

THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW.

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

The OFFICES of the LEAGUE are at 515, Caxton House, Tothill Street, Westminster, S.W.
Telegraphic Address: "Adversaria, London."
Telephone No.: 1418 Gerrard.

No. 84.

LONDON, OCTOBER, 1915.

PRICE 1d.

THE NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR OPPOSING WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Executive Committee :

Presidents: THE EARL CURZON OF KEDLESTON; LORD WEARDALE.

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

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

Honorary Vice-Presidents: The Earl of Cromer, Mrs. Moberly Bell, Mrs. Burgwin, Mrs. Greatbatch, Lady George Hamilton, Charles Lyell, Esq., M.P., Earl Percy.

Hon. Secretary: MRS. JEYES.

Assistant Secretary: MISS HELEN PAGE.

MISS G. LOWTHIAN BELL
MRS. ARCHIBALD COLQUHOUN
MRS. LAURENCE CURRIE
MRS. FREDERIC HARRISON
MRS. GAMBLE

MRS. G. MACMILLAN.
MRS. MASSIE
MISS G. S. POTT
MRS. HUMPHRY WARD
LADY WILSON.

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

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

BELGIAN MILITARY HOSPITAL.

To the Editor of "The Anti-Suffrage Review."

SIR,—Permit me a word in supplement to the appeal in your September issue for help for the Belgian Military Hospital at Bourbourg, of which Miss Beatrice Dormer Maunder, formerly Honorary Secretary of the Ewell Branch of the N.L.O.W.S., is Organising Directress. That appeal for gifts in kind has already met with a generous response, but there is still need for further succour for the ever-changing stream of wounded Belgian soldiers who pass in and out of the hospital from the battlefield.

Cheques will also be welcome, and I write to say that, at Miss Maunder's request, I am acting as Hon. Treasurer for the Hospital Fund in this country, and shall be happy to acknowledge contributions, large or small.

I know of no Hospital to whose funds one may subscribe with greater confidence. Miss Maunder's work in Belgium seems to me to be uncommonly commendable. It is the gratuitous gift of service and self-sacrifice from a New Zealand lady out of gratitude to the little land which has done so much—and at such a price!—for the whole Empire of which New Zealand is a part: an altogether beautiful act.

The Government of New Zealand, where Miss Maunder and her family are well known, has voted for her fund a sum of over £50, which has been handed to me by the Agent-General for New Zealand in London. The King of the Belgians has conferred on her the Order of Leopold (the highest Order of its kind) in grateful recognition of the rare quality of her service to his stricken soldiers. And quite recently a hospital expert, who prefers to remain anonymous, in sending a valuable contribution to the equipment of the Hospital, writes to Miss Maunder saying: "In any case I wish to make a present of this to you, as I think yours is the best hospital organisation in France; at Rouen which I saw, and I am sure it is so at

Bourbourg. I shall feel it a privilege after seeing your Rouen work to be allowed to give it."

Facts such as these speak for themselves, and speak eloquently. Let me, therefore, urge all readers of the REVIEW who feel grateful to Belgium for the priceless service she rendered to England in delaying the onset of the Huns last year, and thus securing to us absolutely invaluable time while we got ready to do our bit, to spare something in money or in goods in support of the really splendid work which our New Zealand kinswoman is carrying on for the Belgian wounded within the ceaseless sound of the guns day and night. No help could be better placed.

Your obedient servant,

A. MACONACHIE.

2, Dr. Johnson's Buildings, Temple, E.C.,
September 22, 1915.

P.S.—At the instance of that gifted French writer, Madame Bertin, the Paris *Figaro* has sent Miss Maunder a number of French books and periodicals. All suitable books in French are obviously of value to convalescent Belgian soldiers.

FOR PRISONERS OF WAR.

The extent to which British prisoners of war in Germany rely for food on parcels sent them from this country is still, perhaps, inadequately realised. It is to be hoped that all readers of the REVIEW who are not sending parcels regularly will arrange to send one or more before Christmas. Miss Page will be glad to furnish the names of needy prisoners.

MISS PAGE will be very glad to receive gifts of socks for the 3rd Batt. Rifle Brigade, who are in urgent need of them, also gifts of socks, shirts, mufflers, mittens, etc., for Mine Sweepers and Airmen, who will want them in the coming colder weather.

Parcels should be sent to Miss Page, 515, Caxton House, Westminster, S.W.

FALSE IDEALS.

It is impossible to follow the course of the present war without being struck by the fervour with which each of the belligerent groups disclaims all responsibility for the outbreak of hostilities, and insists upon the unchallengeable correctness of the ideals for which it is fighting. For our immediate purposes we may confine ourselves to a consideration of the respective ideals of the British and German nations. In examining those of our enemies we shall naturally expose ourselves to the charge of bias. No doubt, if the German ideals were being set forth by a German writer, they would be presented in a more agreeable garb; stress would be laid upon the theory of the ideals, the methods by which expression has been given to them would be glossed over. Even so, the fundamental difference between the ideals of the two nations would remain, and must be apparent to an impartial observer. But the point that it is sought to make here is that, as between Britons and Germans, there is a distinct clash of ideals. The Germans hold up their ideals, all unconscious that exception can be taken to them. To their enemies, however, they appear altogether false ideals, and we are left wondering how they can ring true to any nation. This view cannot be entirely due to prejudice, for it is shared very largely by neutral observers; nor is it inevitable that the ideals of an opponent should always be regarded as false, because the Germans make no attempt to challenge our own; rather do they ignore them as if they had nothing to say against them, or credit us with ideals which we do not have, in order to decry them with much unctious.

In the series of pamphlets issued by the Oxford University Press for the elucidation of matters connected with the war, is one entitled "National Ideals," which embodies an address given at University College, Nottingham, by Mr. P. E. Matheson. Dividing national ideals under two heads, the inward and the outward, the author points out that, if we are asked to sum up in a few words the qualities which we think most characteristic of our life and existence as a nation, what we aim at and strive to secure, we should probably answer—Freedom and Justice. Mr. Matheson analyses these terms. "Freedom, the fact and the spirit of individual liberty, is, we all believe, one thing which distinguishes our life from the life of the German people, so efficient and so powerful, but on the other hand, so wanting in political sense, so dependent on authority. Freedom means the securing to each citizen of the opportunity of living a free life; not a life of 'unchartered freedom,' but a life which gives scope to his natural powers, and which makes wise thinking, honest work, and good conduct possible for his achievement. Justice secures to every member of the State the conditions which make a free life possible. Freedom embodies the conditions that make possible the full exercise of all the resources of the State for a common good. Justice is to be found, not in bureaucratic regulations nor mere severity of discipline or punishment, but in the provision of fair conditions of life for men, women, and children of all classes." In regard to Great Britain's relations with other nations, Mr. Matheson points out that "our main policy is, as it always has been, to promote freedom and free life, to prevent any world-tyranny, to encourage and support that national development in all countries which makes for the spiritual riches of the world. On the same principle," he adds, "we desire to preserve the smaller nations in their

separate existence. To understand other nations, to live at peace with them, to promote by common pursuits, by co-operation in enterprises of learning and science, and by religious sympathy, the friendly relations between them, and to strengthen, so far as may be, the peaceful means of settling disputes between nations. These are among the objects which we should aim at in our foreign relations. These are objects which we have, as we believe, honestly striven to promote."

In practice we may have fallen short of our ideals, but in so far as we have never claimed to have any others, we may be supposed to have striven after these. Our enemies complain loudly of our sea-tyranny, but when analysed the grievance is shown to be based solely on the fact that sea-power belongs to the British Empire and not to Germany. If we have used our sea-power to the world's prejudice, we may be certain that sooner or later we shall pay the penalty. The inference that we have not yet abused that power is justified from the circumstance that Germany's contention finds no support among neutrals. Exception may be taken to individual acts arising out of the war, but the German bogey of a sea-tyranny finds no recognition in neutral countries. If now from British ideals we turn to German ideals, we are conscious at once of a fundamental difference. The burden of all German comment on the war is that it is being waged in the interests of *Kultur*—German *Kultur*. In this word Germans sum up the contention, "that they are in the van of civilisation, that they have absorbed, as no other people has done, the science, the literature, and the art of past ages, and that their nature and character are thereby so enriched and enlarged, and their material resources so magnificently organised, that they may fairly claim to be themselves the school of Europe and of the world." Even if we allowed German *Kultur* to be all that it arrogates to itself, what is to be said of an ideal which proposes to force the whole world into a Procrustean bed of German *Kultur*? What, moreover, is to be thought of a *Kultur* which allows the crimes of which the Germans have been guilty to be committed in its name? German patriotism and organisation are conceded, but they go hand in hand with a brutality which has staggered humanity, and a reckless violation of all the conventions of international honour, which is likely to make Germany and her diplomacy anathema among the nations for many a decade.

The British ideal of "To live and let live," and the German ideal of compelling an unwilling world to embrace German ideas and German methods are as far as the poles asunder. We do not think less highly of our ideal because we have not invoked militarism to force it upon the world. Rather we are so convinced that it is the true ideal and must necessarily outlive all other political ideals, that we are content to see it win its way solely on its own merits.

To the British mind all that can be said of the antagonism between British and German ideals appears axiomatic, because the national instinct comes to the support of our judgment. We are thus able to establish the fact that it is possible for an ideal to be false. It is by no means superfluous to have arrived at this conclusion. Too often in the past it has been urged or taken for granted that any ideal—any claim to be striving for the betterment of things as they are—must necessarily be sound and praiseworthy, and for that reason must on no account be thwarted. To the Germans it seems entirely removed out of the region of controversy

that nothing but good can result from enforcing German *Kultur* upon all the nations of Europe. We in this country, however, hold that the ideal is a false one, and that any sacrifice must be endured to prevent Germany from realising it.

So, in the domestic politics of Great Britain we have been troubled in the past by ideals which were far from being above challenge. Both from our own experience and from Germany's, we know with what vigour and ruthlessness a false ideal will be fought for. Indeed, there may be discovered a strange similarity between the methods adopted in some political controversies and in the present Armageddon in order to attain the ideal in view. It is as if the adherence to an ideal which is false of necessity demoralises its supporters. Conscious at heart that the voice of reason is against them, they cannot "live and let live," trusting to their ideals to win through on their own merits. They must needs seek to thrust their ideals upon an unwilling nation, and the process seems to engender, as is the case of the Germans, indifference to the promptings of moral and social codes.

NOTES AND NEWS.

Woman's Part in the War.

In the eulogies passed on the part that is being played by women in the war, there is a danger of by far the most important rôle being overlooked. Much is heard of the organisation of women for industry. It is the subject of processions and deputations, of innumerable articles in the daily and weekly Press. Women are at work in factories, they are replacing men in offices, at railway stations, and in other public places; they are engaged in increasing numbers in hospital work. There can be no question of challenging the importance or at least the usefulness of all this work. It receives its tribute of praise from every quarter. But when the sum total of the women so employed is added up, it will be found to be but a small proportion of the far greater number who are doing still more important work without any public recognition or encouragement.

The Woman who Stayed at Home.

It is time that a lance should be struck for the women who stay at home. They know nothing of the "picturesque" side of war-work, but they are in continual touch with the realities of life as influenced by the war. It is said that between seventy and eighty per cent. of the men of the new armies are married. Of the women who stay at home many will have made a far greater response to patriotism than they will ever allow anyone else to realise, in speeding their men to the front; they will have suffered the actual loss entailed in the absence of those on whom they have been accustomed to rely in everyday matters, and the thought that this loss may become permanent must always haunt them; they will have turned bravely in many cases to adjust their manner of living to a lower standard. It is certain that but for the part that these women have played, final victory would be yet longer deferred, and all the while they are keeping British homes in being. They wear no uniform, and are given no badges; the part that they play is not even mentioned as entitling them to reward after the war. The country is inclined cheerfully to ignore them, while the Government

does its best to render their lot yet harder, by increasing the duties on the things they consume, and leaving alone the alcoholic drinks, which do not concern them.

Charity Work.

That certain kinds of war work are more "picturesque," and therefore more attractive, than others, is now admitted in the quarters which have specialised in them. There is nothing picturesque, in the same sense of the word, attaching to the work of the women who in the larger interests of the nation have just minded their homes "as usual." They will meet with fuller appreciation, perhaps, when it is realised how potent an appeal the "picturesque" has been in other fields. "It is true," writes the *Common Cause*, "that what may be called the more 'picturesque' kinds of war work are overcrowded.

But the same cannot be said of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Families Association, the Charity Organisation Society, the Care Committees, and many other agencies for social relief. They are in urgent need of workers." And again, "In the poorer parishes of London there is a great danger that the girls' clubs and other organisations, which are needed more than ever now in war time, may have to close down for lack of workers." The lesson is not far to seek. A certain body of women workers has been encouraged to devote their energies wherever the limelight is playing. They were switched on to girls' clubs and other organisations, when clubs were trumps; and now these have been deserted for the quest for munitions, or because the workers have wearied in well-doing that was dull. Some may have turned to the War Service Register in the conscientious belief that their services could be better employed in a different direction. The total number of women whose names had been entered on this Register up to September 10th, was 110,714. But of this number 51,500 women were held to be of no use for the purposes of the Register. To these, therefore, the claims of the clubs and the organisations named above may be commended.

Infant Mortality.

By the terms of the Early Notification of Births (Amendment) Act, which came into force on September 1st, the operation of the Notification of Births Act (1907) is now compulsory in all areas. There is no special merit in the early notification of births, apart from the fact that it enables the Local Authorities, where they are willing, to put themselves into communication with the parents, with a view to safeguarding the life of the infant. Now that the operation of the Act is general, and is no longer left to the whim of any given Local Authority, an incentive is provided to the country at large to see that the further steps required of the Local Authority are taken in every case. Legislation has said its last word (for the time being) on the subject; it is left to the Local Authorities to give practical application to the spirit behind the Act. In New Zealand, with its wonderful low rate of infant mortality, the 1907 Act was recognised to be a useful agent in the reduction of the infant death rate, and its provisions were adopted in the Dominion in 1908. But so long as the Act was restricted in its application in the United Kingdom, there was some excuse for the complaint that the Legislature had failed in its duty. That reproach is now removed, and we shall hope to find that the personal effort to which the Act opens the door will

now be forthcoming in every area, with a view to removing the stigma of a high infant mortality rate from the country. The war has removed the opportunity for regarding the death rate among infants merely as a useful argument in political propaganda, and we may expect that those who made use of it for that purpose will now be the first to promote schemes for the establishment of maternity schools and infant clinics.

* * *

A Useful Clearing House.

A proposal for the establishment of a register of all investigations into social and industrial conditions appears to be a sound step. The Ratan Tata Foundation, which was instituted a few years ago in order to promote the study of methods of preventing and relieving poverty and destitution, is inviting co-operation for the scheme. Similar inquiries, it points out, into wages and conditions of employment, the cost of living, the welfare of children, crime, intemperance, public health, housing, and other matters affecting the well-being of the working classes are constantly being made by many organisations, but there appears to be no means at present by which they may ascertain what is being done by others in the same field. A register of all such investigations would prevent overlapping and waste of effort, would render existing information more readily available, and it is to be hoped, stimulate further research.

A MEMORANDUM issued by the Local Government Board to County Councils and Sanitary Authorities contains the following passages:—

The objects of this Act are to make universal throughout the country the system of the Notification of Births Act, 1907, under which early information concerning all births is required to be given to the medical officer of health, and also to enable local authorities to make arrangements for the care of mothers, including expectant mothers, and young children.

At a time like the present the urgent need for taking all possible steps to secure the health of mothers and children and to diminish ante-natal and post-natal infant mortality is obvious, and the Board are confident that they can rely upon local authorities making the fullest use of the powers conferred on them.

Notification of Births Act, 1907, to extend to every District.

The Act provides that on and after the first of September next the Notification of Births Act, 1907, described as the principal Act, shall extend to and take effect in every area in which it is not already in force.

The principal Act provides that in the case of every child born within the district it is the duty of the father of the child if he is actually residing in the house where the birth takes place at the time of its occurrence, and of any person in attendance upon the mother at the time of, or within six hours after, the birth, to give notice in writing of the birth to the medical officer of health of the district. This notice must be given in the case of every child which has issued forth from its mother after the expiration of the twenty-eighth week of pregnancy whether alive or dead.

The notice is to be given by prepaid letter or postcard addressed to the medical officer of health giving the necessary information of the birth within 36 hours after the birth, or by delivering a written notice of the birth at the office or residence of the medical officer within the same time. The local authority is required to supply without charge addressed and stamped postcards containing the form of notice to any medical practitioner or midwife residing or practising in their area, who applies for the same.

The Act also provides for penalties for failure to notify a birth in accordance with the Act.

It will be the duty of every local authority in whose area the principal Act comes into force by virtue of the new Act to bring the provisions of the principal Act to the attention of all medical practitioners and midwives practising in the area [Section 1 (3)].

THE EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN.

By Miss G. S. POTT.

A number of interesting discussions with regard to the employment of women took place at the meetings of the British Association in Manchester during the early part of September. The war and its effect upon the labour market has, of course, brought into prominence the question of women in industry, and the views of experts or of persons engaged in organising female labour should be of special value at this time. The report of a committee appointed by the Economic Section of the Association, which was keenly discussed on September 9th, and which dealt largely with the employment of women, emphasised two extremely important points, namely, that of the "replacement" of men by women and that of their "equal work"—in the sense of identity of work. It is commonly believed that the thousands of women who in answer to their country's need have recently entered into branches of metal, engineering, and like trades, have replaced men in such a way as that the work previously performed by a given man is now being performed by a given woman; and that therefore she should be in receipt of a similar wage as that earned by the man at the moment he laid down his tools and donned his khaki uniform. That such an idea is erroneous is shown by the report referred to. It informs us that much unemployment amongst women was occasioned at the outbreak of war, though since April last some 50,000 extra women have gone into various trades. But "much of the extension of women's employment in industry proper is in work which is normally done by women, and in which the necessities of war have created an unprecedented demand. Other work now done by women is exceptional work, which will decline with the advent of peace." The fear, therefore, so often expressed by those unfamiliar with the facts that women's industrial labour is through the exigencies of war permanently replacing a considerable proportion of male workers, has little or no foundation. The investigating committee found that the present "extra employment of women was regarded" by employers "as a temporary measure." No doubt certain exceptions are to be found, notably in secretarial and clerical work, but ever here the danger of greatly increased competition between men and women in future is largely discounted, from the point of view of employers, by the eternal difference between the economic value of the two sexes, namely, that marriage makes the work of woman of a less stable nature than that of men. Women employees are "not such a good investment as men," an employer has been heard to observe; "even when they are trained, it is improbable that most of them stay with you. They marry and want to take care of their own house instead." This fact is, of course, one of the great difficulties when attempting a comparison of the wages of the two sexes. We have first to discover equality of work before applying the demand for equality of pay. If the British Association Committee's report is correct, most women industrial "war" workers are not doing the same work as men: "it is very rarely similar either as regards process or conditions to that of men"—we were told.

Another point closely allied with the question of equality of work, and indeed of utmost importance with regard to the employment of women, was discussed at Manchester during the final day of the Association's meeting, viz.: The question of fatigue from the economic stand-

point. Exceedingly interesting figures were given in a report drawn up by a committee of scientists as to the results of fatigue upon industrial output in factories. Tabulated results show a higher output for the second hour than for the first, brought about probably from the facility produced by practice; but a diminishing ratio of production after the second hour, and a corresponding increase in the frequency of accidents. The chief factor seems to be the hour of the spell of work rather than the hour of the day.

Miss Anderson, Principal Lady Inspector of Women's Factories, joined in the discussion, and said there was no stronger feature in our Factory Legislation than its strict limitation of working hours for women and children. A five hours' spell is the maximum allowed, and in some occupations only 4½ hours. She further stated that these limitations of spell for women have been maintained even during the temporary relaxation of legislation during the war emergency.

No reasonable person desires to repeal these rules for the protection of women or young persons; but they form a sensible difference in an attempted comparison between the values of female and male labour in times of pressure.

Both Miss Anderson and Dr. Legge paid well deserved tributes of praise to the exertions of women on behalf of their Empire's need. But here again a difference between young men and girls engaged as tram conductors and similar work has been brought to the notice of some of us by managers of firms employing the latter in place of the former. While approving the girls' work in many particulars, the employers find them unable to sustain the same length of hours as male workers. And it should always be remembered in normal times that from a physiological point of view long hours of standing and the bodily strain involved in many factory processes are extremely undesirable, if not dangerous, for the potential mother.

Still, in spite of the improbability of the permanent displacement of men by women on any large scale, the fact that a certain number of soldiers will not desire to take up again their former occupations, and in view of the sadly long casualty lists we all read with aching hearts day by day, it is anticipated that after the war the proportion of women industrial hands will be greater than it was before the outbreak of hostilities. Therefore as the vast majority of women now being employed (outside the textile trades) are unskilled workers, it is satisfactory to note the various movements on foot towards the better training of girls and women. The above mentioned committee made specific recommendations upon this matter, and an interesting discussion took place under the Educational Section of the Association upon the training and careers of professional girls. Miss Haldane and Mrs. W. L. Courtney read extremely useful papers, the latter as usual treating the subject from a clear and practical point of view. It is noteworthy that so experienced a lady deprecates the early employment of girls in professional life. She tells us that she has seldom seen good results from women clerks who began work before 18 years of age, and urges the continuance of a good general school education until that period. The only person, she observed, who could profit by a girl's earlier employment is the parent, not the child.

Another satisfactory point was made by Miss Oldham in her speech at the same meeting, when she protested vigorously against the idea that domestic tasks are of an

inferior grade to those of other duties in life. No stigma of inferiority ought to rest upon girls whose tastes lay in that direction, but training and encouragement should be afforded to them. One may hope that her opinions will carry weight with the foolish, ignorant women who have so often bored their own sex in times past by denouncing household and domestic work as degrading or only fit for drudges.

In the matter of industrial training for women, some valuable work has been set on foot by the Central Committee on Women's Employment, familiarly known as the "Queen's Fund" for women. Their interim report published in March, 1915, gives some description of their efforts in this direction, and one looks forward to learning more details from a fuller report in future. Whether at this time, when demand for labour is so great, relief money should be spent upon the able-bodied, is an open question; but the March report dealt, of course, with the period during which women suffered considerably from unemployment owing to the war. The London County Council and trade organisations have co-operated in the movement of affording facilities for the training of girls and maintenance grants have been given to the students from the National Relief Fund.

To the social and economic student the present time is full of absorbing interest, and not the least noticeable feature is the abundance of assistance offered to the woman worker.

WAR WORK AND SOME HERESIES.

The war is letting in a considerable amount of light into the problem of women's work, but it is evident that both our thinkers and our talkers, if they are honest, will be forced to admit that there is little enough evidence at present for dogmatism on the subject. An analysis of the National Registration returns may upset some of the conclusions which are being drawn at the present time. Until that is forthcoming, however, it is of interest to note how many of the opinions once held are gradually undergoing modification.

In the *Daily News* of September 21st, Dr. Marion Phillips makes the following statement:—

The demand for woman's labour for the first time in our industrial history appears to reach very near the limit of supply, but the demand has come at a time when industry is disorganised, when haste outruns efficiency, and women with eager patriotism may be ready to overlook their deeper obligations to the nation of which they form part. While all must rejoice that the way into the better paid industries is open to women at last, while all must be glad to see the readiness with which they come forward to give their best energies to the nation, it must be admitted that their entry into trades of all kinds at this moment is fraught with danger to the industrial future both of male and female workers.

There are several Suffragist heresies in this short passage. In the first place the country had been led to imagine that the supply of women workers was inexhaustible; that is to say, within the limits of the female population between the ages of 16 and 60. It is true that the system of local registers had produced less than a hundred thousand applicants for special war work, but it was easy to prove the inconclusive nature of such evidence. Mrs. Pankhurst undertook to prove it by a pageant demonstration of women wanting war work and to sell the *Suffragette*. Complacent newspapers in giving exact figures of the strength of the procession, unfor-

tunately varied between 10,000 and 100,000, but the fact that the deputation was duly received by Mr. Lloyd George demonstrated, according to the Suffragist theory, the existence of an overwhelming desire on the part of the women of the country to exchange a life of unrelieved idleness for what the *Common Cause* calls the more picturesque kinds of war work. Within a few weeks, when it is safe to say that not a thousand of the women in Mrs. Pankhurst's procession had been given the work they claimed, Dr. Marion Phillips writes that the demand for woman's labour appears to reach very near the limit of supply. It is surely another heresy to suggest that the indiscriminate entry of women into industry—at one time a Suffragist goal—can be fraught with danger to the industrial future of male and female workers, while the same term must be applied to the suggestion that "women with eager patriotism may be ready to overlook their deeper obligations to the nation of which they form part."

One of the things revealed by the war is that there is far more to be taken into consideration in connection with women in industry than is dreamt of in Suffragist philosophy. Industrial employment is a matter which is inclined to find its own level, and will not adjust itself to every passing whim. The industrial employment of women on any large scale presents special difficulties. Under existing conditions the demand must almost inevitably be met locally. The attractive theory that a central register of women workers, or would-be workers, has only to be compiled in order to keep every conceivable industry working at full pressure, does not fit in with practice. Hence one Suffragist grievance against the Premier. On September 15th, Mr. Asquith, in the course of a speech in the House of Commons, referring to munition factories and the need for labour, said, "There is no field of what is called national service in which at this moment women can do more to help. There are thousands and tens of thousands of men who would be willing to undertake the work, but who cannot, in the national interest, leave their present jobs. But if the women will step in . . . we ought to make, and I believe we shall make, a gigantic and at the same time rapid stride in the solution of one of our most pressing problems." To this the official organ of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies replies: "If the Government were but able and willing to use the full amount of available woman-power in munition and other vital work, the women themselves are more than ready to start. 'Thousands and tens of thousands' of unskilled workers are eager to step in." It goes on to point out that the Union urged the training of women in August, 1914, and in March, 1915, when the War Register was mooted, asked the Government to summon a conference for the organisation of women's work. But Mr. Asquith's appeal entailed no inconsistency with the Government's unwillingness to fall in with the Suffragist schemes for the centralisation of women's work. That the latter would not have answered its purpose is shown by the fact that when it was being proposed, "crowds of women were waiting outside the armament factories, week by week, for employment, in vain." Those women, no doubt, with the increase in munitions work, are now at work, but they will be employed in their own locality, and will not, in any great numbers, have been transferred to other centres. In the areas within which armament factories are situated, there is, we gather from Mr.

Asquith's speech, still room for women workers, but that does not mean that it would be a feasible proposition to collect a crowd of would-be workers in London, and send them down to one or more of those areas. The reason is not far to seek. It deals with one of the limitations under which women will always be employed in industry, and which tends to prevent their work being strictly "equal" to that of a man, even of the man whom an individual woman may have replaced.

The war would also seem to have thrown light on the vexed question of equal pay for equal work. In the old days Suffragist controversialists invariably approached the subject from the point of view that workers with the same designation are equal to one another. Hence a man and a woman clerk in the same building, or men and women in the same grade in the Post Office service necessarily did the same work, and ought to receive the same pay. Now Dr. Marion Phillips writes:—"Equal pay for equal work is just, and even expedient. But it is not simple to put into practice. In many occupations the work done by women is not quite the same as that formerly done by men. Rearrangements have to be made in order to avoid unsuitable tasks. Fair and equal payment can then only be arrived at by negotiation." The same point is made, *mirabile dictu*, in the *Common Cause*, which a month earlier published an article by Lady Selborne, in which an attempt was made to blackmail workmen into conceding "equal wages for equal work," under penalty of being undercut. "Their (women's) capacity for living on less than men require is their great asset. In all skilled trades they could undersell men, and yet live fairly comfortably." [As often happens, the attempt to make one point leads the enthusiast to concede another. Lady Selborne admits that a "living wage" is not the same for men and women.] In an article entitled "The Thorny Question of Women's Wages" (hitherto the question has been held to be characterised by all the simplicity of an Euclidian axiom) the *Common Cause* (September 24th) writes:—

The principle of equal pay for equal work, for all its obvious justice is by no means easy to put into practice. As a matter of fact, women, at present, rarely do exactly the same work as men, and the differences put forward as a reason for paying a woman less than the man she has replaced are not always arranged merely through masculine perversity, as an excuse for giving the woman the lower status. It must be remembered that quite inexperienced women are frequently replacing men who have been at a job for years. The tendency, therefore, is to re-adjust the work so as to throw the heavier and more responsible share upon the men who remain, and give to the women the lighter and easier tasks, and it is difficult to see how this can be avoided.

The writer goes on to state that, when all things are taken into consideration, the fact remains that the difference between the wages paid to men and women "doing approximately the same work," is frequently quite out of proportion to the difference in the duties which fall to their share. With that statement there will be general agreement, and also with the implied remedy. "A very great deal remains to be done in the way of organising women, and raising both their idea of their own value and their standard of efficiency." The point has been continually urged by Anti-Suffragists, who have watched with keen regret the mischievous attempts made to convince the unfortunate woman worker that all she had to do was to obtain a vote and her wages would at once be raised.

THE WAR PENSIONS BILL.

Before the autumn recess, it will be remembered, the Government tried hard to pass into law a Naval and Military Pensions Bill. The matter was regarded as urgent, and the attitude adopted was that a Pensions Act of any kind was better than no Act at all. This view was endorsed to a large extent by the House of Commons, with the result that the Bill was sent up to the House of Lords in a form which exposed it to considerable criticism. The Government could not deny its short-comings, but persisted in its contention that the passing of the Bill was a matter of extreme urgency, and that it was better to have the measure as it stood rather than delay it for various improvements. The House of Lords refused to support this claim, and the further consideration of the Bill was deferred until after the recess.

On September 23rd the House went into committee on the Bill. During the interval the Government had allowed it to be known that it was willing to be more amenable to criticism than it had shown itself in July. It was not prepared, however, to accept many radical alterations in the Bill, and a trial of strength ensued on the very first clause, to which an amendment was carried against the Government by 35 votes to 26. Clause 1 sets up a Statutory Committee of the Royal Patriotic Fund Corporation for the purpose of dealing with pensions, grants, and allowances in respect of the war. An amendment was moved by Lord Devonport to substitute for the Corporation a body which was absolutely under State control, to be nominated and supported by the State. Such a body, it was pointed out, would be under the control of Parliament, and the Royal Patriotic Fund, the Soldiers' and Sailors' Families Association, and other organisations would probably be given liberal representation upon it. Lord Crewe opposed this amendment. Both he and Lord Lansdowne laid stress on the fact that the Government still counted upon part of the funds required for the purposes of the Act being raised by voluntary contribution, and the Corporation was held to be useful for raising such contributions. Neither this argument nor the other objections brought forward by Lord Lansdowne satisfied the Peers, which accepted the amendment by a majority of nine in a House of 61.

Other important amendments followed. It was agreed, with the consent of the Government, that the number of members of the Statutory Committee should be increased from 12 to 18, and the Government itself proposed that two of the members should be representatives of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Families Association. In the Bill as it passed the House of Commons, this concession, which had appeared in the draft measure, had been eliminated, at the instance of the Government. It was the refusal of the Government to retain the services of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Families Association in connection with work which it had been performing in a highly efficient manner during the war, that stiffened the opposition to the Bill. In the face of this opposition the Government has abandoned its former attitude. It restored to the Association its representation on the Statutory Committee, while accepting other amendments, providing (1) that a scheme regulating the constitution of any local or district committee should provide for substantial representation of persons who have either as members of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Families Association or the Soldiers' and Sailors' Help Society, or other-

wise, been performing functions similar to those to be performed by the local committees; and (2) that a local committee should have power to delegate its functions to the Soldiers' and Sailors' Families Association or other organisation under stated safeguards.

The Bill was still further improved by a Government amendment empowering local committees, out of funds at their disposal, to make advances on account of pensions and grants or separation allowances, to any person out of public funds during any interval before the payment thereof actually commences. It is obvious that this new clause will enable the local committees to remove many hardships which otherwise must have fallen upon the beneficiaries of the Act.

With the exception of the amendment to Clause 1, providing for a Statutory Committee under State control, the Bill as reported to the House of Lords carries with it the approval of the Government. On the subject of that amendment, however, Lord Lansdowne was most emphatic, and he declared that the Government could not accept an amendment which would make so serious a structural alteration in the measure. Whether other views will obtain, or whether the Government will seek to have this amendment revised, remains to be seen. As far as earlier criticism on the Bill is concerned, it has to be admitted that it has been met in large measure by the recognition accorded to the Soldiers' and Sailors' Families Association and the new clause mentioned above.

In this connection it is of interest to record the requests made by the Soldiers' and Sailors' Families Association with a view to rendering the Act, when passed, effective, with a minimum disarrangement of the agency now working. The Association asked:—

First, that place be found in the Bill for an adoption of the principle of differentiating between the dependent relatives (a) of Sailors or Soldiers serving, and (b) of men who are either dead or disabled, and out of the Naval or Military Service. The result would be to confine the operations of the Statutory and Local Committees to the latter class of cases; including the important matter of pensions, finding employment for disabled men, and so forth; leaving the Soldiers' and Sailors' Families Association to deal, in conjunction with the National Relief Fund, with questions of supplementing separation allowances, allowances for rent, special grants, etc., etc. Incidentally, this would obviate the necessity or desirability of any grant by the National Relief Fund to the Statutory Committee.

Second, whether the foregoing suggestion be adopted or not, we are strongly of opinion that this Association, which occupies, as we have noted, an exceptional position, should secure Statutory representation on Local Committees. We ask this, not as a favour, but in the interests of the beneficiaries themselves, and with additional emphasis if we are not to be allowed to deal ourselves with the supplementing of separation and other allowances for dependents of serving sailors and soldiers. The Association adds:—The impolicy of changing horses in the middle of a stream requires no demonstration. Here we are at a very critical period of the greatest war the world has ever known, and the proposal to transfer summarily a burden which has been borne with conspicuous success, by a band of instructed labourers, and to place this upon the shoulders of those who, without any experience in naval or military matters, would have to work up the entire subject from the beginning, seems to us only to require full explanation to be at once rejected.

"THE DOG AND THE SHADOW."

The following article by "Theresa W. Richardson" is taken from the August number of *The Woman's Protest* (U.S.A.):—

Æsop, years ago, gave the world the following pungent and truthful fable:

"THE DOG AND THE SHADOW.

"A dog had stolen a piece of meat out of a butcher's shop and was crossing a river on his way home, when he saw his own shadow reflected in the stream below. Thinking it was another dog with another piece of meat, he resolved to make himself master of that also; but in snapping at the supposed treasure, he dropped the bit he was carrying and so lost all. Grasp at the shadow and lose the substance—the common fate of those who hazard a real blessing for some visionary good."

Ours is a vast opportunity to serve our country. We are unshackled by party restraints, we are unfettered by political affiliations. American women stand for the highest ideals in the world. Let us continue to do so—to stand for humanitarian, non-partisan reform—and yet there are some, who, like the dog on the bridge seeing the piece of meat magnified in the water, are deceived into thinking that the vote is bigger than public opinion, that the tool is greater than the worker, and that legislation is a substitute for character.

What this country needs above all else to-day is respect for the law. We need not so much new legislation, as the enforcement of existing laws. It is comparatively easy to get legislation—we have proved that—but it is hard to enforce what we have gained. There are laws limiting the hours of work for women, there are child labour laws, there are laws guarding their morality, but you know, as I know, that these are not enforced. Laws are not obeyed unless public opinion is behind them. And who makes public opinion a moving, vital force? Yes, who makes public opinion itself? You, and I, and all women. In matters of moral importance we play the largest part, and yearly our influence grows, because each year we realise more its impelling value, and we use it with greater efficiency. This public opinion, which we regulate, is no abstract theory, it is a strong, effective weapon. There have been child labour laws on the statute books of Minnesota for over twenty years, but when did they begin to be effective? When they were passed? No, not then, but when public opinion awoke to their necessity. The evils which the women say they would combat with the vote are largely not the evils which the law permits—rather are they the evils which the law forbids and which public opinion permits—and the voting power of no man, woman or child can change this.

Efficiency is the most wonderful thing in the world, and the discovery of the theory of specialisation makes this the most efficient of ages. The man no longer mends the shoes for the entire family, because he is of more use to himself and to the community in the line in which he specialises. Yet some women would retard our national development by generalising work, by duplicating effort. They would do not only the distinct work which they are now accomplishing, but they would also do what the men are doing, they would vote. As true as is the axiom, an object cannot be in two places at the same time, is the modern theory of efficiency—a person cannot do two things and do them both in the best possible way.

Give me the ballot, and the man for whom I vote becomes one I cannot criticise without criticism of my own discernment. I become a Republican, a Democrat, a Progressive—whatever it may be, I become a creature of party. Leave me without the ballot. Man, the voter, the creature of party, the prejudiced, looks to me for an unbiassed statement of facts based on my impartial investigation of results. Shall we narrow ourselves with the fetters which man must carry, or shall we rather remain on that broader and higher plane where non-partisanship keeps our criticism free from suspicion? Here we can criticise without disloyalty to candidate or party, without bartering or political compromise. But give us the vote and we have lost all this. Moreover, we have lost it for ever. Write into the Constitution suffrage legislation and we have lost something we can never regain. One woman, desiring the vote for personal reasons, can refuse to be disenfranchised, and no law can relieve us. This is no experiment, it is absolute, final—once a voter, always a voter.

That woman has broadened cannot to-day be questioned. She has done this without the ballot. She will continue to do so without the ballot. Perhaps she will do so despite the ballot,

but this we do not know. Certainly man, with the franchise, has not broadened as has woman without it. She has not only retained all her merits of the past, she has achieved a new respect—a respect of her unbiassed opinion on social and economic conditions. While the average man's interest centres largely in candidates and political controversy, she has been open to every broadening influence, and each year her interests widen to include the larger problems of the social and economic world.

No one political party can claim to be wholly representative of this great country of ours. If it could be there would be but one party and we should approximate a Utopia. So, necessarily, no member of any one party can claim to represent all that is best in America. Always there must be parties, and always men must be bound more or less to one party or another, for only so is the suffrage properly guarded and governed. Hence it follows that the influence of the individual man rises or falls with his party. But woman is blessed in this, she has no party. She can always make her influence felt, through the home, the club, the church, the social life—in as many ways as there are women. She may take the ideas of one party in one particular and of others in other matters. It lies within her power to make herself a representative of the best that is in America. This is individuality, this is character, and she is, or should be, the ideal American, for this is freedom.

The Suffragists tell us what the vote will give us. Ask them what it will take from us? Is it a gain to have to work through a party machine? Is it an advantage to have to gain your object by political compromise and strategic juggling? Look at the results attained by women in the last fifty years. Is it not a wise influence which has forced the enactment of laws intended to protect women and children? We are the one mighty body working solely for the public good, regardless of party bonds.

Let us keep our idealism. Let us continue to stand, as we do to-day, for a broader moral and social life. Untouched, undivided by the war of politics, let us use the mightiest and surest weapon of the ages—public opinion. We do not want the vote. It would but add to our duties, narrow our horizon, and prejudice our judgments. But we do want that same fair and impartial influence which we are exercising to-day to go on broadening indefinitely for the public good, for our own development, and for our country.

The Beehive.—A meeting was held at Strathtyrum at 3.15 p.m. on September 18th.

Lady Griselda Cheape opened with prayer, and then said a few words on the work done by the Society. "Women were doing splendid work—as women—and many for the time being were taking the place of men to release these to go to the front. But women had their own sphere, and when they tried to do men's work it was only *faute de mieux*. They were *des pis allés*, for where physical force came in they were found wanting. But the moral force of women was as strong as, and often stronger than, men's, which made the balance as God had ordained."

The Beehive was to unite, strengthen, and organise true practical living Christianity. The Beehive had already sent out one Furber Hand Ambulance to Dr. Raw, and now they had great pleasure in presenting one to the Church Army. Their prayers went with it for the wounded, and also for those who ministered to the soldiers. They had over from their collection £1 10s. 10d. This was the proceeds of a sale, and also a little sketch done by David Cheape dressed as a highwayman.

Capt. Davey then gave a most interesting account of his work, and that of the Church Army: how they went out and worked along with the Y.M.C.A., combining with and helping each other; how they had motors for the sick and wounded, and food cars to refresh the weary. Not only was there bodily food, but a small Communion set, and wherever they could, they had a service. The prisoners were not forgotten, and they have just engaged a chaplain from America, being a neutral country, to attend our prisoners. So far as he could ascertain, the Germans had held good faith, and let our prisoners get the food which was sent. The Church Army was not neglecting home work, and their Labour Homes were looking after men, many of whom were going to the front, and making good soldiers.

Tea was served, and many new members joined.

Our next effort will be for Christmas trees for the very poor. Any gifts are gratefully received by the Secretary, Miss Jacobs, 11, Pilmour Links, St. Andrews.