

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 108, Palace Chambers, Bridge Street, Westminster, S.W.
Telegraphic Address: "Adversaria, London."
Telephone No.: Victoria 2918

No. 103.

LONDON, MAY, 1917.

PRICE 1d.

THE NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR OPPOSING WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Executive Committee :

Presidents: THE EARL CURZON OF KEDLESTON, K.G.; LORD WEARDALE.

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

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

Honorary Vice-Presidents: Mrs. Moberly Bell, Mrs. Burgwin, Mrs. Greatbatch, Lady George Hamilton, Mrs. (Colquhoun) Joll'e, Miss G. S. Pott, Miss Ermine Taylor, The Hon. Charles Lyell, M.P., Earl Percy.

Hon. Secretary: MRS. JEVES. *Assistant Secretary:* MISS NORA GARLAND.

MISS G. LOWTHIAN BELL
LADY CRAIK
MRS. LAURENCE CURRIE
MRS. GAMBLE

MRS. G. MACMILLAN
MRS. MASSIE
MRS. HUMPHRY WARD
KENNETH CHALMERS, Esq.

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

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

A STRAIGHTFORWARD ISSUE.

For the present the Woman Suffrage issue is centred in Parliament, and Anti-Suffragists must face that fact. The merits or demerits of the proposed innovation are no longer under examination. Sentiment or political considerations have gained the upper hand among our politicians, and the attempt is to be made to commit the country to Woman Suffrage by the majority vote of a Parliament that is being maintained in existence solely for the purpose of carrying on the war. According to present indications, an Electoral Reform Bill, containing a clause enfranchising women, will shortly be presented to the House of Commons. Suffragists hope that, on the strength of the great compromise achieved by the Speaker's Conference—a compromise which covered every point except Woman Suffrage—and with the help of the glamour attaching to women's work in the war, the Woman Suffrage clause will obtain the majority which is held to be assured for the rest of the Bill, and so become law. The House of Lords, it is argued, will not dare to run counter these days to an overwhelming majority of the Lower House. We do not disguise from ourselves the possibility of this programme being carried out, if, for instance, Anti-Suffragists take no further interest in the matter. But anyone who has really devoted careful study to the subject of Woman Suffrage, who has watched the trend of political affairs in Suffragist States, who has examined critically Suffragist arguments, Suffragist aims and Suffragist methods, is so convinced that the whole obsession is fundamentally wrong, that he or she remains as certain that Woman Suffrage must fail to materialise in the United Kingdom, as they are certain that the cause of the Allies must triumph in the war. Just how the cup is to be dashed from the lips of Suffragists in this instance we make no claim to know; but we are confident that, if Anti-Suffragists are true to themselves and to the trust imposed upon them as the sole guardians at this stage of the Constitution, then Woman Suffrage will be defeated.

First of all, it may be well to examine what stands between

the Suffragists and success. The voting on the amendment in connection with Mr. Asquith's motion calling for immediate legislation in accordance with the recommendations of the Speaker's Conference, revealed an overwhelming majority (343 to 64) in favour of an Electoral Reform measure. It is true that Woman Suffrage figured prominently in the debate, but no Member of Parliament pretends that the Division List represented the views of the House on the subject of votes for women. When a Woman Suffrage clause figures in the Reform Bill nothing will avail to cloak the fact that it stands alone as not being part of the great political compromise which the Speaker's Conference achieved in regard to all other details of electoral reform. Consequently no violence will be done either to the political truce or to the spirit of coalition government by excluding this old-time controversy from an agreed Bill. It is impossible to ignore the sorry figure which Suffragists have cut over the egregious age restriction recommended by the Conference. Here is the very essence of the whole proposal, and what is the attitude of its supporters? The well-being of the country, they argue, depends on the enfranchisement of women, but as the enfranchisement of women without restriction would admittedly be disastrous, it must be hedged about with limitations which will enable us to declare that it is non-injurious to the interests of the country. Or, again, take the specious argument of reconstruction after the war. It is absolutely essential, say the Suffragists, that the women who have done war work so nobly should have a voice in the industrial settlement after the war. Mr. Asquith, having lost his first trial of strength with Mr. Lloyd George, and being anxious not to be further handicapped in the political game by allowing his rival to consolidate his position by means of Woman Suffrage as well as by vigorous conduct of the war, has been entirely converted to the enfranchisement of women by this weighty argument. Accordingly he falls into line with the proposal to enfranchise precisely those women for whom the industrial settlement after the war will have the least interest, if any at all. We might

well despair of the sanity of Parliament and the future of the nation, if a constitutional revolution should be based on such hollow arguments. Is it expecting too much of Members of Parliament that we should refuse to believe that, when they are confronted in the cold reasoning of the committee stage with these contradictions, they will fail to deal with them as they deserve? For electoral reform a strong case can be made out, and there is no wide-spread opposition to it in principle, although there may be a fear in some quarters that the subject will distract the national mind from the war. Woman Suffrage, however, stands in a very different category. As a chivalrous theory there may be much to be said for it. But if, when it comes to be reduced to the terms of a Bill, it is found to be a mass of contradictions, bristling with difficulties and dangers which its own supporters are compelled to admit, how can Members of Parliament, who consider themselves as the champions of representative Government, deliberately set out to pass into law a measure which they know would be torn to pieces with ridicule and contempt in practically every one of their constituencies? Finally, if neither conviction nor commonsense avails to save the present House of Commons from betraying the nation's trust, there remains the House of Lords, and to that House Anti-Suffragists will look to point the way which the Lower House ought to take of its own accord—that is, to refuse to consider any Woman Suffrage measure until it has been made the subject of a direct appeal to the electorate, and indeed to women as well.

Thus it will be seen that the Suffragists, with their subterranean campaign, like the Germans with their submarine warfare, have still some way to go before they achieve their aim. But both would sweep all before them, if no steps were taken to counteract their machinations. Anti-Suffragists throughout the country, as our American Allies would say, must "wake up and get doing." To a great extent our hands may be still tied, for we agreed to a political truce, and there is a war on, although Suffragists ignore both. Collective action in the way of meetings and petitions is for the most part ruled out of court, unless in any given centre there is the assurance that the proposed step commands the full support of local Anti-Suffragists. But on no account must the case be allowed to go by default; and in this connection the country must be reminded that in practically every single instance, certainly in every instance in the British Empire, Woman Suffrage has been introduced not as a result of the expressed wish of the people, but owing to their apathy. The Australian Commonwealth did not give the Federal franchise to women because there was a general demand for it. It was inserted in the Constitution because certain States had already adopted the principle for the local legislature, and it was suggested that it would be "unfair" to rule out the women who already voted. The country maintained an attitude of indifference, and the measure passed into law. The recent experience of Ontario Province supplies a grave warning to the people of Great Britain. Conditions in Canada have been on all fours with those of this country. Anti-Suffragists have devoted themselves whole-heartedly to war-work, but the Suffragists have been "stump speaking" throughout the Dominion, and pushing their propaganda in every possible way. Political expediency came to their assistance in the Ontario Parliament. A weak Government succumbed to Suffragist influence, and the war was used as an argument for granting Woman Suffrage by legislative enactment without recourse to a referendum. Too much is at stake in the Mother Country to allow a similar course to be adopted. The Socialist trend of every single Suffrage State ought to serve as a sufficient warning. A vote given now for Woman Suffrage

represents a dozen votes in ten or twenty years' time given to the cause of Republicanism in the British Empire. The instinct of the people of Great Britain is sound, and if they are given an opportunity to express their opinions on the subject, there can be no doubt that they will reject Woman Suffrage. Suffragists are well aware of this fact, and are working hard to have the measure passed into law without reference to the wishes of the country. Such a course must not and shall not be allowed. Before Woman Suffrage is introduced there must be a straightforward and direct appeal to the electorate, preceded, if thought desirable, by a canvass of women's opinion. It is incumbent upon Anti-Suffragists to concentrate their efforts upon the formulation of this demand from every possible quarter. By writing to Members of Parliament and by arranging that others shall write to them as well; by deputations, if possible; by communications to the Press, Anti-Suffragists must clearly show, between now and the time of the discussion of Electoral Reform in Parliament, that there is a strong body of opinion in the country which is not prepared to tolerate that the United Kingdom shall be committed to Woman Suffrage in a hole-and-corner manner. If it can be proved unmistakably that the people want women to be enfranchised, the will of the majority must prevail. But until such evidence is forthcoming there must be an end to the contemplated treachery against the Constitution.

NOTES AND NEWS.

In an article in the *Christian Commonwealth* of April 25th, Mrs. Fawcett characterises as a false charge the statement that Suffragists have violated the political truce. "Every one knows," she writes, "that the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies had from the beginning of the war suspended all its usual political activities, and had concentrated its organising and money-raising powers on those non-controversial activities which had as their object the sustaining of the vital energies of the nation. We should not have raised the franchise question in any way, if it had not already been raised by the circumstances of the case, just described, over which we obviously had no control. . . . It is evident from the foregoing narrative that nothing could be further from the truth than the assertion now being scattered broadcast by anonymous advertisement that the Suffragists have violated the political truce." Mrs. Fawcett would have us believe that Suffragists honourably kept the political truce until May, 1916, and only then raised the question of the franchise, because the Government undertook to introduce a measure of electoral reform.

The line of reasoning adopted by Mrs. Fawcett that the Government broke the political truce by seeking to arrive at an agreed measure of electoral reform is one that will carry conviction with no one outside the ranks of her own followers. But when Suffragists are charged with violating the political truce the reference is not merely to their action since May, 1916. A number of Suffragist societies were honourable enough to say that they had not the least intention of observing the truce, as they considered the war an ideal occasion for pushing the Suffrage question. That was a straightforward, if mistaken, attitude to adopt. It was only Mrs. Fawcett's society—the premier Suffragist organisation—that made a great parade of keeping the political truce, and deliberately violated it at every turn and in every possible way. Its very existence and all its activities constituted a violation of the truce.

At the beginning of the war, Mrs. Fawcett informs us, the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies "suspended all its usual political activities." There can be no doubt as to what Mrs. Fawcett wishes the people of Great Britain to understand by that phrase. If it is not true that Suffragists have violated the truce, Mrs. Fawcett must mean that they have kept it. Let us see what Suffragists understand by keeping the truce. In the *Common Cause*—the official organ of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies—we read in an editorial footnote appended to a letter in the issue of November 26th, 1915, as follows:—

"We hope it has been sufficiently clear to readers of the *Common Cause*, week by week, that Suffrage work has not been suspended. The resolution passed by the Executive on August 6th, 1914, and confirmed by the Council, that 'ordinary political work will have to be suspended during the war' did not, of course, apply to propaganda work, which is always being carried on, but to political agitation, which has been in abeyance."

At the annual council meeting of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies, held during the first week of February, 1915, the resolution "to suspend the ordinary political activities of the Union for the time being" was, it is true, formally passed. But the value of the decision was immediately destroyed by subsequent resolutions. The very next clause provided for "carrying on Suffrage propaganda"; another resolution affirms the Union's conviction that Woman Suffrage was "of vital importance to the furtherance of lasting international peace"; provision was made to force the Woman Suffrage question on any Peace Congress of the Powers, and the British Government was to be reminded at every turn of the Suffrage question by the representations of Suffragists.

The interpretation placed by Suffragists upon a political truce entails some subtle distinction between political activities and political propaganda. It would be of interest to have Mrs. Fawcett's explanation of the distinction, for most people would consider letters to Members of Parliament on the Suffrage question as coming within the category of "political activities." But even the Council that abjured the latter instructed the Executive that during the war "in all elections steps should be taken to ensure that the candidate or candidates shall be asked the National Union questions by influential persons in the constituency." Anti-Suffragists charge the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies with having violated the political truce, because at no time since the outbreak of the war have its president and members ceased to thrust the Woman Suffrage question upon the notice of the people of the country in spite of the national absorption in the war. Their conduct in this matter, it has been well said, constitutes a national disgrace, for the nation is in danger of being driven into a bitter political controversy when all attention ought to be concentrated on the war.

In order that it may be realised how the mere existence of Mrs. Fawcett's Society has constituted a violation of the political truce, a few extracts from its official organ are appended. On November 7th, 1914, the *Common Cause* took up the then Prime Minister's appeal to women to help the country, and declared "if they must work, they must also vote." In the issue of January 8th, 1915, a member makes an appeal for hospital necessities in the following words:—

"I aim at making a gift of 300 roller and 300 three-cornered bandages from *Suffragists only*. . . . This is to be a Suffrage gift." (The words are italicised in the original.)

The same organ welcomes on January 22nd, 1915, a new Suffragist publication:—

"It is a spirited action to start a new propaganda paper in these days, and we incline to the belief that no movement but ours would have had the courage to do it."

For "courage" many people would be tempted to read another word. Mrs. Fawcett was reported in a provincial paper to have said in the course of a public speech that Suffragist nurses lost no opportunity of putting in a word for Woman Suffrage with the patients under their charge. No correction of the report appeared in the provincial paper, and the statement was freely commented upon for many months afterwards. Nearly two years later Mrs. Fawcett, we believe, has challenged the accuracy of the words attributed to her, but she has made no attempt to explain how the mistake arose. Even though she may not have openly boasted of a particularly obnoxious form of Suffragist propaganda, there cannot be the least doubt that her followers have deliberately used the war and the opportunities it has given them to forward their political controversy. The bandages to be supplied as a Suffragist gift are eloquent enough, so are the Suffragist ambulances, the Suffragist hospitals. Indeed, everything done by Suffragists in connection with the war has been carefully labelled. It has been the only political label used, for all other schools of political thought naturally refrain from using the country's difficulties as stepping-stones to gain their own ends. As for Suffragist propaganda among hospital patients, the statement attributed to Mrs. Fawcett, which so late in the day she is pleased to challenge, did not represent anything improbable. In the *Common Cause* of February 5th, 1915, the secretary of the French Unit of the Suffragist Hospitals reports in regard to the *Directeur*:—

"After I had had an hour and a-half's conversation with him this evening, he declared himself a convert to Woman Suffrage."

If the secretary is able to devote an hour-and-a-half to convert a Frenchman, her fellow-Suffragist nurses are not likely to deny themselves opportunities for "the word in season" to their luckless patients.

The resolve of Anti-Suffragists not to allow a Woman Suffrage measure to pass into law without insisting upon a direct appeal to the country is causing uneasiness in Suffragist circles. In order to prove that the country has been consulted on the question of Woman Suffrage, recourse is had to the argument that in *The Times* of November 24th, 1910, the following statement appeared:—

"Woman Suffrage and Woman Suffrage on a democratic basis is an issue at this election, and if the election confirms the Government in power, the new Parliament will be considered to have received a mandate on the subject of Woman Suffrage."

It must be a poor case which has to rely upon such support. The quotation from *The Times* is an expression of the views of its Parliamentary correspondent, who objected to Mr. Asquith's handling of certain controversies of the day. It would be of interest to know why the opinion hazarded by this writer before the election took place should carry more weight than the deliberate judgment of, say, the Suffragist *Manchester Guardian*, which wrote in a leading article on December 30th, 1911:—

"The election of December, 1910, was, through the action of both parties, as nearly as possible a poll of the people on the question whether the Parliament Bill, carrying with it Irish Home Rule within two years, should be passed, notwithstanding any further resistance by the Lords."

If, as the writer in *The Times* suggests, Woman Suffrage was going to be an issue at the election, how came it about

that only 103 candidates out of 1,188 mentioned the subject in their election addresses, and that in 98 constituencies out of 644? In any case, if the country is so overwhelmingly in favour of Woman Suffrage, there can be no objection to its verdict being taken on the question, in order that all opposition may henceforth be silenced, and that the enfranchisement of women may be adopted as the deliberate wish of the people duly recorded.

PRISONERS OF WAR.

Of all war's tragedies some of the sorriest reading is to be found in the scattered pages devoted to the history of prisoners of war. They are extraordinarily scanty. This is of necessity: there is so little to say. A prisoner's life, even in modern conditions, is a record of monotony, varied only by the degree of harsh treatment his jailers may accord, from the petty annoyance of rule and regulation the martinet inflicts without any special desire to make his charges miserable, to the unspeakable horrors suffered under the regime of the careless, the callous, or the absolutely cruel official in whose hands Fate has placed temporarily the destinies of large numbers of his fellows.

Civilisation, with all its progress, has not done much to better the existence of these unfortunates, swept by the surge of war into the hands of their enemies. Certain ameliorations have been effected. The simple method of disposal by slaughter or the slave market, that erstwhile solved the prisoner problem, has been officially superseded by a mass of paper regulations that actually amount to this: the chivalrous, the humane, the punctilious, treat their prisoners as the Russians were treated by the Japanese, as the Germans are treated in this country today; the exponents of iron-and-blood, might-is-right doctrines hold their prisoners in duress the vilest for insult and brutality. War is no longer mainly the concern of professional fighters. Every individual now has a share, and national attrition almost more than victory or defeat of armies in the field, would seem to be the determinative factor. For such attrition makes for defeat, renders the staving off of military collapse more complex, less remote. Hence the fate of captured pawns is worse now than what befell eighteenth-century prisoners, when a money value per head settled the business with a decision and celerity present conditions sadly lack. As the treaties and cartels of those days record, value went by rank. There were fixed financial scales of exchange, from the high-priced general, whose release ran into sums of five figures, to the modest unit of the private. The civilian prisoner had no money value. The medical staff, women, and boys under twelve, if captured, were to be set free *sans rançon*. Moreover, in most of these old cartels it was stipulated that prisoners should only be held captive for a fortnight. At the end of the fourteen days, whether the ransom were fully paid or not, they were to be set at liberty.

The nineteenth century saw a reversion to less happy conditions. With the Napoleonic campaigns warfare entered on a new phase. Prisoners were incarcerated in large numbers, not only in old fortresses more or less adapted to prison purposes, but in specially built prisons, such as Norman Cross; or were even herded into open stockades as at Andersonville—and recently at Altgrabow, Brandenburg, Schneidemühle, Stralsund, and Wezel. No longer was there any period to their captivity. Until peace set them free, the wretched pawns had still a part to play in the Great Game. Neither Napoleon nor Abraham Lincoln, to take historical examples, was blind

to the effects, both moral and practical, the safeguarding and feeding of thousands of prisoners entailed. The Southern States, unable adequately to feed their own armies, could not give a sufficient supply to their prisoners. Yet it was the North that prevented exchange, for the Confederates needed men more than the Federals; and little as the Union men got in their Southern prisons, yet that little still further depleted available stores in the South.

The food question is invariably a complex one. Racial differences and prejudices always bulk large in this matter; captivity in alien lands exaggerates any previous divergence of tastes and customs. What are trivial difficulties to a free man may become very real trials to a prisoner. The whole problem is one that must come up for future consideration. Nor is it easy to postulate any practical solution, for nothing binds belligerents but their national code of honour, or, failing honour, fear of ultimate consequences. An enemy whose "code of honour" proves rank dishonour in the eyes of civilisation must be beaten before pressure can be brought to bear to a remedial extent. Neutrals can do little to aid, or they would cease to be regarded as neutral. The studiously non-committal reports recently published by the Croix Rouge Commission had to confess that the food question, "*commence à donner matière à de sérieuse réflexion*," and that bread, "*tout particulièrement, joue un rôle capital*." But an equally serious matter is a deficiency in the supply of fat. Scientists have yet to determine the minimum fat ration required for the nutrition of an adult, but in German *Kriegsgefangenenlager* the fat allowance is a minimal quantity—probably it is everywhere even below this. Nor must it be forgotten that "a diet that would be tolerated if the subject were at liberty, may become intolerable under conditions of imprisonment. There is a large personal equation operative in this direction," concluded Dr. A. E. Taylor, after ten days' inspection of Ruhleben, with the special intention of judging food conditions. He decided "the food provided and served during the week of this survey was not sufficient in any direction to provide nourishment for the 3,700 men concerned, had they been entirely dependent on it." It is to be remembered in weighing this report, that among these civilian prisoners are many who, from long residence in Germany are acclimatised to German cooking, who are, in fact, Germans at least by habit, but avoided naturalisation because it entailed the irksome condition of military service. It follows that the men who have lived only, or mainly, on camp rations are, as Dr. Taylor shrewdly observed, those who "probably suffer less from any resentment of confinement than their companions."

But Germany, whose organisation was a masterpiece, who had devoted years to preparation before she embarked on the arbitrament of war, prepared—it would seem—for devastation, for ruthless conquest, for the irresistible rush of victorious hosts, whose god was a god of vengeance, whose gospel an evangel of hate; yet no preparations that would mitigate the lot of those unfortunates that war should place in her relentless hands. She had ready her engines of death, her instruments of destruction. Methods of frightfulness and savagery, poison gas, liquid fire, incendiary bombs, and pastiles, were no afterthoughts. Nothing in such category was lacking. All was pre-arranged. But any display of organisation of prison camps is a novel feature. Nothing was done until pressure of outside opinion, the guarded criticisms of neutrals, the retaliatory treatment adopted

by France and Russia, and, possibly above all, a nervous fear that such plague spots as Gardelegen and Wittenberg might eventually not only destroy the hated and despised Allies, but endanger the safety and well-being of good Germans also. Either, we must suppose, her original intention was to take no prisoners—and the black reading of the first volume History must write gives some colour to this supposition—or, taking them, was entirely callous towards their fate.

R. HAMILTON.

WAR-TIME COOKERY.

The "home-made" or "farmhouse" bread sold by bakers bears little or no resemblance to the real thing. It is odd how seldom people make their own bread, for it is as easy as possible, so long as the essentials are remembered. In spite of rations, maize-meal, oatmeal, barley and rice bread are all unobtainable at most bakers, but they can be made just as easily as ordinary bread at home. Nearly everyone who makes their own bread uses a well-known bread-making bucket; for twenty minutes' hand-kneading is done just as effectually in three minutes. It is as well, however, to know both ways, as in the bucket it is impossible to use less than four pounds of flour. The only difference is in the kneading. When kneading with the hands, close the fists, but leave the thumb out and knead as steadily and evenly as possible.

TO MAKE FOUR LOAVES OF WHOLEMEAL BREAD.

Ingredients.—2 lb. wholemeal; 2 lb. white flour; 1½ pints water; ¾ pint milk; ¾ oz. yeast; 2 teaspoons salt (or 4 teaspoons for those who prefer it).

Method.—(1) Cream the yeast with a dessert spoon of brown sugar; add the milk and nearly half a pint of the water. The milk and the water must be luke-warm, i.e., 70 degrees. If they are too hot, the bread will be heavy. Put the yeast to work in a warm place—at the extreme end of the range does very well. In three-quarters of an hour or less it will have risen to almost double the height, when it is ready to use.

(2) In using a bread bucket, put in the liquids first; hence the necessity of preparing the yeast as above, instead of putting it to sponge in the usual way. When the yeast and water are in, and the flour and salt, turn the handle for three minutes, or till the dough forms a ball. Put it to rise near a good fire till the bread has risen.

(3) Turn the handle again till a ball is formed, take out of the bucket and divide in four. Put the dough in four tins previously greased and floured. Put the loaves to rise over the rack over the range. When they have risen to about double their height, put them in a hot oven. The slightest shake in moving them will make the bread sink. An hour's baking is usually sufficient. Leave them to cool in a warm place, out of a draught, and upside down. If the bread, when cut, is full of rather large holes, it shows that the oven was not hot enough to kill the yeast. The proper heat is 400 degrees.

OTHER BREADS.

All other breads are made in exactly the same way. To make maize meal bread, use 1 lb. maize meal to 3 lb. standard flour. Maize meal bread is rather dry. To make oat bread, cook 2 oz. coarse oatmeal in 1 pint water. This gives 1 lb. cooked oatmeal. Mix thoroughly with 3 lb. standard flour and proceed as before, but only use one pint more liquid, as there is already one pint of liquid in the cooked oatmeal. Or make the bread with 3 lb. flour and 1 lb. dry oatmeal. To

make barley bread, use 2 lb. barley meal to 2 lb. standard flour, and proceed as before. It is essential to sieve the barley meal first, as otherwise the bread will be full of husks. Delicious bread is made from pearl barley. To make it, soak 3 oz. pearl barley for 24 hours in hot water by the side of the fire, so as to swell it as much as possible. Then cook it in a pint of water. Mix lightly and thoroughly with 3 lb. standard flour, and, as in the oatbread, use only 1 pint more liquid. It is almost impossible to say the exact amount of liquid both in this and in the oatbread made from the cooked oatmeal, but enough must be added to make a dough which with hand kneading comes clean away from the side of the bowl, and in the bucket forms a ball. Rice bread is made in exactly the same way, i.e., 3 oz. rice cooked in 1 pint water, which will give a pound of cooked rice. It is important to beat the rice to a nice smooth paste before adding it to the standard flour, with which it must be well mixed.

Irish soda bread is very easily and quickly made, and most people like it very much. To make a small quantity take a pound-and-a-half of flour (either all standard flour or 1 lb. wholemeal and ½ lb. standard). Rub in 2 oz. butter, add 2 heaping teaspoons baking powder and 1 teaspoon salt, and make into a dough with about a pint of milk, or enough milk to make a dough which comes clean away from the side of the bowl. Bake in a hot oven for about three-quarters of an hour. This soda bread can be varied in any way with barley meal or cooked barley, or oatmeal, or maize, or rice. Always use a third of these to two-thirds of ordinary flour.

SCONES.

Most Scottish people are firmly convinced that south of the Tweed scones and oatcakes are not to be had. This is largely owing to the fact that English cooks imagine scones and oatcakes are hardly worth bothering about, whereas a Scottish cook sets to work on these simple things with the same almost provoking calm with which she would prepare an elaborate dinner. A Scotch scone is neither hard nor soft outside; the inside is soft, yet perfectly cooked, and altogether it has a most appetising-looking appearance. The ordinary English scone is a flat, uninteresting-looking object with no sort of character about it. The following is a reliable recipe for oatmeal scones:—

Ingredients.—8 oz. medium oatmeal; 2 oz. flour; 3 oz. butter or margarine; a pinch of salt, sugar, half a teaspoon of baking powder and a little milk (of course, sour milk or butter-milk if possible).

Method.—Mix the dry ingredients, rub in the butter, make into a soft dough with the milk; cut into scones at once with a floured knife. Set on a floured baking tin, and put in a sharp oven for ten to fifteen minutes. Serve hot. As a rule English cooks do not put their scones into hot enough ovens, they do not trouble to weigh the ingredients exactly, and many of them are firmly convinced that scones, like pastry, can be made long before they are put into the oven. The scones in consequence are tough. Barley meal scones are made in exactly the same way, using rather more flour than in the oatmeal scones. Excellent rice scones can be made by boiling a cup of rice in three cups of water till all the water is absorbed, beating it to a paste lightly, and then when cool enough to handle adding just enough flour to make it into a soft dough. Roll out thinly, cut into rounds and bake on a griddle or in a hot oven. They must be eaten hot. One of the easiest ways of using up cold porridge is to knead it up in the same way with flour, roll it out half an inch thick, cut into rounds, and bake in a hot oven. Maize meal does not make good scones.

E. S. R.

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE N.L.O.W.S.

A special meeting of the National League for Opposing Woman Suffrage was held at 117, Eaton Square on April 18th, to discuss the present position of the Woman Suffrage question. Only short notice could be given, but sixty Branches were able to send representatives, three of these were Scottish, forty English provincial, and seventeen London Branches. Mr. E. A. Mitchell Innes presided.

In opening the meeting the chairman welcomed the delegates, and explained that they had met to take counsel together and to discuss the situation. The political truce had been honourably kept by Anti-Suffragists, but it had not been observed by Suffragists. Not only had they done propaganda work, but they had made their war work a means for carrying on Suffragist activity and for advertisement. It was not too much to say that their action constituted a national disgrace. The argument that the good work done by women since the war began entitled them to the vote had made a number of converts, among them people who ought to have known better. After referring to the Speaker's Electoral Reform Conference and its recommendations, Mr. Mitchell Innes showed that the acute point of danger and interest was in Parliament, and it was to that point that their efforts must be directed. The League had not been idle within the limits imposed by the political truce and the patriotism of Anti-Suffragists. A few months ago a strong protest, signed by Lord Cromer and others, had appeared in *The Times*. There was a further strong protest from Oxford; letters had appeared in the Press; letters had been sent from the head office to the Prime Minister and to Members of Parliament; resolutions protesting against the attempt to settle the Woman Suffrage question at this juncture had been passed by Branches and sent to the Prime Minister, Mr. Bonar Law, and Mr. Asquith, and to local Members of Parliament, and had been published in the local Press; and finally an advertisement protesting against the violation of the political truce had appeared in a number of London and provincial papers. To this advertisement there had been enough answers to show that their friends were still loyal, and that many were willing to offer their services. It had also been shown that, if the question survived the war, they would have many new friends to call upon afterwards. In regard to Parliament itself there had been a very useful discussion with Anti-Suffragist Members of both Houses; printed matter had been distributed among Members, and the article by Mr. Harold Owen which recently appeared in the *Westminster Gazette*, had been printed in circular form for distribution. Last, but not least, they were able to count upon the services of Mr. Arnold Ward, M.P., to assist them in dealing with the Parliamentary situation. Turning to the question what the Branches in the country could do, Mr. Mitchell Innes considered it doubtful whether public meetings would be of any use. It was not the time for them. People strongly opposed to Woman Suffrage considered that the truce must be observed at all costs, and meetings might alienate public sympathy. They were very handicapped by having been loyal observers of the truce. The answers received to the request to Branches to pass the resolution showed clearly how handicapped they are. Anti-Suffragists were busy with war work, and did not want to spend time on controversial questions. But this feeling had been carried too far. There must be a limit to this acquiescence, and this limit has been reached. Conditions relating to the war were temporary, a measure for Woman

Suffrage, should it be passed, would be permanent. It was necessary that Branches should use their influence to bring pressure to bear on their local Members of Parliament. They must try to gather up the threads of organisation, and to keep things together. Things could be quietly and effectively done. The next two or three months would be of supreme importance. He had hopes that with the assistance they would have and the pressure to be brought on Members of Parliament they might come off better than seemed to some likely at the present moment. What they had to do was to bring home the critical character of the situation.

Miss Gladys Pott then spoke. She said that up to the present she had abstained from attending public meetings of a political nature, as she held a post in the Civil Service. Recently a very high official in the Civil Service had attended a political meeting, so she felt justified in attending the private one. She entirely agreed with everything Mr. Mitchell Innes had said about the pressure to be brought upon Members of Parliament. She had not, like some people, changed her views on Woman Suffrage on account of the war work done by women. She did not see how the Government could pass such a measure without submitting it to the people of England. The present Prime Minister had said some time ago that it would be an outrage for such a measure to be passed, unless it was placed before the country. There was no proof that a universal desire for Woman Suffrage existed. Mr. Bonar Law made a statement in the House of Commons, replying to an objection made by a Member that the House of Commons was not looked upon with respect. The heart of the country, he said, was not in the House of Commons now, but with our sons and husbands and brothers, wherever they were fighting. That was one reason why this question should not be introduced now, when all their attention was centred elsewhere. The League must concentrate on making Parliament refer the Woman Suffrage question to the country. Miss Pott then proposed the following resolution:—

"That this meeting of representatives from 43 English and Scottish branches and 17 London branches of the N.L.O.W.S. desires to record its emphatic protest against the proposal to deal with Woman Suffrage in this Parliament, and to urge that the consideration of this question in Parliament should be postponed till the war has been concluded, and the question has been submitted to the judgment of the country."

Mr. Arnold Ward congratulated the League on the success of their efforts in getting up the meeting that afternoon, and pointed out that under the chairmanship of Mr. Mitchell Innes their interests were in reliable hands. There was work to be done, but he could not help feeling that no one should be asked to give up patriotic work, and that no energy should be diverted from the national cause. Some people, however, could be relied upon to help them, and there was work which would be of immense value. For obvious reasons public meetings were in most cases inadvisable, but should there be any exceptions to this case in which they could be held, then they should be held, and he was prepared to go down and address them, if he could be of any use. It was possible that they might have to ask their friends for extra money in view of the special effort that will have to be made. There should be a special fund for this purpose. Leaders would be wanted. He had not heard of any other prominent woman Anti-Suffragist besides Miss Violet Markham who had changed over, but it was most important to have a good supply of leaders. Members of the League should use their influence to induce eminent people with Anti-Suffrage views to come forward and help. Communications from constituents to their Members of Parliament

THE EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN

In view of the interest attaching to the subject, we reproduce a further article from *The Board of Trade Labour Gazette* dealing with the extension of the employment of women.

The figures in the following tables are based on returns made by employers to the Industrial (War Inquiries) Branch of the Board of Trade; they relate to employed persons only, excluding home workers, and the persons employed are classified according to the nature of the employer's business.

The position as regards the employment of females is summed up in the following table, which shows: (a) the expansion in the employment of women since July, 1914; (b) the extent to which women are directly replacing men, according to the returns made by employers.

JANUARY, 1917.

	Estimated number of females employed in July, 1914.		Increase (X) or Decrease (—) in the Employment of Females since July, 1914.		Direct Replacement of Men by Women.	
	Numbers.	Percentage of those employed in July, 1914.	Numbers.	Percentage of those employed in July, 1914.	Numbers.	Percentage of those employed in July, 1914.
Industries*	2,172,000	19.5	+ 423,000	19.5	376,000	17.2
Government establishments†	2,000	0.09	+ 147,000	7.35	139,000	6.82
Agriculture in Great Britain (Permanent Labour)	80,000	3.7	+ 14,000	17.5	23,000	28.2
Transport‡	19,000	0.87	+ 51,000	268.4	59,000	311.3
Finance and Banking	9,500	0.44	+ 43,000	452.6	42,000	442.9
Commerce	496,000	22.8	+ 274,000	55.2	278,000	56.1
Professions	67,500	3.1	+ 18,000	27.8	17,000	25.1
Hotels, Theatres, Public Houses, Cinemas, &c.	176,000	8.1	+ 10,000	5.7	31,000	17.4
Civil Service	66,000	3.0	+ 76,000	115.0	73,000	110.6
Local Government	184,000	8.5	+ 41,000	22.3	40,000	21.6
TOTAL	3,272,000	100.0	+ 1,072,000	32.8	1,071,000	32.7

During the war about 1,072,000 women, or 32.8 per cent. of the numbers employed in July, 1914, have been drawn into the various occupations shown in the table. This figure makes no allowance for a displacement of women, estimated at about 300,000, from domestic service and from very small workshops and workrooms in the dressmaking trade; it also excludes an increase in the number of women employed in connection with the nursing of soldiers and sailors, which is estimated at 37,000. Allowing for both these factors, it is estimated that the net increase since July, 1914, in the number of women regularly engaged in occupations outside their own homes is approximately 809,000. The increase since October, 1916, in the total number of women employed in the table given above is 95,000, which is roughly equal to the increase during the previous three months.

In industrial occupations there has been an increase since October, 1916, amounting to some 29,000, as compared with 32,000 between July, 1916, and October. In the metal and chemical trades alone there has been an increase since October of 43,000, leaving a decrease of 14,000 for all other trades; this corresponds to a decrease of 10,000 in other industries between July, 1916, and October. In both periods this contraction is accounted for primarily by a decrease in the numbers employed in the clothing and textile trades, the decrease since October in these industries being respectively 17,000 and 5,000, as against 15,000 and 6,000 during the previous quarter. The decrease in the clothing trades is mainly due to a drop of 8,000 in dressmaking, but there has also been a contraction in all other branches except in the boot and shoe industry, in which the employment of women continues to grow steadily, the numbers now employed in this industry being 12,500 above the pre-war level, whereas the numbers employed in whole group is 32,000 below that level. In the textile trades, in spite of the continuous decline during the last six months, there are still 25,000 more women employed than in July, 1916. Between July, 1916, and October there had also been a decrease in the numbers employed in the paper and printing trades, but the figures for women in these trades during the last three months have remained stationary. On the other hand, there has been a slight

* Including Controlled Firms, but excluding all kinds of Government Establishments.

† Including Arsenals, Dockyards, and National Shell Filling and Projectile Factories.

‡ Estimated figure. § Decrease due to variation in season.

had been recommended. These should not be mildly worded, but should be couched in terms of indignation. Letters should be written to Members of Parliament, and it would be well if officers and men of all ranks in both services could adopt the same practice in order to show how strong the feeling against this measure is, especially against any attempt to pass it into law while our soldiers and sailors are still abroad.

Mr. Ward went on to say that the new argument for Woman Suffrage based on their good work since the war was only the old one on a larger and national scale. In times of elections some women canvassers thought that, if they helped a Member to get a seat in Parliament, he should use his influence when there to get them the vote. As a matter of fact, the war instead of proving an argument for Woman Suffrage would be a reason against it. Force, and force only, decides the issues of nations. Moral suasion was not of the slightest use. Woman Suffrage in the United States had played its part in keeping the country so long out of the war. In nearly every country where there is Woman Suffrage it had proved deleterious. There was at present a majority for Woman Suffrage in the House of Commons, owing to the fact that so many of the Members were on active service, most of whom were against it. But it was impossible to believe that the House could perpetuate such an injustice as Woman Suffrage, and in the coming weeks they must work to prevent it. None of them shirked a fair decision that had been submitted to the country, but with Woman Suffrage there could be no compromise as there had been with the Home Rule Bill; as women were so much in the majority, once the Bill were passed, sovereignty must pass from men to women.

Mr. Arnold Ward seconded the resolution, which was passed unanimously.

An informal discussion followed, in the course of which the Hon. Mrs. Richard Grosvenor spoke of the prevalence among the working classes of Suffragist propaganda, which the Suffragists managed to introduce into their war work, and Mr. Dowson emphasised the necessity of educating the masses. The matter, he said, was an economic one, and politicians were playing on the ignorance of the people.

WAR WORK.

A report of the second (biennial) conference of the British Dominions Woman Suffrage Union held in London in July, 1916, has reached us. It contains much interesting matter. Perhaps one of the frankest contributions is a speech by Mrs. Ford-Smith, who, as a visitor for the Friends' Committee for Helping Distressed Aliens, had a good deal of experience in working among the wives (often British women) of interned aliens. In the course of her speech Mrs. Ford-Smith said: "One of the cheerful sides of this work has been the opportunity it has given me to work for Woman Suffrage. Over and over again I have pointed it out to the women how, if they had a vote, it might have affected this question of nationality. I have rubbed it in, in season and out of season, that this is what Suffragists have been working for all these years, and many of these women have come to realise that there is something in us after all."

Here is a very candid confession of conduct which to the Suffragist mind does not appear the least immoral. Mrs. Fawcett has challenged the accuracy of a newspaper report which put into her mouth a statement to the effect that the women (who were being paid out of funds contributed by the public) were using their opportunities in Suffrage Society hospitals to preach Suffragism to the patients. But there can be little doubt, after what Mrs. Ford-Smith has boasted about, and in the light of the statement made by the secretary of the French Unit of the Suffragist hospitals, quoted elsewhere in this issue, that, whether Mrs. Fawcett made the statement attributed to her or not, the habit has been widely indulged in throughout Suffragist circles.

decrease in the numbers employed in the food trades, although between July, 1916, and October that figure had increased by 7,000. The number now employed, however, is still 41,000 greater than the number employed in July, 1914.

It was pointed out in the article that appeared in the January number of the *Labour Gazette* that the decrease in the number of women employed in industries such as the clothing and textile trades had been accompanied by an increase in shortage of women's labour. This still remains true.

The number of women employed in Government establishments has increased between October, 1916, and January by 29,000, as compared with an increase of 38,000 during the previous quarter. The Ministry of Munitions establishments have drawn in an additional 26,000 women, of whom 8,000 are employed in the National Filling Factories. The largest proportionate increase has, however, been in Admiralty dockyards, the number of women employed increasing from 4,000 to 6,500. This constant increase in the number of women employed on munition work in Government establishments is responsible, in part at least, for the shortage of female labour for the textile and clothing trades and other occupations in which women are normally employed.

In commercial occupation there has been an increase since October of 32,000 in the numbers of women employed as compared with 25,000 between July, 1916, and October. It appears, therefore, that there has been a certain increase in the rate of expansion in commerce which was not found in industry. In spite of this there does not appear to have been any increase in the shortage of women for commercial occupations, the percentage of firms reporting a shortage being 9 per cent. both in October, 1916, and January, 1917. The shortage is noticeably greater in the group which covers drapers, haberdashers, and clothiers, the proportion of firms reporting a shortage being 22 per cent. This rather suggests that in commerce as in industry it is the groups in which women's employment is on the whole most common in normal times which find it most difficult to obtain women.

The actual increase in the number of women engaged in the various occupations is no guide to the number of women who are being employed to replace men. For example, it is common to find a firm working with a reduced staff replacing men with some of its existing female staff without engaging fresh women; while, on the other hand, a firm with a pressure of work on hand may be employing a large number of extra women without using any of them as substitutes for men. According to the returns received, about 1,071,000 women are directly replacing men; the largest number are to be found in industrial and commercial occupations. Compared, however, with the numbers usually employed, replacement has been most common in the case of Government establishments, the Civil Service, banking and finance, and transport. In industrial occupation there has been an increase since October, 1916, of 55,000 in the numbers of women replacing men; so that the number of women replacing men is increasing more rapidly than the total number of women employed. This increase in the extent of substitution is found even in industries which are employing fewer women than they were three months ago. In the textile trades the number of women stated to be replacing men has increased by 8,000 since October, 1916; and in the clothing trades by 3,000; and in the food trades by 6,000. In commercial occupations the increase in the number of women acting as substitutes for men was 33,000, both between July, 1916, and October, and between October and January; it appears, therefore, that there is less disproportion between the rate of increase in the number of women employed and the number of women acting as substitutes in commerce than in industry, which is doubtless due to the fact that there is more scope for re-organisation in industrial than in commercial occupations.

MARYLEBONE BRANCH.

The Annual General Meeting of the Marylebone Branch was held on March 28th, at 11, Grove End Road, N.W., the President, the Lady George Hamilton, presiding. Lady George Hamilton reminded the members that active propaganda work during the past two years had naturally given place to war work, but that recently the hands of the League had been forced by the action taken by Suffragist Societies, and it had now become necessary that all Anti-Suffragists should stand fast and show their determined opposition to any Bill to include a measure for Woman Suffrage being brought before the present Parliament, whilst so many thousands of male voters were away on active service.

The Treasurer, Mrs. Toller, reported that very few subscribers had fallen away from the Branch, and she had pleasure in stating that they continued to be well supported.

The Secretary then presented her report. The two reports were

unanimously adopted. After the re-election of officers, Lady Boscawen very kindly gave an address on "Household Economy and How to Help the Nation in War-time." She briefly described the different sections of the Women's Central Committee, which was in itself an offshoot of the Lord Mayor's Committee. She mentioned the various public meetings which have been held with so much success at different theatres in London. She then continued: "I wish to impress upon my hearers what a great effect it would have upon the whole country if each person would do even a little towards saving food material. Small efforts make great effects; and whereas we can all deny ourselves small things now without really feeling it, we should not be able to hold out long if it came to sheer starvation. There is no doubt that the lack of wheat in this country is a very serious matter; and the country that is going to win this war is the country that will hold out longest." Lady Boscawen went on to say that: "The one way in which we can all help is to see that there is no waste in our households—this is the essential thing. Everyone must try to use substitutes for flour and substitutes for potatoes. For the moment the meat question is not so serious, but both wheat-flour and potatoes are running short. We who can afford it must use barley-flour, maize, maize-semolina, as well as rice and oatmeal. Lentils and butter beans make excellent substitutes for potatoes. . . . Many people do not realise the seriousness of the situation, and it is therefore necessary to try to bring home to them the paramount importance of economy, especially in the use of wheat-flour. If we do all we can in this direction ourselves and endeavour to influence others, when peace and victory come—as we all believe they will—we shall each of us feel that we have done 'our little bit.'"

At the conclusion of the speech, Lady George Hamilton proposed, and Mrs. Alexander Scott seconded, a very cordial vote of thanks to Lady Boscawen for her most interesting address. In returning her thanks, Lady Boscawen mentioned that their hostess had invited them to a tea where all the cakes were made of substitutes for wheat-flour, and that the recipes, with others, would shortly be printed in pamphlet form.

THE CHAIN GUILD.

Lady Griselda Cheape reports:—

Last month we had a charming lecture from Miss Calina, a Polish lady, on Russian and Polish women. The lecture was given without payment, in aid of the Blue Cross, for which £9 3s. was collected, together with £1 for the Horses' Home of Rest. The lecturer's expenses, £1 6s., were paid by the Guild. This month we are working for civil hospitals.

We are glad to welcome new members. The subscription (including THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW) is 2s.

LADY GRISELDA CHEAPE.

Strathtyrum, St. Andrews.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE TREND OF THE TRUCE.

To the Editor of THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW.

SIR,—Have we not carried our policy of war truce somewhat too far, considering that our adversaries have no such scruples, and do not hesitate to use hospital wards for their propaganda amongst wounded soldiers and girl assistants? But especially in this recrudescence of Suffragism should the eyes of the electors be opened that the hideous diseases which have laid part of our Army low at this critical time have been encouraged by the senseless opposition to the "Contagious Diseases Acts," mainly designed for the protection of innocent women and children. But an innocent woman is nearly as abhorrent by the Feminist as "man."

In their public meddling one can see how dangerous it would be for England to entrust more power to their hands. They have shown their selfishness in this matter, when they would sacrifice a whole community to the comfort of a few of the most degraded of their sex. They have shown it in their tinkering with Married Women's Property Acts, so that they may swindle their husbands and his creditors to their heart's content. Now they are agitating for communal meals, not merely as may be necessary in war-time, but as delivering women from the "drudgery" of housekeeping, with our poor men in the trenches longing to return to homes! Some of them do express a doubt of what these homes will be like on their return with women thinking only of their own comfort and pleasures.

Yours sorrowfully,
A SEPTUAGENARIAN.