

ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW.

1912.

No. 58.



AUGUST, 1913.

CONTENTS.

SOCIALISM AND WOMAN SUFFRAGE.



THE VOTE IN AMERICA.
A Comparison and Test.



"PILGRIMAGE" FUNDS.



A PIONEER.



WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN AUSTRALIA.

HEADQUARTERS - 515 CAXTON HOUSE -
WESTMINSTER.

PRICE ONE PENNY.

SHOPPING BY POST.

DEAL WITH MANUFACTURERS' AGENTS.

We have no extravagant expenses for rent, depreciation of stock, staff, etc.

But as we supply direct from stocks of leading manufacturers to our clients, we give the latter the advantage of our low expenses. Silver and Plated Goods, Leather Bags and Trunks, China, Glass, Footgear, Clothing, Fancy and General Goods, supplied. Write for particulars.

THIS MONTH'S SPECIAL OFFER To Readers of "The Review."



No. 883.
Usually sold at 13/6.



No. 863.
Usually sold at 16/-.

9-carat solid gold Brooches set with real Pearls.

We offer pattern 883 at 10/6, and pattern 863 at 12/-, post free to your address. Send a post-dated Money Order, and return goods to us and stop payment if not satisfied.

WALES, SON & CO., Vernon House,
Southampton Row, W.C.

Mention this Paper.
INTRODUCTORY OFFER.—Much below cost. A 9-ct. solid gold lace Brooch sent to any address post free for 2/6 Postal Order. Money returned if not satisfied. Not more than one supplied to any single client.

SPECIAL BARGAINS

IN

CHEAP SECOND-HAND MOTOR CARS.

Write and say what you require.

We will immediately send you a list of suitable machines now on the market. Inspection and trial by arrangement.

All business supervised by experienced motor engineers.

Motor Dept., **AEROS, LTD.,**

15, ST. JOHN'S HILL, CLAPHAM JUNCTION, S.W.

ALFRED WOLFE,

Advisor in Printing and Advertising,

**VERNON HOUSE, SICILIAN AVENUE,
LONDON, W.C.**

Before placing a Printing Order or starting an Advertising Campaign consult a practical man who can place Ideas, Prices, etc., at your disposal.

Special experience in organising entertainments, meetings (indoor or outdoor), processions, demonstrations, etc.

PAYMENTS BY RESULT IF DESIRED—DISTANCE NO OBJECT.

Encourage English Flying.

If you want to ensure a record attendance at
AN OUTDOOR MEETING

arrange an Exhibition of Flying.

R. W. R. GILL

(The well-known Hendon and Brooklands Aviator)

is open to attend Flower Shows, Political Meetings, etc., in any part of the country at a most reasonable retaining fee, based if desired on percentage of gate money.

Write:—R. W. R. GILL, or ALFRED WOLFE,
43, Southwold Mansions, Vernon House,
Widley Road, Sicilian Avenue,
Maida Vale, London. London, W.C.

THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE HANDBOOK

OF FACTS, STATISTICS & QUOTATIONS FOR
THE USE OF SPEAKERS.

ISSUED BY THE

N.L.O.W.S.

(National League For Opposing Woman Suffrage.)

PRICE ONE SHILLING; POST FREE 1s. 1½d.

To be obtained at the Offices of the League.

THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW.

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

The OFFICES of the LEAGUE are at 515, Caxton House, Tothill Street, Westminster, S.W.
Telegraphic Address: "Adversaria, London."
Telephone Nos.: 8472 Gerrard.
1418 "

No. 58.

LONDON, AUGUST 1ST, 1913.

PRICE 1d.

THE NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR OPPOSING WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Executive Committee:

Presidents: EARL CURZON OF KEDLESTON; LORD WEARDALE.

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

E. A. MITCHELL-INNES, Esq., K.C., Chairman of Executive Committee.

Hon. Treasurer: J. MASSIE, Esq.

Hon. Secretary: MISS GLADYS POTT.

Assistant Secretary: MISS HELEN PAGE.

MISS G. LOWTHIAN BELL

MRS. FREDERIC HARRISON

MRS. HENRY WILSON [M.P.]

LORD HAVERSHAM

MRS. MOBERLY BELL

MRS. MASSIE

A. MACCALLUM SCOTT, Esq.

A. MACONACHIE, Esq.

MRS. ARCHIBALD COLQUHOUN

MRS. HUMPHRY WARD

W. G. W. HASTINGS, Esq.

ARNOLD WARD, Esq., M.P.

Co-opted Members: MRS. BURGWIN, MRS. GREATBATCH, EARL PERCY, LORD CHARNWOOD, G. R. LANE FOX, Esq., M.P.,

CHARLES LYELL, Esq., M.P., HEBER HART, Esq., KENNETH CHALMERS, Esq.

The terms of Membership are:—Vice-Presidents, single donation of £25 or annual subscription of not less than £5; Members of Council, £1 1s.; Members of the League, 5s.; Associates, 1s. (Branches can arrange for the collection of smaller subscriptions.)

SOCIALISM AND WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

THE announcement that the Labour-Socialist Party has secured candidates for an additional number of constituencies, coupled with the fact that the Suffragist societies support this party at the polls, serves to call attention once more to the very distinct Socialist menace contained in the Suffrage movement. There may be at present no evidence to connect the appearance of Socialist candidates in a number of new constituencies with definite offers of financial assistance from the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies or other Suffrage organizations. But Mrs. Fawcett's society has announced the opening of a special campaign against certain members of the present Government, distinct from the ordinary electioneering activity of the society, and last year the sum of £500 appears in its balance-sheet as a grant to the expenses of Socialist candidates, apart from the money spent in the course of propaganda work at the elections in question. The first constituencies marked out for the special campaign are North Monmouth, Rossendale, Rotherham, East Bristol and Accrington. A Socialist candidate is already forthcoming to oppose Mr. C. Hobhouse in East Bristol, and it will be of interest to see whether the Suffragist-Socialist alliance produces candidates for one or more of the other four constituencies. This year appeals are being made by the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies to enable larger sums to be spent on electioneering work. The country is thus confronted with the clear issue that support given to Woman Suffrage is support given to Socialism.

There is nothing new in this presentment of the Suffrage case, but it is one that Suffragists find it convenient to ignore. We have the example of Woman Suffrage countries before us. In practically all Socialism has taken over the reins of power since the introduction of Women's Suffrage. That fact alone, it might be thought, would give Suffragists time to pause; but even professing Conservatives, if sufficiently obsessed by the cry for the vote, shut their eyes to this factor, and urge that all is well in the Suffrage States. This side of the Suffrage movement is emphasized in the June number of *The Socialist Review*. "It is a noteworthy fact," we read, "that in this demand for political equality the women are invariably in all countries supported by the Socialist parties. . . . The introduction of women into national politics would not be the extension of the franchise in kind, but the introduction of a new element and a new force, which would play havoc with the present industrial system. It would be the introduction of a Communistic or Socialist force into a competitive or individualistic society, the tendency of which would eventually be to transform it. It is therefore inevitable that . . . the Socialist parties, which have so much to gain from the advent of women's freedom, should universally support their political enfranchisement." Having said so much, the writer proceeds to demolish the main argument of the Suffragists that the vote will affect the economic conditions of women workers. The vote, he points out, will bring about Socialism, and Socialism will see to the question of wages; but Woman

Suffrage without Socialism is of no avail in a society "governed by the law of supply and demand." In regard to the effect of the enfranchisement of women on the economic relation of the sexes, the writer predicts that "the inferiority of women in the industrial field and her innate conservatism are thus pregnant with great hope for the Socialist movement, for in her, as soon as the issue is seen, it will find the great ally of the future." And he closes his trenchant article with the words: "The full enfranchisement of women is the necessary prelude to the fall of capitalism and the coming of Socialism."

The history of Suffrage States bears out these contentions; but, nevertheless, a body of women with their male adherents, to whom the word Socialism is anathema, is found to advocate Woman Suffrage. On no other ground, except on that of a hopeless obsession, can this phenomenon be explained. In Norway, in Finland, in the Overseas Dominions, Socialism is paramount. Its powers for ill in these countries are limited and Suffragists, ignoring everything but a few details of domestic legislation, covered in Great Britain by local government, profess to approve of all the conditions obtaining in the Suffrage States. Moreover, these Suffragists are consciously or unconsciously preaching Socialism in their whole attitude towards the question of the day. With them it is the State that ought to deal with all the matters with which they are primarily concerned—domestic affairs, clothes, food and the sins of others. But the individual care of the young, the private affairs of family life, the prices of necessities, public morality, these ought not to be made party questions. They are questions of social welfare to be dealt with on non-political lines, keeping pace with the general march of human progress the world over. Suffragist and Socialist would hand over to State inspectors all individual liberty of thought or action. Yet women as a whole would be the first to resent this invasion of the domain that is peculiarly theirs, and the genius of the Anglo-Saxon race is foreign to a hard-and-fast ordering of the private life of the individual. The Suffrage movement has had to fasten upon blemishes not yet removed from our social system in order to justify its existence. But it adduces no proof that the parliamentary vote is necessary to or will prove effective in the removal of these blemishes, while it deliberately plays into the hands of Socialism, which in their non-Suffrage moments the great bulk of Suffragists would unite in condemning.

NOTES AND NEWS.

"The Impressionist Pilgrimage."

The domestic pre-occupations of the Suffragists are their own concern, and for this reason we might be loth to comment upon the "Pilgrimage" which has engrossed their attention for so many weeks. It is, however, meant to figure so very largely in the Suffragist claim for the vote that to ignore it at this stage would be open to misconstruction. In the first place let it be acknowledged that the "Pilgrimage" has been a piece of excellent stage management. Mrs. Fawcett has proved that she knows her followers, and that they are prepared to play

up to her. There must have been quite a large number to whom the idea of a pilgrimage was distasteful; but they have subordinated their views to hers. The deficiencies in the response to Mrs. Fawcett's call have been covered up to the simple device of persuading members of the Union to walk a short distance, and then to swell the Hyde Park gathering by taking a train to London. Hence Mrs. Fawcett's theatrical effect has been cleverly dubbed an impressionist pilgrimage. In all other respects, we venture to think the "Pilgrimage" has been valueless, and therefore a wasted effort. It has shown the people of England nothing that they did not know before. A certain number of keen Suffragists have been willing to walk from Berwick or Land's End to London, just as a certain number of others have been willing to break windows or burn down buildings. Both forms of notoriety-hunting call for grit or fanaticism. A number of others have put in an appearance on the way, just as other Suffragists have always been ready to cheer on the window-breakers and bomb-placers. But that the fact of a few score women spending several weeks in walking to London, and of a few hundred others showing their sympathy with them bears any relation to the opinion of the women of Great Britain on the subject every thinking person will deny.

The "Pilgrimage" Fund.

It is in connection with the so-called "Pilgrimage" Fund that a clear view of the attitude of the public at large towards the Suffrage Movement is obtained. This "Pilgrimage" was arranged in order "to prove throughout the country the extent of the demand for the vote by Constitutional Suffragists, and to raise a very large sum of money." The "extent of the demand" will doubtless be subject to varying interpretations, but in regard to the very large sum of money, there is less room for uncertainty. In the *Common Cause* of July 18th, the amount collected to date in connection with the "Pilgrimage" is given at £3,757. Of this sum no less than £3,440 have been contributed by 403 subscribers. Branches contributed over £100 in lump sums, the details of which are not given. Thus the sum of £200 covers all subscriptions of less than £1, and the amount collected by the so-called "Pilgrims" up to date.

Of the 403 subscribers who gave £3,440, eight alone gave £1,800, or more than half the total subscribed. These eight ladies form a tower of financial strength for the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies. The subscriptions to the Union from all sources for the year ending October 31, 1912, amounted to £1,034, towards which three of the eight gave £155. Donations for the same period amounted to £12,969, out of which the eight give £1,890, a sum that they repeat in 1913 for the Special Pilgrimage Fund. The following are their recent gifts to the N.U.W.S.S.:

	General Fund, 1912.	Election Fighting Fund, 1912.	Pilgrimage, 1913.
	£	£	£
Mrs. Auerbach (1)	50	100	100
Miss B. A. Clough (1)	70	25	100
Miss C. Cortauld	200	100	300
Miss S. R. Cortauld	200	100	300
Mrs. Bassett Fox	10	—	100
Mrs. Illingworth (2)	525	—	200
Miss Lees	500	10	500
Mrs. S. A. Lees	—	—	200

(1) Annual Subscription, £25.
(2) Annual Subscription, £105.

In 1912 Mrs. Auerbach secures an anonymous donation of £300, while Mrs. Fawcett and Miss P. G. Fawcett are large contributors, with £450 in all.

The remainder of the 403 subscribers to the "Pilgrimage" Fund are accounted for as follows:—

4	gave	£50	each	=	£200
14	"	£20-£30	"	=	£340
31	"	£10-£20	"	=	£330
70	"	15	"	=	£350
27	"	£3-£4	"	=	£90
68	"	£2-£3	"	=	£140
181	"	£1-£1 10s.	"	=	£190

The "Pilgrimage," therefore, has served to remind the country that these 403 people, and some others, want Woman Suffrage, and that, presumably, the eight ladies mentioned above want it very badly indeed. In view of the fact that there were probably as many hostile votes at meetings *en route* as there were favourable votes, and, above all, that where favourable votes were given they represented the total muster of Suffragists in that and surrounding neighbourhoods, while the remainder of the population were hostile or indifferent, it is evident, as the N.U.W.S.S. might have realized beforehand, that the "Pilgrimage" has proved the extent of the demand for the vote, but in a contrary sense to that which Suffragists desired.

Illiberal Suffragists.

A new cave of Adullam has been formed for the benefit of Liberal suffragists, and the advocates of woman suffrage are now split up into one more society. Various attempts have been made in the past by suffrage extremists to capture the Women's Liberal Federation and the Women's National Liberal Association, but without success. The majority in each case has adopted the only common sense attitude that a Liberal Association must be Liberal first and suffragist or anti-suffragist second. This view does not appeal to the women who have formed the Liberal Women's Suffrage Union, and the country has been given an additional argument against granting votes to women. The name of the new Adullamites, we learn from the *Daily Chronicle*, "represent the best service given by women to the Party," but such is their standard of political wisdom that they prefer to see a seat lost to the Liberals, in favour, it may be, of a Conservative anti-suffragist, rather than won by a Liberal anti-suffragist. As "A Liberal Candidate" has pointed out in the *Liberal Press*, the policy is "tantamount to opposing the Liberal programme." Anti-suffragists will be tempted to accord a hearty welcome to the Liberal Women's Suffrage Union, or if anything is calculated to confirm a Liberal Government in its refusal to espouse the cause of woman suffrage it is the prospect that will immediately present itself to the minds of harassed Whips, of having ultimately to deal with women Members of Parliament of the type of the committee of the Liberal Women's Suffrage Union, liable to sacrifice every principle for the gratification of a chance obsession.

At the same time we can sympathize with the feeling of annoyance to which members of the League have given expression that Liberal women should adopt this attitude towards their Party, and we shall be happy to receive the names of other Anti-Suffragists who, while recognizing that the League must keep outside Party altogether, wish

individually to work for Liberal Anti-Suffrage candidates at the next General Election.

Feminine Legislation.

California is still enjoying the novelty of woman suffrage, and provides a constant text for suffragists, who find it inconvenient to dilate on the conditions in the Mormon states which were among the first to grant votes to women. Without doubt a great wave of feminine legislation is passing over California, and it would be monstrous if a great deal of it did not comprise good laws. But other States with only a male electorate are placing good laws on their Statute Books, and so far California does not appear to have broken new ground. That State, it must be remembered, has a wide sphere for such work, whatever the nature of the legislative enthusiasm brought to bear upon it. But in gauging the results of the suffrage experiment the good and the bad must be judged together. According to a Press telegram, 4,000 Bills were introduced during the last Session of the Californian Legislature, and 1,100 were passed. This factor in itself undoubtedly supports the get-good-quick claims of our own suffragists. Of course, California is to be envied from the suffragist point of view in not having to waste time on things that do not count, such as an Imperial Navy, Colonial policy, Foreign Affairs, to say nothing of minor matters like Home Rule and Welsh Dis-establishment. It has, therefore, the better opportunity for dealing with the important things of a State's existence, and among the legislation submitted to the Californian Legislature, we are told, were bills to regulate the size of chicken-coops; to dictate the style of shoes that school-children should wear; to regulate the size of sheets used in hotels. The list is instructive, and it is satisfactory to note that the good work will still go on, for thirty-one new commissions were created by the Legislature at a cost of £200,000 annually, with the object of remedying other Californian defects.

Suffrage in Illinois.

The arrival in this country of the American papers dealing with the introduction of woman suffrage in the State of Illinois serves to clear up several misconceptions. What the women of Illinois have secured is the right to vote for all offices not mentioned in the State Constitution. They may vote for Presidential Electors, Mayors, Aldermen, Municipal Court Judges, Sanitary Trustees, and most local officers; but they may not vote for Governors and other State officers, Members of the Legislature, County or District Judges, Congressmen, or United States Senators. The Act provides also that women may vote "upon all questions or propositions submitted to a vote of the electors of Municipalities or other political divisions of this State, and that separate ballot-boxes and ballots shall be provided for women." It is, therefore, not correct at present to call Illinois a woman suffrage State, on a level with the nine others west of the Mississippi. As far as the State itself is concerned, they have not been given the parliamentary vote. The press of Illinois makes it quite clear that the reason for this hybrid type of suffrage was that the Suffragists knew that any proposal entailing a referendum

to the people had no chance of being carried. Accordingly they took refuge in a Statutory Act, and by dint of strenuous lobbying carried their measure. "The constitutionality of the enactment," however, we learn from one newspaper, "will be tested in the Courts." Illinois' record shows that Anti-Suffragists have to guard against being caught napping.

* * *

Teachers' Salaries and Votes.

The return published on July 22nd by the Board of Education, which gives information about teachers' salaries in England and Wales, is interesting reading. The figures are as follows:—

AVERAGE SALARIES OF TEACHERS IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

	Men.	Women.	Percentage excess of men's salaries over Women's.
Certificated Head Teachers—England	£177 os.	£123 9s.	43%
Certificated Head Teachers—Wales	£148 7s.	£114 4s.	30%
Certificated Head Teachers—London	£285 3s.	£204 8s.	39%
Certificated Assistant Teachers—England	£128 5s.	£93 6s.	37%
Certificated Assistant Teachers—Wales	£115 8s.	£87 4s.	31%

Comparing these figures with the only ones furnished for New Zealand, in the Official Year Book for 1912, which refer to teachers in Secondary Schools, as follows:—

New Zealand	£280	£176 19s.	58%
--------------------	------	-----------	-----

It will be seen that the excess of men's salaries over women's in New Zealand is 58%, while in England and Wales it is only from 30 to 43%.

* * *

"Equal Work."

An interesting commentary on the suffragist contention that where men and women work for the same employer with apparently similar duties they are performing equal work, and ought, therefore, to receive equal pay, is provided by recent statistics given in the House of Commons. The Postmaster-General was asked to give the percentages of male and female employees in the Post Office who were absent from duty through illness on any occasions during 1912. The returns show the following percentages:—

	Women.	Men.
Clerical and Supervising Staff		44
Sorters (Money Orders)	83	}
" (Savings Bank)	88	
Counter Clerks and Telegraphists	84	}
Telegraphists	94	
Telephonists	86	}
Postmen		
Porters, Labourers, &c.		47
Boy Messengers		52
Other Unestablished Staff		33

These figures contain no surprise for anyone who has given thought to the subject. They merely emphasise

the fact that the particular argument about equal pay, like the whole suffrage movement, is up against nature. The movement may be no specific harm in countries where it has no significance, and carries no weight, where women are in a minority and domestic legislation alone occupies Parliament. But in a country where militancy and pilgrimages are possible, Nature in this particular department cannot be defied with impunity.

* * *

The Scottish Deputation.

While Mrs. Fawcett's Society has been striving by means of its "Pilgrimage" to outbid the Militants as the Suffragist entertainers *par excellence*, a march has been stolen on both these organizations by the Men's League for Women's Suffrage. To this latter body belongs the credit of having been able to persuade a collection of worthy Scotsmen so far to abandon their traditional characteristics as to add to the gaiety of the nation by undertaking a deputation to the butler at 10, Downing Street. Their original intention appears to have been to see Mr. Asquith, but when the Prime Minister informed them that he would be unable to receive them, these earnest Suffragists replied that they had been "grossly insulted," and announced their intention of persisting in their deputation. Suffragists, as we know, have a great weakness for Town Councils and similar bodies, but in the case of this group of wholly estimable persons, as a Scots paper reminds us, "it did not represent any public body, statutory or non-statutory, or any association, institution, club, fraternity, benefit society or sodality." Clearly, however, there is a particular glamour attaching to the titles of "Police Court Judge, ex-Provost, Bailie of Glasgow, Councillor and J.P.," when held by Suffragists, which is lost on the world at large, and the dignity to be upheld by the holders of those titles reflects the glamour with which they are surrounded. Thus it was that with all the dignity attaching to a Police Court Judge, ex-Provost, Bailie of Glasgow, Councillor and J.P., they pointed out by letter to the Prime Minister that the deputation must be, and it was so—to his butler. That dignity was never lost. It accompanied the processionists from the offices of the Men's League, whose members must be congratulated on the manner in which they persevered in the entertainment; it carried them in single file through an admiring crowd of women Suffragists and it returned with them "unruffled," as one of the deputation was careful to explain, from the brief interview with the butler, whose statements of fact, never palatable to Suffragists, were borne out by the Scottish Liberal Whip. There can be few finer incidents in Scots history; none certainly in the meagre records of the Suffrage movement. In the grim resolve of these forty week-end ticket holders from North Britain was concentrated much of the determination of past ages that has made our nation famous. Mr. Asquith had said that he could not see them. It was theirs then to know the reason why. From Scotland, therefore, to London they came; they marched to Downing Street and asked. The reason, as they learned it, was that Mr. Asquith was out. In Scotland the possibility of there being a reason had not occurred to them; in London they found the reason given a compelling one, for they went away, not indeed on pleasure bent, but with a frugal mind, selling for one penny each copies of the speeches which they would have made, if Mr. Asquith had been in.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN AMERICA.

BY SAMUEL ROBERTSON HONEY, OF THE BAR OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

THOSE who saw the picturesque procession of suffragists who paraded the streets of London on their way from the Embankment to the Albert Hall, in the spring of 1911, will, no doubt, recall the section in which there were five American national flags, each bearing the name of a State which had granted the suffrage to women, namely Wyoming, Utah, Idaho, Colorado, and Washington, the obvious object being to draw the inference that England could safely do that which had been done by five American States. On seeing those emblems it struck me that the flag-bearers could not know, that, by the census of the preceding year, the total population of the five States was much less than that of the West Riding of Yorkshire, although the area of the smallest of them (Washington) is greater than that of England and Wales, and the area of the largest of them (Colorado) is not much smaller than that of Great Britain and Ireland, and that, therefore, a comparison between these five States and the British Empire could not possibly avail for their purpose. But it occurred to me that although such a comparison was out of the question, perhaps there were other States with which these five, or one or more of them, might be compared.

Being one of those numerous persons who neither advocate nor oppose the extension of the Parliamentary suffrage to women, I have diligently searched for some evidence based upon the ground of the welfare of the State why it should be extended, believing that the rule of political conduct, generally known as *laissez faire*, is the best rule—the rule, that is, which opposes change, until it can be affirmatively shown to be necessary or beneficial to the body politic. In the prosecution of my search for such evidence I have frequently asked what legislation has been effected in a State in which women have had the parliamentary franchise, the like of which has not been effected in a State in which they have not had it, without, so far receiving any satisfactory answer.

I recently purchased a quantity of woman suffrage literature at the principal shop in London in which it is sold, in the hope that some light would be thrown on my question. Almost the whole of it is irrelevant. One pamphlet entitled "The Test of Experiment," perhaps, deserves comment. Being published in Boston, Massachusetts, its title led me to expect that, at last, my search would be rewarded. I find in it, however, only the opinions of a number of certain distinguished gentlemen, to the effect that woman suffrage has been beneficial in five American States, and in Australia and New Zealand. Women have had the parliamentary suffrage in Australia since 1900, and in New Zealand since 1893 (so I am informed by one of the books which I purchased).

Of the five American States,* from which we get opinions, one (Kansas) granted this franchise to women in 1912, another (Colorado) in 1893, two others (Utah and Idaho) in 1896. I shall refer to the remaining State of Wyoming (from which also there are opinions) more particularly hereafter. Without casting any reflection upon the good faith of the persons whose opinions are thus quoted, is it not possible that they may have been biased (no doubt unconsciously) in favour of the system under which they hold or have held office, and can it be expected that others will attach as much importance to their opinions of that system as to the results which have accrued from its adoption?

A COMPARISON AND A TEST.

Having thus failed in my effort to ascertain what public effects have been produced by woman suffrage in its actual exercise, I have applied myself to an examination of some of the conditions which are available in the five States whose flags were carried in the procession (and in some other States), and from that examination I am enabled to place in contrast legislation and public conditions existing in two States in close proximity, almost identical in climate and other natural conditions, with similar resources and with similar populations and areas, one of which has always had, and the other of which has never had, women's parliamentary suffrage, and also to make other contrasts which may be useful. In making these contrasts I am not unmindful of the difficulty of an endeavour to prove a negative, and it is, of course, quite conceivable that I have overlooked some law—material to the issue—which has been enacted in one of these States which has not been enacted in another, or that I am ignorant of some public conditions—similarly material—existing in one which do not exist in another. But in any event, I shall have at least secured the advantage that attention will be called to my oversight, and this may be of such a character as to change the attitude of indifference on the part of many persons to one of active support of the movement which is under consideration.

Nine of the forty-eight American States have given women the parliamentary suffrage, four having been added in 1911 and 1912 to the five others whose flags were carried in the procession. These nine States in 1910, according to the census of that year, had a population of about one-twelfth of the whole population of the American Union, that is to say, 7,731,541 out of 91,972,266. Four of them, namely, Idaho, Wyoming, Utah and Colorado are in the Rocky Mountain area, two of them (on the Pacific Coast), namely, Washington and Oregon, are in the Cascade Mountain area, and one, California, is traversed by the lofty and extensive range of the Sierra Nevada. The State of Kansas lies about midway across the continent, that is to say, not less than 1,000 miles from each ocean, and not much less than that from the Gulf of Mexico.

The State of Washington gave women the suffrage in 1910, California in 1911, Arizona, Oregon and Kansas in 1912, Colorado in 1893, Utah and Idaho in 1896, and Wyoming has always had it. It is obvious that the States of Washington, California, Arizona, Oregon, and

* These are not (all of them) the same five States where flags were carried.

Kansas, cannot afford a real "test of experiment" of woman suffrage; they have not had it long enough. Women obtained the franchise in all cases by means of a referendum vote of the existing electorate which, except in Wyoming, was then composed exclusively of men.

In all the States which have adopted woman suffrage there is a numerical preponderance of males, according to the census of 1910. Thus in the State of Washington there were in that year 136 males to every 100 females, in Arizona 138, in Utah 111, in Colorado 116, in Idaho 132, in Oregon 133, in California 125, in Kansas 110, and in Wyoming 168. But, lest an incorrect inference should be drawn from these conditions, I may say at once that a similar disproportion exists in some States in which women do not vote. Thus, in North Dakota, the ratio is 122 males to 100 females, in Nevada 179 to 100, in Minnesota 114 to 100.

WYOMING AND MONTANA.

There remains one Rocky Mountain State—Montana. It is bounded on the north by the Canadian provinces of Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan, and on its south is the State of Wyoming, already mentioned. Montana alone of the five Rocky Mountain States has never given women the parliamentary suffrage, although they vote there in the elections of public school committees, and women who pay taxes vote with men by referendum on questions which are submitted to tax payers. Its proportion of males to females is as 152 to 100.

Women have always voted in Wyoming on exactly the same terms as men. They began to do so in 1869 when a territorial government was established, and when it became a State in 1890, its constitution contained the provision that "The rights of citizens of the State of Wyoming to vote and hold office shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex. Both male and female citizens of this State shall equally enjoy all civil and religious rights and privileges." I learn from the pamphlet, "The Test of Experiment," above mentioned, that in Wyoming "Women vote as freely as men," and that "as large a percentage of women have voted as men." I believe that women have had the parliamentary franchise longer in Wyoming than in any other English speaking State, and probably longer than in any other State, country, or province in the world, and I have, therefore, chosen it as the State in which I should probably find (if in any State) some kind of legislation, or some political result or public effect of a practical character which cannot be found in a State without such suffrage, and I have selected this State, too, because it happens by a fortunate coincidence that its next door neighbour (the above-mentioned State of Montana) has never had this suffrage, and because its natural and political conditions (except as to suffrage) are and have been almost identical with those of Wyoming. It is interesting to contrast these two States in respect of their legislation, and their physical and political, and some other conditions in so far as this is possible.

Montana was organised as a Territory in 1864. Wyoming in 1869. Both became full-fledged States in 1890. Their surface is mainly plateaus and mountains of great height. The area of Montana is about 150,000 square miles, that of Wyoming about 100,000. Both are mining States, producing coal, copper, silver, lead, and gold, and both are adapted to grazing; and in both there are great flocks of sheep, and there are also large herds of cattle and many horses, cows and other livestock in

both. Similar material conditions exist in the other three "Rocky Mountain States" of Idaho, Utah and Colorado. The populations of Montana and Wyoming, according to the census of 1910, were respectively 376,053 and 145,965.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

In 1911 there were in Montana 2,986 places in which liquor or other alcoholic beverages were made or sold, and there were in Wyoming 843.

Montana is very much larger than Wyoming, both in population and area. Taking these facts into account and assuming the Wyoming standard as a basis, Montana would have at the most not more than 2,200, and at the least not more than 1,250 such places. Postulating that temperance is promoted by reducing the number of public drinking houses, and that raising the licence fees reduces the number, some temperance reformers might argue that Montana is less temperate than Wyoming, because in the former a retail licence fee is only \$300, whereas in the latter it is \$1,000. But even if this inference be sound, it cannot fairly be credited to the woman suffrage which exists in Wyoming but not in Montana, as the following facts will show.

In no less than eleven American States in which women have never voted, the retail licence fees range from \$1,000 to \$1,500, and in at least two States in which women vote (Colorado and Idaho) the fees are \$500 and \$750 respectively. But if a reduction in the number of licences tends to promote temperance, surely the temperance reformer would say that perfection is attained by the total prohibition of all selling of alcoholic beverages, and this is what has happened in the State of Maine since 1884, and is now happening in five other States,† in not one of which have women had the parliamentary franchise. Kansas is also a prohibition State. Women acquired the parliamentary suffrage there in 1912, but total abstinence was imposed by law before they acquired it. Undoubtedly the influence of women has generally been exerted in favour of temperance, but voting—not influence—is now under consideration.

EDUCATION AND CRIME.

I am unable to discover any difference in the educational statistics of the States which deserves comment. The ratios of children actually at school to the total number of all children are about the same in each State, although relatively Montana expends a much larger sum than Wyoming on her public schools. Statistics of crime actually committed are not available. It seems that in each State in 1912 there was a case of lynching. In Wyoming there were two executions for murder in that year, in Montana none.

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.

Marriage between first cousins is prohibited in Wyoming, but (apparently) not in Montana. In all other respects the marriage laws of the two States appear to be identical. So also are the grounds on which divorce may be obtained, that is to say, for cruelty, desertion, neglect of husband to provide for his wife during the period of one year, habitual drunkenness, felony, adultery. Wyoming, in addition has the cause of vagrancy in the case of the husband.

Marriage between first cousins is also prohibited in four other States in which women vote, and in eleven States in which women do not vote. Marriage between

† Mississippi, North Carolina, North Dakota, Tennessee and West Virginia.

whites and negroes is prohibited in Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Oregon, and Utah, in which women vote, and in nineteen other States in which they do not vote. Marriage between whites and Indians is void in Arizona and Oregon, where women vote, and also in South Carolina, where they do not vote. Whites and Chinese may not inter-marry in Arizona, California, Oregon and Utah, where women vote, and in Mississippi, where they do not vote.

(Montana's and Wyoming's grounds of divorce are similar to those which are recommended in the majority report of the recent Royal Commission on Divorce, etc. They are much more liberal than in New York, where only one ground exists, or in South Carolina, where there is no divorce, but not so lax as in some other States. The grounds of divorce, when women are plaintiffs, are—except when "neglect to provide" is the charge—the same as when men are the plaintiffs. I think this is the case in all the States.)

CUSTODY OF CHILDREN.

A cognate subject to that of divorce is the custody of infant children of parents who are separated by divorce or otherwise, and I have every reason to believe that the rule as laid down by the Master of the Rolls in the well-known English case of *Besant v. Besant*, and which is the rule in the Courts of New York, Rhode Island and of other American States, is the general rule in all the American States, namely, that the determining factor is the welfare of the children; the custody will always be given to that parent whose care, by the judgment of the Court, will be on the whole most beneficial to the children. In a leading case in Rhode Island, the Court awarded the custody of a child to the mother, who was separated from her husband without any known fault on either side, because it appeared that the child was a delicate girl, four years of age, and that her maternal grandparents were financially able and willing to provide the mother with the means of support. It would surprise me very much to hear that there is a different rule either in a woman suffrage State or in a non-woman suffrage State.

It is said that in the federal district of Columbia and in the States of *Colorado*, Connecticut, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Mississippi, New York, *Oregon*, Rhode Island, *Utah*, and *Washington*, there are laws which constitute the father and mother joint guardians of the minor children. A good many people of both sexes appear to have considered it unnecessary to regulate by statute law that which had already been settled by natural law and by general social rule in the case of parents who are living together in peace. But it is sufficient for the purposes of this article to point out that in six of these eleven States (the names of which are not italicised) woman suffrage does not exist, that is to say, the statute in question has been passed in five woman suffrage States, and in six non-woman suffrage States.

"AGE OF CONSENT."

The raising of the "age of consent" from that which it was at common law was a subject of great interest, both to women and to men during the latter part of the nineteenth century in almost all (if not all) the American States. I have not examined the statutes passed by all of them, but I have given the subject some examination, with the following results:—

Montana raised the "age of consent" to fifteen on March 15th, 1887, and to sixteen on March 19th, 1895.

Wyoming raised it to fourteen on January 1st, 1887, and to eighteen on December 18th, 1890.

The remaining "Rocky Mountain States," Utah, Idaho and Colorado (all of which have woman suffrage) have raised the age of consent; but two of the three passed the necessary legislation before they had woman suffrage, thus Utah raised it to 18 on February 13th, 1896, although its first legislature elected under the constitutional provision that "the rights of citizens of the State of Utah to vote and hold office shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex," was not chosen until the election which was held in November, 1896, and Idaho raised it to 18 years on February 19th, 1895, not acquiring woman suffrage until 1896. Colorado became a woman suffrage State in 1893, and raised the age of consent to 18 years in 1895. Hence two of these States have raised the age of consent to 18 without woman suffrage, two to 18 with woman suffrage, and one to 16 without woman suffrage. Kansas raised the age of consent to 18 years on June 20th, 1887, not then having woman suffrage.

During the agitation which resulted in the legislation referred to there was a great diversity of opinion, both among men and among women, as to the age at which the consent of a woman should be held to suffice as a defence to a charge of felony. I remember very well the public hearings which were given by a committee of the Rhode Island Legislature in the year 1894, at which many public spirited persons of both sexes freely discussed this important question. Some women and some men favoured the age of 18, other women and other men a less advanced age. One grey-haired lady opposed a greater age than 16, on account of the dangers to which she thought very young men would be exposed from the wiles of designing and dissolute young women who were over that age. The committee, adopting this view, reported accordingly to the Legislature, which in the same year fixed the age at 16. The enlightened State of Massachusetts took a similar course on June 9th, 1893. I think every American State has raised the age of consent above that which it was at common law.

POLITICS.

At the Presidential election of November 5th, 1912, Roosevelt (one of the candidates) advocated woman suffrage, the "platform" of his party (adopted August 7th, 1912) declaring that "no people can justly claim to be a true democracy which denies political rights on account of sex, and (the party) pledges itself to the task of securing equal suffrage to men and women alike." Taft and Wilson (opposing candidates) and their platforms were silent on the subject. Our two contrasted States of Montana and Wyoming rejected Roosevelt, and each cast its vote for Wilson. Roosevelt's greatest successes relatively were scored in California and South Dakota; he had 42.1-10 per cent. of the total vote in the former and 50.7 per cent. in the latter. Women voted in California, and did not vote in South Dakota. The men voting alone seem to have done a little better for him than the women and men together, but in any event it cannot be claimed (at least by suffragists) that woman suffrage produced a beneficial effect either in Wyoming or in California if a contrast is allowed its weight. Nor will suffragists derive comfort from the further fact that their candidate lost four States in which women voted, while carrying four other States (Michigan, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, and South Dakota) in which only men voted.

Other results in this election are instructive. Women

voted in six States (they had not yet acquired the right in the other three); of these six States, four (as already stated) rejected the woman suffrage candidate, and two gave him their votes. The four which rejected him were those in which women had voted longest: Wyoming (1869), Colorado (1893), Idaho (1896), and Utah (1896). In Wyoming women had voted in five previous Presidential elections, in Colorado in four, and in Idaho and Utah in three, and they had voted in many other elections for State Officers and Legislative members in all of them. But in California and in Washington—the two woman suffrage States which were carried by the suffrage candidate—women were voting for the first time, and he received a very large percentage of the total vote in each—in California 42 1-10 and in Washington 32 2-100.

In the four woman suffrage States by which he was rejected he received a very small percentage of the total vote: thus Wyoming gave him only 21 83-100 per cent., Colorado 27 9-100 per cent., Idaho 24 per cent., and Utah 21 6-10 per cent.

The figures suggest the possibility that in these four States the women were anxious to be relieved of an onerous duty which had been imposed upon them by inconsiderate men.

NOTE.—The term "woman suffrage" as used in the foregoing pages refers in all cases (unless otherwise stated) to the vote cast for members of the State Legislature and for Representatives in the Federal Congress, in which two bodies are vested all the powers of a sovereign state.

THE SUFFRAGIST "PILGRIMAGES."

SUCCESS OF THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE COUNTER-CAMPAIGN.

The "pilgrimages" organised by the Non-Party Non-Militant Suffragettes are now over, and it is permissible, perhaps, to reflect upon the effect, if any, that they have had upon our policy of opposition to the franchise being granted to women.

That considerable importance has been attached, by the promoters, to these highly-organised and beautifully stage-managed marches cannot be denied. "The Pilgrimage scheme has aroused the enthusiasm of the whole National Union," said the organ of the N.U.W.S.S. in May; and again: "We ought to outdo ourselves this summer, just to show that nothing can make us down-hearted."

So the trumpets were blown lustily, and the Press was regularly fed throughout the kingdom by the effective and efficient Press organisation of the Suffragettes. Hardly a journal in the land was overlooked, and expectancy was aroused to an extremely high degree. The money spent by the suffragettes on newspaper advertisements all along the routes must have been enormous.

Then began the walking, and, strange as it may appear, all was not so rosy as had been hoped. The pilgrims had not been on the move very long before a scapegoat had to be found, and some explanation had to be offered to the public as to why the meetings were not providing evidence of that supposed great mass of opinion in the country in favour of Votes for Women. One of the first indications of this need for a scapegoat appeared in a Manchester Suffragist newspaper, which mildly suggested, what other papers since have bluntly alleged, that Anti-Suffragists were organising hooliganism in order to counteract the influence of the Suffragette pilgrimages. This was promptly taken up in the Manchester Press by the Chairman of one of our anti-suffrage meetings, who indignantly repudiated the disgraceful charge; and very properly maintained the right of Anti-Suffragists to hold meetings when and where they deemed it advisable to hold them. In some cases Suffragists have even claimed that we have hired ruffians to break up their meetings and ill-treat them. The infinitesimal cost of our campaign gives the lie direct to such charges.

In passing, the point may be emphasised that in the past the Woman Suffrage movement has gained much of its momentum through the indifference and inactivity of Anti-Suffragists as a body. Evidence is not wanting of Parliamentary candidates hav-

ing declarations of policy thrust before them, and succumbing to the demands of certain ladies without knowing to what they were committing themselves; only to find themselves called upon to redeem promises in the Division Lobbies that they had not comprehended. But that is a thing of the past, and candidates for Parliamentary honours now are made aware beforehand of the noose into which they are invited to slip their heads, the result of which is that at a whole series of by-elections recently hardly one candidate would look at Woman Suffrage. The National League for Opposing Woman Suffrage can hardly be blamed, then, for resolving that not even by means of pilgrimages shall the people of this land have distorted and one-sided views on this great question put before them to digest, without providing the antidote; and the outcome has amply justified the League in attempting, though with quite inadequate means at its disposal, the organisation of meetings on some of the "pilgrims' route. Never for the future will the N.L.O.W.S. agree to leave the Suffragists in possession of the whole of the kingdom; it will be stoutly contested inch by inch; propaganda and demonstration must be met with not less vigorous work, and if the result is anything like what has been Anti-Suffragist experience on these pilgrimage routes, the supporters of our cause will never know what it is to be down-hearted.

The Anti-Suffrage workers and speakers numbered less than a dozen, all told, for the vast undertaking of covering the lines of march. There was no flourish of trumpets, the Press had not been assiduously supplied with paragraphs beforehand, the only expenditure for newspaper advertisements was seven shillings in respect to a meeting postponed; and in most cases no preparation of the soil was made by means of posters until our speakers arrived on the days of the meetings.

And what meetings they were! The utmost enthusiasm abounded everywhere, and our speakers had a most cordial reception. There was not a poor or indifferent meeting throughout the whole of the campaign, and everywhere, with one exception only, our resolutions were carried practically *nem. con.* Letchworth was the only place where those opposed to us made any show when the "anti" resolution was put to the meeting; here the "pilgrims" arrived before their opponents had moved on to the next place. A public discussion took place at this supposed stronghold of Woman Suffrage, between Mr. H. B. Samuels and Mr. Ebenezer Howard, and the "anti" resolution was carried by 200 to 160 amid loud cheers. From Stockport to Portsmouth, from Bristol to Croydon, throughout the Midlands and along the coasts, the numbers of dissentients at "anti" meetings might have been counted on the fingers of one's hands. At Guildford, Portsmouth, Bristol, Oxford, Bath, Stockport, etc., we had magnificent demonstrations, as is testified by the local Press. Thousands of people assembled in each of these and other towns to greet our people. *Common Cause* says: "We learn that everywhere the antis have been active."

Now for the other side of the picture. The hooliganism we all deplore, and despite the unworthy charges laid at our doors by the Suffragettes in search of an excuse for failure, in no case have our speakers taken any action or spoken any word to inflame the populace against the supporters of Woman Suffrage. Moreover, where the worst riots occurred we have not attempted to cover the ground at all. In many instances we have appealed for fair play for the Suffragettes following in our wake, and if horse-play was paramount, it was not at our instigation. Nevertheless, when it occurs all over the country, as has been experienced by the "pilgrims," it surely is indicative of some deep-rooted antipathy in the public mind, and the unfortunate episodes which occurred to the "pilgrims" at Looe, Stevenage, Huntingdon, Sandy, Warwick, Marlborough, Cirencester, Petersfield, Hanley, Stoke-on-Trent, Wells, Wisbech, Sandwich, Wakefield, Barnsley, Farnham, Thame, Ripon, Mansfield, Newark, Cheltenham, Chippenham, Calne, Swindon, Beaconsfield, Stamford, Stafford, High Wycombe, St. Neots, Bath, and Stratford-on-Avon, can hardly be held to show cordiality for the movement. The reports in the Suffragist weekly papers are amply sufficient, in fact, to prove that the expectations of the promoters of this walking (or riding) crusade have not been realised.

The Anti-Suffrage counter-demonstrations have afforded the League's emissaries an opportunity of seeing the great volume of opinion there is in favour of its policy in the least expected places. Unfortunately, the success of our work has a tendency to react against continued successful organisation. Whilst the enemy is planning the next campaign, many Anti-Suffragists are sleeping in the blissful delusion that the battle is won, once and for all. This is the greatest, and, indeed, almost the only difficulty Anti-Suffragists have to surmount; and we hope that our readers will do all they can to avert this danger, not only by assisting our campaigning by means of subscriptions, but by offers of help as

speakers, the organising of local branches of the National League for Opposing Woman Suffrage, and the distribution of literature. We heartily congratulate all who have taken part in this splendid campaign on the success of their efforts, and thank our voluntary workers for their self-sacrificing zeal.

THE ORGANISATION DEPT.

THE VOTE IN AUSTRALIA.

SIGNIFICANT CRITICISM.

The following letter from a well-informed correspondent on the working of woman suffrage in Australia deserves attention. It is in striking contrast with the vague generalities doing duty as suffragist arguments that would attribute everything of good that has happened within the Commonwealth during the last ten years to woman suffrage:—

DEAR MADAM,—

You ask me as an educated woman, a woman of property, and a political worker, to give you my candid opinion on the results won for women by the vote in Australia.

I must first state that I approve of the principle of franchise being given to educated widows or single women having property—i.e., if upon careful thought, I can honestly say that such franchise will not lead to results which will be seriously harmful to my country. If the giving of this limited vote leads to results which will prove injurious to the whole community, I have at least sufficient patriotism to say I do not want the vote.

INDIFFERENCE OF WOMEN ELECTORS.

The women of Australia have now had the vote for the States or the Commonwealth Parliament for at least ten years. During those ten years a large number of intelligent workers have steadily and consistently worked to educate the women to vote thoughtfully. They have held women's meetings in halls, drawing-rooms, and cottages. The following are the percentages of women voters to women electors enrolled in New South Wales for the Commonwealth Parliament:—

	For Senators.	House of Representatives.
1903	41.16	43.08
1906	43.90	44.87
1910	54.21	54.71

Of these results a large majority would represent labour, and of the rest the greater number would be women of the upper class and upper middle class—of the 45 per cent. who did not record their votes the greater number would be middle class women, shop girls, tradesmen's wives, clerks' wives, etc.—women who have no stake in the country.

To my own knowledge at one of the last State elections a large business house gave its 200 female employees a half holiday in order that they might vote—25 girls recorded their votes.

SUFFRAGE AND SOCIALISM.

Before the women had been enfranchised in Australia there had never been a Labour Government; since then every State except Victoria has been governed by Labour. There is no question but that this result has been achieved by means of the women's vote.

But you ask me what results for good have accrued to the women through their votes. I am sorry to say I cannot point to one single instance during the whole

ten years where the women's vote has been organised and concentrated to obtain benefits for the women. I know women lecturers professing to know all about Australian politics have said in England that the women's vote had done away with sweating. We women in Australia laughed at these wild statements, especially some of us who knew that the lecturers had never, to our knowledge, even attended a political gathering.

THE MINIMUM WAGE.

Before the vote was given to Australia a very noble woman worked so hard in the cause that most useful laws were given to protect women and children from sweating in at least one of the States, and through the efforts of the Labour Unions laws about a minimum wage have been passed—without women interfering in the matter. Where the women are organised in Australia the great majority are organised by and for the men's leagues. They work under them, and vote for them. Let me quote from a very powerful address given to a large gathering by an Australian lady—Miss Rose Scott—who had done more in the cause of woman's suffrage than any other woman in Australia, and who showed her unselfish aims and ends by working incessantly in the cause of the women and children *before she got the vote* (in fact, she gained more for them without the women's vote than has ever been even attempted since the franchise was given).

MISS ROSE SCOTT'S VIEWS.

A recent article in a German newspaper declares that Australian women are quite happy, having all they want. This would, if true, be a content very far removed from that "Divine discontent" which aims at perfection.

True, Australian women have the vote—but the vote is only a tool, and the question is how has this tool been used in the past, and how will it be used in the future? Let us hope it will not be used, as it has been too frequently, merely to add to the strife of nations, and the building up of class hatred, but to help those women and children whose misery and suffering is our continual reproach.

Ladies, I do not speak of what I do not know, and of what I have not seen. And we enfranchised women, happy and comfortable in our homes, why have we not yet won all these rights for our fellow women? *We* with our vote that we have had for ten years?

Here, again, comes in the eternal sex question, and it shows that the great majority of women have chosen rather to serve men at election time than work to ameliorate the wrongs endured by their own sex.

We see Government programme after Government programme—men's needs, interests or fads always first, women's nowhere. Before the woman suffrage cause was won these reforms I have indicated were most of them advocated as *reasons* for the woman's vote. And even now, if women would only combine and work for these reforms, and stand apart from parties and factions, there is nothing that they would not be able to accomplish for their fellow women and the children.

This quotation confirms what I have already stated of facts which came under my own observation.

It saddens me more than I can say to see the strife, the *idleness*, and the great degradation of womanhood which is the outcome of this question of woman's vote. English women, American women, and Canadian women all have told me that much really good work has been put aside and neglected because of this foolish infatuation. Had one-tenth of the money, the organisation, the energy, which has been spent stirring up strife, trampling under foot God's laws, injuring the poor and the innocent, if one-tenth of this outlay had been spent in fighting the wrongs of women and children, England would be the happiest country on God's earth. *Deserve* the vote, and then ask for it.

A PIONEER.

THE biography of an eminent American woman was published a few months ago, which reveals such a striking and inspiring life-story that English readers cannot fail to be interested in it. It is of special value at this time, when women who are clamouring for fresh responsibilities fail to show that they are adequately fulfilling those which they already have.

Mrs. Ellen Henrietta Richards was born in 1842 on a New England farm; her parents had both been teachers, and encouraged her in a desire for higher education. When her father opened a village "store," she helped him in this and her mother in housework. While efficiently and cheerfully working in these practical ways, every spare moment was given to books. She attended an academy in a small country town, where she was well grounded in Latin, which she subsequently taught; she then entered the newly opened Vassar College for women and graduated two years afterwards.

Miss Swallow (as she then was) decided to devote herself to the study of chemistry, and was the first woman to be admitted to the Institute of Technology in Boston. She rejoiced in her successful application for admission, not only mainly because her ardent longings for scientific training were gratified, but because she thus opened a way for other women to follow. Soon after she entered the Institute she wrote: "I am winning a way which others will keep open. Perhaps the fact that I am not a Radical or a believer in the all-powerful ballot for women to right her wrongs, and that I do not scorn womanly duties, is winning me stronger allies than anything else." Not only her ability, but her conscientious, thorough, accurate work soon told, and within a very few years she became assistant to the Professor at the head of the Chemical Laboratory, and he chose her—though he was not a believer in the education of women—to assist in the new and important branch of chemistry—that of water analysis.

Mrs. Richards became an expert in sanitary chemistry, and was consulted on the analysis of water, air, food, wall papers, groceries, various oils used for commercial purposes, and "she also made an investigation of the possibilities of recovering wool grease, which attracted world-wide attention." In all this she was a pioneer in a hitherto untried field for women.

Remembering her own early struggles for scientific training, she wished to share with other women what she had gained, and when, mainly through her efforts, the Woman's Laboratory was opened, she gave her services as teacher for seven years and also two thousand dollars a year towards its support.

Mrs. Richards deplored the fact that weakness, not health, was too often considered the normal condition of women. She became a pioneer in spreading the knowledge of hygiene and sanitation; she wrote books, gave addresses, published articles, on these subjects; she strongly urged the importance of physical education for women; she was one of the first to advocate manual training in schools, and the introduction of the study of domestic science in all colleges and schools for women. In one of her lectures, Mrs. Richards said: "It is often stated that our educational system unfits the girls for their work in life, which is largely that of housekeepers. It cannot be the knowledge that unfits them. One can never know too much of things which one is to handle. Can a railroad engineer know too much about the parts

of his engine? Can the cotton manufacturer know too much about cotton fibre? Can a cook know too much about the composition and nutritive value of the meats and vegetables which she uses? Can a housekeeper know too much of the effect of fresh air on the human system, of the danger of sewer gas, of foul water? . . . We must show to the girls who are studying science in our schools that it has a very close relation to our everyday life . . . if you train the young housekeeper to think, to reason from the known facts to the unknown results, she will not only make a better housekeeper, but she will be a more contented one; she will find a field wide enough for all her abilities, and a field almost unoccupied. The zest of intelligent experiment will add a great charm to the otherwise monotonous duties of housekeeping."

Only a mind very alert, very systematic, very scientific, could have accomplished all that Mrs. Richards did; she helped in all pioneer movements which improved education, or which developed the "science of controllable environment," which she called "euthenics." Her generosity was unbounded; her kindness and helpfulness unending. It is delightful to read of a woman who, while opening up new roads of usefulness for women and becoming a recognized authority on science, rendering public service of the greatest usefulness, ever retained her womanliness. She was a devoted wife and true helpmate; a tender and faithful friend; a skilled housekeeper, whose home was the "abode of peace" and was the most perfectly managed which the writer of this article has ever visited; was entirely free from self-advertisement, self-importance, or aggressiveness; and who had such a sane sense of proportion that when she was invited to become a member of the Board of lady managers of the World's Fair at Chicago, and to exhibit in the Woman's Building, could write: "I have racked my brain in vain to find anything which, as a woman, I have done by myself which could be shown as woman's work. The only thing I can think of is the little course on mineral lessons which I got out with Miss Crocker for the public schools. You are welcome to copies of my little books and papers on scientific topics, but my work in the main is so interwoven with that of the men here that it is impossible to separate, and would be an injustice to do so. The work on the water belongs to the State Board of Health, and will be shown by them. The 200 young men and 100 young women—my pupils—are my best exhibit, and they are not available." Again, later: "I do not wish to be identified with a body the very existence of which seems to me out of keeping with the spirit of the times. Twenty years ago I was glad to work on the Woman's Board for the education of women. The time is some years past when it seemed to me wise to work that way. Women have now more rights and duties than they are fitted to perform. They need to measure themselves with men on the same terms and in the same work in order to learn their own needs."

Mrs. Richards passionately desired and worked for equality of educational opportunity for men and women, but she preferred working with men and women together instead of with women alone; and she protested against special concessions to women. She said: "I prefer to give my time and influence to work in which men and women are in accord"; she had no sympathy with the demand for Woman Suffrage—"she regretted the foibles, fears, and inconsistencies which she believed were handicapping women in their work, and sought to free herself from them as far as possible. She often preached against

them too. The absence of pockets she never forgot to mention when she heard women demanding their rights."

The aim of this full, rich life, which closed in 1911, was to render service and be of help to her fellow creatures, and while such a career of public usefulness and far-reaching influence is open to women, no woman need repine at her lot, because she is without a Parliamentary vote.

FACTS AND WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

We have received the following letter:—

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

SIR,—As one who has not yet joined either of the opposing parties, but who is much interested in the subject, and who has read a good deal that has been written on both sides, may I ask you to give me some definite information on one particular point?

I understand your position to be that women can get, and are getting, all desired reforms without the vote, and that the Empire and women themselves would suffer, if they had it. Your opponents' position is, I believe, that without the vote reforms desired by women have to be wrung out slowly and with much labour, while with the vote they are more rapidly and easily brought about; and that the women's vote has not been in any way detrimental to the wider interests of the States which have granted them the franchise, nor to the women themselves.

It is on this last point (a point of fact, as you see, and not one of opinion) that I am anxious to be informed. Will you specifically mention some definite instances in each of the 12 enfranchised countries or States where the woman's vote has done definite harm to the State and to themselves?

I hope you will be able to find space for an article on the subject, as my question could not be adequately answered in a footnote to this letter.

I enclose my card, and am,

Yours obediently,

E. B.

[If our correspondent will consider for a moment, she will find that the information she asks for is not on a point of fact, but on one of opinion. The anti-Suffragist position which she states quite correctly, "that women can get, and are getting, all desired reforms without the vote," is a point of fact. Witness the progress in this country and the fact that any legislation of any practical value in a suffrage State of the United States of America has its counterpart in one or more non-suffrage States.

Our opponents' position, on the other hand, as our correspondent states it, turns entirely on matters of opinion. In the first place the question whether reforms are "wrung out slowly and with much labour" must needs be a matter of opinion, as "slowly" and "much" are relative terms. In the second place, what is or is not "detrimental to the wider interests of the States which have granted women the franchise" is entirely a matter of opinion.

For instance, in practically every country that has woman suffrage the Socialists are in power or have gained considerable strength since the introduction of woman suffrage. In the July number of the *Socialist Review* quoted elsewhere in this issue, we read: "It is a noteworthy fact that in this demand for political equality the women are invariably in all countries supported by the Socialist parties." . . . "The full enfranchisement of women is the necessary prelude to the fall of capitalism and the coming of Socialism." Now to Socialists neither this prospect nor its realization appears detrimental; but in the eyes of the rest of the world—Suffragists, of course, excluded, for they refuse to face facts—the triumph of Socialism which experience teaches us follows sooner or later the introduction of woman suffrage is detrimental even in a small State and must prove overwhelmingly so in a country with the Imperial responsibilities of Great Britain.

Finally, our correspondent asks for definite instances where the woman's vote has done definite harm. Even if no definite instance could be given, that circumstance would surely be a poor argument in support of woman suffrage. Grave constitutional changes must be introduced because they are necessary to achieve definite good, not because they are unlikely to do definite harm. But Great Britain is still agreed that Socialism is a "definite harm." Possibly Norway, Finland, Australia and New Zealand think otherwise. The use of the word "definite," our correspondent will observe, does not convert a matter of opinion into a matter of fact, and as for "harm to (women) themselves," who is to be the judge? A majority of the people of Great Britain realise that their present

excursion into politics has done Suffragists (militant and non-militant) a considerable amount of harm. Suffragists do not agree. Our correspondent must judge for herself.

It is quite possible that suffrage States have not had time to realise the effect on women of their participation in the rough and tumble of politics. Some countries, for instance, are still without women Members of Parliament, but it is inevitable that a seat in Parliament should follow the vote. Women candidates stand in Australia. Miss Vida Goldstein, whose name figures with a literary halo round it in Suffragist publications in England, has stood three times. A correspondent of the *Yorkshire Post* writes thus of her last candidature:—The Women's National League, the largest in the State, came to the aid of Miss Vida Goldstein's opponent. "It not only canvassed for Sir Robert Best, but it saw to it that whenever a personal issue was raised one of its lady organisers, and not Sir Robert, tore Miss Goldstein's pretensions to shreds. . . . Australian women, as a whole, think that the Amazon who descends into the political arena to fight for her own hand deteriorates rapidly. Perhaps they are right. It is more than a trifle difficult to skim over thin ice, to dodge awkward questions, to battle with interjectors for weeks and to preserve the qualities most admired in women." Even if the preservation of such qualities is an unimportant factor in the situation, what becomes of the whole basis of the suffrage movement in the light of Australia's experience? Suffragists, we know, want votes in order to have the woman's point of view represented. If Miss Vida Goldstein stands for the woman's point of view, how do the women electors help to have it represented by opposing her candidature? If she does not represent the woman's point of view, is it not exceedingly probable that all her fellow-suffragists in Great Britain, who hail her as the champion of the woman's cause, also fail to voice the opinions of their fellow-women?—Ed.]

CORRESPONDENCE.

"WORK FOR BRANCHES."

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

SIR,—We are now in the interval between two campaigns, and that which is coming will probably be at least as strenuous as those which are past; moreover, Anti-Suffragists cannot but be aware that the decay of militancy may strengthen the Suffrage cause, and that conditions favourable to the passage of a Woman Suffrage measure may easily arise, unless we persist in keeping the dangers of any such measure clearly before the country. For this purpose funds are urgently required, and I therefore suggest that all Branches be asked to devote a part of their energies towards raising money to be used during elections. The smaller country Branches will probably be unable to provide the whole of the organization necessary in their own constituencies, but they would do great service to the cause, if they would contribute to a central fund which could be used for electioneering purposes, and I believe that a suggestion to this effect, if made from headquarters, would meet with a ready response.

I am, etc.,

ARTHUR POTT.

Goodrich House, Ross-on-Wye.

"THE SUFFRAGIST PILGRIMAGE."

The Editor of "The Anti-Suffrage Review."

SIR,—Certain suffragist newspapers are endeavouring to interest the public in a "Great Pilgrimage" which, marching, or being conveyed, along the main "arteries" of the country, is to converge on London; though I see complaints from ardent and self-centred suffragists that "it is surprising so little notice is taken of it in the Press." The boast about the pilgrims is that they are, without exception, constitutional and law-abiding, since no militant is "allowed to take part in the procession." Considering the frequent faintness of the border-line between law-abiding and law-breaking, this exclusive provision (if a colloquialism be permitted) is a "large order."

But what about the leaders in this impressionist march? Ever since the feast under the presidency of Mrs. Fawcett, in honour

KENT.

BROMLEY—
President: Lady Lubbock.
Hon. Treasurer: G. F. Fischer, Esq.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Fischer, Appletreewick, Bickley.

CANTERBURY—
President: Lady Mitchell.
Deputy-President: Mrs. Trueman.
Hon. Treasurer: Miss Moore, The Precincts.
Hon. Secretary: Miss Reay, Langley House, Old Dover Road, Canterbury.

CRANBROOK—
President: Miss Neve, Osborne Lodge.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Addison, West Terrace, Cranbrook.
Hon. Secretary: Strangman Hancock, Esq., Kennel Holt, Cranbrook.

DEAL AND WALMER—
President: Lady George Hamilton.
Hon. Treasurer: William Matthews, Esq.

Deal—
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Morris, Court Lodge, Church Path, Deal.

Walmer—
Joint Hon. Secretaries: Miss Lapage, Sheen House, Upper Walmer; Miss A. Bowman, Castlemount, Castle Road, Walmer.

DOVER—
Hon. Treasurer: Miss M. Sanders, 16, Harold Terrace, Dover.

ELTHAM—
Hon. Treasurer: Miss Ethel Thomas.
Hon. Secretary (pro tem.): Miss M. Davies, 64, West Park, Eltham.

POLKESTONE—
President: The Countess of Radnor.
Deputy-President: Mrs. Eddam Whetham.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. G. F. Marsden.
Hon. Secretary: Miss M. Garratt, 2, Western Terrace, Shorncliffe Road, Folkestone.

HAWKHURST—
President: Mrs. Ready, Ellerslie, Hawkhurst.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Beauchamp Tower.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Carter, School Cottage, Flimwell.

Sandhurst (Sub-Branch)—
President: Mrs. J. B. C. Wilson.
Hon. Secretary: Miss E. D. French, Church House, Sandhurst, Kent.

Filmwell (Sub-Branch)—
President: Mrs. Hickson.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Carter, School Cottage, Flimwell.

ISLE OF THANET—
President: Mrs. C. Murray Smith.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Fishwick.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Arthur Daniel, Chylton Lodge, Ramsgate.

Herne Bay (Sub-Branch)—

ROCHESTER—
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Conway Gordon.
Hon. Secretary: Miss Pollock, Holly Lodge, Cobham, Kent.

SALTWOOD—
President: Mrs. Deedes.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Deedes.
Hon. Secretary: Miss I. Stigand, Elmleigh, Saltwood.

SEVENOAKS—
President: Mrs. R. Herries.
Deputy-President: Mrs. Mordecai.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Herbert Knocker.
Hon. Secretary: Miss Tabrum, 3, Clarendon Road, Sevenoaks.

TONBRIDGE—
President: Lady Harriet Warde.
Hon. Treasurer: Humfrey Babington, Esq.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Crowhurst, 126, Hadlow Road, Tonbridge.

TUNBRIDGE WELLS—
President: Countess Amherst.
Vice-President: Mrs. E. L. Pantifex.
Hon. Treasurer: E. Weldon, Esq.
Hon. Secretary: Miss M. B. Backhouse, 48, St. James' Road, Tunbridge Wells.

LANCASHIRE.

HAWKSHEAD—
President: Mrs. Hadley.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Humphrey Boddington.

LIVERPOOL—
Local Vice-Presidents: Lady Royden, Mrs. F. E. Smith, The Right Hon. F. E. Smith, Esq., K.C., M.P., Colonel Chaloner, M.P., Leslie Scott, Esq., K.C., M.P., Gershom Stewart, Esq., M.P., Harold Smith, Esq., M.P., Canon Paige Cox, J. S. Rankin, Esq.
Chairman: Ald. M. H. Maxwell, I.P.
Hon. Treasurer and Assistant Hon. Secretary: Frank A. Goodwin, Esq.
Hon. Secretary: Miss C. Gostenhofer, 16, Beresford Road, Birkenhead.
Secretary: Miss M. Winifred Hughes, Century Buildings, 31, North John Street.
(Continued on page 183.)

Novelties in Sports Coats.



Pure Cashmere Sports Coat (as sketch), very smart exclusive design. The outside of the Coat is mostly of cashmere with a pattern of contrasting coloured silk. **5 Gns.**

Pure Cashmere Sports Jackets (as sketch), made from best quality yarns, in over 100 colours. A very useful Coat for all kinds of Sports. **42/-.**

DEBENHAM & FREEBODY,

Wigmore Street and Welbeck Street, LONDON, W.

Abercromby (Sub-Branch)—
President:
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Pollitt, 4, Canning Street, Liverpool.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Frank Jeans, 30, Rodney Street, Liverpool.
Assistant Hon. Secretary: Miss Gladdis, Bernard, 57, Rodney Street, Liverpool.

Birkenhead (Sub-Branch)—
Hon. Treasurer: H. Wilson, Esq., 16, Ashville Road, Birkenhead.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Edwin Woodhead, 59, Ashville Road, Birkenhead.

Blundellsands and Crosby (Sub-Branch)—
Hon. Treasurer and Hon. Secretary: Miss J. Owen, Rhianva, Blundellsands.

East and West Toxteth (Sub-Branch)—
President: Edward Lawrence, Esq.
Hon. Treasurer: Miss Crossfield.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. R. H. Case, 7, West Albert Road, Sefton Park, Liverpool.

Wallasey (Sub-Branch)—
Hon. Secretary and Hon. Treasurer: Miss E. C. Williams, Ellerslie, Clarendon Road, Wallasey.

MANCHESTER—
President: Lady Sheffield.
Chairman: George Hamilton, Esq.
Hon. Treasurer: Percy Marriott, Esq.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Arthur Herbert.
Organising Secretary: Miss C. Moir, 1, Princess Street, Manchester.

Manchester South (Sub-Branch)—
President: Philip G. Glazebrook, Esq., M.P.
Vice-Presidents: Lady Hopkinson, Dr. Featherstone, Mrs. Seel.
Chairman: A. C. Gronno, Esq.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. W. S. Barratt.
District Secretary: A. E. Salmon, Esq., 83, Palmerston Street, Alexandra Park.

Manchester, North-East (Sub-Branch)—
District Secretary: Mr. W. Molloy, 26, White Street, Ancoats.

Manchester, South-West (Sub-Branch)—
Chairman: H. H. Gibson, Esq., 481, Stretford Road, Old Trafford.

DISTRICTS.

Alderley Edge (Sub-Branch)—
President: Mrs. Moorhouse.
Chairman: J. M. Dale, Esq.
Hon. Treasurer: Miss Rayner.
Co. Hon. Secretaries: Mrs. Dale, Rose Lea, Alderley Edge; Mrs. Robertson Carver, The Meadows, Alderley Edge.

Bolton (Sub-Branch)—
Hon. Treasurer: Mr. F. M. Podmore.
Hon. Secretaries (pro tem.): Miss Podmore, 305, Wigan Road, Deane, Bolton; H. Taylor, Esq., 9, Henry Street, Bolton.

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

Levenshulme, Burnage, Heaton Chapel, and Heaton Moor (Sub-Branch)—
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. N. Smith, 9, Roseleigh Avenue, Burnage.
District Hon. Secretaries:
Levenshulme and Burnage: Mr. and Mrs. H. W. Barber, 15, Roseleigh Avenue, Burnage.
Heaton Chapel and Heaton Moor: Miss L. Bennett, "Parkleigh," Elms Road, Heaton Chapel.

Oldham (Sub-Branch)—
Hon. Treasurer: Leonard Schofield.
District Secretaries (pro tem.): Mrs. Watson-Harrison, 200, Manchester Road, Werneth, Oldham; William Schofield, Esq., Waterhead, Oldham.

St. Anne's and Fylde (Sub-Branch)—
Hon. Treasurer: Miss Norah Waechter.
Hon. Secretary: W. H. Pickup, Esq., 28, St. Anne's Road West, St. Anne's.

Urmston (Sub-Branch)—
Hon. Treasurer: Mr. Jackson.
Hon. Secretary: Miss A. Nall, Brunwood, Urmston.

LEICESTERSHIRE.

LEICESTER—
President: Lady Hazelrigg.
Hon. Treasurer: Thomas Butler, Esq.
Hon. Secretaries: Mrs. Butler, Elmfield Avenue; Miss M. Spencer, 134, Regent Road, Leicester.

LINCOLNSHIRE.

HORNCastle DIVISION—
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Richardson, Halton House, Spilsby.
Hon. Treasurer: Dr. Dean.

Alford (Sub-Branch)—
Hon. Secretary (pro tem.): Miss D. Higgins.

East Kirkby (Sub-Branch)—
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Robinson, the Manor House.

Spilsby (Sub-Branch)—
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Steinmitz, The Vicarage.
Hon. Treasurer: Dr. Dean.

LONDON.

CHELSEA—
President: The Hon. Mrs. Bernard Mallet.
Hon. Treasurer: Admiral the Hon. Sir Edmund Fremantle, G.C.B.
Hon. Secretaries: Mrs. Myles, 16, St. Loo Mansions, Cheyne Gardens, S.W.; Miss S. Woodgate, 68, South Eaton Place, S.W.

CROUCH END—
President: Lord Ronaldshay.
Hon. Treasurer: G. H. Bower, Esq.
Hon. Secretary: Miss Rigg, 29, Haringey Park, Crouch End.

DULWICH—
President: J. G. Dalzell, Esq.
Vice-President: Mrs. Teall.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Parish.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Carr, 5, Carson Road, Dulwich.

EAST DULWICH—
President: Mrs. Batten.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Hawkes, Woodbridge, Eyrella Road, Lordship Lane.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Kubbra, 367, Lordship Lane.

ELTHAM—(See Kent).

FINCHLEY—
President: The Countess of Ronaldshay.
Hon. Treasurer: A. Savage Cooper, Esq.
Hon. Secretary: Miss Lucie Alexander, 5, Redbourne Avenue, Church End, Finchley.

FULHAM—
President: Mrs. Richard Harrison.
Hon. Treasurer: Miss King.
Hon. Secretary: Miss Winthrop, 50, Scarsdale Villas, Kensington, W.

GOLDER'S GREEN AND GARDEN SUBURB—
President:
Hon. Treasurer and Hon. Secretary (pro tem.): Mrs. Russell, 32, Hallswell Road, Golder's Green.

HACKNEY—
President:
Vice-President: A. J. Brough, Esq.
Hon. Treasurer: Mr. Percy O. Wittey.
Hon. Secretary: Mr. Maurice G. Liverman, 23, Bethune Road, Stamford Hill, N.

HAMPSTEAD—
President: Mrs. Metzler.
Hon. Treasurer: Miss Squire, 27, Marlborough Hill, N.W.
Hon. Secretary: Miss M. E. Allsop, 19, Belsize Park, N.W.
Assistant Secretary: Miss Gunning, 43, Belsize Park Gardens.

North-West Hampstead (Sub-Branch)—
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Reginald Blomfield, 51, Frognal.

NORTH-EAST HAMPSTEAD—
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Van Ingen Winter, M.D., Ph.D., 41, Willoughby Road, Hornsey, N.

HIGHBURY—
President: The Right Hon. Sir Edward Clarke, K.C.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Wagstaff.
Hon. Secretary: Miss Dorothy Housden, 19, Compton Road, Highbury.

HIGHGATE—
President and Hon. Secretary: Mrs. J. W. Cowley, 57, Dartmouth Park Hill, N.
Hon. Treasurer: Colonel J. W. Cowley.

KENSINGTON—
President: Mary Countess of Ilchester.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Mason, 83, Cornwall Gardens, S.W.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Archibald Colquhoun, 25, Bedford Gardens, Campden Hill, W.

MARYLEBONE—
President: Lady George Hamilton.
Hon. Treasurer: Miss Luck.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Jeyes, 11, Grove End Road, St. John's Wood, N.W.
All communications to be sent to Miss Emily Luck, 31, York Street Chambers, Bryanston Square, W., for the next two months.

MAYFAIR AND ST. GEORGE'S—
President: The Countess of Cromer.
Chairman of Committee: The Dowager Countess of Ancaster.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Carson Roberts.
Hon. Secretary (pro tem.): Miss Blenkinsop, 35, St. George's Square, S.W.

PADDINGTON—
President of Executive: Dowager Lady Dimsdale.
Deputy President: Lady Hyde.
Hon. Secretary and Temporary Treasurer: Mrs. Percy Thomas, 52, Colchene Court, S.W.
Assistant Hon. Secretary: Miss Hogarth, 175, Westbourne Terrace, W.

ST. PANCRAS EAST—
Hon. Treasurer: Miss M. Briggs.
Hon. Secretary: Miss Sterling, 14, Bartholomew Road, N.W.

STREATHAM AND NORBURY—
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Winckoski, 31, Hopton Road, Streatham.

UPPER NORWOOD AND ANERLEY—
President: The Hon. Lady Montgomery Moore.
Hon. Treasurer: Miss E. H. Tittle.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Austin, Sunnyside, Crescent Road, South Norwood.

WESTMINSTER—
President: The Lady Biddulph of Ledbury.
Hon. Secretary: Miss L. E. Cotesworth, Caxton House, Tothill Street, S.W.

WHITECHAPEL—
Hon. Secretary: Lady Wynne, St. Thomas' Tower, Tower of London, E.C.

MIDDLESEX.

EALING AND EALING SOUTH—
President:
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. L. Prendergast Walsh, Kirkconell, Gunnersbury Avenue, Ealing Common.
Hon. Secretary: Miss McClellan, 35, Hamilton Road, Ealing.
All communications to be addressed to Mrs. L. Prendergast Walsh for the present.

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

CHISWICK—
President: Mrs. Norris.
Hon. Treasurer and Hon. Secretary: Miss M. Mackenzie, 6, Grange Road, Gunnersbury.

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

PINNER AND HARROW—
President: Sir J. D. Rees, M.P.
Hon. Treasurer: Mr. Mayo.
Joint Hon. Secretaries: Mrs. Gardner Williams, "Inverary," Pinner; Miss K. Parker, "Mayfield," Pinner.

UXBRIDGE AND HAREFIELD—
Hon. Treasurer: R. Byles, Esq.
Hon. Secretary: Miss Harland, Harefield Vicarage, Uxbridge.

NORTHAMPTONSHIRE.

NEWPORT—
President: Mrs. Bircham of Chestow.
Hon. Secretary: Miss Prothero, Malpas Court.
Assistant Hon. Secretary: Mrs. MacFarlane, Craigmere, Chestow Road.

WELLINGBOROUGH—
President:
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Heygate, The Elms, Wellingboro'.

NORTHAMPTONSHIRE.

WELLINGBOROUGH—
President:
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Heygate, The Elms, Wellingboro'.

OUNDE—
President: The Hon. Mrs. Fergusson.
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Coombs.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Newman, Bramston House, Oundle.

NORTHUMBERLAND.

NEWCASTLE AND TYNESIDE—
President: Miss Noble, Jpsmond Dene House, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Hon. Treasurer: Arthur G. Ridout, Esq.
Secretary: Miss Moses, 9, Ridley Place, Newcastle.

NOTTINGHAMSHIRE.

NOTTINGHAM AND NOTTS—
President: Countess Manvers.
Hon. Treasurer:
Hon. Secretary: Percy Pine, Esq., Wheeler Gate, Nottingham.

OXFORDSHIRE.

BANBURY—
President: Mrs. Eustace Fienes.
Vice-President: The Hon. Mrs. Molyneux.
Hon. Treasurer: J. Findlay, Esq.
Hon. Secretary: Miss Gurney, 17, Oxford Road, Banbury.

BIOSTER—
President:
Hon. Secretary:
Hon. Secretary and Woodstock—
President: Lady Norah Spencer Churchill.
Hon. Treasurer: W. Poore Clarke, Esq.
Hon. Secretary: Miss Clarke, Market Street, Woodstock.

GORING—
Hon. Secretary (pro tem.): Miss Evans, Ropley, Goring-on-Thames.

HENLEY-ON-THAMES—
President: Lady Esther Smith.
Hon. Treasurer: G. F. Gibbs, Esq.
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Holt Beever, Yewden, Henley-on-Thames.

HEAR

What the New
Oxygen Treatment
is Doing for Women

Suffering from INSOMNIA,
NEURITIS, NERVOUSNESS,
SCIATICA, - - ANÆMIA,
ECZEMA, RHEUMATISM,
----- Etc. -----

Consultations Free, either by Post

or at

THE INSTITUTE OF OXYPATHY,
62, Oxford Street, W.



*Members of the League are especially invited
to call and inspect our Floral Depot.*

SPECIALITIES.

CHOICE CUT FLOWERS Fresh Daily.
TABLE DECORATIONS.
WEDDING DECORATIONS.
WEDDING BOUQUETS.
BALL DECORATIONS.
PALMS and FOLIAGE PLANTS.
CHOICE FLOWER and
VEGETABLE SEEDS.

Seed Catalogue now ready, sent free on application.

WILLS & SEGAR,

Florists to His Majesty the King.

Royal Exotic Nursery,

Onslow Crescent, South Kensington, S.W.

Telephone : KENSINGTON 638.
WESTERN 1635.

Telegrams : FLOSCULO,
LONDON.

**Reliable Hospital-Trained
Nurse and Masseuse.**

RESIDING AT

11, DUKE'S LANE CHAMBERS,
CHURCH ST., KENSINGTON, W.

Visits Patients' Houses
hourly, daily or weekly.

Holding Obstetrical Society of London Certificate ;
Queen Charlotte's Hospital, London ;
Hillcrest's Surgical Hospital, Incorporated,
Pittsfield, Mass, U.S.A.

INSTRUCTED UNDER MEDICAL SUPER-
VISION IN MASSAGE, ELECTRICITY (WEIR
MITCHELL), SHOTT'S TREATMENT.

Doctors or Patients as reference given.

'PHONE 4892 KENSINGTON.

Apply - - **MISS FINCH-SMITH**
(AT ANY HOUR).

The ABSOLUTE NECESSITY

of using a thoroughly reliable disinfectant in the
house, in the kennel and in the stables cannot
be gainsaid.

When purchasing a disinfectant it is well to
bear in mind that "The Lancet" in its issue
of November 20th, 1909, proved that

"COFECTANT"

(Cook's Disinfectant Fluid)

is the most efficient non-poisonous germicide
obtainable.

Full particulars and samples will be sent
free on application to the sole proprietors and
manufacturers,

EDWARD COOK & CO., LTD.,

The Soap and Disinfectant Specialists,

BOW, LONDON, E.