

THE
WOMAN'S LEADER

IN POLITICS
IN THE HOME
IN INDUSTRY

IN LITERATURE AND ART
IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT
IN THE PROFESSIONS

AND

THE COMMON CAUSE

Vol. XIII. No. 5.

FRIDAY, MARCH 4, 1921.

PRICE 3D.
Registered as a Newspaper.

Contents :

	PAGE
<i>"The Woman's Leader" in Politics :</i>	
WOMEN'S INTERESTS	68
NEWS FROM WESTMINSTER	69
A POLICY FOR IRELAND. By H. M. Swanwick	70
ACROSS THE TIDE	72
IS "EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK" PRACTICABLE WITHOUT THE ENDOWMENT OF FAMILIES? By Eleanor F. Rathbone, J.P., C.C.	73
<i>In other Lands :</i>	
WOODROW WILSON: AUTOCRAT AND DEMOCRAT ...	69
<i>In Social and Religious Work :</i>	
A SPIRITUAL REVOLUTION. By A. Helen Ward ...	71
<i>In the Home :</i>	
THE DIARY OF A WOMAN IN THE HOME ...	74
<i>In Literature and Art :</i>	
REVIEWS: "The Crisis in Russia." By Mrs. Philip Snowden	75
DRAMA: "The Wonderful Visit"	76
<i>Correspondence :</i>	77

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

THE COMMON CAUSE PUBLISHING CO. LTD., 62, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.1
and all Bookstalls and Newsagents.

THE WOMAN'S LEADER

AND
COMMON CAUSE.

NOTES AND NEWS

The Treasury Again.

There is no end to the complaints we have to make against the Treasury. At the mass meeting of the Federation of Women Civil Servants last week, Miss Smyth, the Secretary of the Federation, gave concrete examples of the way in which the re-grading and assimilation arrangements tell against women as women. If it were not true we could hardly credit the meanness and gross injustice of some of the things which are taking place. Only this week a further instance has arisen in which an intimation has been sent out from the Treasury to the Scientific Institutions which come under its scope, that the equal scales of salaries hitherto paid are to be brought to an end. The National Union of Scientific Workers has always had a very sound, progressive policy, admitting women, and insisting on equal qualifications and equal pay. The scientific world—never too well paid—has a fine tradition of equality, and places like the National Physical Laboratory at Teddington have hitherto paid for the work done and not for the sex of the worker. The Treasury appears to be trying to upset this—on the strength of the Sex Disqualification Removal Act!

Making Room for Men.

Lieutenant Commander Astbury, stating in the House that "women should leave not only Government departments, but municipal bodies, and make room for men," was attempting to remedy an existing injustice by intensifying another. Every woman is willing to make room for ex-Service men (and this willingness is no small matter when woman's work is as scarce as it is now), but no woman, just because she is a woman is called upon to leave a post for which she has fitted herself, and which she fills with competence, to provide work for a man, whatever his qualifications, his experience, his natural abilities, or his war record. To insist on this would, in many cases, hit ex-Service men very hard. Many women in these posts are wives of disabled ex-soldiers, more are the widows of the fallen and mothers of their children. If they are to make way for the first male comer and be absorbed into domestic service, who is the gainer? Not the public service, not the ex-Service man, but X, as likely as not *embusqué* during the war, and work-shy since the armistice. If women had waited for an example from men before making way for ex-soldiers they would not have begun yet.

Women Detectives.

The evidence given by Sir Nevil Macready on the usefulness of women police is very favourable both as to their work at the moment and the possibilities of extended service. He considers the power of arrest important if full advantage is to be taken of their capacity, and said that if this were granted he had intended putting into their hands the whole work of dealing with prostitutes. The question of women detectives has been little before the public, except in cases of shop thefts. The Chief Constable of Lancashire, who has had women on his detective staff for three years, also dwelt on the necessity of the power of arrest. Both authorities agree that the police and detective forces should include women of varying social status; both have found women of education very useful. It is interesting to note that the highly-educated policewoman seems to have paved the way for the educated policeman, new male recruits to the force being drawn, in some cases, from men of university standard. Educated women do not desire to take a preponderant share in police or detective work, but their complete or virtual exclusion in many districts is not in the interests of justice. The detective is not solely occupied in hunting down criminals, he is essential to the clearing of innocent persons, and the protection of the law-abiding public.

Maternity Welfare.

Mr. Barnes recently asked the Minister of Health in the House, when he intends to carry out the Government commit-

ments in regard to the Maternity Convention adopted at Washington in December, 1919. Dr. Addison replied that, after full consideration, the Government has decided not to ratify the Washington Maternity Convention. As this was a written answer, there was no chance of demanding a reason or justification, but it is hoped that Mr. Barnes, who has been wonderfully persevering in this matter, will not let it end here. The probable reason which will be given is economy. It is being used as an excuse for not undertaking many of the progressive schemes, while the things which are really engulfing masses of the people's money—armies of occupation in Ireland and Mesopotamia, armaments, super-Dreadnoughts, and the rest—proceed unhindered. The Government still pursues its ostrich-like tactics, hoping that if it shouts economy loudly enough, and cuts down expenditure on education and welfare, its excessive expenditure on warlike preparations and expeditions may not be noticed. When will the nation awake to one of the real causes of its excessive burden of taxation?

Maternity Grants in Czecho-Slovakia.

A law has been passed in Czecho-Slovakia relating to the modification of Health Insurance which has a bearing on the Endowment of Motherhood. By this new law, allowances in cases of sickness are granted for a period of one year instead of thirty-nine weeks, and the amount of relief to women before child-birth is increased by an allowance corresponding to the sickness grants. Czecho-Slovakia is following out the Washington Labour Conventions resolutions, and is to be congratulated. It is not for nothing that they have so many women M.P.s.

Wage-Earning Children.

The fact that the Education Act is not yet working in all its sections is creating a problem which must exercise the minds of all people connected with wage-earning children. The Employment of Women, Young Persons, and Children Act, which came into force on January 1st, makes it illegal to employ any child under fourteen in any industrial undertaking, unless the child was already so employed at that date. So far, so good; but the principle of the Education Act is not being put into effect. Control up to the age of sixteen, which all agree is vitally necessary, is not taking place, though some local Education Committees are tending to ignore the nominal school-leaving age of fourteen and to encourage the children, who, in these days of trade depression, are not likely to get industrial employment, to remain at school. What is urgently necessary is an extension of the powers of local authorities to make by-laws in regard to employment up to sixteen, and to bring into actual existence a universal school attendance up to fourteen, and an effective continuation school attendance up to sixteen. The Government meets all arguments with the one excuse—"Economy," but in the long run it actually pays to expend money in the creation of good citizens. The present arrangement, which often leaves a gap between the age at which children leave school and the age at which they take work, involves a serious risk. Even from the economy point of view, it is a pity that the children upon whom the country has spent time and money should turn into irresponsible hooligans.

Vacation Play Centres.

The London Education Committee has decided, on account of its financial position, to conduct no vacation play centres in the playgrounds of the London County Council's Schools this summer. It is a decision which will make life for the children in the poorer districts during the long summer holidays rather drab and dreary. Organised games do much to prevent the children loafing in ugly, squalid streets, gaining information and forming habits with which they could well dispense, and it is a matter for regret that economy should force the Committee to take this step.

Public Assistance.

Though this and previous Governments have neglected the plain duty of providing permanent machinery for the prevention and relief of unemployment, it is not true to say that we, as a nation, leave wage-earners, either in prosperity or adversity, to sink or swim as they can. The extent to which tax- and rate-payers' contributions equalise the gulf between rich and poor has not hitherto been set forth in any Parliamentary paper, and its incidence is so much a matter of course that it tends to escape notice. We learn, from figures available this year for the first time, that no less than £312,000,000 were allotted in 1920 to public assistance, of which sum only a small portion went in poor relief and measures dealing with destitution. The number of persons benefiting was 28,000,000, or more than half the population; the remaining 20,000,000 pay the whole cost. The working classes benefit to the largest extent, and sometimes exclusively, from this vast expenditure. In 1890, public assistance amounted to less than a twelfth of this sum, and the 1920 figures do not include the cost of recent amendments of the Education Acts, nor the £10,000,000 available for public charity. Reformers may be of opinion that the taxpayers have not yet paid their debt to the community; they have, at any rate, provided a large instalment.

Guardianship, Maintenance, and Custody of Children Bill.

This Bill, which has secured the first place in the ballot and which will be debated on May 6th, had passed its second reading in the House of Commons, and had been referred to a Special Committee by the end of last Session. Colonel Greig, who introduced the Bill then, will introduce it again. Both the Bill and its title have been slightly altered. The alterations have, for the most part, been designed to strengthen up the machinery for enforcing the payment of Maintenance Orders. Among other means of enforcing this payment the Bill provides that in the event of a man or woman neglecting to make payments due under such an Order, the Court may order the money to be deducted from his wages, salary, or any property, and paid straight into Court on behalf of the children. In common with the Bill of last Session, this Bill provides that a mother shall have equal rights and responsibilities, with regard to her children, as has a father, and it is to be hoped that this Bill will receive a considerable measure of support from all those interested in the status of women and the welfare of children. We urge our readers to approach their Members on the matter, and make sure that they are "sound."

Protection of Girls.

The various Bills for the protection of girls and the amendment of the Criminal Law which were before Parliament last Session lapsed automatically; the form in which the Bishop of London's Bill has been reintroduced is one which should obtain general support, and we must hope that the Government will give it facilities and will not revive their own measure, with its clauses on compulsory retention of delinquent girls. The Bishop of London's Bill now fixes the age of consent at seventeen, abolishes the defence known as "reasonable cause to believe," provides that consent shall be no defence to a charge of indecent assault on a girl under sixteen, and extends to twelve months the time limit within which such prosecutions may be instituted. It also increases the penalties which may be imposed on "keepers"; but we remain of opinion that fines are not, at least in most cases, an adequate punishment for this offence.

Peers and the House of Lords.

The Committee of Privileges recently appointed by the House of Lords to consider the question of the right of peeresses to sit in that House, has decided against them. One expects extreme conservatism in that august assembly, in spite of a few enlightened members, but this decision is almost more reactionary than had been thought possible. The question is to be the subject of a debate in the House of Lords, and we may then, possibly, discover on what grounds the Committee has made this decision. Meantime, there is, of course, the legal side of the matter which might be explored, and there is always the dim hope, held out again in the King's speech, that the whole Second Chamber question is to be reviewed. Peeresses in their own right need not give up hope!

Burmese Women and the Vote.

The Legislative Council of Burma has passed a resolution, by thirteen votes to two, demanding reforms which will bring

Burma at least up to the level of the major provinces in India, and a resolution demanding votes for women was passed unanimously. The Burmese have been singularly patient, and it would be monstrous if they were penalised for their endurance. It does sometimes strike even the most constitutionally-minded of us that, with a Government like the present one, nothing progressive seems to be achieved unless there is a threat of force behind it. We hope, in spite of the record of the last two years, that Burma will get her demands granted without having to use any threat whatever. Force of any kind seems alien to this very charming people, but no one—least of all, a Government—should take advantage of their national gentleness.

"Titular," "Women's," or University Degrees?

The fight still rages at Cambridge; but the cleavage in the enemy ranks which exhibited itself on the 12th of February, still continues. Men who, like the Master of St. John's, the Master of Clare, and their followers, occupy the elderly standstill position, and do not profess any particular desire for the educational progress of women at Cambridge, are simply concerned to resist the women's demand. They have sent forth a flysheet asking that a Syndicate may be appointed to draft proposals for granting "titular degrees" of the University by diploma—degrees which, of course, are not to carry with them the right to University membership. The same proposed Syndicate is also to consider what fees women shall pay to the University for teaching and examinations, and to suggest a scheme for limiting the number of women students for whom University lectures and laboratory work can be provided. Persons outside Cambridge may hardly perceive the fine shades of difference between the "titular degrees" and the "women's degrees" factions. But to express the distinction briefly: the "titular degrees" group realise that they have to yield something to women possessed of the University franchise, and are concerned to yield no more than the extreme minimum. The "women's degrees" group pretend to an extreme concern for women to develop their education outside the University, and hope, by trading on the simplicity of their dupes, to get rid of women altogether. The ultimate object of both groups is identical; but the "titular degrees" men try to resist, the "women's degrees" men to outwit, women. Meantime, Miss K. Jex-Blake and Miss J. P. Strachey, as Chairman and Secretary of the Joint Girton and Newnham Committee, have circulated a statement to the effect that neither "titular" nor "women's" degrees can be accepted. They have plainly recognised that the proffered gifts are poisoned, for they remark that "these proposals, far from conferring any benefit on the women's colleges and their students, would, if carried into effect, only add new disadvantages to those already existing." In short, nothing less than University degrees and University membership will do.

Profiteering Washerwomen.

The prices which Parisian washerwomen have been charging for the past year and more have been iniquitous, but the protests of the wretched consumer were of no avail—"C'est la guerre" was the inevitable unanswerable response. Now, however, the Under Secretary of Food has threatened the Corporation of Washerwomen with a lawsuit unless they take 20 per cent. off all washing bills. The excuse of the exorbitant price of coal no longer holds good, for coal prices have fallen, but the washerwomen's charges have not. Society women, exasperated by this flagrant profiteering, are forming a company, on the co-operative principle, to compete with the washerwomen's union. There is probably more in all this than meets the eye; but we all know how difficult a problem washing has become.

A Move Forward.

A most interesting gathering took place on March 1st at Lady Astor's house, consisting of representatives of every kind of women's organisation—Trade Union, professional, social reform, party, political, and feminist. Lady Astor, in opening the proceedings, said that she wished to be of the maximum use to women's causes, and hoped the conference would indicate ways of strengthening the Parliamentary effectiveness and the constituency activities of the whole body of women's societies. The discussion which followed was most interesting, and it was decided to hold a further and more formal gathering after the various societies had officially considered the various proposals put forward. There is no doubt that any amount of work is needed, and if this effort results in a new push forward it will be a splendid thing.

WOMEN'S INTERESTS.

Our leading article last week was general in its terms. This week we shall try to be strictly particular, in the hope that we may thus be more useful. We asserted last week that there are subjects which are of special interest to women as such. The very existence of this paper is proof that we believe this, and we think that the fact is self-evident. So long as inequalities between men and women remain part of the law and customs of this country there will be the whole group of equality subjects to come under the heading of women's interests, but this is not by any means the whole story. There are great fields of interest in the organisation of domestic life, not only the laws and customs of marriage (which we have recently been debating so energetically in these pages, and which we hope to return to before long), but also the actual machinery of domesticity. Labour-saving, co-operation, domestic health and preventive medicine, the diet, both mental and physical of young people, all these, and the hundred and one other matters which are the daily occupation of most women, are certainly women's interests. Nor is this all. The current affairs of the women in industry and professions, the shiftings and readjustments of women's societies, political, industrial, social, professional, are all matters which are interesting primarily to women, not to speak of the present wages struggle and the exciting and exasperating effort to secure equal wage-earning opportunity. In addition to this, there are the business interests of the careers which are and always will be mainly carried on by women: the affairs of the nursing world, and the educational world, and so on. There are a half hundred more, and we could fill the rest of this issue enumerating them. But we have said enough to show that however little we believe in a woman's point of view, there really is a legitimate field of women's interests with which women are especially concerned. Now how are we to further these things? That is the practical question we want to discuss, since there is little use in admitting the existence of women's interests and stopping at that. How can we collect together all the scattered forces which make up the interest taken by individual women in these matters, and turn them to practical account? Can we do this at all, or must we be content to let them wander on unregulated and unco-ordinated to take their chances among all the other conflicting interests of which the world is made up?

Our opinion is that by care and sensible organisation we can do much to avoid waste of time and effort, and in fact, though only to a limited extent, this is at present actually the case. We believe that the network of women's societies, ranging as they do from Mothers' Unions and Women's Institutes at the non-political end of the scale, to Women's Liberal Federations and other Party Associations at the other, constitute a satisfactory scheme into which all the combined energies of women for their own interests might with advantage be directed. The trouble of the present situation is not the lack of channels of organisation, but the lack of energy within them. There are appropriate organisations, societies, clubs, groupings of all sorts, which are designed to deal with every shade of the needs of women to-day, and the only thing there is to complain about is that they are not, on the whole, as widely supported as the importance of their objects justifies.

To take, first, the group of equality subjects, it is evident that they are well served by special organisations. The chief society, which is itself a group of societies, is the National Union of Societies for Equal Citizenship. This body is holding next week (March 8th, 9th and 10th) its annual Council Meeting. Other specialist equality societies are associated with it, or affiliated to it, namely, the Association for Moral and Social Hygiene, which deals with the problem of sex-equality, the Women's Local Government Society which deals with women in local government, the London Society for Women's Service which deals with women's employment, while others, such as the League of the Church Militant and the Catholic Women's Suffrage Society, act in constant co-operation. The policy and programme adopted by the N.U.S.E.C. settles and directs to a large extent the direction of political pressure for the strictly feminist reforms from year to year, and the conclusions of its Councils are therefore worth the serious consideration of the general public. Moreover, every member of the general public should hasten to become a member of one or other of the affiliated branches or societies of the N.U.S.E.C. This is a piece of strictly practical advice.

The feminist aims and aspirations specially voiced by this group of societies are, of course, shared, and to a large extent worked for, by other women's organisations also. The National Council of Women possesses a great number of affiliated organisations, and, under its auspices, an immense mass of varied social, philanthropic, political and educational activity is carried on. This body stands solidly for the equality of men and women, and the N.U.S.E.C. is affiliated to it, but this is naturally only one among many aspects of so all embracing an organisation. The special sectional interests of women teachers, women nurses, women clerks, women trade unionists, women civil servants, women doctors, and so on, are served by their own professional and industrial organisations and every woman who has a trade or profession should hasten to join up. There is nothing so convincing in our struggle as the spectacle of a united front; and it is undeniable that every wage-earning occupation is the scene of very serious struggles for women at the moment.

All this is fairly plain sailing; the societies exist and have only to be supported. They are all democratic in character, and the members can make them what they please. Our emphatic advice is to join them.

What is to be done in the case of the domestic pursuits is not so plain however. As yet we have not developed sufficiently mobile organisations. The Mothers' Unions, Women's Citizens' Associations, and Women's Institutes do to some extent deal with domestic affairs, and they do invaluable work. They bring women whose lives are almost empty of social opportunity into touch with others, and they provide a meeting place and an occasion for discussion and mutual education. But as yet they do not seem to have taken any of the more adventurous steps we should like to see. We know of none which has made any experiments in co-operative housekeeping, or even common kitchens for adjacent houses. We know of no systematic agitations for labour-saving installations or communal hot water. We wish these movements would hurry up, and that such things as the Bag-wash Campaign in Fulham were matters of daily occurrence. We can, in this instance, only give our readers the same advice. Join the nearest society of the sort, and urge it forward. For there is a long, long road ahead.

Now, for speedy progress in all these directions it is clear that exchange of information is essential. We do not want to be self-important, but we do believe, in all sincerity, that a newspaper like our own is absolutely essential to the progress and development of all these movements. We know, of course, that each section tends to set up its own news sheet for the detailed information of its own particular adherents; but we think that there is need, beyond this, for a paper of general interest, dealing with all the larger aspects of the problems and reaching the whole public. We are glad to believe that women teachers are not only interested in the Burnham Report; they care for lots of things, including votes on the same terms as men, and the treatment of young offenders; women civil servants sometimes think of other parts of women's interests than the part relating to equal pay, and housewives of other parts than domestic economy. (How tedious it would be if they did not!) And this being so, each needs not only the specialised information of her own branch, but the news and general problems of the whole movement. We think, therefore, that it is a solid statement to say that the continued publication of THE WOMAN'S LEADER is a matter of concern to women's interests, and that it is practical advice to ask our readers to support us. Times are seriously hard: we are desperately in need of money and can only weather the storms of 1921 if our readers really back us up. We need a much wider circulation and we wish that every one of the workers in each aspect of the movement would make the fullest possible use of us. We should be glad to publish in our columns more of the news of women's organisations than we do now; we dream of the time when the domestic news of each society will appear as supplements within our covers; we look forward to the time when every worker in all these fields will read us as a matter of course, and when our prosperity will equal the righteousness of our causes. But we shall not realise these dreams unless we get help from each one of our present readers, and we appeal now very hopefully to the assembled delegates of the N.U.S.E.C. Council. We want them to point out to all the organisations they know how mutually useful we could all be, and to see whether we cannot make of THE WOMAN'S LEADER in this coming year the obvious medium of exchange. We will do our best—and we are sure that our well-wishers will do so too.

NEWS FROM WESTMINSTER.

BY OUR PARLIAMENTARY CORRESPONDENT.

The prophecy that Supplementary Estimates would bring surprises was not long in fulfilment. It is true that the division occurred on a Friday, but its remarkable feature was that fifty Coalitionists—forty-two Unionists, seven Liberals, and Mr. Seddon of the National Democratic Party—voted against the Government. Had either Liberal or Labour been present in strength, the Government would have been beaten. As it was, their majority of ten only was as bad as a defeat. There will be other similar revolts between now and Easter.

This happened on the last day of the week. To go back to the beginning, on Monday, February 21st, occurred the first formal trial of strength. It was on Ireland. When the House met in October last, shrewd judges were convinced that the Government forces were beating Sinn Féin. Those same judges now are doubtful whether Sinn Féin is not gaining. This is ominous enough, truly; for, as Burke said, after you have tried force you cannot go back to conciliation. And if force fails, what remains? But what is worse, is the persistent rumour current of misbehaviour by the auxiliary forces. The House therefore met on Monday in a mood of uneasiness.

Captain Wedgwood Benn's speech in opening was a great advance on anything he has done before. He dropped the note of emotion and aggression which has often marred him; he was calm and extraordinarily effective. He was listened to in silence. His case was a strong one. He was followed by an obviously pre-arranged speech from Mr. Inskip. Mr. Inskip, usually a powerful debater, was not at his best. The only defence he made for the misdeeds of the auxiliaries was that Sinn Féin were worse. That is true, but hardly exculpates the Government; and the House listened with surprise and impatience. Then came Sir Hamar Greenwood. He made the mistake of appealing to passion rather than to reason. He did not attempt to answer Captain Wedgwood Benn. And the House wanted facts and reason, not dialectic.

All through the autumn Sir Hamar Greenwood's hold over the House was remarkable. Many reasons contributed. He had taken up a thankless task from a sense of duty. He showed personal courage. He kept his temper. He had no half tones. He is an effective debater, of the asseverative kind. And, most of all, the House was hostile to Ireland and wanted repression. For all these reasons, he rode triumphantly and aggressively over his enemies. He was less successful on Monday. The Coalition has not lost confidence in him, far from it; but it is shaken and unsettled. The next few weeks should be watched carefully.

This uneasiness was heightened by what followed next day. Captain Redmond accused Sir Hamar Greenwood of reinstating thirty cadets who had been dismissed for looting, whereupon the Commandant, General Crozier, resigned. In the distorting medium of Irish politics truth is wonderfully hard to get, and the only certain fact is General Crozier's resignation. It must not be assumed that he is in the right, or General Tudor in the wrong. The matter will be debated again, and it is best to defer comment. But the incident has assuredly not tended to allay suspicion. The Coalition got a large majority on Captain Wedgwood Benn's motion; but there were notable abstentions.

On the evening of Tuesday, February 22nd, Captain Loseby brought before the House a charge against a high official at the Ministry of Munitions, and Mr. Bonar Law promised an enquiry of a judicial character. Earlier in the day, Mr. Bonar Law had asked for, and got, private members' time up to Easter. There was little resistance to the demand, for nearly all the time will be spent on Finance, which the House wants to discuss.

On Wednesday and Thursday the Unemployment Insurance (Amendment) Bill passed through all stages. The debate calls for no comment for it was a reshuffle of the one in the previous week. The important point is that the Government gave way on the amount, and increased it to 20s. for men and 16s. for women. They were pressed to do so from all sides of the House. Thus always will economy suffer when the appeal is urgent.

Two Government posts remain to be filled. There is no Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Agriculture, and no Financial Secretary to the Admiralty, when Sir James Craig goes. In any event, it is improbable that the appointments will be made before the results of this week's by-elections are known.

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

NEWS FROM OTHER LANDS.

WOODROW WILSON: DEMOCRAT & AUTOCRAT.*

The keynote, not only of the great Presidential career which closes to-day, but of Woodrow Wilson's whole public career (as President of Princeton University, as Governor of New Jersey, as President of the United States, and, finally, as "leader of world Liberalism") was struck by himself in words addressed to the Congress of 1917:—

"The thought of the plain people here, and everywhere throughout the world, the people who enjoy no privilege and have very simple standards of right and wrong, is the air which all Governments must henceforth breathe if they would live."

It was struck again the other day by his intimate friend and secretary, Mr. Joseph Tumulty, in a speech with this moving climax:—

"In Woodrow Wilson's inmost heart there burns like holy fire a passion and a conviction that the democratic ideal is right, the ideal of equal opportunity for all, not only in the eyes of God but here on earth in all the processes of government, and not only among individuals, but also among the nations... and a determination with all the iron will that is in him to live for and fight for, and if necessary die for this principle."

And yet this apostle of democracy has often seemed to act as an autocrat!

In almost every public utterance he has unconsciously explained this paradox. I quote some illuminating sentences; the first from his appeal to the Senate to pass the Suffrage Amendment:—

"Through many channels I have been made aware what the plain, struggling, work-a-day folk are thinking." "I think... I am a typical American... like the other fellows at home."

"It is a great privilege that we can do that kind of thinking for mankind, thinking far ahead, human thinking. Those of us who can sit sometimes at leisure... and think of... the long past that we had no part in, and project the long future... must use our leisure... to feel with them and think for them, so that we may translate their desires into fact as far as that is possible."

Of the first five and a-half years of his career as President he might have said—what he did actually say of the years of warfare—"The proof of my success" (as interpreter of his own people) "is that the spirit of America responded... proved that it was ready to do the thing which I was privileged to call upon it to do." But for a brief space a greater glory was his—the glory of being acclaimed as the spokesman, not merely of the average American but of the average man, at once "the representative of America in Europe," and "the representative of Europe in America"—to quote an American resident in Paris.

Fresh from that wonderful experience, he scorned to haggle with the American Senate over the Covenant of the League of Nations, insisting on a "great solemn referendum."

His resultant downfall appeared to a hostile critic to be the nemesis of spiritual pride. It was really the result of what he once defined to his own people as "the overcrowding pride of being your representative," an intellectual pride based paradoxically upon a profound spiritual humility which forbade him to believe that he could possibly be superior in altruism and in steadfast purpose to his beloved "plain people."

And yet though, in this last year or two, he may have made the splendid mistake of thinking too "far ahead" of his time, the spirit of mankind has not entirely failed to respond to his great appeals. Eight years ago to-day he thus gave utterance to the prophetic thoughts with which he entered upon the Presidential office:—

"The feelings with which we face this new age of right and opportunity sweep across our heartstrings like some air out of God's own presence, where justice and mercy are reconciled and the judge and the brother are one." "This high man, with a great thing to pursue, dies ere he knows it." But the inspiration of Woodrow Wilson has already opened the eyes of "the plain people everywhere" to new visions of justice, mercy, and brotherhood fit for "this new age"; under his leadership "a new world relationship"—to quote the incoming President—has already been inaugurated which makes it possible for the nations to live together in the light of these visions. Such an achievement is not "a high failure": it is a high, an immeasurable success.

M. DOROTHEA JORDAN.

* An excellent brief life of President Wilson, by H. Wilson-Harvis, is published in two editions. Prices 5s. and 2s. 6d.

BURNING QUESTIONS.

We call the attention of our readers to the fact that in the topical and controversial matters which we treat under the heading of "Burning Questions" we endeavour to present the principal views on each question held by differing groups of political thinkers. We do not ourselves express an editorial opinion, beyond this, that it is each woman's business first to be well-informed and then to come to her own opinion.

A POLICY FOR IRELAND.

By H. M. SWANWICK.

"I have the honour to be Chief Secretary for Ireland, and I believe I am the only man in Ireland who is enjoying perfect health, no anxiety, and a perfect optimism."—*Sir Hamar Greenwood, Bath Club, Dec. 31st, 1920.*

The sensation of nausea induced by reading the above report of a speech was probably salutary. One begins to understand how the Irish feel about us and why.

Not in the lifetime of any of us has the condition of Ireland been more deeply disgraceful to British rule. Anarchy and terrorism masquerade as "law and order"; but Sir Hamar Greenwood enjoys perfect health. Little children and pregnant women are casually shot by Crown forces; but Sir Hamar Greenwood has no anxiety. Within a twelvemonth one Lord Mayor of Cork has been murdered, and the coroner's inquest found the constabulary and members of the Government who supported them guilty of the murder; a second Lord Mayor has died, hunger-striking in a British prison, as a protest against British jurisdiction; a third fled to the United States to tell there, if he could, of the long martyrdom of his city; Cardinal Mercier and other Belgian ecclesiastics send a message of sympathy to the Irish hierarchy; but Sir Hamar Greenwood enjoys a perfect optimism. Why do we tolerate him?

We who have been in Ireland, stayed with the common people, and talked with them up and down the country, visited their devastated homes, stared at the piled-up ruins of shops, and farms, and factories, witnessed the shuddering nightmare of curfew raids—we have found that our story resembles Rudyard Kipling's sea-serpent story; it is too strange to be believed. Yet the bare fact is that the British are engaged in devastating Ireland once more. We once reduced her population in seventy years from eight millions to four millions; we can doubtless halve it again. We can cow, and starve, and terrorize the people, and having killed many of their young men and imprisoned many more, we may drive the rest to emigrate and leave the women and the old people "nothing but their eyes to weep with." It is worth while pausing to ask why we should be doing these things.

We are driven, and shall continue to be driven, to do them, so long as we insist upon governing Ireland against the will of the vast majority of her people (in 1918 this was over eighty per cent.). The Irish demand is quite simple. I do not say it is easy for us to grant it. The Irish ask for self-determination. It will not be easy for us to admit the right which we have withheld by force for centuries; yet in that admission lies the only hope of lasting peace. Sir Hamar Greenwood may get his Ulster Parliament going, but even that will not work peacefully. He may conceivably contrive some sort of silly make-believe parliament in the South (though this is very doubtful), but, utterly unrepresentative as this would be, it would settle nothing. As if tyrants had not often before set up bogus democracies and nothing good ever came of them!

What stands in the way of self-determination in Ireland? The fear that the enormous majority would declare for complete separation. Well? Look that squarely in the face and ask why not? Three main objections have been raised:—

(1) FINANCE.—If Ireland were fiscally independent of this country we should suffer. This is the reverse of the old argument, which used to be that Ireland could not stand alone. Frankly, the new one is not very respectable. It does not seem defensible that we should hold down a nation by force, simply for the sake of what we can get out of it by taxation. And it is well to remember that the Irish are convinced that much of our financial policy has been directed not merely to getting a big revenue by taxes, but to discouraging or diverting trade and

industry from Ireland for the benefit of English traders and manufacturers.

But it is doubtful whether the economic destruction of Ireland would benefit this country, and figures show that this destruction is proceeding apace. During the past year, claims for compensation alone are given as £9,184,988, and a vast amount of destruction has not been claimed for by the terrorized people. Careful calculation brings this up to at least ten millions. We have to add to that the loss in credit and trade and unemployment, in death, and injury to health and efficiency, which is incalculable, but proportionally very great. In addition, there is the cost of administering a hostile land, an army of occupation, Irish law charges of nearly five millions (Scotch charges are £1,182,000), a little bill for Chief Secretary's "expenses" of £42,500, and so on. Last year there was a bill of over 8½ millions for "naval and military operations." This year there is a mysterious item which runs to over nine millions, called "unclassified services"; perhaps this includes such items as the cost of the masks, black one side and white the other, with which the War Office thoughtfully equipped the Royal Irish Fusiliers at Carrickfergus, for what is euphemistically called (in the invoice) "night practice"; what Judge Bodkin would call "murder and arson." Even if we think ourselves entitled to bleed Ireland, a decaying or a hostile neighbour can be no asset to us.

(2) STRATEGY.—It is then advanced that an independent Ireland would be a source of danger from a strategic point of view. Now the simple fact is that Ireland will always, from her position, be a danger to us so long as she is our enemy, and the only way to make Great Britain safe from attack through Ireland is to make friends with that country. The modern patriotic movement in Ireland is anxious to develop Irish resources and Irish genius. The most fervid Sinn Feiners are emphatic in their assurance that they don't want to waste their time in quarrelling with, or intriguing against, this country. They hold that we ought to be their best customers, and that their own interests will lead them to desire good relations with so near and powerful a neighbour, and to eschew international complications and militarist adventures.

It would be more than human if the Irish had no hate for those who burn down their homes, shoot down their sons and daughters, insult them by disgusting humiliations, and threaten with Nurse Cavell's fate any woman who "harbours" her rebel son or husband. They must also have some contempt for the inert mass of our people which allows these things. But hatred and contempt would wither in the air of freedom, in the exhilaration of a great *risorgimento*; in the main, one finds it is our rule they hate, not us.

It would be foolish to assert that all danger would miraculously vanish if Ireland were free, but it is quite safe to predict that there would be far less danger from a free Ireland than from a disaffected Ireland, and both De Valera and Arthur Griffith have made it perfectly clear that they are willing, by treaty, or through the League of Nations, to give guarantees that Ireland shall not be used as a base for any attack upon Great Britain. Those who are disposed to give credence to every fresh official puff of the latest measure of coercion as one which is having "excellent results" and which will bring peace to Ireland in a very few weeks, may be asked to reflect for how many generations these patent pills for patriots have been advertised, and to what pass they have brought the credit of this country.

(3) ULSTER.—The Ulster "problem" is the last resort of the opponents of self-determination. We created it; we inten-

sified it; we have now complicated it by what Southern Ireland calls the "Partition Act." It is one of the disastrous results of our rule that it has overlaid simple questions with needless complexities; but it is often salutary to go back to simple principles. The Irish are a nation well-marked by the sea-boundary of their land. It is the *whole* nation, convened by free election and without any interference from outside, which should determine its own government. Southern Ireland, with its intense patriotism, is most anxious to bring Ulster into the body politic as a willing co-operator in Irish welfare and security. Left alone, Southern Ireland would make concessions and offer safeguards which it believes would be accepted by Ulster. It regards the dominance of a small section (not ten per cent.) of Ireland as a monstrous tyranny made possible only by British backing.

The most responsible Sinn Feiners with whom the writer has talked have disclaimed any wish to coerce Ulster, and have expressed the belief that a democratically-elected convention would be able to come to terms; they believe that Ulster's arrogance is largely the artificial consequence of the impolitic declaration by Mr. Asquith's Government that Ulster should never be coerced; and they point out the absurdity of maintaining that a small minority must never be coerced, even though that should entail the age-long coercion of a large majority. They believe they will be able to dispense with coercion, but if there is to be any, they think it should be that of the recalcitrant minority.

There is a strong desire in Ireland for peace, how could it be otherwise? But when we read of negotiations do not let us forget Mr. George's lamentable record with respect to Ireland, and how natural it is that the Irish should suspect that he will repeat his old manoeuvres, leading men on to a seeming settlement, and then suddenly springing on them some new and intolerable condition, wrecking the negotiation, and discrediting the leaders who dealt with him. These hole-and-corner discussions are naturally suspect. The suggestion made by a good friend of Ireland that the British Government should make an offer and take a referendum of the Irish people upon it is entirely impracticable. How can a referendum be taken on a complex matter like a constitution? And how is it possible to take any fair referendum at all with an army of occupation in force, and most of the trusted leaders of the people "on the run"?

What is needed is something truly more difficult, but much more simple: a great act of faith and a courageous reversal of our age-long policy; the summoning of the Irish people to determine their own government.

[N.B.—Since this was written, Sir Hamar Greenwood's exposure of himself in the episode leading to Gen. Crosier's resignation has resulted in an expression of national disgust which should remove the disgrace of having such a man at the head of Irish affairs. But it is all the more necessary to insist that a mere change of persons will not settle Ireland, unless with it comes a complete change of policy.—H. M. S.]

A SPIRITUAL REVOLUTION.

The Anglican Bishops in Session ten days ago in the Upper House of Convocation, found woman sitting in their midst as disconcertingly as a skeleton at a feast; she, the docile slave of a male hierarchy for at least nineteen hundred years, having suddenly in these latter days preferred a claim to call her soul her own. This claim means a spiritual revolution; little wonder, therefore, that the bishops, men of courage and insight as many of them are, were perturbed.

Two resolutions were before them. The first, proposing to restore the ancient order of deaconesses was carried, and a committee appointed to draft appropriate rules and regulations for the order. This will doubtless bring comfort to many devout and decorous daughters of the Church, but to others, even equally devout, it does not appear to call for any exuberance of joy, for the permanent subordination of the "restored" deaconesses to the male hierarchy is pre-ordained.

The other resolution dealt with women preachers in the following, meticulously selected, terms:—

"That in view of the apostolic teaching that women, equally with men, are members of the one Body of Christ and partakers of the Holy Spirit, and in order that fuller use may be made in the Church's service of the gifts and experience of women, this House makes the following recommendation: That under conditions laid down by the Bishop of the diocese it should be permissible for women, duly qualified and approved by him, to speak [sic] and pray in consecrated buildings at services or meetings for prayer or instruction other than the regular and appointed services of the Church."

The ordinary lay person reading all this would rest secure in the conviction that even a wild ass, anxious to follow Biblical tradition and emulate the conduct of that surprising ancestor who rebuked the tardiness of the prophet, could not break away and do much harm, so enmeshed in precautions is the modest proposition. But the realists of the English Church Union are, to do them justice, very wide awake, and they recognise the significance of a cloud even while it is still no bigger than a man's hand. The Bishop of London, therefore, being subject in these matters to their moral suasion, hastened to propose, "in order to allay the fears," &c., an amendment to insert the words, "but primarily to their own sex." Then arose a lively discussion in regard to the precise connotation of terms like *primarily, commonly, ordinarily, normally*, and in the midst of it all came the Bishop of Ely's *jeu d'esprit*—that women be allowed "to pray and speak commonly to women and children." Something about this appealed to the Bench, and it was just about to go forth as their considered view when the Bishop of St. Albans hinted that to admonish women to pray only to their own sex and to children was not quite the correct idea. The Bishops recoiled at once from the abyss yawning before their feet—the whole troublesome thing was referred back to be redrafted—and the next morning, when everyone had enjoyed a good night's rest, the words, "to speak and pray in consecrated buildings at services or meetings for prayer or instruction normally for women, girls, and children," received the episcopal *imprimatur*. It must have been an amusing scene. But the Bishops are not really so wholly ridiculous nor wholly blameworthy; they are merely considerably in advance of the ecclesiastical cliques, both among clergy and laity. Standing on the watch towers, they recognise the real enemies of the city of God more easily than our modern Pharisees whose Bible is the *Church Times*, and many of them find it impossible to regard a human being, woman or man, afire with a vocation to preach Christ's Gospel, as other than a friend. But they dare not brave the Pharisees, full of zeal, replete with organising ability, and wielding the weapon of threatened secession.

Possibly no bishop, possibly few men, can realise the deep-seated indignation aroused in the mind and conscience of the modern thinking woman, whether within the field of organised religion or outside, at the colossal arrogance of the claim made implicitly by ecclesiastical tradition and explicitly by such bodies as the English Church Union—not wholly repudiated by ecclesiastical authority to-day—that man stands of right between the soul of woman and her Maker. Little matter whether the popular "demand" for women preachers is great or small, little matter whether many women or few can cherish, through calumny, ridicule, and insult, the vocation to the Christian ministry, but great matter whether Milton was right or wrong when he penned that remarkable line which in Victorian days seemed but a sonorous platitude, "he for God alone, she for God in him." As aforesaid, the E.C.U. are frankly realist, they despise the sentimentalities of men like the Bishop of London. To them it is incontrovertible that hoary tradition did well in establishing that woman is something mysteriously taboo (the *Challenge* newspaper has challenged Father Leary to say what this mystery is), and that in perpetuity the fabulum of theological truth shall be fed to her by man, nor shall she presume to feed any man with her own interpretations of the mind of God. For man alone is His Friend. The storming of this position, and stormed it will be, will be spiritual revolution. Religion purified from its sex bias, from its degraded double moral and spiritual code, from its false asceticism, from its alliance with State militarism, from the reinforcements of an obscurantist magic, may well become, in the fullness of time, that principle of life and love for which the world to-day is yearning.

A. HELEN WARD.

ACROSS THE TIDE. A PLEA FOR RECONSIDERATION.

There appears to be some danger that readers of THE WOMAN'S LEADER will drift into a general acquiescence in the principle of *Family Endowment*, without ever having listened to the arguments of an opponent, or realised the tremendous and revolutionary economic implications of the proposal. I should like, therefore, to put forward a few suggestions for the consideration of those who claim that "payment according to family needs" is a practical proposition for our present economic structure, or any other economic structure remotely resembling it. I purposely say "in our present economic structure," because it is obvious, even to the least imaginative of us, that should we ever attain to a state of advanced communism, the principle of payment according to family needs would inevitably claim acknowledgment as part and parcel of the general régime: "to each according as he has need." For the present, however, we have not attained to such a state, and it is into a highly-developed and, withal, not very stable capitalist structure that social reformers propose to introduce the principle of payment according to family needs.

In the first place, advocates of family endowment invariably begin with the assumption that there exists somewhere, and at some time, a sum called a "National Income," available for distribution among the inhabitants of the United Kingdom. They do not, as a rule, tell us very much about the composition of this "National Income." Does it include, for instance, the interest which we receive on our War Loan? If it does not, clearly any calculation of the National Income will be intolerably complicated by the fact that certain receipts will have to be deducted from the individual incomes which make it up. If it does, then we open out an obvious financial policy by which Mr. Austen Chamberlain can increase the National Income year by year, at the same time reducing the taxation at which we all grumble. All he has to do is to borrow the annual interest charge. Again, are the mass of domestic services performed by women for their own families part of the National Income? If so, by whom is their value computed, and on what basis? If not, it becomes possible to withdraw these services altogether, without detracting one jot from the National Income, or else to perform them for one another at a money valuation, in which case the National Income is immediately swollen by the amount of their total value. In the first case, society finds itself considerably worse off, while the National Income remains undiminished. In the second case, society continues to enjoy the same measure of service, while the National Income is enormously increased. Whatever else it may be, therefore, the National Income is no test of national well-being; and that being so, we may ask, of what use is the idea of a National Income at all?

But I would go further than this, and declare that there is no such thing as a National Income. There are about twenty-five million individual incomes in the United Kingdom, produced independently, with a view solely to the material well-being of their producers. It is true that the production of these independent incomes leads men into close economic relations with one another, either as complementary producers, or as borrowers and lenders; it involves, in fact, a large measure of interdependence and co-operation. But this, in itself, implies no national economic solidarity, no recognised community either of efforts or needs, no universal disposition to accept or tolerate the Communist's ideal: "From each according to his ability; to each according to his need." The only difference between the present state of affairs and a condition of universal, self-sufficient, peasant proprietorships, is that, in the latter case, the worker receives the whole produce of his labour and property, whereas, in the former, he receives the value of the whole produce of his labour and property. In both cases his incentive is the same—greed and fear: greed of personal gain and fear of personal poverty.

Now, it is true that under our present economic régime a certain proportion of each individual's income is taken from him (in the shape of direct or indirect taxes) and redistributed among the community at large (in the shape of free education, vaccination, police protection, public libraries, military glory, &c.). Care has always been taken, however, that such redistribution should leave virtually untouched those two fundamental and beneficent forces—greed and fear—upon which our material civilisation rests. Occasionally we have threatened them, as Mr. Austen Chamberlain's attempt to continue the Excess Profits Duty and its ignominious withdrawal demonstrates. But on such occasions our national faith in their efficacy has in-

variably triumphed. The majority of us are convinced that if the State redistributes too large a proportion of the nation's individual incomes, those incomes will cease to be produced with the same gusto as hitherto. Even if a National Income exists as an imaginary aggregation of all individual incomes, surely it must be clear, even to the most utopian advocates of family endowment, that this aggregation is not a definite mass of wealth which "droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven, upon the earth beneath." It is not a guaranteed sum, constant as a Civil Service pension, which Providence will continue to dole out to us, irrespective of how we distribute it. It is, on the contrary, a very shy and delicate thing, and if we attempt to distribute it in a way which it does not like, it will cease to appear amongst us. What, then, will be the effect of redistributing nearly five hundred million pounds worth of it at one fell swoop, as the authors of "Equal Pay and the Family" propose to do? Surely, greed will be seriously blunted, and fear virtually extinguished? It is true, of course, that a new element of fear will be generated in the breast of the higher grade taxpayer, whose individual income will be at the disposal of the ever-growing and uncontrolled birth-rate of the casual labour class. From the breast of the latter, however, fear will be forever removed. Already, the Poor Law has removed fear of starvation; the Education Acts have removed fear of illiteracy; the proposed system of Family Endowment will remove fear of malnutrition from the pressure of an increasing family on an inelastic income. I ask readers of this paper to consider thoughtfully and unselfishly whether such wholesale redistribution is likely to have a stimulating effect upon the individual's will to produce wealth—and in so doing I would once more remind them that it is upon the individual's will to produce wealth that the whole of our material civilisation depends. It is possible, however, that to a certain section of this journal's readers such arguments as the foregoing may make little appeal, as savouring of undue sympathy towards the higher grade taxpayer. Let us, however, ask ourselves whether a general redistribution of income with reference to family needs would, in fact, strengthen the economic position of that section of the population which pays its taxes mainly in the form of tea and tobacco duties. In short, would Family Endowment give to the wage-earning classes in children's allowances as much as it would take from them in bargaining power? I suggest that it would not. It would give to them a narrow subsistence income, more nearly adjusted to family needs than any flat-rate minimum wage could be. It would take from them the power (at any rate in the immediate future) of permanently rising above that narrow subsistence income by means of a strongly-organised and united class struggle, and for this reason: it is well known that there exists in the labour market to-day a comparatively small class of persons whose presence is a constant menace to their fellow workers. I refer to those women workers, married or unmarried, whose economic position is not entirely dependent upon their own industrial activities. Here we are up against a class of workers whom it is notoriously easy for the employer to sweat and difficult for the trade unionist to organise. It is a class of workers which, if organised, might tend to strike more readily, having less to lose, or less readily, having less to gain. At any rate, its economic interest and outlook is slightly different to that of the normal independent and self-reliant male wage-earner. Hitherto its comparative smallness has been such that trade unionism has been able to hold it at bay—seeking its strength and solidarity elsewhere. Now, however, it is proposed to add to this class a considerable proportion of the organised, male wage-earners—all those, in fact, who possess dependent children, and whose families would, therefore, be in receipt of independent State allowances. It has been difficult enough in the past to obtain the necessary solidarity between skilled and unskilled workers. To-day, that difficulty is being solved by the vertical organisation of large industrial unions, such as the N.U.R. I would ask those readers of THE WOMAN'S LEADER who profess Labour sympathies, to consider whether or no such a step as National Family Endowment would conduce to that working-class solidarity which, it is hoped, will eventually lift the entire wage-earning class far above that minimum subsistence level which social reformers have worked out with chemical precision. Meanwhile, let it always be remembered that the further such a subsistence level is left behind, the further does the wage-earner recede from an economic position in which inelasticity of family income spells destitution for the larger families.

R. S. V. P.

IS "EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK" PRACTICABLE WITHOUT THE ENDOWMENT OF FAMILIES?

By ELEANOR F. RATHBONE, J.P., C.C.

The proposition "that if men and women do the same work they ought to receive the same pay," seems at first sight so obviously just that most women accept it without question as a sort of truism. They would be quite right in doing so, if it were possible to regard wages merely as an arrangement between employer and employee, by which the former pays the latter the value of his services. But as the financial arrangements of Society are at present constituted, it is unfortunately impossible to regard wages solely from this point of view. The community is not entirely made up of persons whose services to it, whether as employers or employed, are remunerated in cash. Besides very nearly twenty and a quarter million persons of all ages over fourteen described as "occupied" in the last census, there were over twenty-five million persons described as "unoccupied," and these included, roughly speaking, twenty and three-quarter million wives and children. This vast horde has to be maintained somehow, and at present it is undeniable that the great majority of them are maintained out of the wages of men. It is not necessary for my purpose to discuss whether it is historically due partly to this fact that men's wages are on a higher level than women's.* However this may be, it is obvious that Society would have died out long ago if it had not somehow or other made provision for the rearing of fresh generations, and that the only way it has so far done this is through the wages of individual fathers. It may have made this provision unconsciously, and it has certainly made it clumsily, blunderingly, with a great deal of skimming in some places and unnecessary waste in others, but the fact remains that it is made. Wives and children continue to exist, and they exist on the wages of men.

Here we must make a distinction. Children are genuinely "non-producers" and "unoccupied," in the sense that they do not produce goods or perform services of economic value to the community. But the same is not true of wives, and every woman resents their inclusion in the census among "unoccupied persons." In producing children and in bearing and rearing them, they are performing a service essential to the very existence of the community. For this they receive no direct remuneration, but Society provides for them indirectly through their husbands' wages.

Thus the seemingly indisputable proposition, that if men and women do work of equal value, they ought, in justice, to receive equal pay, can be countered by the equally indisputable proposition, that if men have to provide out of their wages for a double set of services, their own services as wealth producers, and their wife's services as child producers and have in addition to pay for the maintenance of children, they ought in justice to be given extra money to do it with.

The reply generally given to this argument is that Society itself clearly does not recognise this double aspect of men's wages, since it pays the higher wage indifferently to the bachelor and the father of six children, and the lower wage indifferently to the spinster and the widowed mother. But it is always a mistake to argue as though Society was a rational animal which thought out its needs clearly and made its arrangements to meet them. Society, like the majority of individuals composing it, is a muddle-headed sort of creature, guided partly by its appetites, partly by instincts—good and bad, and only partly by reason. Further, as most of the reasoning that has guided it has been done by men and not by women, it has naturally concerned itself more with wages as a method of remunerating labour than as a method of providing for the upkeep of the race. But the latter aspect has not been wholly overlooked. Quickened by the experiences of the war, Society has begun to recognise that the problem of child supply concerns it quite as vitally as the problem of wheat supply, and that more adequate provision for it must be made. But being still under

* This question is fully discussed in my pamphlet on "The Problem of Women's Wages." (N.U.S.E.C., 4d.)

the dominion of the old ideas, the only way of doing this that has yet occurred to Society, is by paying what it calls "a living wage," and by interpreting this to mean in the case of men, a wage that will enable a man to keep a wife and children as well as himself. Only very gradually is it dawning on the thick wits of Society that this is an appallingly extravagant way of providing for the rearing of fresh generations, since it means in effect that in order to provide for the needs of the 49 per cent. of men who have one or more dependent children, a family wage must be paid to the 30 per cent. who are bachelors and to the 21 per cent. who are married but without dependent children.

Now consider the bearing of all this on the doctrine of "Equal Pay for Equal Work." To carry this into effect under present conditions would mean that in addition to paying a family wage to several million bachelors, we must also be prepared ultimately to pay a family wage to several million spinsters. This may be denied on the ground that only a small proportion of women wage-earners are engaged on the same jobs as men, and that it is only for these that "equal pay" is demanded. But this argument will not hold water. What is there so sacrosanct about "men's trades" that the women engaged in them should receive a higher level of remuneration than women engaged in work of equal skill and value in trades where only women are employed? Why, for example, should a first-class dressmaker or hospital nurse receive a wage based on individual subsistence, while a first-class tailoress or elementary school teacher receives a wage based on family subsistence? If we are to get rid of the idea that wages should be influenced by sex, let us do it thoroughly and have one basic minimum for all workers.

Consider what this would mean in a single profession. In elementary teaching about four-fifths of the teachers are women and one-fifth men. Thus of ten teachers, eight are women, one is a bachelor, and one a man with a family to support. On the equal pay system, if Society wants to provide for the one man who has a family, it must pay a family wage to the nine teachers who have none. Very good: but can Society afford it? The reader who considers the present facts of the nation's economic and industrial position can answer the question for herself. Do not all these facts point to the conclusion that the way to achieve "equal pay for equal work" is not by adding extravagance to extravagance, injustice to injustice, by overpaying spinsters in the same proportion that we are now overpaying bachelors, but by a readjustment of the whole wages system, so as to bring it into a real relation with human needs? If children were provided for by "Family Endowment," either on a national basis, or as in the Australian scheme out of a pool formed by *per capita* contributions from employers according to the number of their employees, then and only then would it become possible to pay workers according to their merits without regard to sex or family responsibilities.

Meantime, there is something to my mind not only illogical but repulsively disingenuous about the position of those feminists who at one moment extol in high-flown phrases the sanctity of family life, the services of the mother to the race, and the value of children, and the next moment, brush contemptuously aside the whole question of the economic provision for mothers and children, and are content to let them be treated as the mere appendages of men, to be paid for out of the pocket money of those men who choose to indulge in so expensive a luxury, while other men and women are to be free to spend the same pocket money on football, or dress, or "a trip to lovely Lucerne." This is not true feminism but a travesty of it.

The reader interested in the economics of the question is recommended to the following books:—Bowley's "Livelihood and Poverty," 3s. 6d. "The Distribution of the Product of Industry," Clarendon Press, 2s. 6d. "Equal Pay and the Family," N.U.S.E.C., 1s. "The Remuneration of Women's Services," chapter by E. F. R. in "The Making of Women," "Family Endowment," N.U.S.E.C., 2d.

THE DIARY OF A WOMAN IN THE HOME.

16, Plane Tree Road, G—.
February 23rd, 1921.

The other day a letter reached me from one who has made her home for twenty-two years in the streets of Whitechapel, and who writes of "lovely, darling little lives fading and slipping back from this war-craze for gold." She invites me to a conference in London in March (which is, alas! impossible for me), feeling that women who are spending most of their time in caring for children in the home are wanted to join the experts and idealists in discussing problems of faith and politics. The letter has set me thinking.

Children are the visible link between the world of individual pre-occupations and personal relations in which many women live, and the world of politics that some of us have striven so hard to enter. Not even an opportunist can deny that the business of politics is more concerned with the future than any other of the higher professions. The scientific observer deals with facts as they are, that is, with the present; the historian thinks of the past; the philosopher tries to see through past, present, and future into the Is and the Was and the Ever-shall-be; but the politician has to make the future, and it is on the future (though perhaps sometimes only his own future) that his eyes are fixed. And children are the future in the present. They will not only have to live in the world that the politicians are fashioning, but they will themselves make up that world. When one thinks of this, it seems surprising that the average political leader does not pay more attention to the children that actually exist.

It is hardly less surprising, however, that many women in the home still pay so little attention to politics. It was not difficult to understand when we had no votes—but now! I suppose that even now, it is our feeling of helplessness in the face of coupon elections, party machinations, and a commercialised Press that makes us so reluctant to give our minds to public affairs. Or perhaps it is that we don't feel we have much mind left after fulfilling our immediate tasks, and the little that is left is often wanted for some aspect of "personal relations." But it is all very wrong. It is quite clear that the respective indifference and thoughtlessness of the politician and the woman in the home act and react on one another, and it is the future in its concrete expression, the child, that suffers.

That suffering is all too plainly written on the faces of many of the children we see. G— is a healthy place, especially for children and, in the residential district in which we live, one does not meet many very poor children; but even here I often feel sharp pricks of pain at the appearance of little ones I come across, and when I used to go about a good deal in London I hardly got through a day without a pang. There are some little faces one never can forget. I should notice even more now. Those who live constantly with children get into the habit of observing their faces as sportsmen observe the points of horses or countrymen the signs of the weather. I am afraid that to many working mothers this sharpened faculty brings only pain. They see the harm that is happening and cannot stop it. Others, and this makes one still more sad, get so used to a low physical condition in their children that they accept it as inevitable. Some are, however, able not only to gain knowledge from their babies, but to use it for them. Middle-class mothers can and do, do this all the time. The puzzle is why more of them do not use the gift of knowledge received from their own children, in their own homes, in observing the world outside and trying to improve it. They are tied, of course, by their own tasks; but, whatever may be the case with working-class women, middle-class women are not as a rule, very closely tied for more than a period of their lives. If only more of them would look at other people's children, with the same eyes with which they look at their own, surely we should have stronger movements for family endowment, for better housing, and for more education? If things were as they should be, the candidates in the by-elections now going on would know that it was on those subjects, and those subjects

only, that they could unite, what the newspapers are pleased to call "that mysterious factor, the Woman's Vote." As it is the one political cry to which it is thought that women voters are certain to rally is the cry for economy.

There are certainly moments when one feels that one would do anything, or permit anything, to mitigate those terrible demands for payment from the tax collector and the borough council that make one cold with fear when they come in. But when one has recovered from one's private panic sufficiently to scrutinise the proposals for economy made by politicians, one cannot help being struck with the fact that so many of them begin with education. It is said that well-known commercial firms are preparing to economise by shutting down the continuation schools for their employees which, only the other day, they were organising with great pomp. In the same way the political advocates of economy are too, too apt to want to begin their cutting down by cutting bits out of the operation of that none too large measure, Mr. Fisher's Education Act. It is true, of course, that it is very difficult to know where to begin one's economies, or, for that matter where to go on and where to end. We are most of us experiencing that acutely in our private lives. There are the things that really cost a lot of money, and that we think we would gladly do without, but which seem fastened upon us by what we have done in the past. Then there are the things that we want so much in the present that we feel we cannot possibly do without them whatever happens. Then there are things which we don't want so very much, but which we know in our hearts we need, or that our children will need in the future, and then—and then there is very little left. "Can we retrench?" said Miss Austen's Sir Walter Elliot to his daughter Elizabeth, "does it occur to you that there is any one article in which we can retrench?" Elizabeth, "in the first ardour of female alarm, set seriously to think what could be done, and finally proposed these two branches of economy—to cut off some unnecessary charities, and to refrain from new-furnishing the drawing-room; to which expedients she afterwards added the happy thought of taking no present down to Anne, as had been their usual yearly custom." How many of us have lately been driven to cutting off unnecessary (or necessary) charities, and "taking no present down to Anne"! The Government, too, has done something of the kind—a good many women clerks have been dismissed. But it finds, as we have found, and as the Elliots found, that it is not enough, and Ministers appear quite as incapable as were Sir Walter and Elizabeth "of devising any means of lessening their expenses without compromising their dignity, or relinquishing their comforts in a way not to be borne." There are the things they really want like—would it be wicked to say?—the support of profiteers, and the things that are fastened upon them like armaments and the things they don't so much want, but which the nation really needs like education. I hope—but almost against hope—that they will not begin with the last. And so little can be saved on it! If it were armaments now! I do not feel very courageous about immediate and total disarmament, I confess, but when one considers what has been, and is being, spent on weapons of destruction compared with what is spent on education, one feels inclined to exclaim, with Prince Hal, over Falstaff's hotel bill, "O monstrous! but one halfpenny-worth of bread to this intolerable deal of sack!" It is bread of life, too, that we are economising!

Well, I have strayed a long way from what I began by thinking about—the wrongness of the woman in the home not taking an interest in politics. Instead of checking my Army and Navy Stores book, I will read the *Times'* report of the Allies Conference and the debate on Ireland. I must make haste if I am to get through it all before the children come home from school.

MARGARET CLARE.

[Readers whose interest has been aroused by the articles on this page have sent us suggestions for books and authors suitable for children. "Four Sea Urchins," "Two from Town," "Princess Lily-of-the-Valley," by Theodora Mills; "The Garden of Childhood," "The Pansy Patch," "The Magic Garden," by Miss Alice Chesterton; "Rhonda's Holiday," "Miss Netherby's Niece," "Christa's Adventure," published by Messrs. Nelson; "Mr. Rutherford's Children," (by the author of the "Wide Wide World,") and "Sybil and Chryssa" are among the suggestions offered.—Ed., W.L.]

REVIEWS.

MR. ARTHUR RANSOME'S REVISED VIEWS.

BY MRS. PHILIP SNOWDEN.

The Crisis in Russia. By Arthur Ransome. (Allen & Unwin. 5s.)

Mr. Arthur Ransome did more than any other English writer in the early days of the Second Russian Revolution to popularise the Bolsheviks in this country. His emotional temperament was captured by the glamour of this great world event. He brought to the examination of the Revolution no equipment of political knowledge or critical faculty. His previous acquaintance with the Russian people had developed a warm affection for them, which everybody who is brought into close association with them feels for their many admirable qualities.

His latest book, "The Crisis in Russia," is a very different work from the one he published two years ago, entitled "Six Weeks in Russia." It is not unjust to him to assume that he wrote the former book for the purpose of giving to English readers a favourable impression of the Bolsheviks to counteract the widespread, and often unfair, campaign against them which, at that time, was raging furiously throughout Europe and America.

During the last two years Mr. Ransome has apparently devoted much time to the study of political and economic questions, and the result is that his latest book is much more critical in its character and much more judicial in its conclusions. He now regards the Russian Revolution, not as it appeared to be in its early stages as a struggle between the revolutionary and non-revolutionary countries, but as an effort to recover from the economic disaster which the war had brought upon Russia.

The problem which the Russian Bolsheviks are endeavouring to solve is that with which all other European countries are faced, namely, to restore as quickly as possible the import and export of raw materials and manufactured goods. "The victory or defeat in this struggle in Russia, or anywhere else on the world's surface, is victory or defeat for everyone." The purpose of Mr. Ransome's book is to make that fact clear.

The dogmas of a few extremists have obscured the real character of the Russian Revolution. They have found their opportunity for propaganda in the collapse of industry. But with the restoration of trade and the satisfaction of hunger, these fanatical extremists will find that their opportunities for exciting the masses to a conflict at the barricades have disappeared.

The crisis in Russia is part of the crisis in Europe, and has been in the main brought about, like the Revolution itself, by the same forces. That is the truth that Mr. Ransome has set himself to demonstrate in his latest book. Faced by the collapse of industry and the means of transport, driven to use desperate means to deal with a desperate situation, the Russian Revolutionary Government has been compelled to adopt methods unsuitable for normal conditions, but necessary for a revolutionary period, just as in Great Britain during the war restrictions of personal freedom were imposed under the stern necessity of a grave national crisis. There have been in Russia excesses in the use of these revolutionary powers corresponding with the more serious internal and external situations.

Mr. Ransome's interpretation of the Russian Revolution as a form of the struggle in which the non-revolutionary Governments are also engaged is interesting and penetrating, because, if this interpretation be accepted, it exposes the folly of the Allied countries fighting Russia when both are menaced by the same enemy, namely, the complete collapse of their industrial and economic life.

I think Mr. Ransome is right in this interpretation of the Russian crisis. He is undoubtedly right in maintaining that the urgency of the economic crisis has driven political questions into the background. People have little time or disposition to bother about forms of government when they are starving. Their main concern in such circumstances is to get food and clothing. In the early days of the Bolshevik Revolution the extremists were no doubt more concerned about applying their dogmas and theories than about the economic reconstruction of the country. This led to disastrous experiments which made the economic condition of the country worse and postponed the commencement of reconstruction.

Some of these extremists have not yet been disillusioned, and are prepared to sacrifice the people of Russia to a further period of privation and misery, rather than abandon impractical experi-

ments of a dogmatic character. But the wiser among the Communists have realised that they can save the political Revolution only by compromising on matters of industrial and economic organisation. The disastrous experiment of workers' control has been abandoned, and to secure some measure of industrial efficiency, individual control by experts has been re-established. In other words, as Mr. Ransome so persistently emphasises, the Bolshevik Government in the main is now sacrificing theory to expediency and necessity.

Only by such a policy as this could the Bolsheviks maintain any semblance of authority. With this view of the situation I heartily concur as the result of my own investigations in Russia. The Russian people have endured so much during the last three years that they have come to acquiesce in a system of government which is autocratic and tyrannical because they fear that a further general upheaval might be followed by the complete and irretrievable breakdown of what remains of an industrial and economic system.

A further reason which has helped the Bolsheviks to maintain their tyrannical system of government is that it corresponds in so many respects with the old régime to which the population were accustomed.

Mr. Ransome confirms all that has been said and written about the undemocratic character of the "dictatorship of the proletariat," though he excuses or justifies this by the exceptional conditions of a revolutionary period and the urgent necessity of restoring some measure of economic prosperity. No critic of Bolshevism, so far as I know, has ever maintained that the normal conditions of democratic government are fully applicable to such a condition as Russia is in to-day. My criticism of Bolshevism and Bolshevik methods has been rather a refutation of those supporters of Bolshevism who have claimed for its methods and achievements something which is in advance of, and preferable to, the system of democratic government. Mr. Ransome emphatically confirms my own contention that there is neither democratic government nor industrial liberty in Russia to-day. The country is under the dictatorship of a committee of five persons, though some concession is made to the form of popular government by the nominal existence of representative bodies which, as Mr. Ransome points out, have no effective authority or influence whatever.

The main purpose of Mr. Ransome's book, however, is to discuss the possibilities of reconstructing the industrial and economic life of Russia. Two important chapters of the book deal with the appalling shortage of material and the shortage and inefficiency of labour. This condition cannot be attributed wholly to Allied policy towards Russia, though this undoubtedly has hindered the efforts of the Communists to restore the transport system and to start the factories. It is, in the main, due to the fact that Russia is not, and never could be, wholly independent of other countries for manufactured goods.

There are still two schools of policy among the Russian Communists, the smaller section still believing in the imminence of the world revolution which, when it comes, will reduce the other capitalist countries of the world for some years to a state of industrial stagnation. Holding this belief, they do not look to the Western Powers to help Russia towards economic reconstruction. The other, and much more numerous section, has been disillusioned, and has now abandoned the hope of an early collapse of Western capitalism through revolution. Russia, therefore, must seek the assistance of these countries in her efforts to restore her industry. They are not unwilling to associate with Western capitalism, if by association they can gain help for the restoration of Russia's economic life.

Mr. Ransome's book, though it does not, perhaps, throw much new light upon the Russian situation, brings into prominence the essential features of the crisis. It is, in fact, a plea to the Western Powers to come to the assistance of Russia in her pitiable situation. There is not, he rightly maintains, any prospect of an improvement of conditions in Russia except by trade with the Western Powers. The restoration of Russia's industrial and economic life is a task beyond the capacity of her Government, but he asks for help for Russia now, not merely in the interests of Russia, but because if we indefinitely postpone the time when that help is given, it may be too late.

The Theory and Practice of Bolshevism. By Bertrand Russell. (George Allen & Unwin. 6s.)

"Then said they unto him, 'say now Shibboleth,' and he said 'Shibboleth,' for he could not frame to pronounce it right—so they took him and slew him. . . ." So runs the sacred story, and there is also a profane fairy tale about a certain king whose courtiers were each louder than the other in admiration of his beautiful and kingly raiment, till one spoke the ugly, naked truth. "He has no clothes on at all." These things are written for our learning. They speak for themselves, and we will pass to the matter in hand—Mr. Russell on Bolshevism. The book is remarkable because it is written by a convinced communist who yet loves truth and freedom and fellowship more than he loves communism. He has not forgotten that he was a man of science before he was a communist. He says, "Almost all the progress in the world from the earliest times is attributable to science and the scientific temple; almost all the major ills are attributable to religion." And mark, "Bolshevism as a social phenomenon is to be reckoned as a religion." Mrs. Snowden, though intellectually far less in accord with the theory of communism than Mr. Russell, yet, having the religious temperament, displays a more genial human sympathy with the Bolsheviks than Mr. Russell. Her "Through Bolshevik Russia," already reveive in these columns, is the necessary complement of Mr. Russell's "Practice and Theory of Bolshevism." Both utterly condemn the methods of the present Bolshevik Government, from standpoints similar and yet most interestingly different.

Mr. Russell's book abounds in those vivid phrases and characterisations which derive from a truly Gallic realism in description, for he is free from the mistiness of affectionate sentiment. This sort of thing is clear cut enough. "One of the first things I discovered after passing the Red Flag which marks the frontier of Soviet Russia amid a desolate region of marsh, pine wood and barbed wire entanglements, was the profound difference between the theories of actual Bolsheviks and the version of those theories current among advanced socialists in this country." Friends of Russia here think of the dictatorship of the proletariat as merely a new form of representative government, in which only working

men and women have votes, and the constituencies are partly occupational, not geographical. They think that "proletariat" means "proletariat," but "dictatorship" does not quite mean "dictatorship." This is the opposite of the truth, and further, "a great part of the despotism which characterises the Bolsheviks belongs to the essence of their philosophy." Extreme pacifists who sentimentally coquette with a force which it is charitable to suppose they do not understand, should ponder the following passage: "The universal class war foreshadowed by the Third International, following upon the loosening of restraints produced by the late war, and combined with a deliberate inculcation of disrespect for law and constitutional government, might, and, I believe would, produce a state of affairs in which it would be habitual to murder men for a crust of bread, and in which women would only be safe while armed men protected them," and this, from an official Bolshevik resolution: "The ninth Congress approves . . . compulsory labour service, militarisation of production, and the application of military detachments to economic needs!" Mr. Russell, on Lenin, leaves us with few illusions—us old-fashioned ones who still mulishly adore freedom. "He (Lenin) has as little love of liberty as the Christians who suffered under Diocletian and retaliated when they acquired power."

We have dwelt much upon Mr. Russell's criticisms of the Bolshevik system, because we believe that the main purpose of his book is critical. He does not ignore the good, he recognises that care has been shown for art and for education, he describes with enthusiasm the rugged impressiveness of a great pageant of the "World Commune," a mystery play designed by the High Priests of the Communist faith to instruct the people, he declares that "even under present conditions in Russia, it is possible still to feel the inspiration of the essential spirit of Communism," but—he pricks the bubble of that fantastic illusion of many thousands of socialists and communists throughout the world, that the path to a World Commonwealth is broad and smooth, and that the Russians, as they travel along it, do well in beckoning all to follow, on pain of damnation.

A. HELEN WARD.

DRAMA.

"The Wonderful Visit" at the St. Martin's.

Mr. Wells has established himself on such a high pinnacle in English literature—more especially by that great book, "The Outline of History"—has he proved himself a powerful moral influence—that one went to the St. Martin's Theatre in the pleasurable anticipation of seeing a play full of noble idealism and original thought. The fact that Mr. St. John Ervine had collaborated in the dramatising of Mr. Wells's novel, and that Mr. Basil Dean was the producer, served to make assurance doubly sure that "The Wonderful Visit" would prove an intellectual treat, as well as a moral stimulant. Alas! one was doomed to disappointment.

There is much that is beautiful, and some of the writing is clever, especially in the second act. There is, however, an air of unreality about the play—quite apart from the dream atmosphere, which is never consistently sustained—a striving and straining for effect, an artificiality which deprives it of any possible genuine appeal, and perplexes one with a haunting feeling that the authors and producer have missed a golden opportunity.

Partly this is due to the play, partly to the acting, but undoubtedly the general effect of artificiality is largely contributed to by the method of production. The tableaux at the end of each act are unforgivable. The angel posturing in a bush of rhododendrons, the angel kneeling in prayer to the piping of the *Vox Angelica*, the angel standing against the war memorial, holding out his arms so as to cast the shadow of the cross across a darkening sky, while toy fireworks are intended to give the impression of shooting stars—these things offend the taste and are the negation of Art.

The play itself centres round the household of a kindly vicar. In the charity of his heart he has given shelter to a village girl (Delia) and her war-baby, and in so doing has offended the narrow-minded conventionalities of his

housekeeper, and raised all the unrighteous indignation of the curate's wife, who, in the first act, concentrates all the venom of an uncharitable nature upon the effort to force the vicar to turn Delia out of his home, where she is acting as housemaid. To the vicar, in his dilemma, comes a dream, and we are introduced to the "Visitor" in the person of the Angel—the conventional lodging-house-text Angel, with tinted wings, and clad in garments of shimmering cotton-wool. The idea, although not new, contains infinite possibilities, and if the authors had introduced more incidents to enable them to contrast the divine attitude of mind and spirit with the selfish and intolerant motives of humanity, the result would have been a much stronger and more appealing play. The Angel of the play is a sentimental posturing angel, who, in contact with the prejudices and conventionalities of a selfish world, loses his divinity, learns to hate, and finally is required to make the supreme sacrifice before he can recover his divinity.

The part of Delia was acted by Miss Moyna Macgill, with true pathos and quiet emotion, and the difficult scene at the foot of the war memorial, which, in less able hands, would tend to sink into sheer sentimentality, proved her an emotional actress of great ability. Miss Compton, as Lady Hammergallow, one of the "old aristocracy," was restrained and natural, and contrasted refreshingly with some of the other actors, whose exaggerated, grotesque, and marionette-like movements reduced parts of the play to the level of a farce, and which in no wise gave the dream atmosphere which the authors had evidently intended to create.

Mr. J. H. Roberts was excellent as the Vicar, whose Christianity is a real and live thing. Mr. Harold French, as the Angel, has a difficult task, but his articulation was exasperatingly precise, and his gestures were too studied and unnatural, even for a celestial being. In the last act he acted with sincerity and dignity.

CORRESPONDENCE AND REPORTS.

ENGLAND'S TRAGEDY.

MADAM,—May I suggest to your correspondent Gertrude M. Johnston that the alternatives in Ireland are not between the Legislative Union and some measure of self-government, but between the proposals of the Government of Ireland Act and—for southern Ireland—Crown Colony government? It is to my mind important that this fact should be realised. Unless the elections for the Southern Parliament can be held, that section of the country will be governed by a Legislative Assembly consisting of members of the Privy Council of Ireland with additional members nominated by the Crown. If any elections are conducted, those returned in such elections will be *ipso facto* members of this Assembly, subject to the qualification *re* membership of the Privy Council.

DORA MELLONE.

CO-ORDINATING AGENCIES.

MADAM,—Your remarks on the "agency of co-ordinating co-ordinating agencies" fill me with such sympathy that I hasten to send a comment.

I once mislaid a letter asking me to serve on some committee, and could not remember what it was. I asked my secretary if she had any recollection of it. "Oh, yes," she replied, cheerfully, "it was one of those committees for coagulating all the others."

Have I not a pearl among secretaries?

A. MAUDE ROYDEN.

A TIMEWORN MISQUOTATION.

MADAM,—As a regular reader of your paper, I was surprised to see in the article on the King's speech in the issue of February 18th, to use your own phrase, a "timeworn" misquotation of the Church Catechism; that excellent document gives no ground for your sneer.

The child, rich or poor, is taught therein to believe that there is such a thing as "duty" which has to be done, irksome or otherwise, "in that state of life, unto which it shall please God to call me," not, as you misquote, "has" pleased God to call me. You may say "no quotation was intended." Then why use well-known words altering their meaning, and so creating prejudice?

JANE E. HEYWOOD.

J.P., Co. Lancaster.

THE INSTITUTION OF MARRIAGE.

MADAM,—G. Bailey in his, or her, fine spirited article on marriage says that a woman can discover "in most men the old lingering feeling, often subconscious, that women are taboo, in some sense unclean."

One has been led to believe that the opposite is the case, that—with the exception of prostitutes, who are thought to belong to a different species—most men believe that women are, and ought to be, purer than themselves. Certainly this latter idea penetrates through the whole history of art and literature.

If G. Bailey is right, it is at least equally true that a great many women consider men as much more animal than themselves, that many unmarried women think of the sexual side of men with loathing, and that the attitude of not a few wives towards it is, at best, one of patient, or pitying, distaste.

One wonders to what extent these mutual aversions are instinctive and to what extent due to a faulty preparation for the married state; also, short of changing human nature, what can be done to combat them in the best interests of marriage; for it is certain that marriage is the normal human state, and ought to be at least as carefully prepared for as work, business, or the professions.

G. Bailey writes eloquently, even beautifully, of the idea of permanence that belongs, or ought to belong, to the married state. But why is he afraid of divorce to meet the hard cases? If people are prevented from leaving their homes only by locked doors, what beauty of morality is there in such permanence? Surely indissoluble marriage is anti-social, very cruel to incompatible couples, and perhaps crueler still to their children, whose whole lives are often warped by dissension between their parents. Only last week I overheard the following bit of conversation in a train. The speaker was a kind-hearted, wistful-eyed Englishman of more than fifty: "No, I'm not married—never felt like risking it. My father and mother were a proper misfit. It spoilt my childhood; I can't bear to think about it. Both me and my brother ran away from home before we were twelve. Never went back! Never wanted to!"

In conclusion, may I express the hope that, you will not be bullied into allowing your stimulating pages to become "stuffy" by correspondents who write about "disgusting articles" when referring to sober, objective criticisms of modern tendencies, nor others who object to the reviewing of plays unsuitable for drawing-room charades. THE WOMAN'S LEADER is not a parish magazine, and will never lead modern women if it is afraid to face the forces which are making or undoing our world of to-day.

E. WATSON.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED HUSBAND'S BROTHER.

MADAM,—I have read with interest the letters and articles which have recently appeared in THE WOMAN'S LEADER with regard to the need for the introduction of a measure sanctioning the marriage of a woman with her deceased husband's brother. There must be in this country many who, like myself, though not directly penalised in this way, have suffered vicariously on behalf of friends or relatives who have found themselves thus debarred from becoming united to those to whom they have given

their affections, and to many of us it seems the height of folly and iniquity that legal sanction is so long withheld.

The principle has already been admitted, and the way made easy by the passage of the Deceased Wife's Sister Act, and I believe that it is widely considered that few would offer any real opposition to the passing of legislation to remedy this intolerable situation.

It is true that there is a great deal of important and necessary work waiting the attention of the Government; nevertheless, there is no real reason why the introduction of the bill should be further delayed. It may so reasonably be expected that no great opposition will develop that it is not unduly optimistic to say that the passage of the bill should not occupy a great deal of Parliamentary attention, and the time devoted to it will be well spent if it succeeds in removing the disgraceful anomaly which exists at present, which makes marriage with a deceased wife's sister right and lawful, but fails to extend the same protection to the woman whose husband has died (in many cases in defence of his country), and who has formed a natural attachment to the brother who resembles him.

It is easy to see that this piece of domestic legislation will be neglected until the demand for it becomes so clamorous that it can no longer be overlooked. The introduction of legislation is largely governed to-day by the volume of the outcry in its favour, and it is therefore incumbent on all who are directly or indirectly interested in the passage of such a bill to make their desires so plainly heard that the echo may reach the precincts of St. Stephen's and prevent the Government from turning a deaf ear much longer.

A SYMPATHISER.

A WOMEN'S CORPS FOR THE TERRITORIALS.

MADAM,—The recent recruiting meeting at the Guildhall makes me wonder why steps have not been taken to popularise the Force by giving women an official share in the domestic work of the camps. There are thousands of Ex-Service women who would gladly do the cooking and waiting for the various units; the men in training would know that such an arrangement would ensure their better feeding, and the Army Council should know that the better feeding would be done at less cost, or at any rate with less waste.

To supply such women *personnel* to the units at once raises the number available for pure military training, and has the far greater advantage of the spiritual good that will accrue by the avoidance of the segregation of one sex for a more or less holiday period.

The Army Council has power to take such action, as this year's Army Estimate (1920-21) allows for the provision of a Women's Corps, and should their needs lead to the contemplation of such a corps, I strongly urge that it is formulated on the scheme of the earlier Women's Corps, known as the Women's Legion.

The later policy was inconclusive and illogical, and substituted for a fine high spiritual standard of obedience to regulations, a half-hearted, semi-military mechanical obedience, which killed all the joy the women felt in their rendered service.

HESTER M. EDWARDS.

CATHOLIC W.S.S.

The annual meeting of the Catholic Women's Suffrage Society was held at the Minerva Cafe, 144, High Holborn, on Saturday, February 19th, Miss Kathleen FitzGerald, B.A., in the chair. Miss F. de G. Merrifield, in moving the adoption of the report, congratulated the Society on having become affiliated to the International Woman Suffrage Alliance. She referred to Mrs. Chapman Catt's message to the C.W.S.S., in which she said that she "was convinced that the great work of the Society lay ahead. The C.W.S.S. must go on until women were enfranchised the world over. There was work to be done that only Catholics could do, and other women looked to them to do it. The world needed the C.W.S.S.; they must not tire, but go on. She knew they could be trusted to do their duty."

A discussion took place on the question of women jurors. Miss Bevan, one of the jurors in the famous Allen *versus* Allen case, gave an account of her experiences, and expressed her firm conviction that it was in the public interest that women should serve on juries.

The following resolution was put to the meeting and carried unanimously: "In view of the motions proposed by Mr. G. Terrell, M.P., to make service by women on juries optional, and of Sir Ernest Wild, K.C., M.P., to submit the matter to a referendum of women, this meeting of the Catholic Women's Suffrage Society reaffirms its conviction that women must shoulder their responsibility as citizens in this matter as in others in the interests of the community and of justice."

MARRIED WOMEN AND THE POOR LAW.

At a meeting of the Oxford Citizens' Association held on February 25th at the Assembly Room, Town Hall, Oxford, the Warden of Wadham College in the chair, Mrs. J. L. Stocks proposed the following resolution:—

"That every candidate for the office of Poor Law Guardian for either the Headington or Oxford Unions be asked whether he or she is in favour of necessary poor law relief to women, whether married or unmarried, who are necessitous but not in the ordinary sense of the word destitute."

This was seconded by Mr. J. Theodore Dodd. As, however, the required notice of the motion had not been given it could not be discussed; but it was arranged that the subject should be brought before the Executive of the Association.

NATIONAL UNION OF SOCIETIES FOR EQUAL CITIZENSHIP.

President: MISS ELEANOR F. RATHBONE.
Hon. Secretaries: Miss Macadam. Miss Rosamond Smith. Parliamentary and Information Bureau Secretary:
Acting Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Soddy. General Secretary: Miss Stack. Mrs. Hubback.
Offices: Evelyn House, 62, Oxford Street, London, W. 1.
Telegraphic Address: Voiceless, Westcent, London. Telephone: Museum 6910.

ANNUAL COUNCIL MEETING.

INVITATION TO VISITORS.—Readers of this page are reminded that visitors are welcomed to the Council meetings (tickets rs.). Regular attendance at these meetings should prove to be of educational value to women who desire more intimate knowledge of the work in Parliament and elsewhere, with regard to the reforms on our programme. There will be lively discussions on such subjects as the interpretation of "Equal Pay for Equal Work," "National Family Endowment," the proposed national procession in support of the League of Nations. Reports will be presented on the actual position with regard to our N.U.S.E.C. Guardianship, Custody and Maintenance of Children Bill (which is to come up for its second reading on May 6th), as well as other bills which we have promoted but which are in a less hopeful position: Equal Franchise Bill, Widows' Pensions Bill, Women Jurors, Children of Unmarried Parents, &c.

BY-ELECTIONS AND EQUAL FRANCHISE.

By-election work concentrating especially on equal franchise has been started in connection with two of the present by-elections. Miss Deakin, a member of our Executive Committee, and Mrs. Lucan-Davies, a former organiser, are at work in Woolwich, and Miss Knight, our organiser of the Scottish Federation, is organising a campaign in the seven burghs which compose the constituency of Kirkcaldy.

ELECTION OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Election addresses (received too late to appear with others in last week's issue).—As regards Equal Pay for Equal Work, the point on the N.U.S.E.C. programme round which controversy centres, I believe that the Union should press for this reform wherever Parliamentary action can help to bring it about (as in the Civil Service), and should devote much energy to propaganda and education on the subject in the constituencies. I think this should be done, whether Family Endowment is placed on the immediate programme or not, because the present conditions lead to the under-paying of women, the under-cutting of men, and the employment of women because they are cheap (whether they are suitable or not), which is bad for the work, the workers, and the nation.

As regards the general tendency gradually to widen the objects of the Union, I am inclined to think that we are perhaps getting to a point when more concentration on certain points may be advisable. I consider Equal Franchise and Equal Pay for Equal Work the most important points on the programme.

(Signed) M. G. C. GAME.

CONFERENCE ON EQUAL FRANCHISE.

The Conference on Equal Franchise summoned by the N.U.S.E.C. to consider the best means of bringing pressure to bear on the Government to introduce an Equal Franchise Bill, met on February 17th. There was a good attendance of representatives from the following societies: Conservative Women's Reform Association, Catholic Women's Suffrage Society, Women's Freedom League, National Council of Women, Young Women's Christian Association, Women's International League, Federation of Women Civil Servants, Kensington S.E.C., Women's Co-operative Guild, Association of Women Clerks and Secretaries, N.U.S.E.C., London Society for Women's Service.

In the unavoidable absence of Miss Rathbone, Miss Macmillan occupied the Chair. After an interesting discussion as to the best methods of propaganda, the following resolutions were carried unanimously:—

"That since united action is necessary in order to bring effective pressure to bear on the Government, this Conference strongly urges the organisations here represented, both from their headquarters and from their branches

(a) To pass resolutions on Equal Franchise to send to the Government.

(b) To urge Members of Parliament to sign the Memorial to the Government, prepared by the N.U.S.E.C., demanding Equal Franchise."

"That this Conference urges all the Societies here represented which have organisers to earmark a certain amount of the time of their organisers, and ascertain the amount of their money, for special work for Equal Franchise."

"That it be a recommendation to the Executive Committee of the N.U.S.E.C. to take a hall at every by-election, and invite the candidates to express their opinion on Equal Franchise."

"That at any by-election a candidate declare himself not in favour of the Equal Franchise should be opposed by women's organisations."

Many of those present signed a Memorial to the Prime Minister similar to that sent to Members of Parliament, on behalf of their Societies.

LIST OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT WHO HAVE SIGNED THE EQUAL FRANCHISE MEMORIAL.

COALITION LIBERALS:—

Barrand, A. R. (Pudsey and Otley); Barnes, Major H. (Newcastle, E.); Bowyer, Capt. J. E. W. (Buckingham); Breese, Major C. E. (Carnarvon-shire); Casey, T. W. (Attercliffe); Cooze, Capt. C. (Isle of Ely); Cowan, Sir W. H. (Aberdeen, E.); Cowan, D. M. (Scottish Universities); Edwards, Major John (Aberavon); Edge, Capt. W. (Bolton); Farquharson, Major A. C. (N. Leeds); Filde, H. (Stockport); Gardiner, J. (Kinross and W. Perth); Hancock, Major J. C. (Belper); Johnstone, J. (Renfrew, E.); Kenyon, B. (Chesterfield); Mallison, F. W. (Colne Valley); Murray, J. (Leeds, W.); Morrison, R. (Battersea); Norman, Major Rt. Hon. Sir H. (Blackburn); Rendall, A. (Thornbury); Rodger, A. K. (Rutherglen); Robinson, S. (Brescon and Radnor); Scott, A. M. (Bridgeton); Watson, Capt. J. B. (Stockton-on-Tees); Williams, Sir Rhys (Banbury).

COALITION UNIONISTS:—

Astor, Viscountess (Sutton, Plymouth); Bellairs, Com. C. (Maidstone); Burn, Col. C. R. (Torquay); Clough, R. (Keighley); Chamberlain, N. (Ladywood); Churchman, Sir A. (Woodbridge); Cohen, J. (Brunel Fair-field, Liverpool); Colfox, Major (Dorset, N.); Davidson, Major J. H. (Rathmines); Davies, T. (Cirencester and Tewkesbury); Dockett, Sir M. (Rathmines); Elliott, Capt. W. E. (Lanark); Ford, P. J. (Edinburgh, N.); Foreman, H. (Hammersmith, N.); De Frece, Sir W. (Ashton-under-Lyne); Ganzoni, F. J. C. (Ipswich); Hills, Major J. W. (Durham); Hood, J. (Wimbledon); Hope, Col. Sir John (Midlothian and Peebles); Hudson, R. M. (Sunderland); Hunter, Gen. Sir A. (Lancaster); Kelley, Major F. (Rotherham); Knight, Capt. E. H. (Kidderminster); Lort-Williams, J. (Rotherhithe); Mosley, O. (Harrow); Newman, Sir R. (Exeter); Norris, Sir H. G. (Fulham, E.); Prescott, Major W. H. (Totterham, N.); Raper, A. B. (Islington, E.); Samuel, A. M. (Farnham); Scott, L. (Liverpool Exchange); Turton, E. R. (Thirsk and Malton); Ward-Jackson, C. L. A. (Leominster); Watson-Rutherford, Sir W. (Edge Hill); Wild, Sir E. (Upton); Wood, E. (Ripon).

NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY:—

Taylor, J. (Dumbarton).

INDEPENDENT LIBERALS:—

Acland, Rt. Hon. P. D. (Cambourne); Benn, Capt. Wedgwood (Leith); Bramson, Sir T. (Portsmouth, Central); Briant, F. (North Lambeth); Entwistle, Major (Kingston-on-Hull); Hogge, J. M. (Edinburgh, E.); Kenworthy, Lt.-Com. (Hull, Central); Kiley, J. D. (Whitechapel); Newbold, A. E. (Leyton, West); Raffan, P. W. (Leigh); Thomson, T. (Middlesbore, W.); Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton, E.); White, C. G. (West Derbyshire); Williams, A. (Consett); Winttingham, T. (Louth).

LABOUR PARTY.

Bell, J. (Ormskirk); Bowerman, Rt. Hon. C. W. (Deptford); Bromfield, W. (Leek); Brown, J. (Ayrshire, S.); Cairns, J. (Morpeth); Cape, T. (Wokington); Clynes, J. R. (Plating); Crooks, Rt. Hon. W. (Woolwich); Davies, Evan (Ebbw Vale); Davison, J. E. (Smethwick); Edwards, G. (Norfolk); Edwards, C. (Bedwely); Finney, S. (Burslem); Graham, D. M. (Hamilton); Graham, R. (Nelson and Colne); Graham, W. (Edinburgh, Central); Griffiths, T. (Pontypool); Grundy, T. W. (Rother Valley); Guest, J. (Hemsforth); Hall, F. (Normanton); Hallas, E. (Duddeston); Hayday, A. (Nottingham, W.); Hartsorn, V. (Ogmore); Henderson, Rt. Hon. A. (Widnes); Hirst, G. H. (Wentworth); Hodge, Rt. Hon. J. (Gorton); Irving, Dan (Burnley); Jones, J. J. (Silvertown); John, W. (West Rhondda); Lunn, W. (Rothwell); Lawson, J. J. (Chester-le-Street); Maclean, N. (Govan); Mills, J. E. (Dartford); Myers, T. (Spen Valley); O'Grady, J. (Leeds, S.E.); Parkinson, G. A. (Wigan); Richardson, R. (Houghton-le-Spring); Roberts, F. C. (West Bromwich); Rose, F. H. (Aberdeen, N.); Robertson, J. (Bothwell); Royce, W. S. (Holland-with-Boston); Shaw, T. (Preston); Short, A. (Wednesbury); Sitch, C. H. (Kingswinford); Smith, W. R. (Wellingborough); Spencer, C. A. (Brox-towe); Swan, J. E. (Barnard Castle); Tootill, R. (Bolton); Thomas, J. H. (Derby); Thomas, Will (Plaistow); Tillett, Ben (Salford, N.); Waterson, A. E. (Co-op., Kettering); Watts-Morgan, Major D. (Rhondda); Wilkie, A. (Dundee); Wignall, J. (Forest of Dean); Wilson, W. T. (West Houghton); Williams, J. (Gower); Young, R. (Newton).

OTHER COUNCIL EVENTS.

Latest News.

The Reception on Tuesday evening will be held at Bedford College, Regent's Park, by kind permission of Miss Tuke and the Council of the College. Cards of invitation will be issued immediately. If anyone is inadvertently omitted the Secretary will be grateful for a postcard with London address.

The day and hour of the Public Lunch at the Holborn Restaurant has been accidentally omitted from the Final Agenda—Wednesday, March 9th, 12.45 p.m. for 1 p.m. Applications for cards should be made as early as possible. Delegates 5s., other guests 7s. 6d.

COMING EVENTS.

INTERNATIONAL FRANCHISE CLUB.

MARCH 9.
9, Grafton Street, Piccadilly, W.
Speaker: Miss Picton-Turbervill, O.B.E.
Subject: "The Coming Clergywoman."
Chairman: Rev. W. Hudson-Shaw, M.A. 8.15 p.m.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS UNION.

The following meetings on League of Nations subjects will be held:—
MARCH 4.
At Shoreham, Church Room.
Speaker: Frederick Whelen, Esq. 8 p.m.

MARCH 5.
At Cumberland Villa, Highgate Road.
Speaker: Lady Gladstone. Afternoon.

MARCH 6.
At Norwich.
Speaker: Miss M. Currey, O.B.E.

MARCH 7.
At Glasgow.
Speaker: Mr. W. L. McKerrrow.

MARCH 8.
At Basingstoke, Town Hall.
Speaker: Silas K. Hocking. 7.30 p.m.

MARCH 9.
At Fulham, Wesleyan Church, Munster Park.
Speaker: Major-Gen. Sir F. Maurice. 8 p.m.

MARCH 10.
At Marlborough, Grammar School.
Speaker: J. H. Clynes, Esq. 8 p.m.

WOMEN'S NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO SECURE STATE PURCHASE AND CONTROL OF THE LIQUOR TRADE.
MARCH 7.
At Burdett Road, Congregational Church.
Subject: "Debate on Solution of Drink Problem."
Speaker: For State Purchase: Miss M. Cotterell. 8.30 p.m.

MARCH 8.
At Liverpool, Women's Co-operative Guild.
Subject: "State Purchase of the Liquor Trade."
Speaker: Mrs. Boyd Dawson. 3 p.m.

At Barking, Women's Labour Party.
Subject: "Public Ownership of Liquor Trade."
Speaker: Miss M. Cotterell. 5 p.m.

At Rainham, Public Meeting, Congregational Church.
Subject: "State Purchase as Solution of Drink Problem."
Speaker: Miss F. L. Carre. 7.30 p.m.

MARCH 9.
At Belvedere, Women's Co-operative Guild.
Subject: "State Purchase of the Liquor Trade."
Speaker: Miss F. L. Carre. 2.30 p.m.

MARCH 10.
At Penmaenmawr, Society for Equal Citizenship.
Subject: "State Purchase of the Liquor Trade."
Speaker: Mrs. Boyd Dawson. 7.30 p.m.

At Rugby, Women Citizens' Association.
Subject: "State Purchase of the Liquor Trade."
Speaker: Miss F. L. Carre. 8 p.m.

At Enfield, Women's Co-operative Guild.
Subject: "The Carlisle Experiment in State Purchase."
Speaker: Miss M. Cotterell. 3 p.m.

BRIGHTON & HOVE UNION FOR WOMEN'S LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND EQUAL CITIZENSHIP.
MARCH 7.
At the Y.M.C.A. Hall, Old Steine.
Subject: "Alcohol and its Relation to Social Problems."
Speaker: Dr. Mary Scharlieb, M.B.E.
Chair: The Mayoress of Brighton. 3.15 p.m.

IRISH WOMEN CITIZENS' AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION.
MARCH 16.
In the Gregg Memorial Hall, Dawson Street, Dublin.
Subject: "The Future of the Woman's Movement."
Speaker: Miss E. F. Rathbone, J.P., C.C.
Chair: Lady Dockett, J.P., U.D.G., C.C. 5 p.m.

YORKSHIRE COUNCIL FOR EQUAL CITIZENSHIP.
MARCH 4.
At 18, Park Row, Leeds.
Members' Meeting. 5 p.m.

NATIONAL UNION OF SOCIETIES FOR EQUAL CITIZENSHIP.
MARCH 8, 9 & 10.
Annual Council Meeting. 10.30 a.m.—5 p.m.

THE LADY CHICHESTER HOSPITAL, HOVE.
MARCH 11.
At 11, Cheyne Walk, Chelsea, by kind permission of Lady Scott Moncrieff,
a Drawing-Room Meeting will be held at 3.30
Speakers: The Countess of Chichester, Dr. Mary Scharlieb, Dr. Helen Boyle.
Chair: Lady Emmott.

N.B.—An article on this important and unique Hospital for the nervous diseases of women and children will appear in our issue of March 11th.

ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN CLERKS AND SECRETARIES.
MARCH 4.
At the Central Hall, Westminster,
Mass Meeting.
Speakers: Mrs. Oliver Strachey, J. E. Mills, M.P.
Chair: Miss Evans. 6.30 p.m.

WOMEN'S FREEDOM LEAGUE.
MARCH 7.
At the Minerva Cafe, 144, High Holborn.
Subject: "Women in the Professions."
Speaker: Miss Normanton, B.A.
Chair: Mrs. Mustard. 7 p.m.

MARCH 9.
Subject: "Are Women Menkes Minded?"
Speaker: Mrs. Florence Daniel.
Chair: Mrs. Lucas. 3 p.m.

A CORRECTION.

Through a very regrettable error, the title of Mrs. Stocks' article was wrongly printed last week. It should have been The Rate for the Job.

SUPPORT OUR ADVERTISERS and mention THE WOMAN'S LEADER when ordering goods.

DELICIOUS FRENCH COFFEE

RED WHITE & BLUE

For Breakfast & after Dinner
In making, use LESS QUANTITY it being much stronger than ORDINARY COFFEE

ANNOUNCEMENTS.

THE URGENT NEED TO-DAY: CONVINCING WOMEN SPEAKERS.

THE WOMEN'S LECTURE SOCIETY will hold Lecture Courses on NATIONAL PROBLEMS, by Able Women Graduates. For particulars write Secretary, W. L. S., 34, Maiden Lane, Strand, W.C.

KENSINGTON TOWN HALL.—Fellowship Services. 6.30, Miss Cicely Ellis. "What is man that thou art mindful of him."

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S FRANCHISE CLUB, 9, Grafton-street, Piccadilly, W.1.—Subscription: London Members, £2 2s., Country Members, £1 5s. (Irish, Scottish, and Foreign Members, 10s. 6d.) per annum. Entrance fee, one guinea. Excellent catering; Luncheons and Dinners à la Carte. Bedroom accommodation.—All particulars, Secretary. Tel.: Mayfair 3382.

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE & FREEDOM

International Summer School.

SUBJECT: "Education for Internationalism."

DATE & PLACE: August 1-15 at Salzburg, Austria.

LECTURES IN English, French and German.

For all particulars, apply to the Secretary, W. I. L., 14, Bedford Row, W.C. 1.

INSURANCE.

THE CLERICAL AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S INSURANCE SOCIETY is an Approved Society for professional and business women. The official valuation shows a surplus for additional benefits. Write to the Secretary for particulars, 12, Buckingham-street, Strand, W.C.

SITUATIONS VACANT.

TWO or three friends or relatives for housework for invalid lady and daughter; good wages; comfortable home; hilly country district; if three, one to help in garden.—Box W 35, WOMAN'S LEADER, 170, Fleet-street, E.C. 4.

TO LET AND WANTED.

FURNISHED FLAT: four rooms, scullery; use linen, plate; gas fires; piano; suitable for two ladies; £5 weekly.—Apply Superintendent, Holbein House, Sloane Square.

FURNISHED COTTAGES TO LET: Burton Bradstock, Dorset; 150 yards from sea.—Apply Rendall, 13, West Allington, Bridport. Enclose stamped envelope for reply.

ATTRACTIVE detached old COTTAGE TO BE LET FURNISHED several months; 2½ miles Hemel Hempstead (whence motor bus, 6 minutes, Boxmoor); stabling; 2 meadows; 3 large bedrooms (single beds); outdoor sanitation; 25s., later 2 guineas.—Mrs. Hann, 79, Onslow-road, Richmond, Surrey.

TO LET FOR ONE YEAR, small well-furnished house, close to Kew Green; three bedrooms, two sitting-rooms, kitchen, bathroom, offices; small secluded garden; three guineas per week.—Apply Lowndes, 27, Trafalgar Square, Chelsea, S.W.

NORTH CORNISH COAST. — Till mid-June. Eight-roomed Bungalow; bath (h. & c.); five minutes sea; good bathing; walks; 2 guineas weekly.—Write Hubback, Threeways, Wellgarth-road, N.W. 11.

FURNISHED SUITE.—Two bedrooms, bathroom, sitting-room, kitchen.—Miss Brackenbury, 2, Campden Hill-square, W. 8.

SMALL UNFURNISHED FLAT or two Unfurnished Rooms in lady's house required by gentlewoman (social worker), N.W. district preferred.—Box W 38, WOMAN'S LEADER, 170, Fleet-street, E.C. 4.

WELL-FURNISHED FLAT, 3 or 4 rooms, kitchen; geyser; gas fires; quiet, convenient; now vacant; references.—22, Trafalgar square, Chelsea, S.W. 3.

WANTED: to rent for one month from middle July or beginning August, Detached Cottage or Bungalow, furnished; country and sea; two single, one double bedrooms; two or three hours London.—"D." 24, Havelock-road, Croydon.

FOR REST AND HOLIDAYS.

DEAN FOREST, Severn-Wye Valleys. A Beautiful Holiday Home (600 ft. up). Fifty Rooms. Five acres, pretty grounds. Tennis, Croquet, Bowls, Billiards. Motor excursions. Garage. Golf within 3 miles. Board residence, 47s. 6d. to 65s. Prospectus.—Hallam, Littledean House, Littledean, Glos.

SILVERDALE, Lancashire.—Resthaven; ideal for holiday and rest; lovely country; delightful scenery; comfortable; good cooking; board optional; terms moderate.

OXFORD (6 miles), Vegetarian Guest House; Station under 2 miles; own dairy; bath (h. & c.); pony trap; orchard; tennis.—Baillys, Manor House, Noke, 151p.

LOW GREEN HOUSE, Thorally, Aysgarth, S.O. Yorks. Paying guests received; also furnished cottage to let.—Particulars from Miss Smith.

"QUALITY AND FLAVOUR"

BOURNVILLE COCOA

MADE UNDER IDEAL CONDITIONS

See the name "CADBURY" on every piece of Chocolate

DRESS.

COSTUMES, coats, fur, underwear, gentlemen's and children's clothing, house furnishings, Wanted. Specially good prices given.—Hélène, 361, New King's-road, Fulham, S.W. 6.

SMART CUT AND PERFECT TAILORING AT MODERATE PRICES

H. Melissen,

Ladies' Tailor.

PERSONAL ATTENTION.

62, GREAT PORTLAND STREET, LONDON, W.1.

IRISH DAMASK TABLECLOTHS.—Beautiful floral designs, fine quality, slightly imperfect, size 2 by 2 yds., 16s. 6d.; 2 by 2½ yds., 20s. 10d.; 2 by 3 yds., 24s. 9d. Also bundles of Damask Tablecloths, slightly imperfect, for Boarding Houses, Restaurants, &c., four cloths in a bundle, sizes about 1½ to 2 yards, 35s. per bundle. Write for this month's free Bargain List. Safe delivery of parcels guaranteed.—HUTTON'S, 159, Larne, Ireland.

BLOUSE LINEN.—Remnants of snow-white Irish Linen, fine quality, for Ladies' Blouses.—One blouse length, 7s. 6d., or three blouse lengths, 22s. 3d.; postage 9d. Send for Bargain List. Safe delivery of parcels guaranteed.—HUTTON'S, 159, Larne, Ireland.

CORSETS and Blouses made to order, or lady's patterns copied from £1 1s.—Emilie Wiggins, 63, Elizabeth-street, Eaton-square, S.W. 1.

THE HAT DOCTOR, 3a Little Sussex Place, Hyde Park Square, W. 2. Re-blocks and makes hats, toques; own materials used if required; recovers shoes, satin, thin kid, or canvas; own material if preferred. Furs altered and returned at lowest possible price.

LINGERIE AND CHILDREN'S CLOTHES made to order; Ladies' own material used and patterns copied.—F. M. Castle, 35, Carlton Hill, N.W. 8.

WHERE TO LIVE.

BROOKLYN PRIVATE HOTEL.—Earl's-court-square, S.W. 5 (Warwick-road corner), finest centre all parts; 12 minutes' Piccadilly; quiet, separate tables; write or call for tariff; strictly inclusive terms; unequalled for comfort and attention; own private garage. B. and B., 7s. 6d. Tel.: Western 344.

ROOMS and breakfast (Gentlemen only); temporary or permanent; gas stoves.—Miss Kemp, 10, Endsleigh-street, W.C. 1.

TO WOMAN WORKER.—Comfortable home offered in pleasant South Kensington maisonette; partial board; near trams and buses; no other guest; moderate; references exchanged.—"H." Box W 37, WOMAN'S LEADER, 170, Fleet-street, E.C. 4.

PROFESSIONAL.

"MORE MONEY TO SPEND" (Income Tax Recovery and Adjustment).—Send postcard for this booklet to Mrs. Ayres Purdie, Women Taxpayers' Agency, Hampden House, 3, Kingsway. Phone, Central 6049.

MISS MARY GWYNNE-HOWELL, Director of Modern Housecraft, specialises in all methods of efficiency planning and labour-saving in the household; consultations by appointment.—8, Redcliffe-road, S.W. 10.

FOR SALE AND WANTED.

SECOND-HAND CLOTHING wanted to buy for cash; costumes, skirts, boots, underclothes, curtains, lounge suits, trousers, and children's clothing of every description; parcels sent will be valued, and cash sent by return.—Mrs. Russell, 100, Raby-street, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

FOR SALE.—Charming slippers of plaited coloured felt; men's, 4s. 6d.; women's, 3s. 9d.; children's, from 1s. 9d. pair; postage extra.—Peasant Shop, 41, Devonshire-street, Theobald's-road, London.

FOR SALE, TYPEWRITER; 1920 Remington Junior; cost £15 15s.; used 1 week only; perfect condition; sale price £10 10s.—Apply Miss Power, Grove House, Hollywood-road, S.W. 10.

TYPEWRITING AND PRINTING.

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

The Misses NEAL & TUCKER undertake every description of Typewriting and Secretarial work, reporting meetings, &c. First-class training for ladies secretaries.—Walter House, 52, Bedford-street, Strand (Gerrard 1472).

TYPEWRITING promptly executed by educated woman; 3d. per quarto sheet; copies half-price; also French and German.—Box W 36, WOMAN'S LEADER, 170, Fleet-street, E.C. 4.

Duplicating by Roneo, also typewriting.—Miss Rosseter, 141, Upper Clapton-road, E. 5.

TEMPLAR PRINTING WORKS, BIRMINGHAM.

ENQUIRIES SOLICITED.

R. CROMBIEHOLME, General Manager.

MEDICAL, Etc.

ISLINGTON DENTAL SURGERY, 69, Upper Street, N.

MR. CHODWICK BROWN, Surgeon Dentist.

FREDK. G. BOUCHER, Asst. Dental Surgeon. Estd. 35 Years.

Gas Administered Daily by Qualified Medical Man.

Nurse in attendance. Mechanical Work in all its Branches.

Send Post Card for Pamphlet. N.B.—No show case at door. CONSULTATION FREE. Telephone: North 3795.

ELECTROLYSIS for removal of superfluous hair, moles, &c. Face Massage and Electrical Hair Treatment. Lessons given and Certificates granted.—Address Miss Theakston, 54, Devonshire-street, W. 1.

PUBLIC SPEAKING.

MARION McCARTHY, 16, Hallam Street, Portland Place, W. 1. Gerrard 8736. PUBLIC SPEAKING. Specially Systematized Course which insures proficiency.—Write for Appointment.

THE WOMAN'S LEADER

1s.

ADVERTISEMENT FORM.

12 words cost 1s.; 1d. should be added for each word beyond 12. The advertisement must be received on Tuesday to appear the same week.

Box Office No. 6d extra each insertion.

YOUR ANNOUNCEMENT PRINTED IN "THE WOMAN'S LEADER" FOR ONE PENNY PER WORD, EACH INSERTION.

To the Advertisement Manager, "Woman's Leader," 170, Fleet St., London, E.C. 4

Please insert the following in your next.....issues. I enclose

P.O. for _____ Signed _____

Address _____

[Tear this form out and post it as above.]

Receipts are not sent for amounts below 5s.