In the right guardianship of the home, in all that concerns the care and education of children, the welfare of the sick and the insane, in the world of Science, Art and Letters, and in the various professions now freely open to women, and in the great tasks of Local Government women have now powers and opportunities abundantly equal in the sum of the nation's life to those of men. And in many fields of activity women are only just beginning to use and understand these powers and opportunities. In local government, indeed, where the nation urgently needs the services of women, and where they have possessed the municipal vote since 1867, women have made little or no use of their power for the promotion of reforms, and the progress of the women's movement in this sphere, to which it was hoped the Act of 1907 would have given so great an impetus, has been entirely checked by the general resentment roused by the recent phases of the Suffrage movement. In Manchester an important Women's Local Government Association has lately had to be wound up, owing, as the secretary declared, to the attitude of the electors towards women candidates, and to the unwillingness of women to risk the unpopularity attaching to their candidatures—

in other words, to the feeling against women in politics provoked by the Suffrage campaign of the last few years, and prevailing in one of the most important constituencies of the kingdom. In five wards of the same city 1,459 women municipal electors—the electors who would be enfranchised under this so-called Conciliation Bill—have been recently canvassed on the subject of the Suffrage, with the result that 682 signed a petition against the Suffrage, and 192 were for it and 585 were neutral or indifferent. Numerous other facts of the same kind could be quoted. Two thousand petition sheets have been issued from our League office within the last fortnight, and demands for them are coming in by every post. All the evidence gathered by our League during the last two years convinces us that Englishwomen—except so far as a small and active minority is concerned—do not want the Suffrage, that the tasks at present laid upon them are more than they can fulfil, and that it would be both to the injury of the nation and of women to add to these tasks that of the Parliamentary franchise. We point to the fact that in America the social legislation of the non-Suffrage States, where men and women work together, but do not vote together, is ahead of the social legislation of those States where Woman Suffrage exists. We do not believe that the possession of the vote will increase women's wages, which are determined by economic causes. In the textile trades, where alone women have strong trade organisations, their wages have risen in the last twenty years more than those of men, and through their unions the views of women on the burning question, for instance, of factory labour and maternity, could be more directly and efficiently presented to Parliament and Ministers than through any such Bill as you are now asked to grant facilities for in the House of Commons. The teaching profession—men and women acting together—puts two members into Parliament, and secures representation on the County Council. When it is a question of legislation, the opinion of all ranks of women is consulted and ascertained by Ministers in charge of any Bill before the House dealing with the interests of women and children. The anomalies and injustices of the Divorce law, of which the Suffragists make so much, are now the subject of investigation by a Commission to which women have been appointed, and which is specially enquir-

ing into the grievances of women of the poorer classes. We see nothing to be gained by the concession of Woman Suffrage that could not be more directly and surely reached by other means, and, on the other hand, we see the prospect of great injury to women in any measure which drags them into the strife of party politics, and into direct rivalry and competition with men. The nation is weakened by anything which interferes with the special qualities of women. The passage of any Woman Suffrage Bill in this country would most seriously tend towards conflict between men and women. In this country only among the great civilised nations is there an immense preponderance of women over men, which must be reflected in the electorate, if the sex distinction is obliterated. The last few years have seen the rise of an educated, and, to some extent, an unemployed class among women, who will, if the Suffrage is passed, easily furnish a class of professional politicians. We have seen some specimens of its activities already. We can imagine what it might become. In the interest, both of women and the nation, we beg that your Government will give no assistance whatever to the Woman Suffrage movement, such as would be involved in the grant of facilities to Mr. Shackleton's Bill.

Lord HAVERSHAM: Sir, on behalf of the Men's League, I have been desired to say a few words, and to apologise for the absence of Lord Cromer, as well as for Sir Edward Clarke and Mr. Austen Chamberlain. With regard to this Bill, we know, from the speech of Mr. Shackleton when he introduced it, from the memorandum which accompanied it, as well as from the views of Sir Charles Dilke and those who feel with him, that they by no means regard this Bill as the close of the disputation about woman suffrage. They regard the Bill as the stepping-stone to further agitation until they really can have adult suffrage. I find that the view I always took was expressed by the greatest authority who has ever sat in your chair—Mr. Gladstone. He was of opinion that if Parliament once granted the suffrage to women, you logically could not possibly stop short. You must give them the right to become, not the electorate, but the elected representatives of their sex in Parliament itself. In addition, of course, to being members of Parliament, there is no logical reason why

they should not be civil servants, magistrates, or be raised to the judicial Bench. If you once destroy the barrier of sex, you put them in the position of agitating for further enfranchisement in the different professions. Women are in a great majority in the country, and consequently women and women electors will be able to decide questions relating to the Army and the Navy and the police and those great services in which they cannot take a part on account of their weakness. They will govern the Estimates, pass laws which they cannot enforce, and possibly interfere in Imperial questions with which they are utterly unacquainted, and they would determine the question of peace and war, which men only determine now. I wish to call your attention, Sir, to the statement that has been made that there is a great movement in favour of woman suffrage, and that large numbers are clamouring for it. But I will call your serious attention to the fact that a petition has been presented to Parliament signed by 357,000 women against the granting of the franchise to women. Of these 16,000 came from Scotland, and the remainder from other parts of the Kingdom. I am certain, also, that if petitions are undertaken now, they will be signed by even a larger number. A great number of those signatures were of working women. It has been said that other countries have adopted this woman's franchise and have not suffered from it; but there is no parallel between the granting of the franchise here and in Colorado or Norway or in our Colonies. The example of Colorado is one of the last that we ought to adopt, and has acted as an object lesson to other States not to adopt this policy. It has no Imperial policy whatever. Australia and New Zealand have not undertaken, so far, the defence of their own portions of the Empire, and women are hardly the proper persons to decide on the question of the Army and the Navy for the Colonies. I would call your attention to the facts of the last General Election. I do not think that anybody could possibly affirm that this question was a test question at all. I do not believe a single seat was either lost or won on either side on the grant of the refusal of the franchise. It has never been before the country at all, and now we are asked, in the presence of such an entire absence of discussion, at the bidding of a few militant women, and a few other women who

do not represent their sex as a whole, to adopt this Bill at the invitation of a private member of Parliament, and not with the support of the Government. I am sure, Sir, you will feel with me that where the Cabinet Ministers are divided on a subject, it cannot be made a Government question; and, therefore, a reform, or rather a revolution, of this nature cannot be carried at the initiative of a private member.

Sir ALFRED LYALL said: I am convinced, from a clear and broad survey of the conditions and circumstances under which the Government of this country is carried on, that all the considerations and arguments are against this policy of woman suffrage. I do not myself know of any grievances for the removal of which it is necessary for women to have the vote. I believe that the British Parliament is above all other representative assemblies in the world in having to deal with complicated problems often uncommon and unusual in remote places. Its Colonies, dependencies, and possessions are a cause of concern and anxiety to all those who are responsible to Parliament for their administration, and I do not think that those who demand for women a share—and if they get it at all it must be a large share—in the direction of this very formidable trust have any realisation of what goes on on the frontiers and in the outlying parts of the British dominions. They scarcely know the risks and perils that have to be faced for the peace and security of the Empire, and for these reasons I am certainly of opinion that the management of Imperial interests, and the exercise of Imperial powers, extending so widely and so broadly, should be left in the hands of men.

Mr. MASSIE said: Sir, as this change in the centre of political gravity will be a revolution, we are humbly of opinion that no such revolution ought to be flung at the head of the nation without the nation being first asked whether it is prepared to receive the blow. It is undeniable that at no General Election has woman suffrage, the Governmental vote for women, ever been a serious question. My own experience absolutely confirms this statement. In 1906 I was asked only one question on the subject, and my refusal was received with general equanimity. Between 1906 and 1910 I was not idle in the matter. In 1910 I was asked, not whether I would support, but whether I would abstain. My refusal was received with general

cheering. My constituency was a purely working-class one, and I was repeatedly thanked by working men for the action I had taken. No one could say that woman suffrage was even a fly on the wheel for my defeat. I am, therefore, all the more ready to accept the assertion which one of the Labour leaders made to a friend of mine that, though the Parliamentary Labour leaders, especially the Socialist section, are mostly in its favour—not, improbably, with a side glance at the Ministerial results of woman suffrage in Australia—the rank and file of labour in this country are against it. It is a groundless assumption that the electors are in its favour. All concrete testimony that can be obtained goes altogether the other way. The only woman suffrage candidate, strictly so-called, at the last election, the candidate fighting Mr. Lewis Harcourt, absurdly extinguished himself. Moreover, there had been a systematic canvass, for the first time, on the part of the suffrage societies to induce candidates to publish in their election addresses that they supported votes for women; but, according to a Suffragist statement since made, the canvass had succeeded with 96 elected members only. It is not strange that certain women should desire to add political power to the almost immeasurable power they already possess, and it is even less strange that some men should help them. The higher education of women has had this weak side; it has fostered the delusion that academic examinational ability suffices for government, and that in everything that really matters for government a woman is as suitable as a man. But we have still to maintain that the full power of citizenship cannot be given to a sex which is by nature debarred from fulfilling some of the crucial duties of citizenship—enforcement of law, of treaties, and of national rights, national defence, and all the rougher work of Empire. This does not mean that in government, any more than in nature, there need be sex antagonism. There never has been any till now. The tares are now being sown. But the roll of legislation proves that with men in Parliament and in power the cause of women is absolutely safe.

Mr. ASQUITH said: Ladies and gentlemen, when I consented to receive a deputation from the Suffrage Societies, and my assent to do so was followed by a request that I should receive also a deputation from the

bodies whom you represent, I felt it not only a duty but a matter of plain and simple obligation to comply with that request. Obviously the Government cannot come to a fair and equitable decision as to procedure, for this, after all, is a matter of procedure to begin with, until it has had an opportunity through its representatives of having it fully and adequately stated, the arguments both on one side and the other, and that intellectual pleasure has been abundantly vouchsafed to me to-day. (Laughter.) So far as the general considerations against obliterating the distinction of sex which has hitherto prevailed in our political constitution, so far as those general considerations have been advanced by you to-day with so much ability and weight, speaking for myself individually, but not at all for the Government to which I belong, I need hardly tell you that you are preaching to the converted. (Hear, hear.) I admit to the full force of those considerations. I do not attempt to discriminate between the relative weight of each different argument, or say how much ought to attach to one or the other, but their cumulative weight have always seemed to me, notwithstanding the agitation and perturbations of the past few years, to constitute an overwhelming case in point of policy, both of national and Imperial expediency, against getting rid of distinction of sex. That is my own individual opinion. It has never altered, and I am not sure that it has not been somewhat strengthened as time has gone on. As regards this particular Bill that is now being brought forward, I am not sure that it ought to be described as a democratic measure. I am disposed to think that it is hardly entitled to that epithet, but I do not think it is a matter of very much concern, because as has been pointed out by more than one speaker to-day, it was most courageously and honestly avowed by Mr. Shackleton, when he introduced it, that it is not put forward in any sense as a settlement of the question. I think he used the old metaphor, the "thin end of the wedge." It is intended by the promoters quite frankly as an instalment. I do not impute any blame to them in the matter at all, but they say it is the first step on a much longer journey. Therefore, whatever may be said by way of criticism as to the precise form of the Bill, it does raise in effect the larger general issue as to whether or not it is desirable that the political enfranchisement, as it is called, of women in this

country, should take place. Well, upon that, as I say, my own views are decided, and they are well known; but I must at the same time make the avowal that they are not the views of the majority of my colleagues, as far as I know. As I said a little while ago, I have not catechised them on the subject, but as far as I know, and according to the latest of my information, they are not the views of my colleagues, and I am disposed to doubt whether they are the views of the majority of my party. But the question which we have now to decide is the question whether or not what are vaguely called facilities should be given for a free discussion, and for obtaining the opinion of the House of Commons on this particular measure. That is a point which must be decided by the Cabinet as a whole, and, as I promised the deputation to which I listened before you came, so I repeat to you now, that the considerations which you have brought before me shall be faithfully conveyed by me to my colleagues, and I trust while they will lose some little force in the process of transmission, yet they will be put before them with all honesty, and with as much weight as I can command. The decision must be left with the Government at large, and I think they may be trusted to deal with the matter in a spirit not of partisanship either one way or the other, but with equity and with a due regard to the political exigencies with which we are at this moment confronted, and which, as you know, are various and complicated, and in some respects unprecedented. I have listened with very great interest to what Lord Haversham and Mr. Massie said in regard to the facts at the last election. I will make further enquiries about that, and my friend here (the Master of Elibank) who knows the ins and outs of it better than I do, will probably assist me. But perhaps I had better say that I will collect such information as I can and place it before my colleagues; but I am sure you will be content with my assurance that in coming to a decision it must be a difficult one either way, as I am bound to say, after my experiences in the last hour and a half. There are so many excellent reasons for all possible courses, that I think it is a question of opinion in which we may fairly claim a little allowance, and which demands full and fair consideration. All those considerations which you have placed before me shall be duly borne in view, and whatever the result of our delibera-

tions may be, so far as you and I are concerned, I do not think it will very much alter our view as to the merits or demerits of the main question at issue. (Applause.)

The deputation withdrew after Mrs. Humphry Ward had thanked Mr. Asquith for the manner in which he had received them.

### WOMEN IN POLITICS AND A NEW BOOK.

By Mrs. HUMPHRY WARD.

(Partly reprinted from the "Times" of June 4th, 1910.)

I HAVE ON various occasions in the past drawn the attention of the readers of this "Review" and the public in general to the course and history of the Suffrage movement in America. Let me recommend all members of the League to get and read for themselves a remarkable recent book, published on the Suffrage side, which has done not a little to bring home the anti-Suffrage facts and arguments to the general American mind. The "Equal Suffrage" report of Miss Helen Sumner, Ph.D., on the results of Woman Suffrage in Colorado, presented to the Collegiate Equal Suffrage League of New York State (a league representing, we believe, the women graduates of the State who hold Suffragist opinions), is a scholarly and open-minded contribution to an argument too often disguised by wild and reckless statement. Miss Sumner is a Suffragist, and she very naturally makes out as good a case as she can for the female franchise of Colorado. She believes that, on the whole, women are less corrupt than men in politics, though she qualifies her statement by various significant admissions; she shows that, in the few big towns at least, the women use their vote largely, and that the educated and well-to-do women do not abstain from voting, and she is clear that the women's vote has done much to exclude men of immoral lives, or men connected with the liquor traffic, as candidates for office, though she points out equally clearly that it has had no effect whatever in promoting efficiency, or business honesty, or public honour. But consider the following passages:—

"A prominent Denver politician thought there was not a woman working in Colorado politics who was not paid for it in one way or another." "Canvassing is paid work, and in many localities it is the custom to appoint as canvassers, and also as election officers, needy widows with children to support, sempstresses or laundresses, to whom \$3.00 to \$5.00 a day so easily earned about election time is a welcome addition to an uncertain income." In elections women act as judges and clerks on election day. "Many widows and other needy intelligent women are appointed." They also bring in the voters, which is again paid work—"and," says a woman delegate, "the more efficient those I have seen were, the less I have enjoyed seeing them do it." "It is often said by equal-suffrage advocates that, if given the franchise, prostitutes would not vote, as they would not be interested, and would not wish to give their names and addresses. This is a fallacy. True, they do not wish to vote."

But they are made to register and vote, and their vote is cast solidly for the party in control of the police force. Moreover, much of this vote is fraudulent. "Sometimes thirty or forty persons have been registered from small houses in the red-light districts, where on investigation only six or eight legal votes could be discovered." And even outside this degraded class "repeating" is common among women. "Fraudulent registrations of women were distributed in the same ratio as those of men over the entire city. . . . In every investigation that has been made for years in Colorado of alleged election frauds women have been implicated in one way or other."

All that can be said is that there are fewer corrupt women than corrupt men, which a number of persons whose answers are quoted explain by saying that women "are less corrupt because they have less opportunity, or because they don't know the game." A Denver woman delegate, on the other hand, says that "women are more corrupt, because they will work cheaper. Five dollars looks bigger to a woman than it does to a man." A man delegate, unfavourable to woman suffrage, says "women are more corrupt, more easily bought up, because, as a rule, a large percentage of the better class of women will not actively engage in political work, and a large percentage of those who take active interest do so for selfish reasons." And another witness says "the women who take the most interest are from the lower classes, and always look for the money." "The average woman," says Miss Sumner, "is much less likely to dispose of her vote for a consideration than the average man, but it is highly probable that men and women politicians do not differ so widely." That is to say, a moral standard which was originally higher than that of the men becomes degraded as soon as a woman becomes a "politician" employed in the getting and giving of votes. And where the active women politicians are less corrupt than the active men politicians, Miss Sumner candidly suggests it is because "they are rarely trusted with the corruption funds," and "for the most part simply follow the lead or obey the orders of the men," so that their political morality in different localities reflects that of the men.

#### EFFECT ON WAGES.

With regard to the effect of Woman Suffrage on wages and salaries, Miss Sumner sweeps away—so far as the evidence from Colorado goes—all the usual Suffragist contentions. The franchise has not raised salaries, and it still holds good, as a labour leader in the State bluntly puts it, that "organised labour is the only force that has benefited the condition or wages of workers." "Taking public employment as a whole," says Miss Sumner, "women receive considerably lower remuneration than men. The difference in the salaries of men and women teachers in Colorado, instead of being unusually small, is unusually large."

Well may these figures and facts have spread discomfort among the Suffrage societies of the States. Nor can Miss Sumner, candid inquirer as she is, point to any certain gain on the legislative side from the women's vote in Colorado—any gain, that is, which might not have been equally well reached without the women's vote, though she gathers all the evidence she can. The truth is that Colorado, like the other Suffrage States, is not in front of, but behind the non-Suffrage States, in the quality and

range of its social and domestic legislation. And meanwhile it is absolutely clear, from a close study of the book, that participation in the routine work and active excitement of politics has been bad for women, that it has led in many directions to a marked roughening and coarsening of their standards, that it has introduced fresh temptations into their lives, and that the best and most instructed opinion in the State is more than doubtful about its results. Miss Sumner confesses that there has been much speculation of late as to whether Woman Suffrage will be abolished in Colorado. She herself does not believe that it will be abolished; but the mere fact that the step is openly discussed shows how dubious the whole experiment has been.

It will be said that Colorado is not England, and that English politics are not those of a corrupt mining State. But that argument will hardly avail the English Suffragist leaders, who are constantly holding up the Suffrage States of America as beacons in the cause. Nor will it be contended after the ugly experiences of the last two years that there are not evils in our own political life—evils of violence, of reckless statement, of headlong partisanship, of hysterical excitement—to which we now see that women in English politics may be specially exposed, just as the political women of Colorado are specially exposed to evils of another kind.

MARY A. WARD.

### THE ANNUAL COUNCIL MEETING.

OUR Annual Council Meeting, which was held in the Caxton Hall on June 28th, was very largely attended by members of Council and delegates from Branches. The platform was very prettily decorated with white daisies and scarlet geraniums, and our colours of rose, black, and white, and members wearing our badges and the colours added to the brightness of the scene. Outside the building a rose, black and white flag was flown. Thanks to the kindness of Lady Hyde the members and delegates were entertained to tea at the conclusion of the meeting. Lady Jersey was in the chair, and was presented with a beautiful bouquet of pink roses and sweet peas, tied with ribbons of the League's colours. Amongst those supporting Lady Jersey on the platform were Lord Cromer, whose stirring speech was the feature of the afternoon, Mr. J. Massie, Hon. Treasurer, Mrs. Massie, the Duchess of Montrose (President of the Scottish League), Lord Haversham, Lady Weardale, Mrs. Humphry Ward, Lady Hyde, Mrs. Arthur Somervell, Lady Biddulph of Ledbury, Miss Gertrude Lowthian Bell, Mrs. Greatbatch, Mr. St. Loe Strachey, Mrs. Otto Kiliani, and Mrs. Dodge of the New York State Anti-Suffrage Association. The Treasurer, Mr. J. Massie, announced that to help towards the financing of the special efforts the League was making against the Conciliation Bill, they had received from Lady Durning-Lawrence £100, from Lady Wantage £100, from Lord Rothschild £100, and from Lord and Lady Haversham £70, Mr. George William Palmer £20, and from Mr. Massie £20. Some of the branches had contributed sums according to their ability.

The Countess of Jersey said, regarding the deputation to the Prime Minister, she thought they would all understand that they would not have been anxious to trouble the

Prime Minister had he not consented to receive a deputation from the Suffragist party. That being so, it was, of course, only common sense that he should hear both sides of the question, and should have other views laid before him. Therefore the President of the Scottish League, the Duchess of Montrose, herself, and in all twenty ladies and gentlemen approached the Prime Minister and were most courteously received. She thought they would have already observed that Mr. Asquith said, as far as he was concerned on this question of Woman Suffrage, they were preaching to the converted, but she could not but hope and trust that their deputation to some extent fortified that conversion and assisted him in setting his views before the Cabinet. There was always a comic side to everything, and the side that appeared to be rather comic on this occasion was the very great care that appeared to be taken in order that the Anti-Suffrage deputation should not encounter Suffragists who were just coming away from seeing the Prime Minister. In fact, they were escorted to a room in some distant recesses of the Prime Minister's abode, and kept there until the others were safely out of the way. She noticed that the Suffragists were now busy learning ju-jitsu. She did not know that it was necessary for them to learn physical ju-jitsu, but she thought they ought to learn a moral and mental form of that exercise. They must not go to sleep themselves, and they must not allow any of those with whom they came in contact to go to sleep either. On the contrary, they must wake up and go ahead.

Miss TERRY LEWIS announced that in accordance with the rules of their constitution, six of the members of their Executive retired by ballot, and had kindly consented to stand for re-election.

The result of the election appears on the first page of the REVIEW.

LADY HYDE proposed the re-election of Lord Ashby St. Ledgers and Mr. Massie as Hon. Treasurers, and spoke of the admirable way in which they had done their work.

Miss POTT seconding, the resolution was carried unanimously.

Miss TERRY LEWIS then read the report of the year's work.

"We wish to express the thanks of the League to all Branch Committees for their loyal help and splendid work. The burden of this work falls, of necessity, upon the Hon. Secretaries of our Branches, and the increased membership and the efficiency of the work done is, therefore, primarily due to them. Where one and all have done their best, it is perhaps invidious to mention names, but it is impossible not to lay especial stress on the work accomplished by Mrs. Colquhoun, Kensington; Mrs. Rundall, Reigate; Miss Peachey, Esher; Miss Long Fox, Bristol; Miss Pott, North Berks; Miss Gabrielle Butler, Leeds; Mrs. Murray, Dublin; Mrs. McLeod, Glasgow; also at Shotter's Mill, Paddington, Ealing, Bournemouth, and Kew. Last, but not least, Mrs. Somervell, who, up to the end of 1909, carried on the arduous work of Hon. Secretary at the Central Office, in addition to speaking for the League at no less than seventy-three meetings in twelve months.

Other speakers to whom we owe much gratitude are: Miss Violet Markham, Mrs. Humphry Ward, Mrs. Colquhoun, Mrs. Harold Norris, Miss Lindsay, Miss Fothergill, Mrs. Greatbatch, Mrs. Burgwin, Mr.

Maconachie, Mr. Calderon, Mr. Newman, Miss Agnes Hills, Miss Broadwood, Miss Stuart, Mr. Morgan Veitch, Mr. D'Egville, Mrs. Mortimer, Miss Pascoe, Prof. Dicey, Mrs. Biddle, Mrs. Barter, Dr. Cowburn, Major Frank Johnson, Mr. Arthur Burton, and very many others.

A special feature for the year 1909-1910 was the motor tour undertaken early in September last by Mr. and Mrs. Harold Norris and Mr. Maconachie; it lasted a fortnight, and a dozen most successful meetings were held—seven indoors and five in the open air in Yorkshire, Durham, Northumberland, Cumberland, and Dumfriesshire. An account of this tour was given at the successful reception held at this hall in December last. This was followed later by a tour undertaken by Mrs. Humphry Ward and Mrs. Somevell; meetings and debates were held at Macclesfield, Manchester, Sheffield, Leeds, Edinburgh, Glasgow, St. Andrews, Perth, and Inverness. Here, too, success followed in the wake of our speakers, and interest in, and enthusiasm for, our campaign was manifested everywhere.

The announcement of a General Election then, in a great measure, stopped our more active work, as it was thought neither desirable nor right that we should assert ourselves unduly, and possibly, by so doing, jeopardise greater Imperial issues, more especially as Woman Suffrage was not then a vital political question. The Central Office and the Branches did, however, approach the Parliamentary candidates of both parties with representations of the strong opposition of many hundreds of thousands of men and women to the Parliamentary enfranchisement of women, and quiet work was carried on and the ground prepared for further effort.

Throughout the year, besides the meetings already referred to, the Branches have held meetings and taken part in debates. North Berks, under the Presidency of Lady Wantage, held many meetings, and Miss Pott has given a series of lectures to working women to discuss various controversial points. Kensington (South Kensington and North were amalgamated into one Branch in December last) has had fortnightly meetings, and other very successful meetings during the year have been held in and about London, in Manchester, Leicester, Bournemouth, Exeter, Cheltenham, Hereford, and Leeds (where much organising work has been done), Salisbury, Wendover, Sidmouth, Sheffield, Frimley, Newport, &c., &c. The existing Westminster Branch, with subscribers in the districts of St. George's, Hanover-square, and Mayfair, are now to be amalgamated as a Central Office Branch, still to be known as the Westminster Branch, with Lady Biddulph on the Executive representing this Branch.

Great progress and increased energy is seen throughout the League. New Branches have been formed at Inverness, Nairn, Liverpool, Birkenhead, Southwold, Woodbridge, Chiswick, Bedford Park, Reading, Upper Norwood, Anerley, and Woodbridge (Suffolk), and Sub-Branches at Abingdon, Wantage, Newbury, East Dulwich, Headingley, Roundhay, Marple, Basingstoke Town, Farnborough, Hartley, Wintley, Minley, Yateley, Hawley, and Fleet, and other Branches are in course of formation. Manchester has undertaken to form and affiliate Branches in the counties of Lancashire and Cheshire, and has suggested a federation of the Northern Branches, which is still under consideration.

The Scotch Branches, which have all done excellent work, are now formed under the Scottish Council, in affiliation with our League.

In Dublin several very successful meetings have been held, and the question of Woman Suffrage is arousing great interest and enthusiasm all over Ireland.

We cannot be too grateful to Miss Hogarth and Mrs. Humphry Ward, who gave so much of their valuable time to carrying on THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW. When Miss Hogarth was obliged to give up this work, Mr. Atlay (who had before written our "Notes and News") undertook the Editorship, and it is much to be regretted that he is unable to carry it on any longer.

In the last three months we have nearly doubled our REVIEW subscribers, and it is much hoped that any of our members who do not take it in, may be induced to do so, as there is no better means of keeping in touch with the work of the League, and the price is only 13d. a month, post free, although the increased size and the new cover naturally add to the cost of production.

A badge has been adopted this year, which has proved very popular, and has resulted in a considerable profit.

In December last Mrs. Gerard sent us £50, the proceeds of the sale of her Ideal Calendar, as a donation, and only a week or so ago has most generously sent a further cheque for £15.

In addition to the Petition, bearing 337,018 signatures of women, which was presented to the House of Commons in March, 1909, collected in ten months, a supplementary Petition was presented in November bearing 82,000 additional signatures. These petitions are still being signed all over the country, and are being received daily at the Central Office. Many Branches have also been collecting signatures of electors with conspicuous success.

We have nearly doubled our membership in the last twelve months.

Our largest Branch is Bristol, with nearly 2,000 members, and there are others not far behind this fine total.

Although the work being done throughout our League just now should not be mentioned in the report of the year ending May, 1910, we cannot refrain from thanking our Branches for their splendidly prompt response to the Central Office letter of the 13th inst., which has already resulted in letters being sent to individual M.P.'s, several thousand additional signatures of men and women, and contributions to forward our work."

The EARL OF CROMER said: I have recently had some excellent opportunities for judging of the manner in which the Women's Anti-Suffrage League conducted their business, and, in watching their proceedings, I have been led to a conclusion which might appear, at first sight, to be strangely paradoxical. That conclusion was that, if women were to vote at all, the class which could most confidently be trusted to exercise their electoral privileges wisely are also precisely those who most strenuously and most wisely object to those privileges being conferred upon them. We are told that the measure which has recently been introduced into the House of Commons is a Conciliation Bill. I think that term is a misnomer. I think I can suggest a more accurate and a more thoroughly descriptive title. I should be inclined to call this Bill "a Bill to facilitate the speedy in-

troduction of adult suffrage for both men and women into the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland." There are now, I believe, some seven million electors in this country. If this Bill passes into law, we may confidently anticipate that before many years have elapsed, the number of electors will be at least twenty-five million. I wonder, indeed, where the conciliation comes in, judging by the manner in which you have received Lady Jersey's remarks, which were in themselves convincing proof that there are some ladies who support our cause who are, in a remarkable degree, gifted with the faculty of lucid exposition and persuasive eloquence. The Bill does not appear to conciliate any of those I am now addressing. It certainly does not conciliate me. Indeed, I may say that I have rarely been animated by a less conciliatory disposition. I intend to fight and resist the passing of this Bill to the utmost of my power. All the conciliation it effects is to bring about a truce—and remember it will be a very temporary truce—between the moderates and the extremists in the ranks of our opponents. The moderates like the Bill because they labour under the delusion—the very profound delusion—that having once passed this Bill, which they consider innocuous, into law, they can then rest and be thankful. Should they succeed, I think they will be very speedily undeceived. The extremists avow that they do not like it, but they accept it, albeit reluctantly, as a step in the right direction, and they hold, and very rightly hold, that it will serve as an excellent starting-point for other and more drastic proposals. They regard it as what is called the thin edge of the wedge. I know well enough the fallacy involved in the argument that reasonable and moderate reform should be opposed, because it may lead to proposals which are neither moderate nor reasonable at some future time. All history, and especially the history of our own country, is there to teach us that this argument has been at times abused. But I submit that this Bill is not the thin edge of the wedge. It is the whole wedge—lock, stock, and barrel! Once concede the principle, and its full application is merely a matter of time. Previous Reform Bills, those of 1832 and 1866, did not involve the discussion of any fundamental question of principle. The subjects then under discussion were, comparatively speaking, matters of detail, although of very important detail. The issue in these cases was where, amongst men, the line of demarcation should be drawn between those who were and those who were not entitled to vote. Now we have to deal with a totally different issue. As has been pointed out hundreds of times before—and by no one more clearly than by that great Liberal statesman, Mr. John Bright, and also by Mr. Gladstone—we are asked to destroy not a class, but a sex distinction. I believe I am correctly representing your views when I say that our objections to the destruction of this distinction are fundamental, and that so far as we are concerned we cannot accept any compromise whatsoever. We do not object to giving votes to this or that class of women. We object to giving votes to women of any and of every class. We are sometimes told that our arguments are commonplace and antiquated. They may perhaps be commonplaces, but they are none the less valid for that. Most of the profound truths of the world have passed into commonplaces. As to being antiquated, they only deserve that epithet in the sense

that human nature is itself antiquated. Nature has pointed out with no faltering or erring hand that the functions and spheres of action of men and women, though equally important, are widely different. Notably Nature has made to devolve on women the sacred and all-important functions of motherhood. Those functions necessarily carry with them enormous responsibilities, and the exercise of supreme influence—an influence which is perfectly legitimate, which we all welcome, and from which almost all of us have derived incalculable benefits. The joys, the responsibilities, and the privileges of motherhood are accompanied by certain physical disabilities which render it not only unseemly, but impossible, that in respect to certain matters women should be placed on a precisely similar footing to men.

I doubt whether the extreme gravity of the question now under discussion is always fully realised. Consider what is the issue really at stake. It is nothing less than this, that the supreme government of the British Empire, which has heretofore been in the hands of one sex, should be ultimately transferred to the two sexes, in which the female is numerically greatly superior to the male. In the name of our great traditions, of our past history, in the name of common-sense, I would ask why, of all political communities, should this vast fabric, which we call the British Empire, whose foundations have been laid through centuries of toil by the foresight and indomitable energy of statesmen, whose superstructure has been watered by the blood of countless heroes in our civil, naval, and military services—why should this splendid monument of human effort, which is alike the envy and admiration of the whole world, and to which no parallel can be found since the days of Ancient Rome—why should this great Empire of which we are all so proud, be made the dumping-ground for a crude experiment which has never yet been tried by any other of the great nations of the world, and has, indeed, never been tried in any community, great or small, under conditions at all analogous to those which exist in the United Kingdom? I say that to try such an experiment would be empiricism run mad. The heart of the British Empire, of which we are all so proud, lies in the Palace of Westminster. Every throb of that heart pulsates to the utmost extremities of the world. It is felt by the 450 millions of people of divers races, creeds, and colours who owe allegiance to King George V. You cannot make any fundamental change in the central machine which guides this mighty fabric without the consequences being, sooner or later, felt by all these. Whatever may be the opinions of individual members of either Houses of Parliament on this subject, they have no moral right whatever to impose a change of this momentous description on the country and on its dependencies without a specific mandate showing without manner of doubt that the change is desired by the majority of the electors. No such mandate has as yet been given. I doubt if it ever will be given.

Do not let us be under any misapprehension as to the reality of the danger to which we are exposed. What we have to fear is not so much the activity of our foes as the apathy and indifference of our friends. All accounts agree in stating that at the last General Election the question of Women's Suffrage attracted but little interest and exercised but little influence, and the fact that it excited so little interest has tended to lull

the opponents of this measure into a sense of false security. I am convinced that, if the movement is to be successfully resisted, this attitude of apathy and indifference must be wholly abandoned. Remember, that the particular Bill with which we now have to deal is a most insidious measure. Besides those who have really studied the question, and have honestly come to a conclusion different from ours, the Bill will attract those who, though not really in favour, have not the courage to resist it—and I fear that this class is very numerous. It will attract the weak-kneed politicians who think that the change is bound to come sooner or later, and therefore that it is useless to resist it. It will attract those who are in favour of internal peace at any price. I am a man of peace, but I am entirely opposed to peace at any price, either in our external or internal affairs, and, in my opinion, we are asked to pay too high a price for peace. This Bill will likewise attract those who are under the delusion to which I have already alluded, that a reform such as that which is now proposed has in it an element of finality, and it will also attract all those—a very numerous class—who fail to appreciate the glaring fallacy in the argument that there is some inconsistency in granting the franchise to a number of individual men far less intelligent than a number of individual women who are deprived of it. That argument has been answered hundreds of times before. For these reasons therefore, we must exert ourselves. We rely on the Association which I am now addressing to rouse their countrymen and countrywomen to the necessity of effort. The ladies who compose this Association have to show no small amount of moral courage. Not only have they to bear the taunt, for which there is not a shadow of foundation, that they are indifferent to the welfare of their own sex, but in the next place they are also of necessity placed in the position which has an appearance—and an appearance only—of inconsistency, for, in combating the views of the Suffragists, they are obliged so far to belie their own principles as to enter into all the hurly-burly of political strife.

A short time ago I was reading an account of a Suffragist meeting, at which one of the speakers, a lady, expressed great regret and astonishment that so distinguished a member of her own sex as Mrs. Humphry Ward was "so unreasonable," but she added, in words which I am convinced will find an echo in this hall, "We all love her for it." I am convinced that if Lady Jersey, Mrs. Humphry Ward, and the other talented ladies acting with them can imbue large numbers of their own sex, and also of the opposite sex, with some share of their unreasonableness, they will acquire an additional claim to the regard and esteem of their countrymen and women. This question has fortunately not as yet been engulfed in the whirlpool of party conflict. I should be the very last to wish to make any remarks which could in the slightest degree be construed into imparting a party colouring into our discussion—all the more so because, to say the truth, I have no very profound attachment to either party. But I hope that I may be allowed, as a Unionist, to bear testimony to the deep debt of gratitude which all of us who are opposed to this measure owe to the present Prime Minister for the attitude he has taken on this subject. Mr. Asquith has shown that quality which, in these democratic days, I very especially admire in

politicians—I mean, moral courage. He has, indeed, allowed a Second Reading debate to take place in the House of Commons, a concession received with such enthusiasm by the Suffragists that one ardent Suffragist at once, with some inconsistency, broke the windows, not of the House of Commons, where Mr. Asquith sits, but of the House of Lords, where he does not sit. I am glad that he has promised to allow a Second Reading debate. It will, at all events, let us know who are our friends and who are our foes. But he has made his own opinion quite clear. He is wholly opposed to this Bill. Let us do all in our power to show Mr. Asquith that, in adopting this attitude, he has the support of tens of thousands of his countrymen and women. I know that no appeal of this nature is required to those whom I am now addressing. But I wish to appeal over your heads to others. I appeal to that very numerous body of electors who agree with our views, and with whom the ultimate decision of this question rests. I ask them to scrutinise very carefully the division list on this Bill. I ask them, if their Members, whether Conservative or Liberal, vote contrary to their wishes, to insist on knowing the reason why, and to express their disapproval in very clear terms, and to make it quite plain to those members that they will regard abstention from voting as synonymous with approval. This is a measure as to which the process generally known as sitting on a rail cannot, for one moment, be admitted or tolerated.

Mrs. GREATBATCH (Chiswick) seconded the resolution, and said their warm congratulations were due to the Executive Committee for the splendid way they had carried on the work during the year, and especially for organising the deputation to the Prime Minister. That step taken at a moment so opportune, had had a wonderful effect in strengthening their League, and had brought the League into notice in a way that no other step could have done. They would be encouraged by that step to work harder, so as to render the campaign of votes for women during this Session an impossibility. The representations made to Mr. Asquith by that deputation had a great effect on his words and attitude subsequently in the House of Commons. They also owed a debt of gratitude to Mr. Shackleton and to various prominent Suffragists for so plainly making known the fact that this Bill, if passed, was not to be regarded as a settlement of the whole Suffrage question, but that it was to be used as a lever to extort concessions from future Parliaments. They rightly regarded statesmen as representatives of the trusteeship of the Empire and of the race, and they had a right to demand that they should take no steps involving a change so drastic and so far-reaching at the clamorous demands of a few, or to satisfy the desires of this political party or that. The supreme consideration for men and women alike in regard to the Suffrage question was the safety and well-being of the State and of the Empire as a whole. That must be secured even if the sacrifice of lesser interests was involved. They stoutly maintained that the bulk of women throughout the country did not want the vote. Nine-tenths of the women of the country were utterly indifferent to the whole franchise question, and would be thankful to be allowed to remain indifferent. To many of them the idea of a vote was repugnant. It was as unwise as it was unnecessary. The responsibilities of women to the

State had been fixed for them once for all by nature. They were no less dignified, no less important, and no less arduous than those of men, but they were essentially different in character. It was utterly unnecessary for women to interfere in politics. They did not share the view of their opponents that votes were necessary to make all things well with women. They believed that much was wrong in women's affairs to-day, but what was wrong was not due to the want of votes, but to the want of a better comprehension of those affairs. The reformation in women's affairs must begin in women's houses, and not in the House of Commons.

Mrs. OTTO KILJANI, member of the New York State Association, then gave some very interesting details on the condition of the Suffrage movement in America, which showed how well Anti-Suffragism is holding its ground in that country.

Mrs. DODGE, who has been connected with the Anti-Suffrage movement in the United States since it first started, nearly sixteen years ago, in the course of an enthusiastic and instructive speech, spoke of the rapid advance of the Anti-Suffrage movement in New York.

The Treasurer, Mr. J. MASSIE, then read his report.

Mr. J. ST. LOE STRACHEY said he wanted to add his humble voice to Lord Cromer's potent voice in thanking the League for the splendid, difficult, arduous, and disagreeable work they had done in opposing the Suffrage agitation. They were doing the work which could not be done half so efficaciously by men. He moved the adoption of the Treasurer's report.

Mrs. SOMERVELL formally seconded, and paid a tribute to the staff and the Treasurer for their admirable work.

The report was unanimously adopted.

The DUCHESS OF MONTROSE said the Scottish League had been formed to meet the wishes of a large number of women in Scotland, who were anxious to unite in opposing the political enfranchisement of women. Branches had already been started in a number of Scottish towns, and a large number of well-known ladies had joined it and promised it their support. In Edinburgh they had already 350 members. In Glasgow, the League had only recently been started, but over 300 had joined it. In many other Scottish towns it had been taken up very well. The numbers that she had mentioned did not in any way represent the numbers of those who opposed the enfranchisement of women as many opponents of it were reluctant to give their names. Could the vote in the House of Commons be taken by ballot, they would have very little fear that Woman Suffrage would be established. Lord Cromer had clearly demonstrated the dangers of this so-called Conciliation Bill, which set at nought the qualifications of sex, and destroyed the principles for which they contended. If a stand was to be made for this principle, it must be made on this Bill. What proof had they that a serious revolution was desired by the majority of men and women in this country? On their own computation the Suffragists claimed about half a million persons in favour of the Suffrage. That did not touch the fringe of the majority of the community, who numbered about forty millions. Surely the enthusiasm of such a small minority, however ardent, was no substitute for the earnest convictions of millions

of men and women who had not as yet shown any desire for such a constitutional upheaval. Until it was proved that the large majority of the people in this country desired Women's Suffrage, such a radical change in the electorate should not be made. Mrs. Dodge had touched on the fact that some people felt that the Anti-Suffrage League had hitherto opposed Women's Suffrage by a merely negative policy. Would it not be possible to put forward some scheme which would gradually strengthen the League, which would give women greater power over social legislation, or enlarge the powers they already possessed on local boards, and bring such powers into closer relation with Government departments, and thus turn the Suffragists' energies into another channel? Many Suffragists claimed to be fighting solely in the interests of their poorer and weaker sisters, realising there were many hardships and grievances under which they laboured, and they desired the Suffrage merely as a lever to give them the power to remove these grievances. If such a scheme could be revived in the interests of women and children, it would meet the wishes of the Anti-Suffragists, and might satisfy the reasonable demands of many moderate Suffragists. Mrs. Humphry Ward had referred to such a scheme in many of the articles she had written on the Suffrage question, and had suggested that representative women might be brought into closer consultative relationship with Government Departments where the special interests of women were concerned. They who were opposed to Women Suffrage were quite as anxious as the Suffragists to do all they could to remedy the grievances of poor women and children all over the country, but they maintained that this could be accomplished by means other than the vote. This Bill would concede the principle of the obliteration of sex. A gradual enlargement of the measure would follow, with the result that the Empire would be governed by an electorate in which women would predominate. In the interests of the Empire, they could not contemplate with equanimity such a disastrous policy. They must therefore oppose it by every means in their power.

Various resolutions from the Branches were then discussed at length.

Mrs. BIDDLE (Newport), Mrs. TRAPNELL (Bristol), and Mrs. GREATBATCH (Bedford Park) spoke strongly in favour of a more active policy on the part of the League.

Mrs. SOMERVELL said she felt strongly that they could never effectively fight the Suffragists' propaganda unless they had something to put in its place. In the words of the Genoese thinker, Henri Amiel, "Nothing is destroyed until it has been replaced." They could go on for a long time saying they did not want the vote, but there was always an effective answer to that—"We do." After a time the question must arise, if they did not want the vote and others did, what was the *via media* that could replace that active movement which was far too full of life to be ignored, and had far too many splendid women in it, with most of whose ideals they must to some extent sympathise. In the field of work which was now open to women in all the domestic and social affairs of the country, infinite damage had been done, and animosity had been aroused by the actions of the militant Suffragists. In Manchester a committee for Local Government had been practically broken up, and the prospects there for the work of women in all those spheres where

they were most wanted were exceedingly dismal. They felt most strongly that in this Local Government work they could most effectively fight the Suffragists. Anti-Suffragist members should be on every Local Government committee, on every Board of Guardians and borough council, and in every place where women's work was wanted, because all that work was the home work and the mothering work of the nation. They must make it clear that the woman's movement was not necessarily the Suffragist movement. They wished everything to go forward which was for the benefit of women, but they would not see put into incompetent hands the civil power of the State. They said that the woman's place was in the home, but they had never said, and they did not think, that woman's place was never beyond it, because no home could rest on a sound foundation which did not look after the other homes round about it. They did not want women to stand still. They wanted them to go forward on the immemorial lines of the mothering work and under the guidance and on the lines that men had made for them. Man must be the head of the home and the father of the family. The best work was done by the man who came from the home that was competently managed by the woman. They knew that the Suffragists were opposed to women's reform until they got the vote. They knew they could get any reform they wanted. All that they had to do was to make up their minds as to what they wanted, and then ask for it, not by usurping the power of the men, but by setting to work quietly and seriously to secure reforms by means of the delegated authority which had already been put into their hands.

#### A MANCHESTER NOTE.

As a protest against the Conciliation Bill the Manchester Branch issued a manifesto, copies of which were sent to all the chief London and provincial papers, to the Members of Parliament for Cheshire and Lancashire, and to the Executives of the political Associations. From a study of this manifesto it will be seen that, in five wards of this city, 682 women householders out of 1,459 visited signed the Anti-Suffrage Petition, while only 192 were declared Suffragists; and it is only reasonable to suppose that this is a fair indication of the feeling of all those women whom the Bill would enfranchise.

#### OUR LEEDS BRANCH.

OWING to great pressure on our space this month, "Our Branch News Letter" has had to be held over, but this will only mean a longer letter next month, when all news from the Branches, which we are now obliged to omit, will be given. There is an omission from the June number which we much regret. In our detailed report of the admirable organising work done by Leeds recently, by some error in setting-up, the name of Mrs. Hawthorn Kitson did not appear as heading the list of drawing-room meetings held in Leeds. It was at Elmet Hall, the residence of Mrs. Hawthorn Kitson, that the first of this successful series of meetings was held.—ED.

## A FEW MORE WORDS ON THE WOMAN'S CHARTER.

By Mrs. FREDERIC HARRISON.

SOME two years ago or more, I wrote a letter to *The Nation* to urge that a Woman's Charter should be drawn up wherein reforms might be suggested and grievances plainly declared. Lady MacLaren's effort in this direction has been a gain to Suffragists and Anti-Suffragists alike. We understand very well that it has not the support of all the sections of the advanced women, much less could it have the adhesion of the Anti-Suffrage women, whom I take leave to call the Defenders of the woman's cause. The points are far too numerous, the issues too grave, marshalled as they are under the flag of the franchise, to win general acceptance. But we have at last, clearly stated, something like a programme; we need no longer tilt against such vague generalities as "the monstrous injustice of man-made laws." Definite proposals are made, definite remedies suggested for many undoubted evils. All are invited to consider these points with a view to finding some agreement. We claim for the Woman's Charter that it has cleared the ground.

This REVIEW has spoken with no uncertain voice on the chapter on Infanticide. We need only say here that all women who know anything of the life of the submerged in the dark, hidden depths of London, know of the ease with which a young infant can be put out of the way, and of the horrible proposals made to the unhappy mother. We have to show her that her salvation lies in her care for her helpless babe, a sacred trust that she holds for humanity. We dare not lessen the public sense of the sanctity of human life, or lower the estimation of the love and protection due from a mother to her child. It should be an easy matter to approximate the form of the legal sentence to the actual punishment.

There is no space in a short article to criticise the Charter in detail. We are greatly struck by the constant appeal to the State to interfere, to do this or that, to pay for this or that, even apparently to rewrite the Church of England marriage service, but it is considered a doubtful measure to prevent women from going to work immediately before the birth of a child! Mrs. Colquhoun has well said in your columns that the providing constant doles for women to spare them their home work, amongst other things,

must entail very great expense. It must become a question as to whether special contributions would not have to be levied on women by compulsory insurance or otherwise.

Again, it is impossible not to be struck in reading the Charter by the *bourgeois* middle-class aspect of the whole woman's movement, in its inception, its methods of work, and political demands. We may find the same attitude in Mr. J. S. Mill's recently published *Letters*. If the majority of women really believed that the gift of the Parliamentary vote would act as a "talisman" to abolish sweating, raise wages, make of women good citizens, wives, and mothers, surely all women would be eager for the franchise. It is because they believe in none of these things, nor in the application of "spermaceti for an inward wound" that they resist the claim. It seems strange to some of us that the mother of a family is to have no vote, nor the poor working-girl, for, if votes are essential to the redressing of wrongs, these women need them perhaps more than all others. The suggestion that wives are to have maintenance—wages, that is—on a housekeeper scale, is, indeed, a mockery when made to the working-man's wife, or the wife of the poor clerk. It is entirely a middle-class notion. The workman's wife does not have a dress allowance. When times are good she gets herself a new gown, when they are bad she goes without. A country-woman explained to me the other day the true economy of clothes. I had asked her if she made clothes for the children out of her old ones. "It don't pay," she said. "I take a much larger bit of stuff than the children; so I wears my clothes quite out and buys them (pointing over her shoulder) a little bit of new."

"Equality of rights" is a barren phrase, and can never obtain as between men and women, because we cannot have equality of duties. There can be no "rights" without corresponding "duties." Equality would apparently give us a Government of professional women and independent rate-paying women, the majority of whom would be unmarried. These ladies would not be representative of the women of the country, but they would claim the right to speak for them, make demands for them, and legislate for them. It would be a highly specialised representation of "doctrinaires" for the most part, remote from the actual life of women. Many Suffragists would say that this

was only the beginning, the first introduction of a principle. But we have a right to ask them what is their ultimate aim. Are they prepared for a universal suffrage in which women voters would be in the majority? And, if not, what class of women would they exclude? I once saw it suggested that domestic servants should have no votes. That would be a most ungrateful return to make for all that women owe to the admirable service rendered by generations of devoted women—R. L. Stevenson's tribute to his old nurse, Alison Cunningham, tells us a better way.

It may be surmised that this suggestion was not a serious one; it shows, however, how inchoate the whole question remains, how seriously the vote must affect every class of women, how well-nigh impossible it is to make any practical working scheme. But we are grateful to Lady MacLaren for her effort to clear the ground.

E. B. HARRISON.

## THE "CONCILIATION" BILL IN THE HOUSE.

By A. MACONACHIE.

WELL done, Mr. Shackleton! With the bluff, breezy brusqueness of his class, which is so refreshing in these days of foolery and *finesse*, the Member for Clitheroe let the cat out of the bag at once. The boasted "Conciliation Bill" satisfied its sponsors "for the moment." It was, he told the House, accepted by Suffragists as "a first start." Dotted the "i's," he added this golden and memorable sentence: "*It is in that sense* I ask leave to introduce it." And precisely "in that sense" Anti-Suffragists understand it, and will describe it in the country.

\* \* \*

It is easy now to see why Mr. Shackleton was specially chosen for the part of arch-conspirator. He declared himself a lifelong devotee of the "thin end of the wedge" habit. "It has been one of my ideas," he told a crowded House, somewhat stupefied at his exuberant candour, "throughout my life, not only in the political, but in the industrial world, to get in the thin end of the wedge. *I have*

generally found it to be the most successful way of achieving my object." Finally, to make quite sure that the world should know the secret charm of the "Conciliation" Bill, Mr. Shackleton bluntly asserted: "And it is because I find that this is the only objection to the present Bill that I am so much in favour of it."

\* \* \*

Well might Mr. F. E. Smith, who promptly rose when Mr. Shackleton resumed his seat, declare that Anti-Suffragists could not be sufficiently grateful to Mr. Shackleton for disdaining the methods by which Unionist Suffragists have sought to represent their new Bill as a check on adult suffrage, and openly commending the bantling as a future means of lowering the franchise still further. It was very pleasing to see the brilliant young "silk" with deadly calmness in a hushed House warn the Government that, even if facilities were given for the Bill, it would meet from Mr. Smith and his fellow Anti-Suffragists "the most implacable resistance which the rules of Parliament permit." The handful of Conservative and Unionist Suffragists, who had already been visibly frozen by Mr. Shackleton's amazing *naïveté*, seemed to cower into themselves still further, and Suffragists generally began to look glum. The actual prospects of the Bill this Session are zero. But as I descended the stairs from the Strangers' Gallery, I could not help wishing that, for the welfare of England, we had more politicians with the honesty of Mr. Shackleton and the grit of Mr. Smith.

\* \* \*

The section of the Suffragists which is hardest hit by Mr. Shackleton's unexpected frankness is the Conservative and Unionist Women's Franchise Association. They intend the exact opposite of what Mr. Shackleton sees quite clearly his Bill must lead to. They think to stave off manhood and adult suffrage by enfranchising a fraction of the feminine world now. But the Labour Party are under no such

illusions. They know very well that not all the Mrs. Partingtons in Dover Street could avail, with a broom in each hand, to keep out the full flood-tide of democracy once the sex barrier is submerged. That gone, there is no possible excuse, as the "Standard" well argues, for saying a man lodger shall have a vote, but a woman lodger be denied it. And is it not clear as noonday that the Suffragists would at once raise the old cry about "sex disabilities," and with tenfold force, if Parliament had already abandoned the disqualification? Conservatives who amiably, but mistakenly, play with Woman Suffrage would do well to remember the old adage: "It is the first step that costs." With the best intentions in the world, they are unwittingly digging the grave of every principle they hold dear. Remember Australia, where Woman Suffrage has put the Labour Party in power for the first time in the history of the Commonwealth.

\* \* \*

Mr. Shackleton is devoted to the policy of the wedge. It is—when openly declared—vastly more honourable than that to which so many of his fellow-members rush so readily for shelter—the hedge. I have more respect for the wedge than the hedge.

A. MACONACHIE.

### FREE TOILET SOAP.

For a limited period all readers of this paper desiring to try for themselves the delightful Toilet Soap manufactured by the Oatine Co., can do so by writing to the Oatine Co., who will be pleased to send, absolutely free, a Visitors' Tablet of Oatine Toilet Soap, together with a dainty toilet case containing samples of seven other Oatine Preparations.

The Oatine Preparations are made from the pure healing essence of the finest Oats, and contain no animal fats.

This is a unique opportunity for all to test these delightful Preparations, and readers are recommended to send to-day, enclosing 4d. in stamps for postage (halfpenny stamps preferred), when the toilet case and free tablet of soap will be forwarded by return of post. Should the toilet case only be required, it is only necessary to send 3d. for postage and packing. Write to-day, The Oatine Co., 490c, Oatine-buildings, Borough, London, S.E.

### BRANCHES.

**ASHBOURNE AND DISTRICT**—President: The Lady Florence Duncombe. Chairman: Mrs. R. H. Jeff. Vice-Chairman: Mrs. Sadler. Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Parkin. Hon. Secretary: Miss M. L. Bond, Alrewas House, Ashbourne.

**BASINGSTOKE AND DISTRICT**—President: The Lady Calthorpe. Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Allnut, Hazelhurst, Basingstoke.

**Basingstoke Town (Sub-Branch)**—Chairman: Mrs. Illingworth, Mapledurwell.

**Farnborough (Sub-Branch)**—Chairman: Mrs. Grlerson, Knellwood, South Farnborough.

**Hartley Whitney (Sub-Branch)**—Chairman: Minley, Yateley, and Hawley (Sub-Branch)—Chairman: Mrs. Lawrence Currie, Minley Manor.

**Fleet (Sub-Branch)**—Chairman: Mrs. Hornblow, The Views, Fleet. All communications to be addressed to Mrs. Allnut, Hazelhurst, Basingstoke.

**BECKENHAM**—Provisional Hon. Secretary: Miss E. Blake, Kingswood, The Avenue, Beckenham, Kent.

**BERKS (NORTH)**—President: The Lady Wantage. Hon. Secretary: Miss Gladys Pott, The Red House, Sreadley-on-Thames; and 7, Queensborough Terrace, Hyde Park, W.

**Abingdon (Sub-Branch)**—Hon. Secretary: Lady Norman, 36, Bath Street, Abingdon.

**Wantage (Sub-Branch)**—Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Woodhouse, Wantage.

**BERKS (SOUTH)**—President: Mrs. Benyon. Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Dickinson, Eastfield, Whitechurch, Reading.

**Newbury (Sub-Branch)**—President: Mrs. Arthur Thompson. Treasurer and Secretary: Mrs. Finn, Phoenix Lodge, Newbury.

**BERKS (EAST)**—President: Lady Haversham. Hon. Treasurer: Lady Ryan. Secretary: Mr. C. Hay, South Hill Park, (Bracknell, Berks).

**BERWICKSHIRE**—President: The Hon. Mrs. Baillie Hamilton. Vice-President: Mrs. Baxendale. Hon. Secretary: Miss M. W. M. Falconer, L.L.A., Elder Bank, Duns, Berwickshire.

**BIRMINGHAM**—President: The Lady Algernon Percy. Vice-President: The Lady Calthorpe. Mrs. E. M. Simon; Miss Beatrice Chamberlain. Hon. Treasurer: Murray N. Phelps, Esq., L.L.B. Hon. Secretaries: Mrs. Saundby; Mrs. E. Lakin-Smith; Miss Baker. Secretary: Miss Gertrude Allarton, 19, New Street, Birmingham.

**BOURNEMOUTH**—President: The Lady Abinger. Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Drury Lowe. Hon. Secretaries: Miss Fraser, Dorloch, Alum Chine Road, Bournemouth; Miss Sherring Kildare, Norwich Avenue, Bournemouth. All communications to be addressed to Miss Fraser.

**BRIDGWATER**—President: Miss Marshall. Hon. Treasurer and Secretary *pro tem.*: Thomas Perren, Esq., Park Road, Bridgwater.

**BRIDLINGTON**—No branch committee has been formed; Lady Macdonald Bosville, Thorpe Hall, Bridlington, is willing to receive subscriptions and give information.

**BRIGHTON AND HOVE**—President: The Hon. Mrs. Campion. Vice-President and Hon. Secretary *pro tem.*: Mrs. Curtis, "Quex," D'Avigdor Road, Brighton.

**BRISTOL**—Chairman: Lady Fry. Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. A. R. Robinson. Hon. Secretaries: Miss Long Fox, 15, Royal York Crescent, Bristol. Assistant Secretary: Miss G. F. Allen.

**CAMBERLEY, FRIMLEY, AND MYTCHELL**—President: Mrs. Brittain Forwood. Vice-President: Miss Harris. Hon. Secretary and Treasurer: Mrs. Spens, Athallan Grange, Frimley, Surrey.

**CAMBRIDGE**—President: Mrs. Austen Leigh. Hon. Treasurer: Miss Seeley. Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Bidwell, 10, Barton Road, Cambridge.

**CAMBRIDGE (Girton College)**—President: Miss K. H. Brownson. Treasurer: Miss D. Watson. Secretary: Miss R. Walpole.

**CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY**—President: C. C. Perry, Esq., M.A. Hon. Secretaries: Herbert Loewe, Esq., M.A., 6, Park-street, Jesus Lane, Cambridge; D. G. Hopewell, Esq., Trinity Hall, Cambridge. All communications to be addressed to D. G. Hopewell, Esq.

**CARDIFF**—Hon. Secretary: Austin Harries, Esq., Glantaf, Taff Embankment, Cardiff.

**CHELSEA**—President: Lady Hester Carew. Hon. Treasurer: Admiral the Hon. Sir Edmund Fremantle, G.C.B.

Hon. Secretaries: Mrs. Myles, 16, St. Loo Mansions, Cheyne Gardens, S.W.; Miss S. Woodgate, 68, South Eaton Place, S.W.

**CHELTHENHAM**—President: Mrs. Hardy. Hon. Treasurer and Hon. Secretary: Miss Geddes, 4, Suffolk Square, Cheltenham.

**CRANBROOK**—President: Miss Neve, Osborne Lodge. Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Mordaunt, Goddard's Green, Cranbrook.

**CROYDON**—Provisional Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Corry, Rosenheim, Park Hill Road, Croydon. Assistant Hon. Secretary: Miss Jefferis, 49, Park Hill Road, Croydon.

**CUMBERLAND AND WESTMORELAND**—Chairman: Hon. Nina Kay Shuttleworth. Hon. Treasurer: Miss Thompson. Hon. Secretary: Miss Howard, Greystone Castle, Penrith.

**DUBLIN**—President: The Duchess of Abercorn. Chairman: Mrs. Bernard. Hon. Treasurer: Miss Orpin. Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Albert E. Murray, 2, Clyde Road, Dublin. Asst. Hon. Secretaries: Miss C. H. Pollock and Miss Dickson.

**DULWICH**—President: Mrs. Teall. Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Dalzell. Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Parish, 1, Woodlawn, Dulwich Village.

**East Dulwich (Sub-Branch)**—Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Batten, 2, Underhill Road, Lordship Lane, S.E.

**EALING**—President: Mrs. Forbes, Kirkconnel, Gunnersbury Avenue, Ealing Common. Hon. Treasurer: L. Prendergast Walsh, Esq. Hon. Secretary: Miss McClellan, 35, Hamilton Road, Ealing.

**EALING DEAN**—Joint Hon. Secretaries: The Misses Turner, 33, Lavington Road, West Ealing.

**EALING SOUTH**—Mrs. Ball. All communications to be addressed to Miss McClellan as above.

**EALING (Sub-Division), CHISWICK AND BEDFORD PARK**—Chairman *pro tem.*: Mrs. Norris. Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Greatbatch. Hon. Secretary: Miss M. Mackenzie, 6, G-range Road, Gunnersbury.

**ACTON**—Branch in formation.

**EASTBOURNE**—Hon. Treasurer and Secretary: Miss I. Turner, Holmwood, Milnthorpe Road, Eastbourne.

**EAST GRINSTEAD**—President: Lady Musgrave.

**EDINBURGH**—President: The Marchioness of Tweeddale. Vice-President: The Countess of Dalkeith. Chairman: Mrs. Stirling Boyd. Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Paterson. Joint Hon. Secretaries: Mrs. Johnston, 19, Walker Street; Miss Kemp, 6, Western Terrace, Murrayfield, Edinburgh.

**EPSOM**—President: The Dowager Countess of Ellesmere. Joint Hon. Treasurers: Mrs. Godfrey Lambert, Woodcote, Esher; Mrs. Lawson, Bracknellen, Esher. Joint Hon. Secretaries: Mrs. Cameron, Chessington Lodge, Chessington; Miss FitzGerald, Lammus Cottage, Esher; Miss Norah Peachey, Esher. All communications to be addressed to Miss FitzGerald for the present.

**EXETER**—President: Lady Acland. Chairman: C. T. K. Roberts. Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Depree. Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Lessey Derry, 4, The Crescent, Mont Radford, Exeter.

**GLASGOW**—President: The Duchess of Hamilton. Chairman of Committee: Mrs. John M. McLeod. Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. David Blair. Hon. Secretary: Miss Eleanor M. Deane, 180, Hope Street, Glasgow.

**GLOUCESTER**—Chairman: Mrs. R. J. Tidswell. Vice-Chairman: Mrs. Nigel Haines and Mrs. W. Langley-Smith. Hon. Treasurer: W. P. Cullis, Esq. Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Naylor, Belmont, Brunswick Road, Gloucester.

**GOUDHURST**—Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Fitzhugh, Grove Place, Goudhurst.

**HAMPSTEAD**—President: Mrs. Metzler. Hon. Treasurer and Hon. Secretary *pro tem.*: Miss Squire, 27, Marlborough Hill, N.W.

**HAMPTON AND DISTRICT**—Hon. Treasurer: H. Mills, Esq. Joint Hon. Secretaries: Mrs. Ellis Hicks Beach and Miss Goodrich, Clarence Lodge, Hampton Court.

**HAWKHURST**—President: Mrs. Frederic Harrison. Hon. Secretary: Miss Patricia Baker, Delmonden Grange, Hawkhurst. Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Beauchamp Tower.

**HEREFORD AND DISTRICT**—Hon. Treasurer: Miss M. C. King King. Joint Hon. Secretaries: Miss Armitage, 3, The Bartens, Hereford; Miss M. Capel, 22, King Street, Hereford. District represented on Committee by Mrs. Edward Heygate. Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Sale, The Forbury Leominster.



Photographed from Life.

Registered Design.

### SPORTS COATS

We have made a special study of Knitted Goods and have now in stock a wide assortment of exclusive novelties in pure silk, "Silkuna" and woollen coats and caps, etc., of which the garment photographed here is a typical example.

### SILKUNA COATS

(as sketch), made exclusively for Debenham & Freebody, closely resembling real silk in appearance, in a wide range of fashionable shades.

59/6.

Cap to match, 5/11

Real Silk Coats from 59/6 to 6 gns. each.

Caps to match, 8/11

Sent on approval.

## Debenham & Freebody

Wigmore Street, Welbeck Street, London, W.

Famous for over a Century for Taste, for Quality, for Value.

**HERTS (WEST)**—Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Lucas.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Mitchell-Innes, Churchill, Hemel Hempstead.  
Co. Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Stafford, The Warren, Potten End, Berkhamsted.

**HULL**—Hon. Treasurer: Henry Buckton, Esq.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Walker, 18, Belvoir Street.

**INVERNESS AND NAIRN**—  
President: Lady Lovat.  
Hon. Treasurers and Hon. Secretaries: Inverness—Miss Mercer, Woodfield, Inverness; Nairn—Miss B. Robertson, Constabulary Gardens, Nairn.

**ISLE OF THANET**—  
President: Mrs. C. Murray Smith.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Fishwick.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Weigall, Southwood, Ramsgate.

**ISLE OF WIGHT**—President: Mrs. Oglander.  
Hon. Treasurer: Miss Lowther Crofton.  
Provisional Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Perrott, Clantagh, near Ryde, Isle of Wight.

**KENNINGTON**—President: Mrs. Darlington.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Millington, 101, Fentiman Road, Clapham Road, S.W.

**KENSINGTON**—  
President: Mary Countess of Ilchester.  
Hon. Treasurer: Miss Jeanie Ross.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Archibald Colquhoun.  
The Kensington office (14, Church Street) will be closed from June 11th until further notice, after which all communications should be made to the Hon. Secretary, 25, Bedford Gardens, Kensington, W.

**KESWICK**—President: Mrs. R. D. Marshall.  
Hon. Treasurer: F. P. Heath, Esq.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. J. Hall, Greta Grove.

**KEW**—  
Hon. Secretary: Miss A. Stevenson, 10, Cumberland Road, Kew.

**LEEDS**—President: The Countess of Harewood.  
Chairman: Mrs. Frank Gott.  
Hon. Treasurer: Miss E. M. Lupton.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Gabrielle Butler, St. Ann's, Burley, Leeds.  
District Secretaries: Miss H. McLaren, 158, Otley Road, Headingley; Miss M. Silcock, Barkston Lodge, Roundhay.

**LEICESTER**—President: Lady Hazelrigg.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Butler.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Valeria D. Ellis, 120, Regent Road, Leicester.  
Assistant Hon. Secretary: Miss Nancy Druce.

**LIVERPOOL AND BIRKENHEAD**—  
Hon. Treasurer and Hon. Secretary *pro tem.*: Miss C. Gostenhofer, 16, Beresford Road, Birkenhead.

**LYMINGTON**—President: Mrs. Edward Morant.  
Chairman: E. H. Pember, Esq., K.C.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mr. Taylor.  
Hon. Secretary *pro tem.*: Mrs. Alexander, The Old Manston, Boldre, Lymington, Hants.

**MALVERN**—President: Lady Grey.  
Hon. Treasurer: Miss Sheppard.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Hollins, Southbank

**MANCHESTER**—  
President: Lady Sheffield.  
Hon. Treasurers: Mrs. Arthur Herbert; Percy Marriott, Esq.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Henry Simon.  
Secretary: Miss M. Quarrier Hogg, 1, Princess Street, Manchester.

**Didsbury (Sub-Branch)**—  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Henry Simon, Lawnhurst, Didsbury.

**Hale (Sub-Branch)**—  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Arthur Herbert, High End, Hale, Cheshire.

**Marple (Sub-Branch)**—President: Miss Hudson.  
Chairman of Committee: Mr. Evans.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. G. F. Sugden, 53, Church Street, Marple.  
Assistant Hon. Secretary: Miss Rayner, Stoke Lacy, Marple.

**MARYLEBONE (EAST)**—  
President: The Countess of Cromer.  
Chairman of Committee: Mrs. Moberly Bell.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Carson Roberts.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Markham, 10, Queen Street, Mayfair.

**MARYLEBONE (WEST)**—  
President: Lady George Hamilton.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Alexander Scott.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Jeyes, 11, Grove End Road, St. John's Wood.

**MIDDLESBROUGH**—President: Mrs. Hedley.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Giers, Busby Hall, Carlton-in-Cleveland, Northallerton.

**NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE**—  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Noble, Jesmond Dene House, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

**NEWPORT (MONMOUTHSHIRE)**—  
President: Lady Llangattock.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Prothero, Malpas Court.

**NORTH HANTS AND NEWBURY DISTRICT**—  
President: Mrs. Gadesden.  
Vice-President: Lady Arbuthnot.  
Hon. Treasurer: Paul Forster, Esq.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Stedman, The Grange, Wootton Hill, Newbury.

**NORTH WALES (No. 1)**—  
President: Mrs. Cornwalls West.

**NOTTINGHAM**—  
Acting Hon. Secretary and Treasurer: Miss A. J. Lindsay, 54, Parliament Street, London.  
Mrs. T. A. Hill, Normanton House, Plumtree, Notts, has kindly consented to give information and to receive subscriptions locally.

**OXFORD**—Chairman: Mrs. Max Müller.  
Vice-Chairman: Mrs. Massie.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Gamlen.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Dawne, 62, Banbury Road.  
Co. Hon. Secretary: Miss Willis-Sandford, 40, St. Giles, Oxford.

**PADDINGTON**—  
President of Executive: Lady Dimsdale.  
Deputy President: Mrs. Clarendon Hyde.  
Hon. Secretary and Temporary Treasurer: Mrs. Percy Thomas, 37, Craven Road, Hyde Park.  
The Hon. Secretary will be "At Home" every Thursday morning to answer questions and give information.

**PETERSFIELD**—  
President: The Lady Emily Turnour.  
Vice-President: Mrs. Nettleship.  
Hon. Treasurer: Miss Amey.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Loftus Jones, Hylton House, Petersfield.

**PORTSMOUTH AND DISTRICT**—  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Burnett.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Craigie, Silwood Villa, Marmion Road, Southsea.

**READING**—President: Mrs. G. W. Palmer.  
Hon. Treasurer: Dr. Secretan.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Thoys, Furze Bank, Redlands Road, Reading.

**RICHMOND**—President: Miss Trevor.  
Hon. Treasurer: Herbert Gittens, Esq.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Willoughby Dumergne, 5, Mount Ararat Road, Richmond.

**ROCHESTER**—  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Conway Gordon.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Pollock, The Precincts.

**ST. ANDREWS**—  
President: The Lady Griselda Cheape.  
Vice-President: Mrs. Hamar.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Burnet.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Playfair, 18, Queen's Gardens, St. Andrews.

**SALISBURY**—President: Lady Tennant.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Malden, The Close, Salisbury.

**SCARBOROUGH**—Chairman: Mrs. Daniel.  
Hon. Treasurer: James Bayley, Esq.  
Hon. Secretaries: Clerical, Miss Mackarness, 19, Princess Royal Terrace; General, Miss Kendall, Oriol Lodge, Scarborough.

**SEVENOAKS**—President: The Lady Sackville.  
Deputy President: Mrs. Rycroft.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Herbert Knocker.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Tabrum, 2, Hillside, Eardley Road, Sevenoaks.

**SHEFFIELD**—  
Vice-Presidents: The Lady Edmund Talbot, Lady Bingham, Miss Alice Watson.  
Hon. Treasurer: Miss M. Colley.  
Hon. Secretaries: Mrs. Arthur Balfour, "Arcadia," Endcliffe, Sheffield; Mrs. Munns, Mayville, Ranmoor Park Road, Sheffield.

**SHOTTERMILL**—  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. R. S. Whiteway.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. H. Beveridge, Pitfold, Shottermill, Haslemere.

**SIDMOUTH**—President: Miss Chalmers.  
Acting Hon. Treasurer: B. Browning, Esq., R.N.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Browning, Sidmouth.

**SOUTHAMPTON**—President: Mrs. Cotton.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Langstaff, 13, Carlton Crescent.

**SOUTHWOLD**—  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Adams, Bank House, Southwold, Suffolk.

**SPILSBY**—No branch yet formed.  
Mrs. Richardson, Halton House, Spilsby, acting as Provisional Hon. Secretary.

**SURREY (EAST)**—  
Hon. Treasurer: Alfred F. Mott, Esq.  
Hon. Secretaries: Reigate—Mrs. Rundall, West View, Reigate; Redhill—Mrs. Frank E. Lemon, Hillcrest, Redhill.

**SUSSEX (WEST)**—  
President: The Lady Edmund Talbot.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Travers, Tortington House, Arundel, Sussex.  
Assistant Hon. Secretary: Miss Rhoda Butt, Wilbury, Littlehampton.

**TAUNTON**—President: The Hon. Mrs. Portman.  
Vice-President: Mrs. Lance.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Somerville.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Birkbeck, Church Square.

**THREE TOWNS AND DISTRICT, PLYMOUTH**  
President: Mrs. Spender.

**TORQUAY**—President: Hon. Mrs. Bridgeman.  
Hon. Treasurer: The Hon. Helen Trefusis.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss M. C. Phillpotts, Kilcorran, Torquay.

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS**—  
President: The Hon. Mrs. Amherst.  
Hon. Treasurer: E. Weldon, Esq.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss M. B. Backhouse, 48, St. James' Road, Tunbridge Wells.

**UPPER NORWOOD AND ANERLEY**—  
President: Lady Montgomery Moore.  
Hon. Treasurer: J. E. O'Connor, Esq.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Austin, Sunnyside, Crescent Road, South Norwood.

**WENDOVER**—President: The Lady Louisa Smith.  
Hon. Treasurer and Secretaries: Miss L. B. Strong; Miss E. D. Perrott, Hazeldene, Wendover, Bucks.

**WESTMINSTER**—  
President: The Lady Biddulph of Ledbury.  
Hon. Treasurers and Hon. Secretaries: Miss Stephenson and Miss L. E. Cotesworth, Caxton House, Tothill Street, S.W.

**WESTON-SUPER-MARE**—  
President: Lady Mary de Salis.  
Hon. Treasurer: Miss W. Evans.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. E. M. S. Parker, Welford House, Weston-super-Mare.

**WHITBY**—President: Mrs. George Macmillan.  
Hon. Treasurer and Secretary: Miss Priestley, The Mount, Whitby.

**WIMBLEDON**—President: Lady Elliott.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. T. H. Lloyd.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Morgan Veitch, 2, The Sycamores, Wimbledon.

**WINCHESTER**—President: Mrs. Griffith.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Bryett, Kerrfield, Winchester.

**WOODBIDGE**—  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Nixon, Priory Gate, Woodbridge.

**WORCESTER**—  
President: The Countess of Coventry.  
Hon. Treasurer: A. C. Cherry, Esq.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Ernest Day, "Doria," Worcester.

**YORK**—President: Lady Julia Wombwell.  
Hon. Treasurer: Hon. Mrs. Stanley Jackson.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Jenyns, The Beeches, Dringhouses, York.