

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: 5934 Westminster.

No. 5.

LONDON, APRIL, 1909.

PRICE 1d.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
MR. GEOFFREY HOWARD'S BILL AND ADULT SUFFRAGE	1
NOTES AND NEWS	2
THE QUEEN'S HALL DEMONSTRATION	4
NEWS FROM THE BRANCHES:	
Manchester and Liverpool	5
Hereford and District—Hampton and District—Easton (Bristol)—Bournemouth	6
Wimbledon—Brighton—Malvern—Hampstead—Farnborough—Reigate and Redhill	7
Skegness—Westminster—Eastbourne—Dublin—Epsom—Mr. L. J. Maxse at Sheffield—South Berks—Ashbourne—Arnside	8
BRANCHES	9
CIVIL WAR: WANT OF COHESION AMONG WOMEN	11
THE DIFFERENCE IN WAGE BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN	12

NOTICE.

For the opinions expressed in articles signed or initialled, or in letters to the Editor, the authors alone are responsible.

The following are the members of the Executive Committee:—

THE COUNTESS OF JERSEY
(Chairman),

MRS. MASSIE (Vice-Chairman),

Lady Haversham, Mrs. Humphry Ward, Miss Ermine Taylor, Mrs. Frederic Harrison, Miss Lonsdale, Lady George Hamilton, Miss Beatrice Chamberlain, Miss Gertrude Lowthian Bell, Lady Weardale, Miss Janet Hogarth, Hon. Nina Kay Shuttleworth, Ellen Countess of Desart, Mrs. Clarendon Hyde, Mrs. Arthur Somervell (Hon. Sec.), Mr. Heber Hart, Mrs. Burgwin, Miss Low, Mrs. Simon, Lady Robson, Mrs. Godfrey Benson, Lady Biddulph, Mr. J. Massie, M.P., and Hon. Ivor Guest, M.P.

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.

MR. GEOFFREY HOWARD'S BILL AND ADULT SUFFRAGE.

ANTI-SUFFRAGISTS have every reason to be grateful to Mr. Geoffrey Howard. They never could have devised so effective a means of bringing into clear relief the hopeless divisions in the Suffragist camp as the ingenious measure, which proposed with a stroke of the pen to hand over the government of the Empire to an enormous and utterly untested electorate, in which a majority would be women. It almost looks as if some *agent provocateur* had been at work, or at any rate as if the more or less half-hearted male supporters of the enfranchisement of women were riding for a fall. Look at the reception which their efforts met with from the Suffragists themselves. Mrs. Fawcett, on behalf of the older—may we say the more sedate—societies, hastened to repudiate the Bill in the columns of the *Times*. Lady Knightley of Fawsley's newly created Conservative Franchise Association, seeing that if the Bill passed women landowners might indeed stand on an equality with their gardeners, but were likely to be outnumbered by their housemaids, raised a serious protest. Miss Christabel Pankhurst and her Suffragette friends of the Social and Political Union heaped scorn upon this latest sample of man-made law, and contrasted "the listless character" of the debate upon it with the enthusiasm felt in 1908 in Suffragist circles for Mr. Stanger's proposal to enfranchise women of property. Women in passing will please note that up to the present the

Suffragists are not, apparently, proposing to do anything whatever for their poorer sisters, though in season and out of season they accuse the Anti-Suffragists of considering only the comfortable, and urge that the vote is a necessity to improve the condition of the wage-earning classes. Yet when a Bill is brought forward to give the working women votes, with one consent every Suffragist opposes it!

Not that such opposition is to be taken as the last word in the matter. It cannot be too often repeated that there is no permanent resting place on the road to adult suffrage. Neither Mrs. Fawcett, nor Lady Knightley, nor any of the amiable advocates of half-measures, can possibly stop at a limited franchise, when once the principle of women's direct participation in elections has been conceded. Mr. Stanger's Bill was blessed by the Women's Social and Political Union because it dealt simply and solely with the removal of sex-disability, and they were perfectly right so to bless it. They were much more right and much more logical than the Conservative ladies, who saw in it a safe measure, likely to confine political power to a select band of duly qualified women. It might have done that for a year or two; but what the militant organisations saw, with a perspicacity which does them credit, was the importance of getting Parliament to affirm that no woman was to be debarred from voting by reason of her sex. That point once gained, they could afford to wait until the traditional Conservative policy of

"dishing the Whigs" had opened the gates to the flood of democracy, when manhood suffrage would be only a question of time, and would perforce mean adult suffrage. What else could it mean, if "men" by Act of Parliament included "women"?

Anti-Suffragists, therefore, are on perfectly firm ground when they maintain that either no women must vote, or all women must vote. How countries can prosper when no women vote can be read in the records of universal history. What happens to a country where all women vote the imaginative must be left to decide. Perhaps Mr. H. G. Wells, who has a special gift for social prophecy, will kindly enlighten us. At present we are restricted to the views of New Zealanders, the romances of Colorado, and the apocryphal histories of the Suffragettes. Miss Robins has lately told us that Norway granted the full Parliamentary franchise to three-fifths of her women, and that the plan works so well that the Royal Council has recommended the giving of equal rights to the remaining two-fifths, all of which would be very interesting and enlightening if there had been any election since the women had votes. But as so far they have never exercised their privilege, it seems a little "previous" to pronounce judgment upon its political effect. Sentence first and verdict after, only, like Alice, we can't quite see the justice of the proceedings! Of course, there remain New Zealand and Colorado, but Colorado likes making experiments, and can pass Acts "declaratory of public opinion" without any fear of provoking either national or international complications. Indeed, nobody seems likely to take much notice. And what one of the older States thinks of Women's Suffrage has been efficiently demonstrated by the decision of the Massachusetts Legislature, which has just rejected a Bill by 171 votes to 54. As to New Zealand, let the Suffragists get what encouragement they can from its blameless

record of parochial politics. But when they maintain that these examples form a sufficient precedent to justify them in handing over the destinies of the Empire to a feminine electorate, the Anti-Suffragist League, they may rest assured, will not keep silence.

NOTES AND NEWS.

WE report elsewhere the proceedings at the great Queen's Hall meeting convened on the 26th of March under the auspices of the Women's National Anti-Suffrage League. It was conspicuous for its representative character, its numbers, its enthusiasm, and for the entire absence of any taint of party feeling. Admirable speeches were delivered by Lord Cromer and by Mr. Austen Chamberlain, the latter of whom evoked cheers and laughter by his declaration that he opposed female suffrage for the oldest and shortest of reasons, 'because man was man, and woman was woman.' Nature had made them different, 'and Parliament could not make them the same.' Lord Cromer tore to tatters the arguments based on 'innate rights,' and on the extraordinary perversion of the maxim that taxation must be accompanied by representation. Mrs. Humphry Ward, who presided, made claim for the League that it was a living answer to Mr. Asquith's demand for information as to the real opinion of the women of England on the question of the suffrage. The League had been endeavouring to get the facts for him, and they meant to continue doing so. They were bringing home for the first time the real meaning of the suffragist agitation to hundreds of thousands of women to whom it was before but a mere name, who had been vaguely inclined to it, but had never at any time been made acquainted with the reasons against it. By Mrs. Fawcett's admission the suffragist movement for the first time in forty-three years was confronted with a strong and organised opposition. * * *

It is no mere coincidence that the revival of interest in foreign politics and in the efficiency of the Army and the Navy should have been followed by a drop in the suffrage agitation. The question of the moment is the security of the British Islands resting in the last resort upon 'the strong man armed.' And it is here that the

essential weakness of the suffragist lies. In patriotism, in the courage to bear and suffer, in the will and power to organise, and to put heart into the weak and the wavering, women yield not one jot to the sterner sex. But, and it is a 'but' which ends the matter, they are physically incapable of sustaining the responsibilities of national defence. In the weighty words of Lord Curzon, it is the men who have to fight the battles, extend the frontiers, conduct the administration, and bear the burdens of the Empire. The half-amused tolerance with which the antics of the militant 'demonstrators' have been hitherto accepted is a thing of the past. The thinking public has begun to reflect upon the consequences in a national crisis of having a Cabinet dependent upon women's votes.

ANYTHING that appears above the signature of Mr. Bernard Shaw is bound to be whimsical, unconventional, and suggestive. His contribution to the March number of the *Englishwoman*, entitled 'The Unmentionable Case for Women's Suffrage,' is no exception to the rule. There is much in it with which readers of both sexes must agree, whatever are their views on the suffrage, and all the more so that, except in the title, the article contains no reference whatever to the subject of the Parliamentary franchise. Mr. Shaw's arguments and illustrations are all avowedly directed to what he forcibly calls 'the injustice and the abomination' of 'the exclusion of women from public life.' Mr. Shaw can hardly be ignorant of the fact that among the strongest opponents of 'votes for women' are included those who have for years past taken a leading share in obtaining for women a full participation in local administration, in factory inspection, in education, in the supervision of public institutions, and in other directions too numerous to be specified. That there have been instances of retrogression, for the most part only temporary, and followed by corresponding advances, is true enough. But Mr. Shaw leaves us utterly in the dark as to how the 'hard cases' which he enumerates would have been avoided had women been directly represented in the House of Commons. * * *

The *Westminster Gazette* has recently given some interesting quotations from a Canadian paper, to show the light in which the tactics of the 'advanced'

suffragists are regarded in the Dominion. 'It does not seem to have occurred to the belligerent ladies, who fight with the police, chain themselves to seats in public places, way-lay public men, and generally make themselves obnoxious, that they are going to work in the surest way possible to defeat their own objects. They are demonstrating their own unfitness for the very thing they ask.' And the words that follow should act at once as an incentive and an encouragement to our League. 'Nothing better illustrates that the women of the United Kingdom do not want the vote than the attitude of the vast majority of them towards the Suffragettes. There is absolutely no popular demand for Woman Suffrage.' We should remember that the admission of women to the Parliamentary franchise is not a matter of merely academic interest to Canada, and the other Britains beyond the seas. It is the Parliament at Westminster which controls the great issues of peace and war, issues which may involve the Colonies in vast expenditure of blood and treasure, possibly in devastation and humiliation.

At a reception of welcome to the latest batch of released 'prisoners' Mrs. Despard is reported to have summed up the anti-suffragists of her own sex as 'the duchesses, countesses, heiresses, and wives and daughters of millionaires.' Such folk, she maintained, were of no account. 'If they were painlessly to disappear the world would be none the worse. The women who really counted were administrators of households, women who had made a professional career for themselves, and women workers who wanted the vote, and would use it to the advantage of the country.' Such tirades as these are in reality a very high tribute to the work accomplished by the Woman's Anti-Suffrage League during its short existence. Misrepresentation is one of the first symptoms of anger and panic. The rapid growth of our organisation throughout the country has once and for ever pricked the bubble of a preponderant desire among women for the Parliamentary vote, and nowhere has it received more cordial support than among the very class of women workers of whom Mrs. Despard claims to possess the monopoly. The reports of our branch meetings, to say nothing of the gigantic petition which Mr. Massie presented to the House of Commons on the 19th of March, should

be a sufficient answer to these extravagant statements.

AN examination of the first page of this petition shows the utter baselessness of Mrs. Despard's assumption. There we find side by side the signatures of a peeress, who is a widow and a large landowner, of a headmistress of a high school with a Cambridge degree, of a highly educated working woman, of a *Times* librarian, of a woman author, and a woman wage-earner. In the petition, as a whole, we find representatives of every trade and profession and occupation and walk of life. There are authors, journalists, secretaries, schoolmistresses from the universities to the elementary schools, farmers, shopkeepers, typists, clerks, domestic servants, mill hands, shop assistants, fishwives, coastguards' wives, soldiers' and sailors' wives, charwomen, caretakers. And those who took round the petition and collected the signatures are unanimous as to the eagerness with which it was signed, and as to the strength of the feeling against 'the vote.' The last thing which the women workers desired was to see the Government of the country entrusted to themselves and their sisters.

THIS cry of 'the classes against the masses' is really too ridiculous. In the United States the woman's suffrage movement is notoriously engineered by the richest and most fashionable members of New York society. Here at home the suffragists number in their ranks a goodly proportion of the titled and the wealthy whose painless extinction Mrs. Despard demands. Nor does the agitation suffer from lack of funds. A very Pactolus seems to flow into the war chest of 'moderates' and 'extremists' alike. Meanwhile the following incident should warn the credulous of the extreme caution with which the statistics and the allegations of the suffragists should be received. A little time ago one of them boasted in public that all the wardresses in Holloway, converted, we presume, by the 'martyrs,' were desirous of the vote. A member of the Woman's Anti-Suffrage League at once proceeded to Holloway to verify this startling announcement, with the result that 68 out of the 72 wardresses in that establishment signed the League's petition against any measure having for its object the granting of the Parliamen-

tary franchise to women. An equally remarkable case of hallucination is provided by Lady Constance Lytton, whose 'tales of my prison-house' have been so promptly and ignominiously dealt with. * * *

WE heartily recommend those of our readers who may have missed an article by Mrs. Somervell, in the *National Review* for March, on 'Suffragist Ideals,' to take an early opportunity of reading it. Mrs. Somervell deals in trenchant manner with a widely circulated book, 'Women and Economics,' by Charlotte Perkins Gilmer (now Mrs. Stetson), which is being accepted by many suffragists of all sections as a fair and able exposition of their views. We have not had an opportunity of perusing the work itself, and Mrs. Somervell's article does not admit of condensation. But the following quotation given by the latter lady from 'Woman and Economics,' sets one 'to think furiously':—'Marriage and the family are two institutions, not one, as is commonly supposed. . . . The family is a decreasing survival of the earliest grouping known to mankind. . . . Marriage is the increasing development of high social life, not fully evolved. . . . So far from being identical with the family, marriage improves and strengthens in inverse ratio to the family.' On such passages, and Mrs. Somervell quotes many, the best commentary seems to us to be supplied by the brown-wigged Transcendentalist lady in 'Martin Chuzzlewit': 'Howls the sublime, and softly sleeps the calm ideal in the whispering chambers of Imagination. To hear it, sweet it is. But then outlaughs the stern philosopher, and saith to the Grotesque, "What ho, arrest for me that agency!" And so the vision fadeth.' * * *

It is an extraordinary thing how misrepresentations, to give them their mildest name, can survive repeated exposure, and even thrive under the process. Only a few days ago Mrs. Zangwill is reported to have said in public that 'since the working-men of this country had been enfranchised their wages had increased from 50 to 100 per cent., while during the same period women's wages had remained stationary or become less.' This assertion, a very favourite article in the suffragist stock-in-trade, is absolutely contrary to fact, as may be seen in the recently published volume of the Board

of Trade Report dealing with the earnings and hours of labour of workpeople of the United Kingdom. Mrs. Massie promptly nailed it to the counter with a telling quotation from the 'History of Factory Legislation,' by Miss Hutchins and Miss Harrison (p. 284): 'We have already seen that over a period of forty or fifty years there has been no decrease in women's wages, but that on the whole they have kept pace with, or increased in greater proportion than, the earnings of men in the same industry.' In other words, women's wages, without the vote, have increased in at least the same proportion as men's with it. Nor is this surprising. Wages do not depend on the possession of the franchise. They depend on supply and demand, and on other economic conditions.' Mrs. Zangwill complains that the sweated industries are almost entirely women's industries. Perhaps she will take note that there are at the present moment two Bills before this man-elected Parliament, one introduced by a member of the Government, the other by a member of the Opposition, to establish a minimum wage in those industries where women are most liable to oppression.

* * *

EVIL communications do indeed corrupt good manners. The principal speaker at a Woman's Suffrage meeting, held at Bungay in Suffolk a few weeks ago, was Miss Evelyn Sharp, of the National Women's Social and Political Union. In the course of the evening Miss Sharp was asked if she approved of the intrusion of two uninvited women into the house of a prominent Liberal politician, whose wife was giving an evening party. Her answer, we quote from the *East Anglian Daily Times*, was to the following effect: 'She must explain that it was not a private reception. It was a semi-public, if not entirely a public affair. These ladies were not invited, as if they waited for an invitation they would never have got there. So they went without an invitation. She approved entirely of what those ladies did.' It is almost incredible that any woman with the slightest sense of good manners or of the common decencies which regulate social intercourse should have publicly condoned such an outrage. But if the speaker was the same Miss Evelyn Sharp whose delightful stories have charmed generations of schoolgirls, our amazement is turned into genuine sorrow.

The following extract from a letter dated March 19th, of a lady writing from Albany, New York, throws some light on the much vaunted progress of the suffrage movement in the United States: 'The Judiciary Committee of the Assembly of New York defeated the Bill for striking the word "male" from the Constitution by a vote of 10 to 2, one of the two announcing publicly that he was opposed to woman suffrage, but in favour of letting the whole Assembly vote on the Bill. Such being the feeling of the Assembly on the subject, the Senate will probably take no action at all. Massachusetts Committee defeated the same Bill 8 to 2. Iowa has likewise defeated it lately. South Dakota passed a Bill, but it needs to be passed by another legislature next year, and then submitted to the people.'

THE QUEEN'S HALL DEMONSTRATION.

BOTH in enthusiasm and numbers our great Queen's Hall Demonstration on March 26th was an unequalled success. The brilliant and statesmanlike speeches of Lord Cromer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, and Lord Weardale, the keen argument of Sir Edward Clarke, and the charming addresses of Mrs. Humphry Ward (in the chair) and Mrs. Arthur Somervell, made a deep impression on the crowded audience and on the disturbing Suffragist element, whose objections, cleverly met and silenced, served to give zest and further interest to the proceedings.

A picturesque touch was added to the animated scene in the vast hall by the presence of lady stewards of the League, who, clad in white, and wearing carnations, and ribbon favours of the colours of the League (white, rose, and black), flitted about selling leaflets and literature. Miss Ibbetson and Mr. Julius Bertram, M.P., played selections on the grand organ pending the arrival of the speakers, and Miss Clarendon Hyde presented a bouquet of carnations and lilies of the valley to Mrs. Humphry Ward in the name of the League.

Those supporting the speakers on the platform included many well known and influential people drawn from political and social circles.

Mrs. HUMPHRY WARD, who was very cordially received, congratulated the mem-

bers of the League on the enthusiasm with which their invitation to the meeting had been met, and on the great success which, during the last six months, had attended their endeavours to place before the country the protest of what they believed to be the majority of Englishwomen against the concession of woman suffrage. The Premier had asked for less talk and more facts. The League had been endeavouring to get the facts for him, and it meant to go on doing so. The militant suffragists might have rushed the House of Commons, but the anti-suffragists, she thought, had been strong enough to prevent them from rushing the Constitution. They were bringing home the real meaning of the suffragist agitation to hundreds of thousands of women to whom it was before but a mere name. As Mrs. Fawcett admitted in the new organ of her party, the suffragist movement, for the first time in forty-three years, was confronted with a strong and organised opposition. A great majority of the women of the working classes supported the League. They did not believe the suffrage would help them, and they were scandalised by the methods employed to obtain it. Let them not be daunted by taunts that they were proclaiming the inferiority of women, belittling their sex, and encouraging the base tyranny of men. Their platform, and the hall as a whole, contained hundreds of women whose conception of the mission of their sex was not a whit less lofty than that of the most impassioned and dithyrambic speakers in the opposition camp, but they believed in the proper apportionment of the national tasks between men and women. She referred to the splendid services rendered to the League by its president, Lady Jersey, and also expressed regret that Lord Curzon of Kedleston, who was in sympathy with them, found it impossible to be present on that occasion.

LORD CROMER, in proposing the resolution, said that attempts were at times made to minimise the importance of the question which they had met to consider. The change which was proposed involved a revolution, both political and social. Once let the principle be conceded, and of a surety before long the privilege of voting would be extended beyond the category of those women who now asked for a vote. More than this, women would make good their claim to sit in Parliament, and when this claim had been conceded, it had been rightly pointed out by Mr. Gladstone and others that capacity to sit in the House of Commons involved, both legally and practically, capacity to fill every office in the State.

What reason was there for supposing that public opinion was really in favour of the measure? It was true that a certain number of women had petitioned in favour of the measure; but they represented a very small, albeit noisy, portion of the female population of the country. They had been answered by the petition recently presented to Parliament by Mrs. Massie. Also, it was said that no fewer than 400 members of Parliament were pledged to support female suffrage. It had been whispered to him that some of those 400 members of Parliament, with what, he presumed, would be considered the habitual perfidy of their sex, could not be altogether relied upon to act up to their rash pledges. His firm belief was that when the importance of the question was understood, and the danger realised, the sound common sense of

NEWS FROM THE BRANCHES.

MANCHESTER AND LIVERPOOL.

MEMBERS of the League will doubtless be interested in hearing about the preliminary work in Manchester. This enormous city, or congeries of cities, has always been the stronghold of the women's suffrage movement, both moderates and militants having been Manchester people. We were, therefore, not surprised when we heard from our organising secretary, who started there some weeks ago, that her first meetings were practically broken up, and the rowdiest and rudest of the 'suffragettes,' men and women, together with their usual allies, the less-educated Socialists, assiduously attended and disturbed all meetings. It was decided, however, in view of certain letters, and the sympathy shown by influential people of Manchester, that our hon. sec. should spend a week there just after the Queen's Hall meeting, and that some small meetings should be arranged. Mr. J. Hills, M.P. for Durham City, and Mr. Morgan Veitch, of Wimbledon, kindly promised to speak, and two voluntary helpers went up also to help with meetings, sale of literature, etc. On Monday, the 29th, a preliminary meeting of supporters was held in a small room in the Memorial Hall, and the hon. secretary gave nearly an hour's address, setting forth the general principles of the League, and the reasons for opposing the suffrage movement, and also urging the importance of furthering the organisation of Manchester, and the signing of the petition. About eighty ladies and a few gentlemen were present, and a very small number of suffragists, who asked a few questions about women's wages, and the numbers of voters who can send a government into power, as compared with those who vote for the defeated side.

On Tuesday at the house of the Vice-Chancellor of the University, a large and influential drawing-room meeting was held, attended by about 100 ladies. The hon. secretary again addressed the meeting, and shorter speeches were made by Mr. Gerald Hertz, son-in-law of the Vice-Chancellor, who was, unfortunately, travelling in the East, and by Mrs. Charles Hughes, chairman of the Provisional Committee of the Manchester Branch. In the evening, a well-attended meeting was held in Broughton Town Hall, under the chairmanship of Councillor J. Cremlyn, who made an interesting speech. Mrs. Arthur Somervell and Dr. Walker were the other speakers. A considerable number of questions were handed up, and Mrs. Somervell answered them at the close of the speeches, and a resolution in opposition to woman's suffrage was carried by a large majority. The sexes were about evenly represented in the audience, and a majority of those present were working men and women. There was no rowdy behaviour or rudeness to the speakers. The *Manchester Guardian* and the *Courier*, of Wednesday, contained excellent reports of the speeches. On Wednesday night a meeting of about 400 was held in the Carlton Hall, at Liverpool, and Mrs. Somervell and Mr. Morgan Veitch, of Wimbledon, were the speakers, Mr. Veitch being in the chair. The audience followed the arguments with very close attention, and evidently a large number who had come indifferent or 'wobbling,' were won to the anti-suffrage cause. Fourteen persons joined the League, and a large number signed the petition. Mrs. Somervell and Mr. Veitch replied

the people of England would assert itself. His principal objection to giving votes to women was because they were not men. They did not wish, neither did the best of the other sex wish, that women should be sullied by being dragged into all the hurly-burly of political conflict. They did not wish that women should be exposed to the flippant remarks, to the misrepresentation, to the caustic criticism which were inevitable accompaniments of political life, and which any man who was worth his salt could bear without flinching, but from which the more sensitive nature of women very naturally and rightly shrank.

What were the main arguments advanced in favour of woman suffrage? In the first place, it was said that every human being, man or woman, had an innate right to vote. He did not believe in innate rights in politics any more than he believed in innate ideas in philosophy, or any more than he accepted the Socialist doctrine that every man had a right to work even when the person who paid him did not wish the work done. In the second place, it was urged that there should be no taxation without representation. Had any serious politician ever advocated that the principle that representation and taxation should go together should be applied in this sense, that every human being who paid taxes in any form whatsoever should be given a vote? There was not a single individual in this country who smoked a pipe, or who drank a glass of beer, or a cup of tea, or who put a lump of sugar in his tea, who did not pay taxes. Were all these to have votes?

Then we were told that under the existing régime questions immediately affecting women were overlooked, and that in some respects the law dealt unjustly with them. This was in reality the only serious argument which was advanced in favour of the cause. It was one which was enormously exaggerated. Then we were told that if votes were given to women, the consequence would be that the wages of women would rise. Why should they do so? The rate of wages depended on economic causes, on the capacity of the wage earners, and on the support and protection afforded to them by trade unions. Every one of these causes lie outside the domain of the special issue now under discussion. Let us by all means remedy any proved injustice. Let us encourage woman's activity in those spheres which are suitable for her action. Let us improve female education. But, on the other hand, let us stoutly resist those who had wantonly and unnecessarily raised this futile war of the sexes.

Above all, he wished to urge on them the importance of closing their ranks and showing a united front to their opponents. For the moment the essential point was to gain a victory on the main issue; and in order to ensure this victory unity within their own ranks was, above all things, necessary.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, M.P., in seconding the resolution, said that he felt it would be somewhat cowardly if he, holding the views he did, refrained from taking at least one opportunity of expressing them frankly and plainly, and of associating himself with the men and the women who were ranged against this monstrous innovation. It was time for those who were opposed to the movement for, he did not say 'conferring,' but for 'imposing,' upon women the ordinary political obligations of men, to speak out. He was

convinced that the majority of thinking women viewed the proposed change with horror and distrust. Not a few had given their assent to it, thinking that it was a trifling matter. It was nothing less than a revolution, not merely in our political, but in our whole social and domestic life. It was folly to ignore the facts. The country was face to face with a movement which, if it succeeded, could lead only to adult suffrage pure and simple. The woman suffrage societies repudiated Mr. Howard's Bill; they knew that to show the whole game at once was not to advance, but to retard, their cause. It was idle to suppose that any House of Commons at this time in the country's history was going to create a new property franchise. He thought their opponents would get nearer to the truth if they talked a little less about rights and thought a little more about duties. The influence of women upon our national life was great, it was effective, it was ubiquitous, it was none the less real because it was exercised quietly and in womanly ways and by womanly methods. He urged them to protest against a movement which would impose a burden unfitted to their sex, unsuited to their nature, and incompatible with the fulfilment of the greatest of their duties and the highest of their privileges.

LORD WEARDALE supported the resolution, and said that he was in favour of a large democratic extension of the franchise, but the extension must be confined to those who ought to govern the country, namely, the men. The vote was asked in the interests of the women who worked. For many years he represented in Parliament a Northern working-class constituency. Nearly ninety per cent. of the women there worked in the mills, and he never had a single representation from them in favour of the vote. The women there recognised that their conditions of labour and their wages could be improved by other processes than the granting of the vote. Men had passed the Children Act, and would, he hoped, carry the Bill to deal with sweating. He trusted that there would be a united stand made against the reactionary proposal to grant the franchise to women.

Mrs. ARTHUR SOMERVELL denied that women were not represented in the councils of the nation and that their interests were neglected. The conduct of the militant suffragists was an injury and a set-back to the cause of women the world over. It would not be right to have high political responsibility forced on a class which did not want it.

SIR EDWARD CLARKE said he regarded the claim of women to have the vote as futile. It was said that if they had the vote the wages of women would rise. Men's work would always fetch higher prices. Why? Because men's work was worth more. It was said that women wanted to have equal industrial opportunities with men. Did they want to repeal the Factory Acts which were passed even before working men had the vote? The League was making a strong stand against this dangerous movement, and he trusted that all thinking men and women would do what they could to help the organisation in its work.

Mrs. HUMPHRY WARD then put the resolution to the meeting, and it was carried by an overwhelming majority, amid the objections of a handful of dissentients. A hearty vote of thanks to Mrs. Humphry Ward concluded the proceedings.

to numerous questions, those on women's economic position, and the possibility of raising women's wages without the vote, being effectively answered with the help of the new Board of Trade Enquiry Report on Wages, just issued, a Blue-book which the suffragists present had obviously not yet studied.

On Thursday a well-attended meeting in the Memorial Hall, Manchester, was held. Mr. Hills, M.P., was, unfortunately, unable to travel, owing to a severe attack of influenza, and the notice was too short to get a substitute in time. Mrs. Somervell and Mr. Veitch were therefore again the speakers, with Sir Wm. Sinclair, M.D., in the chair, and Councillor J. Cremllyn and Mr. Maurice M. Bear proposed and seconded the votes of thanks to the speakers. Mr. Veitch gave a very interesting and well-reasoned speech on the injustice to women of giving them 'equality' with men before the law, thus taking away the protection of person and property which all civilised countries give them by the privileged position they now have, while pointing out that protection and privilege necessarily carry for the protector and those who ensure the privilege, certain powers of decision, such as the recognition by the State that, where the two parents are at variance, the father is recognised as the head of the family, unless he has by any misconduct forfeited this position. He also pointed out that while at present legislation concerning women and children is usually treated as outside party politics, together with other questions of supreme importance, such as national defence, foreign affairs, criminal legislation, and so on, if women came in as voters, their interests must, like those of various classes of men, become the sport of party tactics.

Mrs. Somervell spoke chiefly on the danger of dividing the power to make laws from the power to enforce laws, and on the question of which women are to vote, showing the anomalies and absurdities of any women's suffrage, save on the adult basis, and pointing out the way in which Norway is being forced to recognise this, though Norwegian women have not yet exercised their limited vote.

The last meeting was held on Friday at the Memorial Hall, and was not well attended, as several other meetings were going on in the city at the same time. Sir Edward O'Malley, formerly Attorney-General at Jamaica and Hong Kong, and Chief Judge of H.M. Supreme Consular Court for the Ottoman Empire, addressed the meeting, and was listened to with attention by the majority, but was perpetually interrupted by four or five suffragette women and men, who shouted irrelevant or rude remarks, and questioned his statements regarding the law in a manner which disgusted the audience.

The *Manchester Guardian* reports as follows:—

'The interruptions so lengthened the meeting that there was no time for questions. As usual at these meetings, the question of the divorce laws was raised by young unmarried girls, and Mrs. Somervell was greeted by a hearty round of applause when she stated that the Divorce Law was a subject which she declined to discuss in a casual gathering of men and women of all ages, including young girls and youths.'

The net result of the week's work is that a Branch has been formed, of which Mrs. M. Bear is hon. sec. The provisional office has been taken on, and a strong committee has been formed. Subscriptions and donations are coming in, one lady having made a donation of £100 to the Branch, and it is arranged that

a large demonstration shall be held in the autumn, at which Mrs. Humphry Ward, and probably an eminent member of the Men's League, and Mrs. A. Somervell, will be the chief speakers. The accounts of workers and supporters lead to exactly the same conclusion that our workers have come to elsewhere, that the vast majority of all classes, men and women, are either wholly indifferent, or firmly opposed to the grant of the suffrage to women, and many facts which came to our knowledge point here, as elsewhere, to the decline of the well-advertised boom of the suffrage movement.

* * *

HEREFORD AND DISTRICT.

A LARGELY attended meeting on behalf of the Women's National Anti-Suffrage League was held at the Town Hall, Hereford, on March 2nd, when Mr. Frank James presided, supported on the platform by Miss Mary Angela Dickens, Lady Mabel Beresford Peirse, Mrs. M. King King, Mrs. Paul Chapman, Captain Cecil Battine (late 15th Hussars), Mrs. Battine, Preb. Hopton, and Mr. T. Turner.

The Chairman read letters of regret for non-attendance from Lady Hopton, Ana Lady Croft, Mrs. Edgar Heygate, Mrs. Chambers, and Lord James of Hereford, who had written to Miss King King as follows:—'I have heard with great satisfaction of your endeavours to establish a branch of the Women's Anti-Suffrage League in Hereford. Allow me to wish you all success. It is some forty years since I entered the Parliamentary field against female suffrage. I thought then that the enfranchisement of women would greatly change the character of domestic life in this country, and would grievously weaken the strength of true and solid political action. Recent events have strengthened my belief in these views. Women have entered into active political life, and by their words and acts have shown how unfit they are to do so. Violence, illegality, and turbulence have been the weapons employed by the suffragette ladies who surely have shown that they do not represent the happy life of English homes, or an amount of political intelligence capable of directing the affairs of the country.'

The Chairman, proceeding, said these were his uncle's views, and they were also his own, or he would not be there presiding that evening. He was there to introduce to them the Hereford Branch of the Women's National Anti-Suffrage League, which had only been started that afternoon, but it already had a strong committee, and had begun with about fifty or sixty members. He had no doubt, as time went on, their strength would be still further increased.

In the afternoon of the same day a meeting was held at Eaton House, Hereford, Miss King King presiding, when it was decided to form a branch of the League. The following officers were appointed:—Hon. secs., the Misses Armitage and M. Capel; hon. treasurer, Miss M. King King. These constitute the committee, together with Lady Beresford Peirse, the Dowager Lady Croft, Mrs. Edward Heygate, and Mrs. Paul Chapman, with power to add to the number. Some fifty members joined the League. Those wishing to join the League are requested to communicate with the hon. secretaries: Miss Armitage, The Barton, Hereford, and Miss M. Capel, 22, King Street, Hereford.

HAMPTON AND DISTRICT.

A DRAWING-ROOM meeting in connection with the Women's National Anti-Suffrage League was held on March 2nd at Cranham House, Hampton, the residence of Mr. and Mrs. Ellis Hicks-Beach. The chair was occupied by Mr. Hicks-Beach.

Mr. Anthony Brown proposed a resolution to the effect that the meeting considered female suffrage detrimental to the best interests of the Empire, and pledged itself to resist the proposal to admit women to the Parliamentary franchise.

Miss Goodrich (Hampton Court) seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

Miss Fothergill moved a resolution to the effect that the meeting considered it desirable to form a branch of the League for Hampton and district. The success of the Anti-Suffrage League throughout the country had been almost phenomenal. It had not been in working order more than seven or eight months, and yet had over eighty branches.

The Rev. James Morgan seconded, and the resolution was carried unanimously.

Mrs. Ellis Hicks-Beach, Cranham House, Hampton-on-Thames, and Miss E. J. Mather, Sheen Cottage, are appointed hon. secs. of this Branch, and Mrs. Ellis Hicks-Beach Hon. Treasurer. The following are the Committee: Miss Goodrich, Misses Petty, Mrs. Mills, Mrs. Murphy, Miss Christie, Miss J. Finlaison, Mrs. Elsee, Mrs. Dashwood Howard, and Mrs. F. Smith.

* * *

EASTON (Bristol).

A MEETING of the Women's Anti-Suffrage League was held on March 5th at Manor Hall, St. Mark's Road, Easton, Bristol. Mrs. C. W. J. Brasher presided, and said very few people in that part of the city considered the vote would be any benefit to women.

Mrs. Mortimer (of London) said in working for this anti-suffrage movement they were taking up the challenge to the country thrown down by Mr. Asquith when he said that no great constitutional change could be carried out unless it was required by the majority. The answer to that challenge was to be found in the inactivity of the great mass of the women in the country with regard to the suffrage. It was often asserted that by granting women the suffrage their wages would be raised. The real reason why men obtained higher wages than women was because women's trades and professions were not so highly organised. It was organisation, and not the vote, which secured the higher wage and maintained the position of the labourer in relation to capital.

* * *

BOURNEMOUTH.

UNDER the auspices of the Westbourne Debating Society, a public debate, at which there was a crowded attendance, was held at St. Peter's Hall, Bournemouth, on March 9th, on the subject of Women's Suffrage. A resolution against the extension of the franchise to women was moved by Mrs. Arthur Somervell, who put forward two reasons against such a course. The first was based on her belief that the granting of female suffrage would be a direct danger to the nation; the second, that it would be most hurtful to women themselves.

Lady Frances Balfour replied in the interest of women's suffrage. Her arguments were

those with which we are now so familiar—the injustice under which women laboured, those who earned their living especially, though she did not prove this point any more satisfactorily than others of her creed have done.

Although the vote for the suffrage slightly outnumbered that against, the net result of Mrs. Somervell's eloquent address has been a satisfactory addition to the membership of the Bournemouth Branch of the Anti-Suffrage League.

* * *

WIMBLEDON.

A CROWDED drawing-room meeting was held, by the kind permission of Mrs. Burrell, at Oak Holm, Wimbledon, on Wednesday, March 10th. The chair was taken by Lady Elliott, and the meeting was addressed by Ellen Countess of Desart, and Mrs. Arthur Somervell, hon. secretary to the League.

The following resolution was put to the meeting:—'That this meeting protests against any extension of the Parliamentary franchise to women, and welcomes the formation of a branch of the Anti-Suffrage League in Wimbledon, and pledges itself to support the same by every possible means.'

This resolution was carried unanimously, and Mrs. Arthur Holland proposed a vote of thanks to the speakers.

* * *

BRIGHTON.

A LARGE and influentially attended meeting, in connection with the Women's National Anti-Suffrage League, was held in the Banqueting Room of the Royal Pavilion, Brighton, on March 11th, as the result of which a Brighton and Hove Branch of the League was formed and officers were appointed. Colonel Trevor presided, and briefly introduced Miss Mary Angela Dickens. Miss Dickens, who was enthusiastically received, set forth the objects of the League, and adduced a great many arguments against women's suffrage.

Miss King moved, and Mrs. W. Gorringe seconded, that a Brighton and Hove Branch of the League be formed, and this was carried by an overwhelming majority.

It was next resolved that Miss Duke be appointed hon. secretary, and General Erskine, J.P., hon. treasurer of the Branch, and the following were elected on the committee, with power to add to their number: Mrs. Bythesea, the Hon. Mrs. Campion, Mrs. Ruth Cobb, Mrs. Curtis, Mrs. W. Gorringe, Mrs. Hubbard, Mrs. Herries, Lady Macleay, Miss Pardoe, Mrs. Thomas, and Mrs. Dower Wilson.

* * *

MALVERN.

A VERY successful meeting was held at the Imperial Hotel, March 11th, in connection with the newly formed Malvern Branch of the Women's National Anti-Suffrage League. Lady Grey (President of the Branch) occupied the chair, and was supported by Mrs. Richard Harrison (from London), the Rev. Anthony Deane, and Mr. H. A. Acworth, C.I.E.

Mrs. Hollins said there was already a Branch in the county, with Lady Coventry, president, and Mrs. Ernest Day, of Worcester, hon. secretary. Of that Branch they should correctly describe themselves an offshoot. In the one short month since they had begun work, they had obtained the support of 910 women—heads of households, heads of schools, business women, women workers, thinking women—all anxious to dissociate

themselves from this unseemly agitation for 'Votes for Women,' and to help forward what they all considered to be the cause of sanity and common sense.

Mrs. Harrison said she would give a few reasons why they were opposing women's suffrage. They thought, in the first place, that men had built up the State, and built it up extremely well, and they could not do better than leave them to manage it in the future as they had done in the past. The granting of votes for women would be at best an experiment, and it might be a fatal experiment, because the vote, once given, could never be taken away. If women had the vote, it would not be logical to deny them a seat in Parliament.

Mr. Acworth and the Rev. A. C. Deane also delivered interesting addresses.

* * *

HAMPSTEAD.

AT the Hampstead Conservatoire, on March 11th, an interesting meeting was held under the auspices of our Hampstead Branch. In the absence through illness of Mrs. Wilfrid Ward, the chair was occupied by Mr. George Calderon, hon. secretary of the Men's League for Opposing Women's Suffrage, who was supported by Mrs. Arthur Somervell, Mr. R. S. Bond, Mr. A. H. Richardson, Mrs. Gladstone Solomon, hon. secretary of the Hampstead Branch, and Mrs. G. H. Pooley, hon. treasurer of the Branch.

The hall was crowded, and early in the course of the proceedings it was made manifest that the great majority of those present were in sympathy with the organisers of the meeting. There was, however, a small but persistently noisy minority of enthusiastic supporters of women's franchise.

Mrs. Arthur Somervell, in the course of her address, said that the women who were opposed to the extension of the franchise to their sex had been blamed for coming forward to express their opposition. Mr. Asquith had said that if it could be proved that a majority of the women wanted the franchise they should have it. That seemed to constitute a challenge, and those women who had hitherto been Passive Resisters to the demand now thought it was time to come into the open and actively oppose the movement.

The Chairman and Messrs. A. H. Richardson and R. S. Bond also spoke.

Mrs. Gladstone Solomon said this League was formed last July, and up to the present eighty branches had been started. The Hampstead Branch was only two months old, but it already had 130 members, and had obtained about 1,200 signatures to the petition.

* * *

FARNBOROUGH.

THE Anti-Suffragist movement is making headway in the Farnborough District, where a Branch of our League has recently been formed. Mrs. H. F. Grierson is the president, Miss Pinckney is the hon. secretary and treasurer, and the committee consists of Mrs. Franks, Mrs. Foard Harris, Mrs. Northcote, Mrs. Richardson, Mrs. Read, Miss Giffard, Miss Gwen Hopkinson, Miss Knox, and Miss Pinckney.

An inaugural meeting was held in the Farnborough Town Hall on March 16th, when Lady Calthorpe presided. Supporting her were Miss Stuart (the speaker), Mrs. Allnutt (Basingstoke), Mrs. Courtenay Bruce, and Mrs. Northcote, etc.

Lady Calthorpe observed that the League was formed to show what a great calamity it would be to the country if women were given votes. She then moved: 'That this meeting is of opinion that the extension of the franchise to women would be detrimental to the best interests of the Empire, and the individual woman.'

This resolution was seconded by Mrs. Courtenay Bruce, and carried.

Miss Stuart then gave an address on the objects of the League. A public meeting in connection with this newly formed Branch was held in the Assembly Room of the White Hart Hotel, Blackwater, on March 23rd, when Lady Calthorpe presided over a large gathering, which included many of the principal residents in the neighbourhood. An able and stirring address was given by Miss Stuart, who clearly and eloquently set forth the reasons of the Society's opposition to the agitation for women's votes.

Mrs. Lawrence Currie also addressed the meeting, and a resolution approving the objects of the League was carried.

Mrs. Lawrence Currie was unanimously elected president of the Branch.

* * *

REIGATE AND REDHILL.

A LARGE and representative audience assembled in the King's Hall, Colman Institute, Redhill, on March 17th, when a meeting was held under the auspices of the South-East Surrey branch of the Women's National Anti-Suffrage League, of which Mrs. G. W. Rundall and Mrs. Frank E. Lemon are the hon. secretaries. Mr. A. F. Mott (honorary treasurer to the League), presided, and was supported by Mrs. Arthur Somervell and Mr. Julius Bertram, M.P.

The Chairman, in a neat speech, explained the objects of the League.

Mr. Julius Bertram, M.P., said they were glad to have an opportunity of expressing their views.

What were the objects in view of those who supported the extension of the Parliamentary franchise to women? He supposed that some of their objects were the promotion of legislation which should be beneficial to women. In the past, had the best interests of women been neglected by the British House of Commons? He ventured to say that where a point had been strained in favour of one sex against the other that straining had always been in the direction of furthering the interests of women workers. They had only to look at one of the most recent pieces of legislation—the extension of the liability of employers for injury to their servants. In that matter the House of Commons went deliberately out of the way to protect that great mass of woman labour.

Suffrage speakers went about the country addressing women factory workers and others, and told them that if they had the direct Parliamentary vote they would be able to bring about an increase in the rate of the wages. Every economist of any repute had always pointed out that the question was governed by the law of supply and demand, against which no laws made by Parliament could for one moment prevail. Matters of domestic policy were being more and more placed upon municipal and county authorities to deal with, and for which women were qualified to vote, and where their vote was valuable and useful.

Mrs. Arthur Somervell followed with an

interesting speech, and answered a few questions at the close.

SKEGNESS.

An evening meeting, organised by Mrs. Murray Lockhart, was held at Skegness on Thursday, March 18th, at which Miss Dickens gave a most excellent and helpful speech after moving the following resolution:—'That the extension of the Parliamentary franchise to women is fraught with grave danger to the Empire and to womanhood.' Mr. Packer seconded it, and the resolution was carried by a large and enthusiastic majority. Mrs. Richardson, of Halton, was in the chair.

WESTMINSTER.

The first meeting held under the auspices of the Westminster Branch of the Women's Anti-Suffrage League took place on Friday, March 19th, by kind permission of Lady Wantage, at 2, Carlton Gardens. Lady Wantage took the chair. Ellen Countess of Desart, Mrs. Wilfrid Ward, and Mr. J. St. Loe Strachey addressed the meeting. There was a large and influential gathering.

Lady Wantage said they hoped to show that the suffrage movement was not a national movement, and, in her opinion, the large majority of women did not want the vote.

Lady Desart said that the League wanted to combat the inherent and pernicious doctrine put forward by the woman suffragists that, owing to political disabilities, they were unable to perform their duties as citizens, and they protested most emphatically against that policy. Women outnumbered the men of the country by over a million; and if they were given the vote it would mean leaving the decision of political matters to a sex which had not the political force to carry out their decrees.

On the motion of Mr. St. Loe Strachey, seconded by Lady Wynne, a resolution was unanimously adopted, declaring that the conception of woman-suffrage was a danger to the State, and would tend to diminish the influence of women in social reform.

EASTBOURNE.

At a well-attended meeting at the Lismore Hall, Eastbourne, on March 20th, under the presidency of Colonel Sir Duncan A. Johnston, K.C.M.G., it was decided by a large majority to form a local branch of the Women's National Anti-Suffrage League. This decision was arrived at on the proposition of Mrs. Campbell, seconded by Mrs. Durell, while, on the suggestion of Mrs. Gripper, the following Committee were elected: Lady Harriot Eliot, Lady Johnston, Lady Smith, Mrs. Alexander Campbell, Mrs. Durell, and Mrs. Fahey. The chairman briefly introduced Miss Mary Angela Dickens, whose address against 'Votes for Women' was listened to very attentively.

The Chairman, in thanking Miss Dickens, said a great deal too much stress was laid on the supposed advantages which the vote would give to women. What they ought to consider was that which was best for the country as a whole; the question was one of patriotism.

DUBLIN.

The Dublin Branch is arranging, as we go to press, for several meetings to be held in the week after Easter. It is making rapid

progress, and is fortunate in having the Duchess of Abercorn as its President, while upon an influential list of vice-presidents are the Dowager-Countess of Drogheda, the Countess of Pembroke, Viscountess Iveagh, Lady Holmpatrick, and Lady Beatrix Wilkinson. We feel that this Branch will be the pioneer of our work in Ireland, for it is excellently organised. Its chairman is Mrs. Bernard, the wife of the Dean of St. Patrick's.

EPSOM.

THROUGH the hospitality of Mrs. Allom, a drawing-room meeting was held at the Village Hall, Tadworth, for the Banstead and Walton-on-the-Hill district, with Mrs. Cameron in the chair. Mrs. Colquhoun and Mr. R. T. Monier-Williams were the speakers. Local secretaries have been appointed for seven districts in the constituency, and it is hoped that more members will come forward to undertake this work, in order that each place may be thoroughly organised. A drawing-room meeting is being arranged (as we go to press), to take place at Leigh Hill, Cobham, on April 17th, when Miss Mary A. Dickens and Mr. R. T. Monier-Williams will speak.

MR. L. J. MAXSE AT SHEFFIELD.

A SUCCESSFUL meeting, organised by the Sheffield Branch of the Women's National Anti-Suffrage League, was held in the Cutlers' Hall, Sheffield, on March 11th, and the promoters had secured as their leading oratorical attraction Mr. L. J. Maxse, the editor of the *National Review*.

There was a good attendance, those on the platform being Miss Lindsay (organising secretary of the League), who presided; Mrs. Munns, Mrs. Theophilus Smith, Mrs. Charles Laycock, Mrs. C. H. Bingham, Mrs. W. H. Berry, Miss Mabel Colley, and Sir John Bingham. There were a good many Suffragists present.

Mr. Maxse delivered a characteristically spirited address. He complained of the element of indifference which he said existed to a certain extent in regard to the women's suffrage movement in the party to which he belonged. A considerable number of Unionists had, however, been caught by the specious cry of 'votes for women' on the same terms as men. But Mr. Maxse pointed out that while there was a very strong argument in favour of a moderate reform, they could not stop at moderate reform.

His objection to women's suffrage was frank and fundamental. If the new ideal of the household of the manly woman and the womanly man was ever attained, the greatness of this country would be a thing of the past, and we should be doomed to disappear before the onset of some other community whose women had remained womanly, and whose men had remained manly.

In reply to a question, Mr. Maxse said it seemed to him that if they dragged women into the vortex of politics—especially under their present leaders—they were very likely to see politics developed and organised on the lines of sex antagonism.

'Would you be in favour,' inquired one young lady, 'of ousting women from Boards of Guardians and other authorities?'

'I think it is a very unfortunate thing,' was Mr. Maxse's retort, 'that women don't take the opportunities already thus offered

them. They have had very considerable privileges of proving their political and administrative capacity.'

A resolution was eventually put protesting against the extension of the Parliamentary franchise to women.

The appointment of the following officers of the local branch was confirmed:—Vice-presidents, Lady Edmund Talbot and Lady Bingham; executive, Mrs. Adams, Mrs. W. H. Berry, Mrs. C. Bingham, Mrs. Biggin, and Mrs. Theophilus Smith; hon. secretaries, Mrs. Arthur Balfour and Mrs. Munns.

SOUTH BERKS.

THE Long Gallery at Englefield House, near Reading, was the scene of a notable gathering on March 15th—the first meeting in connection with the South Berks Branch of the Women's National Anti-Suffrage League, which Mrs. Benyon, wife of the Lord Lieutenant of Berks, has been instrumental in forming.

The letters of apology for absence included one from Lady Wantage.

Mrs. Benyon, in an excellent little speech, said she would leave it to others better qualified, to go into the arguments for or against, but she thought what they wanted to realise was what they were fighting. The mildest form that the advocates for women's suffrage demanded was votes on the same terms as men. That meant ultimately adult suffrage; but some went even further than that, as was clearly shown by the Bill to be presented to Parliament by Sir Charles Dilke, 'Franchise and Removal of Women's Disabilities.' That Bill provided that every man and woman of full age, whether married or single, shall be qualified to vote at a Parliamentary or local election; and that no person shall be disqualified by sex or marriage from being elected a member of either House of Parliament. That was what they had to fight against.

The true function of women was consultative, not legislative. They advocated most strongly the claim of women in the spheres in which they could be most useful—parish councils, county councils, factory legislation, sanitation, hygiene, etc. All those matters concerned women and children, and if they fulfilled their duty in those spheres, they would not have the time for the study of the Imperial questions which would be necessary if they had the Parliamentary vote.

Lady Haversham moved a vote of thanks to the Chairman, Mrs. Benyon, who had initiated that meeting, which was the first of the South Berkshire Branch of the Anti-Suffrage League. That Branch completed the whole of the Berkshire organisation, there being now a North Berks, a South Berks, and an East Berks Branch.

On March 22nd a meeting of ladies was held at the residence of Mrs. Arthur Thompson, in Northbrook-street, under the auspices of the South Berks Branch. Mrs. Thompson (a Vice-President) presided, and the attendance also included Mrs. Benyon, Miss Caroline Fothergill (from the head office of the League), etc. Miss Fothergill delivered an interesting address explaining the aims and methods of the Anti-Suffrage League.

ASHBOURNE.

A MEETING was held at Ashbourne, Derbyshire, on March 17th, for the purpose of forming a local branch of the League for that part of the county. The chair was taken by Colonel R. H. Jelf, C.M.G., and among those

ARNSIDE.

A MEETING organised by Mrs. C. D. Shepherd, hon. secretary of the Arnside (S. Westmorland) district, was held on March 31st at Arnside, with Miss Lindsay in the chair. Mrs. Weston, of Endmore, gave an interesting address, and Miss Thwaites gave an account of the Queen's Hall demonstration (London), at which she had been present, quoting freely from the speeches. Miss Lindsay's speech from the chair dealt with the objects of the Anti-Suffrage League, and Miss Batt, of Arnside, proposed a vote of thanks to the speakers.

BRANCHES.

ASHBOURNE AND DISTRICT—

President: The Lady Florence Duncombe.
Chairman: Mrs. R. H. Jelf.
Vice-Chairman: Mrs. Sadler.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Parkin.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. L. Bond.

BATH—

A Branch has been formed here. We hope to have a list of officials in next month's issue.

BASINGSTOKE—

President: The Lady Calthorpe.
Hon. Treasurer and Secretary: Mrs. Allnutt, 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, Streatley-on-Thames; and 7, Queensborough Terrace, Hyde Park, W.

BERKS (SOUTH)—

President: Mrs. Benyon.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Dickinson, Maiden Hatch, Pangbourne (until end of April).

BERKS (EAST)—

President: The Lady Haversham.
Hon. Treasurer: Lady Ryan.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Montague Broun, 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: Lady Leigh.
Vice-Presidents: The Lady Calthorpe; Mrs. E. M. Simon; Miss Beatrice Chamberlain.
Hon. Treasurer: Murray N. Phelps, Esq., L.L.D.
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. Secretary: Miss Clara Sivewright, Brinklea, Bournemouth.

BRIDGWATER—

Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Foster-Barham, Marycourt, Bridgwater.

BRIDLINGTON—

No Branch Committee has been formed; but Mrs. Bosville, Thorpe Hall, Bridlington, is willing to receive subscriptions and give information.

BRIGHTON AND HOVE—

Hon. Treasurer: General Erskine.
Hon. Secretary: Miss Irene Duke, 30, New Church Road, Hove.

BRISTOL—

Chairman: Lady Fry.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Alfred Robinson.
Hon. Secretaries: Miss Long Fox, 15, Royal York Crescent, Bristol; Miss Lillingston, 91, Pembroke Road, Bristol.

CAMBRIDGE—

President: Mrs. Austen Leigh.
Hon. Treasurer: Miss Seeley.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Wardale, Orcheston, Madingley Road, Cambridge.

CAMBRIDGE (GIRTON COLLEGE)—

President: Miss R. Lubbock.
Hon. Treasurer: Miss I. Wilkinson.
Hon. Secretary: Miss E. L. Duckett.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY—

President: C. C. Perry, Esq., M.A.
Hon. Secretary: Herbert Loewe, Esq., M.A., 6, Park Street, Jesus Lane, Cambridge.

CHELTENHAM—

President: Mrs. Hardy.
Hon. Treasurer: Miss Plumer.
Hon. Secretary: Miss Geddes, 4, Suffolk Square, Cheltenham.

CHELSEA—

Hon. Treasurer: Admiral the Hon. Sir Edmund Fremantle, G.C.B.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. A. Myles, 16, St. Loo Mansions, Cheyne Gardens, S.W.; Miss S. Woodgate, 68, South Eaton Place, S.W.

CRANBROOK—

President: Miss Neve, Osborne Lodge.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Mordaunt, Goddard's Green, Cranbrook.
Hon. Secretary (for Benenden): Mrs. W. Hoare, Summerhill, Benenden, Cranbrook, Kent.

CROYDON—

Provisional Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Corry, Rosenheim, Park Hill Road, Croydon.

CUMBERLAND AND WESTMORLAND—

Chairman: Hon. Nina Kay Shuttleworth.
Vice-Chairman: Mrs. Hills.
Hon. Treasurer: Miss Cropper.
Joint Hon. Secretaries: Miss Howard, Greystoke Castle, Penrith; Miss Thomson, Ashbank, Penrith.

DUBLIN—

President: The Duchess of Abercorn.
Chairman: Mrs. Bernard.
Joint Hon. Treasurers: Miss Dickson and Miss Orpin.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Albert E. Murray, 2, Clyde Road, Dublin.

DULWICH—

President: Mrs. Parish.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Teall, 174, Rosendale Road, Dulwich, S.E.

EALING—

President: Mrs. Forbes.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Beckett, Elmcroft, Warwick Road, Ealing.

EALING DEAN—

President: Mrs. Sommerhayes.
Joint Hon. Secretaries: The Misses Turner, 33, Lavington Road, West Ealing.

EASTBOURNE—

Committee formed.
Provisional Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Durrell,
Enys House, Eastbourne.

EAST GRINSTEAD—

President: Lady Musgrave.
Hon. Secretary: Miss D. G. Arbuthnot,
Plawhatch, East Grinstead.

EDINBURGH—

President: The Marchioness of Tweeddale.
Vice-President: The Countess of Dalkeith.
Chairman: Mrs. Stirling Boyd.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Paterson.
Joint Hon. Secretaries: Mrs. Johnson, 19,
Walker Street; Miss Kemp, 6, Western
Terrace, Murrayfield, Edinburgh.
Joint Hon. Secretaries for the Petition:
Miss Dick Peddie, Miss Mackenzie,
M.A., and Miss Horne.

EPSOM—

Hon. Treasurer: R. T. Monier-Williams,
Esq.
Joint Hon. Secretaries: Miss Norah
Peachey, Esher; Mrs. D. R. Cameron,
Chessington Lodge, Chessington, Surrey.

EXETER—

President: Lady Acland.
Hon. Treasurer: Miss Sanders.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Lessey Derry, 4,
The Crescent, Mount Radford, Exeter.

GLASGOW—

President: The Duchess of Hamilton.
Chairman of Committee: Mrs. John M.
MacLeod.
Hon. Secretary and Treasurer: Miss Bick-
nell, Armstrong's Hotel, 244, Buchanan
Street, Glasgow.

GLOUCESTER—

Hon. Treasurer: W. E. Cullis, Esq.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Naylor, Belmont,
Brunswick Road, Gloucester.

GOUDHURST—

Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Fitzhugh, Grove
Place, Goudhurst.

GRIMSBY—

Advisory Committee appointed, but no
officials chosen yet.
Convener: Miss Pickford, Cleethorpes,
Grimsby.

HAMPSTEAD—

President: Mrs. Metzler.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. G. H. Pooley.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. W. E. Gladstone
Solomon, 98, Sumatra Road, Hamp-
stead.

HAMPTON AND DISTRICT—

Joint Hon. Secretaries: Mrs. Ellis Hicks
Beach, Cranham House, Hampton-on-
Thames; Miss E. J. Mather, Sheen Cot-
tage, Nightingale Road, Hampton.

HASLEMERE—

Branch in the course of formation.
Apply, Mrs. Beveridge, Pitfold, Shotter-
mill, Haslemere.

HAWKHURST—

President and Hon. Secretary: Mrs.
Frederic Harrison, Elm Hill, Hawkhurst.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Beauchamp Tower.

HERTS (WEST)—

Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Lucas.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Mitchell-Innes,
Churchill, Hemel Hempstead.
Co. Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Stafford.

HEREFORD AND DISTRICT—

Hon. Treasurer: Miss M. C. King King.
Joint Hon. Secretaries: Miss Armitage,
The Bartons, Hereford; Miss M. Capel,
22, King Street, Hereford.
District represented on Committee by
Mrs. Edward Heygate.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Sale, The Forbury,
Leominster.

HULL—

Hon. Treasurer: Henry Buckton, Esq.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Walker, 18, Belvoir
Street, Hull.

ISLE OF THANET—

President: Mrs. C. Murray Smith.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Fishwick.
Hon. Secretary: Miss Weigall, South-
wood, Ramsgate.

ISLE OF WIGHT—

Hon. Treasurer: Miss Lowther Crofton.
Provisional Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Perrott,
Clantagh, near Ryde, Isle of Wight.

KENNINGTON—

President: Mrs. Darlington.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Millington.
Hon. Secretary: Miss Beck, 80, Fentiman
Road, Clapham Road, S.W.

KENSINGTON (NORTH)—

Hon. Treasurer: Lady Webb.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Houghton Gray,
The Limes, Linden Gardens, W.

KENSINGTON (SOUTH)—

President: Mary Countess of Ilchester.
Hon. Treasurer: Miss Jeanie Ross.
Hon. Secretary of Petition Sub-Com-
mittee: Miss Manisty, 33, Hornton
Street.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Archibald Colqu-
houn, 13, Upper Phillimore Place, S.W.
(Office hours, 10.30-1. Tel.: Western 28.)

An 'At Home' is held weekly in the Kensington
Small Town Hall at 8.30 p.m. Admission Free. Music,
Debates and Speeches.

KESWICK—

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

KEW—

Hon. Secretary: Miss K. O'Reilly, Ash-
field, 23, Mortlake Road, Kew.

LEEDS—

Branch in course of formation.

LEICESTER—

President: Lady Hazelrigg.
Treasurer: Mrs. Butler.
Joint Hon. Secretaries: Miss Valeria D.
Ellis, 120, Regent Road, Leicester; Miss
Fielding Johnson, Groscole Hall,
Leicester.

LIVERPOOL—

Branch in course of formation. Address,
Miss Lindsay, 197, Seaview Road, Lis-
card, Cheshire.

LYMINGTON—

President: Mrs. Edward Morant.
Chairman: E. H. Pember, Esq., K.C.
Hon. Treasurer: Mr. Taylor.
Joint Hon. Secretaries: Mrs. Armitage,
Farnley, Lymington; Miss Bedford,
Moor Cottage, Setlen, Brockenhurst.

MALVERN—

Joint Hon. Secretaries: Mrs. Hollins,
Southbank, Malvern; Miss Sheppard,
Tedstone, Malvern.

MANCHESTER—

Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Arthur Herbert.
Provisional Hon. Secretary: Mrs.
Maurice Bear, 1, Princes Street, Man-
chester.

DIDSBURY (SUB-BRANCH)—

Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Henry Simon,
Lawnhurst, Didsbury.

HALE (SUB-BRANCH)—

Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Arthur Her-
bert, High End, Hale, Cheshire.

MARYLEBONE (EAST)—

President: Mrs. Moberley Bell.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Carson Roberts.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Baynton, 27, North
Gate, Regent's Park.

MARYLEBONE (WEST)—

Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Alexander Scott.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Jeyes, 11, Grove
End Road, St. John's Wood.

MIDDLESBROUGH—

President: Mrs. Hedley.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Gjers, Busby Hall,
Carlton-in-Cleveland, Northallerton.

NORTH HANTS AND NEWBURY DIS-
TRICT—

President: Mrs. Gadesden.
Vice-President: Lady Arbuthnot.
Hon. Treasurer: Paul Forster, Esq.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Stedman, The
Grange, Woolton Hill, North Hants.
N.B.—All communications to be sent to
Mrs. Stedman until the end of May.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE—

Hon. Secretary: Miss Noble, Jesmond
Dene House, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

NORTH WALES, No. 1—

President: Mrs. Cornwallis West.
Hon. Secretary: Miss Ermine Taylor,
Dolhyfryd, Abergele, North Wales.

NOTTINGHAM—

Officials not yet appointed.

OXFORD—

Chairman: Mrs. Max Müller.
Vice-Chairman: Mrs. Massie.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Gamlen.
Hon. Secretary: Miss Tawney, 62, Ban-
bury Road.
Co. Hon. Secretary: Miss Wills-Sandford,
40, St. Giles, Oxford.

PADDINGTON—

President of Executive: Lady Dimsdale.
Deputy President: Mrs. Clarendon Hyde.
Hon. Secretary and Temp. Treasurer:
Mrs. Percy Thomas, 37, Craven Road,
Hyde Park.

PETERSFIELD—

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

PORTSMOUTH—

President: Mrs. Twiss.
Hon. Treasurer: Capt. Blakemore-
Fletcher.
Provisional Hon. Secretary: Miss Lindsay,
44, Shaftesbury Road, Southsea.

READING—

In course of formation. Apply to Central
Office for information.

ROCHESTER—

Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Conway Gordon,
Longley House, Rochester.

ST. ANDREWS—

President: The Lady Griselda Cheape.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Burnet.
Joint Hon. Secretaries: Mrs. Curran, 9,
Abbotsfort Crescent; and Mrs. Rodger,
St. Mary's Place, St. Andrews.

SALISBURY—

President: Lady Tennant.

SCARBOROUGH—

President: Viscountess Helmsley.
Chairman: Mrs. Daniel.
Hon. Treasurer: James Bayley, Esq.
Hon. Secretaries: Clerical, Miss Mackar-
ness, 19, Princess Royal Terrace;
General, Miss Kendall, Oriol Lodge,
Scarborough.

SEVENOAKS—

President: Edith Lady Auckland.
Deputy President: Mrs. Rycroft.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Herbert Knocker.
Hon. Secretary: Miss Tabrum, 2, Hill-
side, Eardley Road, Sevenoaks.

SHEFFIELD—

Vice-Presidents: The Lady Edmund
Talbot; Lady Bingham.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Biggin.
Hon. Secretaries: Mrs. Arthur Balfour,
Arcadia, Endcliffe, Sheffield; Mrs.
Munns, Mayville, Ranmoor Park Road,
Sheffield.

SIDMOUTH—

Chairman: Miss Chalmers.
Hon. Secretary: Miss Browning, Sid-
mouth.

SOUTHAMPTON—

Provisional Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Arthur
Day, Northlands House, Southampton.

SOUTH STAFFORD—

Provisional Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Claren-
don Hyde, Lyndhurst, Wednesbury.

SPILSBY—

No Branch yet formed. Miss Richardson,
Halton House, Spilsby, acting as Pro-
visional 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.
Assist. Hon. Secretary: Miss Rhoda Butt,
Wilbury, Littlehampton.

TAUNTON—

President: The Hon. Mrs. Portman.
Vice-President: Mrs. Lance.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Sommerville.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Birkbeck, Church
Square, Taunton.

THREE TOWNS AND DISTRICT (PLY-
MOUTH)—

President: Mrs. Spender.
Hon. Secretary and Treasurer: Mrs.
Reginald Yonge, Fursdown, Plympton.

TORQUAY—

President: Hon. Mrs. Bridgeman.
Hon. Treasurer: The Hon. Helen Tre-
fusis.
Hon. Secretary: Miss M. C. Phillpotts,
Kilcorran, Torquay.

WESTMINSTER—

President: The Lady Biddulph.
Hon. Treasurer and Secretary: Miss
Stephenson, 46, Ennismore Gardens,
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—

A meeting has been held, and it is hoped
that a Branch will be formed here
shortly.

WIMBLEDON—

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

WINCHESTER—

Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Bryett, Kerrfield,
Winchester.

WORCESTERSHIRE—

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

YORK—

President: Lady Julia Wombwell.
Hon. Secretary: Miss Jenyns, The Beeches,
Dringhouses, York.

CIVIL WAR.

WANT OF COHESION AMONG WOMEN.

To the Editor of THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW.

DEAR MADAM,—It is generally conceded that if women are to obtain the Parli-
mentary suffrage at all it must be extended
to all women, and it is also a well-known
fact that women are greatly in excess of
men in this country. The result must be
that the greater number of the electorate
would be women. The government of the
country would in fact pass into the hands
of women. Now women differ in opinions
as much as men, and would be as much
divided into parties. A good deal of
acrimony is displayed between men, in
politics. But what would it be among
women? Is it not generally allowed that
women conduct their quarrels with more
bitterness, more malice, and more violence
than men? Is it necessary to do more
than to look at the present state of things
among female advocates of the suffrage?
Do they not present a spectacle of un-
bridled passion, violence, and immodesty?
Already they are divided among them-
selves; they write and speak against each
other, and suffragists and suffragettes have
come to actual blows at public meetings.
They have not yet met the mass of their
antagonists, who in the event of general
female suffrage would be forced to come
forward. But if that day should ever
come, it would no longer be a war of
women against men, but a general war of
women against women, conducted with all
the violence which belongs to the undis-
ciplined female character. It could be
nothing less than chaotic, in which men,
combining together, could not fail ulti-
mately to be the sole ruling power.

For it is contrary to nature that women
should combine together, and remain
welded together in an *esprit de corps*, as

is the case with men. Woman is essen-
tially individual, far more so than man. I
will accept the doctrine of the New Testa-
ment that the man is the head of the
woman, and of the family. But the
woman is the *heart* of the family, and its
centre; and while the man's sphere lies
much outside the home, she remains at its
centre; and, as that centre, she is neces-
sarily *sole*. I do not here argue the point
that the woman is formed primarily for
motherhood; I take that as assumed.
Physically it is her sole vocation, and
morally and spiritually she is destined for
it. At the present time, and in this
country, there are very large numbers of
women who are debarred from their
special functions, and there are a large
and increasing number who refuse them;
and to this cause must be referred all this
feminine trouble; but this is a state of
things that has not been in the past, and
may not be in the future. Normally every
woman is wife, mother, and mistress in her
own home. As a mother, she is sole and
absolute mistress of her children in their
infancy. The poorest woman is mistress
in her own home. Ascending in the social
scale, up to queens, she is mistress of her
servants, who are normally young women,
awaiting their own turn—handmaidens in
the Bible language—and in the same lan-
guage, the Queen is spoken of as sur-
rounded by her troop of virgins. If her
sovereignty is disturbed or disputed, it is
not by men, but by other women; and in
the present age this is a growing menace.
All this conduces to the isolation of the
completed woman. She stands alone in
the midst of her kingdom, whether great
or small, and she is self-reliant, and has to
meet all the varying emergencies of life,
which never runs in a pre-determined
groove. Women have proved themselves
splendidly fitted to rule and to reign. The
greatest and best sovereigns have been
women. But the sovereign occupies her
throne alone, and not in conjunction with
others.

It is different with men. Men act best
together, under discipline, in regular
grooves, and animated by an *esprit de
corps*. Comparatively few men can be
masters, as every woman is a mistress;
the great majority must always be sub-
ordinate. In every profession—the army,
the navy, the Church, law, medicine, and
commerce—this holds good. Therefore
men are naturally and habitually more
able to combine and to cohere than
women.

Added to this is the natural jealousy of
women. I do not mean by this jealousy
of the favour of men; for in a natural
state of society, it is men who are jealous
of women's favour, and every woman
chooses her own mate. If it is otherwise,
it is a sign of something wrong. But
every woman is naturally jealous for her
own *children*. Her reason may tell her
that her own children are not the best and
most gifted in the world; but at least they
are to her the *dearest* in the world; and if
they are not so, she is not a woman, but a

monster. She naturally desires the best for her children; and since everyone cannot have the best, she is jealous of other women's children. This natural passion may be controlled by reason, by religion, by kindness of heart; but it is a primitive and ineradicable instinct, and it opposes an effectual obstacle to the combination of women as a whole.

I cannot enter into all the side-issues of this matter; but I consider that the root of the trouble is the present disproportion of the sexes. And the solution should be sought in the endeavour to correct this disproportion, not by overturning the whole order of the world, for the sake of gratifying the broken vision and hysterical aspirations of the incomplete.

I remain, dear madam,
Yours faithfully,
H. E. HAMILTON KING.

THE DIFFERENCE IN WAGE BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN.

MRS. FAWCETT has so often laid stress on the difference in wage between men and women, that these extracts from a paper by her in the *Economic Journal* of 1892, in which she herself gives some of the reasons for this difference, should, we think, be of interest. Throughout the paper there is nowhere the slightest suggestion that the *vote* has anything to do with it.

'The problem first presents itself, "What makes the rate of wages in any particular (labour) group?" . . . The answer is: The value of the produce of the labour in the most productive industry of the group—less what is necessary to replace the capital and induce the capitalist to go on with his share in the business of production. This sets the standard of wages for the group. . . . I think this cardinal fact in the solution of the wages problem has been too much overlooked by those who have discussed the causes of the difference in wages between men and women. The most wealth-producing of men's industries, such as engineering, mining, banking, etc., in almost every industrial group are more wealth-producing than the most wealth-producing of women's industries, such as cotton spinning, and weaving, school-keeping, etc. A bookbinder (male) has to be, all things considered, as well paid as, say, a carpenter or a mason, or he will not bring up his son to his own trade, but to another in the same group which promises better wages. . . . A man clerk in the Post Office Savings Bank has to be paid as much as he could earn in other employments he would be able to take up. The best paid women's industries in the same groups are less productive than the best paid men's. A woman bookbinder only looks to get as much wages as perhaps a charwoman, or a sewing machinist. A woman servant, who may be, and generally is, a much more

desirable person to have about one than a man servant, and who, therefore, if mere utility governed value, would get more, is paid about half as much, because the other employments within her reach are only about half as productive of wealth as the man's. The woman Post Office Savings Bank clerk, who is fully as good at her work as the man, and in some respects better, is paid about one-third as much because, if she were not a Post Office clerk, the other employments open to her would be governessing or something of that kind. The male heads of departments in the General Post Office are paid salaries sufficiently large to cause them to think twice before throwing them up to become railway managers or secretaries to banks, the value of whose special skill to their employers is reckoned by thousands of pounds annually. The female heads of departments in the General Post Office are paid salaries sufficiently large to cause them to think twice before they would become superintendents of hospitals, high school mistresses, and so on. Their remuneration, that is to say, is reckoned by hundreds, where men in the same position would command four or five times as much. The reason why women servants command better wages in Lancashire than in Dorsetshire, is because enough has to be paid them in the former county to induce them to take up domestic work, instead of going into a mill. Just in the same way a Dorsetshire agricultural labourer is paid less than a man doing precisely the same work in Durham, because of the comparatively high productivity of the mining and other trades of Durham to which he might devote himself if he chose. . . .

'I have always regarded it as an error, both in principle and in tactics, to advise women under all circumstances to demand the same wages for the same work as men. The London School Board pays its women teachers less than its men teachers, but the number of women applying for the posts is considerably in excess of the number required; whereas it is, I am told, difficult to get men enough to fill the vacancies for male teachers. Under these circumstances no one can accuse the Board of injustice to their women teachers because they pay them less than the men teachers for the same work. The cry "the same wages for the same work" is very plausible, but it is proved to be impossible of achievement when the economic conditions of the two sexes are so widely different. The governors of an endowed school in Hertfordshire started with the good intention of giving the same wages for the same work to all their teachers, whether men or women. The result was that the women, attracted by the, to them, exceptionally favourable terms, were exceptionally well qualified for the work; the men were mere average specimens of their professions. The equality therefore was only nominal: the same money bought a better article in the female labour market than it did in the male labour market.'

LIST OF LEAFLETS.

2. Woman's Suffrage and After. Price 2s. 6d. per 1,000.
3. Mrs. Ward's Speech. Price 3d. each.
4. Queen Victoria and Woman's Suffrage. Price 2s. 6d. per 1,000.
5. Is Woman Suffrage Inevitable? Price 5s. per 1,000.
6. Nature's Reason against Woman Suffrage. Price 5s. per 1,000.
7. Shall Women Receive the Vote? Price 3s. per 1,000.
8. Woman's Suffrage and National Welfare. Price 2s. 6d. per 1,000.
9. Is the Parliamentary Suffrage the best way? Price 10s. per 1,000.
10. Women of Great Britain. Price 2s. 6d. per 1,000.
11. The Latest Phase of the Women's Suffrage Movement. Price 5s. per 1,000.
12. Why Women should not Vote. Price 3s. per 1,000.
13. Women's Position under Laws made by Man. Price 5s. per 1,000.
14. (1) The Franchise for Women of Property. Price 3s. per 1,000.
14. (2) Women and the Representation of Property. Price 3s. per 1,000.
15. (1) Woman's Suffrage and Women's Wages. Price 5s. per 1,000.
15. (2) Woman's Suffrage and Women's Wages. Price 3s. per 1,000.
15. (3) Votes and Wages. Price 5s. per 1,000.
16. Look Ahead. Price 4s. per 1,000.
17. Why the Women's Enfranchisement Bill (1908) is unfair to Women. Price 5s. per 1,000.
18. Married Women and the Factory Law. Price 5s. per 1,000.
19. A Suffrage Talk. Price 3s. per 1,000.
20. A Word to Working Women. Price 2s. 6d. per 1,000.
21. Votes for Women (from Mr. F. Harrison's book). Price 10s. per 1,000.
22. 'Votes for Women?' Price 2s. 6d. per 1,000.
23. Anti-Suffragist's Letter. Price 6s. per 1,000.
24. Reasons against Woman Suffrage. Price 4s. per 1,000.
27. The Constitutional Myth. Price 2s. 6d. per 1,000.
28. We are against Female Suffrage. Price 2s. 6d. per 1,000.
29. Report of Queen's Hall Demonstration (in press).
30. Mrs. Arthur Somervell's Speech at Queen's Hall. Price 5s. per 1,000.

PAMPHLETS.

- A. Freedom of Women. Mrs. Harrison. Price 6d.
- B. Woman or Suffragette. Marie Corelli. Price 3d.
- C. Positive Principles. Price 1d.
- D. Sociological Reasons. Price 1d.
- E. Case against Woman Suffrage. Price 1d.
- F. Woman in relation to the State. Price 6d.
- G. Mixed Herbs. M.E.S. Price 2s. net.

Printed by Hazell, Watson & Viney, Ltd., 4-8, Kirby Street, Hatton Garden, London, E.C., and Published by the Executive Committee of the Women's National Anti-Suffrage League, 515, Caxton House, Tothill Street, London.