

# THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW.

The ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW is published by the Women's National Anti-Suffrage League, and can be obtained through any bookseller or newsagent. Annual Subscription, 1/6, post free.

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

No. 24.

LONDON, NOVEMBER, 1910.

PRICE 1d.

## THE WOMEN'S NATIONAL ANTI-SUFFRAGE LEAGUE.

**Executive Committee:** *Chairman:* THE COUNTESS OF JERSEY; *Vice-Chairman:* MRS. MASSIE;

LADY HAVERSHAM,	MISS GERTRUDE LOWTHIAN BELL,	ELLEN COUNTESS OF DESART,	LADY SIMON,
MRS. HUMPHRY WARD,	LADY WEARDALE,	MRS. ARTHUR SOMERVELL,	LADY ROBSON,
MRS. FREDERIC HARRISON,	MISS JANET HOGARTH,	MR. HEBER HART,	MRS. ARCHIBALD COLQUHOUN,
LADY GEORGE HAMILTON,	HON. NINA KAY SHUTTLEWORTH,	MRS. BURGWIN,	MRS. GEORGE MACMILLAN.
MRS. CHARLES TENNYSON,	LADY BIDDULPH OF LEDBURY,		

*Hon. Treasurers:* J. MASSIE, ESQ. LORD ASHBY ST. LEDGERS.

*Secretary:* MISS L. TERRY LEWIS.

The terms of Membership are:—Members of Council, £1 1s.; Members of the League, 5s.; Associates, 1s.; Membership of Branches, 1s. to 5s. (Branches can arrange for the collection of smaller subscriptions.) Men are admitted as subscribing or affiliated members.

The Men's League for Opposing Women's Suffrage (*President:* THE EARL OF CROMER) invites all men who are opposed to Woman Suffrage to enrol themselves as members. For full particulars apply to the Sec., Caxton House.

### PROMINENT ANTI-SUFFRAGISTS.

LADY GRISELDA CHEAPE.

The President of St. Andrews Branch of the Scottish W. N. A.-S. L.



We gave on this page not long ago the portrait of the President of the Scottish Women's National Anti-Suffrage League, the Duchess of Montrose, and we have now much pleasure in presenting our readers with the portrait of a very earnest and enthusiastic official of the Scottish League, Lady Griselda Cheape, the President of the rapidly growing St. Andrews Branch. Lady Griselda has been for a long time an untiring supporter of the Anti-Suffrage cause, and as a Branch President is one who takes a deep personal interest in the growth and building up of this great national movement. When we speak of Lady Griselda as an uncompromising Anti-Suffragist (and she most certainly is), we are glad, too, to say of her that she is a woman who, first and foremost, has worked for the good of her own sex, for it is towards the particular interests of women and children that her public and social work has been directed. Lady Griselda has one very deep and particular interest, the nursing of sick children, and before her marriage

undertook a long course of special training in children's hospitals. She first worked at the Children's Hospital, Edinburgh, then at the Pendlebury Sick Children's Home, Manchester. She next had experience and training in the wards of the Royal Infirmary, Dundee, and at the London Temperance Hospital. Lady Griselda is the President of the British Women's Temperance Association in St. Andrews, and in this capacity is brought much in touch with the working women and busy mothers of the poorer classes in that town. She attended the N.U.W.W. Conference at Lincoln as delegate of the Association.

As President of the Open-Air Sanatorium Committee and Invalid Children's Committee of St. Andrews, she wages war with the greatest enemy of the poor—ill-health—and on the Committee of the Rescue Home, Dundee, shows that practical sympathy with the unfortunate which is surely a woman's true work. Our portrait shows Lady Griselda Cheape with her three children.

L. V. M.

*Griselda Cheape*

## ARDOUR AND APATHY.

ONCE more the women Suffragists are making their plans for calling the attention of Parliament to their demands. The Suffragettes (since the name has established itself to describe the militant suffragists) have taken precisely the decision one would have expected. In one of those military metaphors which are so conspicuously unhappy and unreal when applied to any issue between men and women, they have announced that they will call off their attacking army if Mr. Asquith will give facilities for the Conciliation Bill in the coming session. Mrs. Pankhurst has said this in effect at Dublin, South Shields, and Manchester. Of course, Mr. Asquith could not possibly give facilities next session. Mr. Birrell has said that the idea is "perfectly absurd," though he thinks the Government would very likely give facilities next year. It is one of the principles of the Suffragettes, however, never to let good results wait on prudence. The prospect before us, therefore, is that when Mr. Asquith has refused, as refuse he must, Parliament Square will be, as Shakespeare's Henry IV. says in his gloomy vision of England under Henry V., "peopled with its old inhabitants." The "old inhabitants" of the vision were wolves, but we borrow only the sense of the passage, and mean that there will be a set-back to the orderly development of our life. This is an example of the "return to savagery" to which Mr. St. Loe Strachey refers in the article we print elsewhere, and which every right-minded person, man or woman, must deeply deplore. Another plan for the campaign is to refuse to pay taxes. We cannot ourselves help putting a good deal of blame on those members of Parliament who have trifled with the Suffrage question. We undertake to say that there are many members who voted for the Conciliation Bill who not only had no good-will towards the Bill itself, but were instinctively opposed to Woman Suffrage in any form. Women do not like to be trifled with any more than men, and in this matter they have a genuine grievance. We do not be-

lieve that members will save themselves trouble in their constituencies by lip service to Woman Suffrage. As it is, the Suffragists are able to cite the undoubted fact that the Conciliation Bill passed its second reading by a larger majority than was given to any Government measure.

Now let us turn from the various results of Suffragist ardour to the other side of the shield. The contrast is indeed extraordinary. Simultaneously with all this clamour made by a minority of women, there is a deplorable apathy in that area of civic work where women already have equal rights with men, where they could, if they would, do infinite service to their country, and where they could, above all, prove the *bona fides* of their argument that women are longing to avail themselves of further rights. At the Municipal elections in England and Wales on November 1st there were only twelve women candidates. The number of women voters for County Borough Councils in England and Wales is 365,860. What is the explanation? What is the excuse? We direct the earnest attention of our readers to this fact. We believe that there is no explanation and no excuse, except that women are indifferent to the powers placed in their hands. To some extent, we know, this indifference is due to the fatal influence of Woman Suffrage, which diverts the active spirits from local government work while it alienates the electors. But all the same it is to be regretted, and, for ourselves, we can honestly say that we wish it were otherwise. It would be folly, however, to blink the fact, which is a remarkable disproof of the arguments of the women Suffragists. It will be said that married women with only a residential qualification are debarred from standing at Municipal elections, and that unmarried women cannot afford the expense. In the case of the qualification for married women we hold that there should be an alteration of the law. But most Suffragettes are, we believe, unmarried, and their cause never lacks money. Why should money be withheld from this work? There is no

answer at all, but the one we have given.

Fortunately for the anti-Suffrage cause, there is something more than apathy to prove the aversion of women in general from the idea of the Parliamentary vote. There is a positive declaration of dislike. This is shown in the very interesting and important canvass of women Municipal voters which is being conducted by the Women's National Anti-Suffrage League. The returns are not yet complete, but we give a few, as examples, on another page, and explain the nature and significance of the canvass. The very women who have had a taste of voting, who have had the opportunity to compel Municipal authorities to accept their views in certain respects—the very women in whose interests the Conciliation Bill was framed—are positively opposed to Woman Suffrage.

## NOTES AND NEWS.

THE death of Mrs. Julia Ward Howe has removed a most winning and brilliant figure from the literary and social world of America. Mrs. Ward Howe was an ardent supporter of Woman Suffrage. She entered upon that campaign just when John Stuart Mill was on this side publishing his famous book, and when a democratised Suffrage, as the instrument of social reform, was more hopefully relied on by both philosophers and politicians than it is, perhaps, at the present day. In the United States, the American women of the North had rendered conspicuous service in the nursing and administrative departments of the War. They had gained a new power and a new self-consciousness; and they were pressing forward to a much-improved education. It was a day of new hopes and ambitions; and it was natural enough that the Suffrage should be included among them. Mrs. Ward Howe, one of the most sympathetic and pure-minded of women, threw herself into the movement, and it has ever since had the advantage of her honoured name.

YET, during Mrs. Howe's lifetime, almost all those reforms which, in the late 'sixties, the Suffrage leaders,

both here and in the States, declared could only be got through the vote, have been steadily obtained by other means; and one may well speculate whether, if Mrs. Ward Howe were now entering on life, with her clear brain and her quick refinement and womanliness, she would look upon the Suffrage in quite the same light. Many of those who would very likely have been with her in the circumstances of 1869, are to-day in another camp. They have learned more of the limitations and the dangers of democracy since those days; they realise the immense importance of variety and elasticity in the forms of national life. Mrs. Ward Howe's enthusiasm for the Suffrage was part of that enthusiasm for political and civil freedom which made her such an ardent Abolitionist, which drew from her the battle-hymn of the Republic, and was, indeed, the chief inspiration of all the leading men and women of the mid-nineteenth century. But, after fifty years, we know that a nation may have the fullest political freedom and yet suffer from many and grievous ills. The Suffrage is one means to the regulation and betterment of life; a means that men must use and make the best of. That women should develop their own means and instruments, instead of merely claiming those of men, is the true note of the movement which, in real sympathy with Mrs. Ward Howe's temper, though in apparent opposition to her, is now making such headway in England.

MRS. WARD HOWE was one of the most delightful of social companions. She was full of sympathy and full of wit. She could turn her humour upon herself at any moment, and differing opinions never prevented her from making a friend where she wished to make one. Speaking came quite naturally to her, and it was delightful to see her, when nearly ninety, address a crowded meeting, not, of course, with the energy of her middle life, but with all the ease, simplicity, and fun that were natural to her. At Boston she was universally beloved, and women especially, of all opinions, on both sides of the Atlantic, will long and tenderly remember her.

A PAPER in the October number of the "Englishwoman," called "A Brief Analysis of Anti-Suffragism," shows how difficult Suffragists find it to appre-

ciate the motives of their opponents. The writer, Mr. J. R. W. Tanner, is a very able Suffragist, and he writes his "analysis" with the most laudable intention of pointing out where there seems to him to be some weight in the arguments of the Anti-Suffragists. We should be sorry to frighten away so rare a bird by any ungraciousness. But, after all, perversity and misstatement do not become acceptable because they are presented with a good deal of candour. "To be fair," says Mr. Tanner, "one must admit that the logical result of the vote will be that women may stand for Parliament—and therefore, in considering arguments against the vote, one must treat them as arguments against women members." We are grateful for the admission. There are a large number of women who would not play with the idea of Woman Suffrage for a moment if they understood that the grant of the vote would mean that women would sit in Parliament and become members of the Government, thus exposing their sex to the gross injuries of political wrangling, and knocking away all the underpinning of the conventions on which our social structure is raised. Another admission which we welcome is that, under Woman Suffrage, a minority might easily be physically stronger than the majority.

AFTER making a few admissions, however, Mr. Tanner's candour or penetration fails him. He says:—

"When a man says that it is unnatural for a woman to enter politics, he means (if he is honest with himself) that he prefers the old relationship between the sexes. He personally prefers that a woman should look up to him as a superior being, and that he should have the pleasure, and, if you like, the privilege of looking after her. He likes this, partly because it makes him feel his own importance (so dear to the heart of man) and partly because it is a genuine pleasure to him to feel that he is protecting those he cares for. He thinks, dear fellow, that because this is what seems to him good, it is therefore the natural condition of things."

We beg leave to say that when a man argues that it is unnatural for a woman to enter politics, he does *not* mean (if he is honest with himself), that he wishes to be considered a superior being. All he says is that he is a *different* being—that certain functions belong to a man and certain functions to a woman. While he holds that woman is unsuited to some offices in life, he admits humbly that he himself is just as unsuited to others. If he calls a woman his inferior in physical strength

(which is true), he calls her his superior in many of the most important and gracious acts of life. Mr. Tanner, with the best will in the world, succeeds, in fact, in writing nonsense, and, we must add, mischievous nonsense. In vain for him does the homely man call his wife his "better half," and mean it when he says it.

A DELIGHTFULLY humorous pageant, for which grateful acknowledgments appear to be due to Miss Cicely Hamilton, was given on October 15th at Sheffield. This "Pageant of Great Women" was part of the propaganda of the Suffragists, the intention of it being, as we understand, to prove the greatness of women in the past and, by implication, their right to a Parliamentary vote in the future. Accordingly, a vision of great women was presented, which proved conclusively that the noble and unforgettable services of women to humanity in the past have suffered nothing from the want of the vote. It is strange that this thing should have been done in the cause of votes for women. But, perhaps, only a very pedestrian author would have called the Pageant, what it really was, a tremendous argument on the other side. Miss Hamilton has, indeed, the courage of her humour. Among the historical characters presented were Jane Austen (imagine the best domestic comedies in our language laid under contribution for Suffragist arguments!), Elizabeth Fry, who knew, above all things, that there is more work for women to do in the world than they can ever do—work that is women's work, not men's work), Queen Elizabeth (an absolutist, who thought too little of her own sex), the Empress Tzù Hsi of China (another absolutist very much like our own Elizabeth), and so on. We had almost forgotten that Queen Victoria was one of the characters—Queen Victoria, who wrote of "this mad, wicked folly of 'Woman's Rights,' with all its attendant horrors on which our poor sex is bent." We trust that this vein of humour will not speedily exhaust itself. It is invaluable.

UNDER the heading of "Chivalry?" "Votes for Women" of October 21st publishes this letter:—

"DEAR SIR,—Into a crowded Tube compartment to-day, with only standing room left, came an elderly, tired-looking woman. She stood for a few moments, and then a

young and charmingly pretty girl, growing very pink, got up and offered her a seat. Not a man had moved before; but the moment they saw this girl, young and lovely, standing, one rose with much show of hat-lifting and a complacent smile and offered her his place. I am glad to think she took it. He stood wearing the look of a man conscious of heroism. And the incident struck me as a typical instance of that so-called chivalry we are told we shall lose when we have the vote!—Yours, &c.,

“AN ONLOOKER.”

We wonder whether the writer of this letter knows that, in the judgment of many observers, the sex antagonism introduced by the Suffragist movement has caused an appreciable decline in the deference of men to women in such circumstances as she describes? Some women Suffragists make a practice—or are reputed to do so—of refusing a seat if it is offered. The average Englishman, knowing this, is much too self-conscious to expose himself to the risk of being snubbed or embarrassed in a railway train. Of course, the ignoring of the greater physical strength of man as a distinguishing fact of life, and the maintaining of the demand for deference towards women are mutually destructive principles—a truth of which this correspondent seems to be pathetically unaware.

☪ ☪ ☪

An article in the September number of the “Atlantic Monthly,” by Mrs. Seawell (Molly Elliot Seawell), illustrates the essential objections to Woman Suffrage from a standpoint which is, in many ways, unfamiliar to English-women. Take the important argument, for instance, that woman, not having the same physical force as man, could not invest laws with the same authority. In discussing this, Mrs. Seawell says, incidentally, “women would not be able to fight their way to the polls.” Here, in England, when we use the physical-force argument, we are thinking of the possibility of revolutionary resistance to law, not of reaching the polling booth successfully in order to record a vote. “Fight their way to their polls.”—it is a vivid glimpse of the elections in certain States. We have heard of those ardent women Suffragists who “fought every inch of the way” to the House of Commons; but they were pitted against more or less indulgent policemen, not against excited and determined male partisans. Mrs. Seawell, by the way, falls into some inaccuracies when she writes of the Suffrage movement in the British Empire,

but her greatest inaccuracy is when she speaks of the London police using dog-whips. Another notable difference between the points of view of English and American women is provided by the American property laws. These treat American women with peculiar generosity, and give Mrs. Seawell an argument which would not have quite the same force here, though it would still have a great deal. The grant of the vote to women would bring them, one points out, into conflict with the principle that “No voter can demand maintenance from any other voter.” Are they prepared to sacrifice their present security?

### WHY I AM OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

(By J. St. Loe Strachey, Editor of the “Spectator.”)

I AM asked to write down my reasons for opposing Woman Suffrage, and I shall do so as briefly as possible, and in the plainest possible words. Before I deal with the merits of the question, however, I desire to say at once, that nothing in my argument is in the least degree dishonouring to, or disparaging of, women. I do not offer this explanation as a polite concession, in the nature of courtesy or chivalry; the issue at stake is far too momentous to restrain me from the language of critical depreciation if I thought it to be justifiable. But in truth it is not. I do not for a moment base my objections to Woman Suffrage on the assumption of any kind of intellectual or moral inferiority in women. Woman, in my belief, has capacity for the highest conceivable work, both moral and intellectual; her mind is as sound, her heart is as brave, her character is as firm, and her instincts and motives are as worthy of trust and respect as those of men, and in several respects more so. Over and over again her devotion to the State and her infinite capacity for self-sacrifice have been proved. The women are the daughters of their fathers, as much as the men are the sons of their mothers. Therefore, I can only say that anyone who bases his or her objections to

Woman Suffrage on the assumption of any inferiority of intellect or character in woman is building on a very insecure foundation, and is jeopardising the cause which all we Anti-Suffragists have at heart.

My reason for opposing Woman Suffrage is quite different. It rests upon a recognition of the mysterious union in diversity between the sexes; and this, precisely because it is one of the greatest mysteries of life, is also one of its truest and most vivid realities. Women are not men, and men are not women—that is the heart and pith of the matter. Any State that is to retain the respect and affection of its members must rest on a union and harmony of the sexes. The importance of that union cannot possibly be exaggerated. Now, it is evident that, if conflict and friction arise between the sexes, union, if it does not vanish, is at all events in danger of a vile deterioration. Hitherto union has been maintained, and conflict has been avoided, by making one sex the depositary of supreme political authority. The sex chosen for that purpose is naturally the one which has the power of ultimately enforcing its authority; in other words, the sex which is physically stronger. If the supreme political authority were shared with women, dissensions of the most anarchical and painful kind that the human intellect can conceive would be a permanent and haunting possibility; for the very excellence of women's character would prevent them from shrinking from conflict if their conscience urged them to it. Women are by nature intensely conscientious, and deeply scrupulous as to the conduct of any matters which they feel have been confided to their trust. If they have a duty to perform they will force it to an issue, be the results what they may. To them right and wrong (and we men deeply honour them for it) are absolute things, upon which compromise is inconceivable. As long as women are without *direct* political power, there is no fear of such a conflict.

Supreme political authority can be reposed, then, in only one sex, and that sex must be the stronger one. If my

readers bear this essential consideration in mind, they will have no difficulty in meeting the familiar argument that women have a right to vote if they have those property qualifications which now give votes to men. Indeed, the property qualification in itself is an unsound basis for the suffrage, because it assumes that the most important function of the State is taxation—the taking tribute from a man's property in order to carry on the affairs of the State. As a matter of fact the essential work of Parliament is legislation, the making of laws which constrain a man's life and liberty, and the life and liberty of those dependent on him. In accordance with this, the only just view of the construction of the State, the voter claims his share in the direction of national affairs, because he is ready, if need be, to devote not only his property, but his life, to defend the safety and honour of the country. Manhood suffrage secures the maximum sanction for the laws of the State.

I must not ignore certain objections to the broad issue I have stated, for one always hears them raised when the question of Woman Suffrage is discussed. When sex-antagonism is mentioned, someone in sympathy with the cause of the Suffragists at once exclaims: “But you do not suppose, do you, that all women will be ranked on one side, and all men on the other, so that the minority of men will be able to overcome the majority of women?” I suppose nothing of the sort. But I do foresee the possibility that the majority in some momentous political question might be a majority entirely owing to the number of women on that side, and that the minority, even though insignificant in point of numbers, might have the physical force to defeat the majority. We have almost fallen into the habit of assuming in England that revolutions are things of the past, but let us not deceive ourselves into believing that such a thing as a revolutionary movement might not happen again if the feelings of a large part of the men of the country were worked upon powerfully to resist some unpopular legislative Act. In my own opinion even a General Election, fought

on the issue of Woman Suffrage, would lead to a distressing outburst of sex-antagonism. No doubt the majority of women do not desire the Suffrage, but there would be enough women excited by the proposal to produce the appearance of real antagonism, and in the struggle bitter, foolish, and false things would be said, that would not only deeply wound the feelings of women generally, but would produce a reaction towards savagery in the dealings of men with women. Such antagonism would mean the weakening, if not the destruction, of the wonderful structure of society, which has been carefully built up by experience. This structure may be artificial, but it is nevertheless ennobling and humanising. One of its main supports, be it noted, is the social convention under which women are protected and respected, without being humiliated, and under which their influence over men has become extraordinarily wide, potent, and beneficent.

Another objection which one frequently hears in conversation with women Suffragists, is that Woman Suffrage is already in existence in certain States, and no harm whatever has come of it; that there has been no challenge to orderly government. In answer to this, I would say that there is no case of a State practising Woman Suffrage which has anything like the complicated responsibilities and obligations which rest upon Great Britain. The risks which would be run by Great Britain in granting Woman Suffrage would be entirely out of proportion to the risks run by any experiment yet known to the world. In the governing of India, for instance, the knowledge among Indians that supreme political authority was partly vested in women might create the gravest difficulties. No doubt some women who are working for the vote would say that if the British Empire cannot be maintained on conditions consonant with the perfect political liberty of women, it had better not be maintained at all. But it seems to me certain that that argument would appeal to very few persons. Let us remember, too, that the four

Woman Suffrage States in America are among the most backward in the Union.

I cannot understand why some women should be so desperately anxious to undertake duties for which nature has obviously not fitted them, at the cost of sacrificing duties for which they are eminently and peculiarly fitted. Wordsworth has a line of extreme beauty, pathos, and grandeur, in which he writes of “the patriot mother's weight of anxious care.” Surely every mother, in educating and training her offspring, is performing a duty which commands a degree of respect and reverence that one cannot yield to any man alive. Nor is it only the “patriot mother” who commands respect, for the functions of motherhood are potentially invested in every woman who acts as a nurse or a teacher, or helps children in the thousand-and-one ways in which only a woman can help them. There are innumerable occasions every day of our lives, when only the knowledge and peculiar instincts of a woman will avail in educating, nursing, or consoling. When a man tries to step in on these occasions, even though he be a man who has a rare power of affection and much gentleness, he feels helpless in his incompetence. He knows that he is “a perfect fool” at doing what nature has not purposely fitted him to do. Why, then, should women, who have this beautiful and important gift, desire to impair its quality by sharing with men the functions which men are solely qualified to discharge? If I were a woman, I should be as proud of my peculiar duties as a man is of, say, commanding a battleship or leading his regiment. Indeed, if women Suffragists want supreme political power to be exercised by a mixed electorate, they should undertake to serve as soldiers in the Army and as seamen in the Navy. By pressing the demand to its logical conclusion, one understands its absurdity. This represents my essential objection to Woman Suffrage. All other objections are but extensions and particular applications of this one.

J. ST. LOE STRACHEY.

## A CANVASS OF WOMEN MUNICIPAL ELECTORS.

### ASTONISHING RESULTS.

THE very class in whose interests the Conciliation Bill is framed do not desire Woman Suffrage. We have the pleasure of publishing below some figures which prove this extremely important fact. The canvass of Women Municipal Electors by which we have obtained the figures is not yet complete, in the constituencies that have been undertaken, but we have no doubt that the results already obtained are typical of those yet to come. We feel justified, therefore, in urging them most earnestly on the attention of Members of Parliament. The whole case for the Conciliation Bill rests on the assumption that those women who now have the Municipal Vote are those who suffer the most crying injustice in not having the Parliamentary Vote. Those Members who voted for the Conciliation Bill did not hesitate to make this assumption, just as Mr. Balfour makes the wider assumption that women in general want the Suffrage. Mr. Balfour has declared that if his assumption proves to be unfounded, his opinion would be greatly modified. We venture to hope that the figures below will help towards that modification, and that figures yet to be published will complete the process. The figures show that among women householders and women with occupier qualifications, there is no grievance. The vast majority declare that they do not want the Parliamentary Vote:—

District.	Electorate.	Anti.	Pro.	Neutral.	No Reply.
Bristol	7,244	3,207	873	1,941	1,223
Croydon	4,080	1,571	605	30	62
Southampton	2,243	1,361	147	229	496
Westminster	1,979	1,036	221	136	586
Torquay	1,640	467	210	13	950
*North Berks	1,291	1,085	75	63	68
Central Finsbury	1,216	535	128	257	296
Weston-super-Mare	935	380	235	69	251
Kew	155	96	21	23	15
Ashbourne	153	107	5	2	39

Thus, of those who have answered the questions put to them, 9,845 are opposed to Votes for Women, and only 2,520 are in favour of them. But that is not all. A large number of those canvassed have not answered. It is reasonable to suppose that these mostly—probably almost entirely—are unfavourable to Woman Suffrage. It is not to be supposed that many Woman Suffragists would fail to declare the faith that is in them, well knowing that the results of the Canvass might be used against their cause. We do not pretend, of course, to estimate the exact majority against Woman Suffrage, but it is certain that it is very large, and it is probable that it is enormous.

\* North Berks embraces 87 villages, 2 county towns, 2 boroughs, representative of all sorts and conditions of women.

### THE W.L.G.S. AND WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

OUR Secretary has received the following rather peremptory letter from the Secretary of the Women's Local Government Society, which we insert at once as a matter of courtesy, with our regrets that any statement in this REVIEW should have given umbrage to the members of the W.L.G.S. But we are bound to say that, although the statement in the REVIEW may have been inaccurate as it stands, it certainly represents a tolerably widespread opinion in the outside world, which finds its justification in the overwhelming Suffragist complexion of the names associated with the W.L.G.S. Even though—and, of course, we absolutely accept Miss Leigh Browne's statement—the Society has refrained from giving its official support to the Suffrage movement during the last few years, it is difficult to see how a Society so exclusively controlled by those holding Suffragist opinions could be so run in matters of local government as not, in fact, to strengthen the Suffrage movement. The remedy for the impression which has got abroad would seem to be the addition of a considerable number of Anti-Suffrage members to the Society, and to obtain their strong representation on the Executive Committee. This would give confidence to those in our camp who would most gladly co-operate with the Suffrage members of the W.L.G. Society in a really neutral movement for the furthering of the great cause of women in local government.

#### “THE WOMEN'S LOCAL GOVERNMENT SOCIETY

For the United Kingdom.

“17, Tothill Street,

Westminster, S.W.

“8th October, 1910.

“DEAR MADAM,—My attention has been drawn to an article in the July issue of THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW, in which the Women's Local Government Society is referred to as ‘a simple branch of the Suffragist propaganda.’

“This statement which I have quoted is absolutely contrary to fact. Communications have been addressed to this Society on several occasions during the last five years asking that the support of the Society might be given to this movement for Women's Suffrage; but on every such occasion my Committee has refused, explaining that the Parliamentary Suffrage is outside the scope of the Society's objects.

“My Committee have instructed me to request that a complete withdrawal of the above-mentioned erroneous statement may be inserted in the next issue of THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW, and I must ask for an immediate assurance that this will be done.—Yours faithfully,

“ANNIE LEIGH BROWNE.

“To the Secretary of  
“The Women's National Anti-Suffrage League.”

### LORD CURZON ON WOMEN'S WORK.

WHEN opening the new buildings at Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford, on October 22nd, Lord Curzon made a speech on women's work. He referred to the wonderful advance in women's education which had taken place at Oxford in the last thirty years, and pointed out that this was only part of a much wider movement in the outside world, which had been going on for fifty years.

It was undoubtedly the case (we quote from “The Times” report) that the movement had been far more rapid among the different branches of the English-speaking races in this country, in America, and in our Colonies than among the branches of the Latin race. He sometimes wondered what was the cause of that. He thought that it was due to four reasons—in the first place, to the traditional and accepted impulse towards freedom of the Anglo-Saxon people; and, secondly, to the peculiar economic conditions of English society, particularly in relation to factory labour, which had enabled women engaged in industrial life in this country to claim and to receive their independence much earlier than in foreign lands. The third reason was that their cause had had the inestimable advantage of being championed in this country by an able succession of writers, both men and women. He supposed that if in any foreign country there had been a galaxy of writers of the intellectual eminence of John Stuart Mill, the Brontës, Elizabeth Barrett Browning, Tennyson, George Eliot, George Meredith, all illustrating or expatiating on different branches of the subject, their progress would have been much more rapid than it had been. Finally, their cause here had the advantage of being represented by women of first-rate ability themselves.

#### THE FUTURE.

What was going to be the future? That was a more complex and difficult question, which he could not hope to answer. They had in this country a surplus of a million women over men. The figures showed, if they took the total female population of the country, that more than 80 per cent. were engaged in earning a livelihood, for the most part in industrial occupations, and, of course, the number of those who were doing so was steadily increasing from year to year. That meant, in the first place, that women were steadily extruding men from the spheres of activity which they had hitherto monopolised or occupied. But that did not end the matter. The chances were that women would presently be extruding each other, and that opened up a serious speculation. The danger was that if there were too many women clamouring for the large number of posts available to them, a certain number of them would drift into unsuitable employment, or, perhaps—what was worse—would relapse into respectable but un-

occupied indigence. If that were the chance of the future, was it not a fact that it was the duty of every friend and sympathiser with this women's movement, as far as possible, now while there was still time, to sketch out a plan of action for the future, and to select those spheres of occupation and activity which were likely to be suitable to women, and in which they would not find themselves in unseemly, unprofitable, or uneconomic competition, either with men or with each other? Their latest annual report told him the sort of occupations that ladies passing from that place turned to when they left the University. He found time after time the words “assistant mistress,” “head-mistress,” “senior mistress,” every variety of mistress, apparently, and now and then, popped in as a sort of agreeable contrast, “private secretary.” Now he asked them a question in complete ignorance, and, therefore, they must receive it with compassion: Are you not just possibly confining yourselves to rather a narrow and stereotyped channel?

#### NEW FIELDS OF ACTIVITY.

It seemed to him that there was really an immense field for the activities of educated and cultivated women in this country in the near future in directions which did not at present, at any rate to any considerable extent, appear to have been tapped by them. He suggested that they might take up the profession of journalism, or that of librarians or organists; the whole field of literature was open to them; the artistic decoration of houses was another opening, as also was that of the professional designing and laying out of gardens. Besides these there was an enormous opening in the Colonies, as heads of institutions, as managers of households, as secretaries, and so on. Then in India, although it was slowly awakening from the torpor of centuries, there was a movement towards the emancipation of the native women, even inside the walls of the zenana. As these ladies freed themselves from the shackles of their old traditions and customs they would want English teachers and English ladies to preside over their households and teach their children. He had known several ladies who had rendered most valuable help in that direction, and he commended India to them as worthy of their attention. He felt about Oxford that he would like its sound to go out into all lands, and its voice to the uttermost ends of the world, and he did not see why women as well as men should not bear the message. He hoped the ladies would never forget, while they pursued their vocations, or in their attainment to academic success, in their possible triumph in respect to degrees, in their search for vocations, which they were going to fulfil in after life, they would never forget the sublime truth that the highest ideal and conception of womanhood was after all to be found in the home.

We notice that this speech was followed, as we expected it would be, by the argument in newspapers favourable to Woman

Suffrage, that Lord Curzon had presented a complete case for giving the vote to women. If the case for the vote depended on the intellectual equipment of women, we do not suppose that Lord Curzon would be an Anti-Suffragist. But, of course, it does not. We are very glad that Lord Curzon so amply assumed that there is a wide field of intellectual work open to women, which, however, lies along lines parallel to, and perfectly distinguishable from, the political franchise.

### AN AMERICAN CANVASS.

In reference to a letter from Mrs. Ward Howe, which had appeared in the "Times" a few days previously, maintaining that the opinion of ministers of religion in the four Suffrage States of America was favourable to the working of Woman Suffrage, the "Times" of October 22nd published the following letter from Mr. John Massie, the Hon. Treasurer of the Women's National Anti-Suffrage League:—

"To the Editor of the 'Times.'

"SIR,—It would be entirely repugnant to my feelings to criticise any action of Mrs. Julia Ward Howe in the presence of her lamented death.

"But, dealing solely with the facts recorded in the letter from her which you publish, I would venture to point out that the section of society consisting of clergymen and ministers of religion is an unfortunate one to select for a canvass on the question of Woman Suffrage. The preponderance of women in their churches and the activity of the more restless ones create a situation in which it is hard for them to pronounce an unbiased and especially a hostile opinion. I have heard clergymen in this country say that they did not believe in Woman Suffrage, but that it would be useful in the fight for their schools. And I know Nonconformist ministers who are strongly against it, and yet feel that it is wiser for them to keep their opinion for private consumption. And there is small difficulty in foreseeing what would happen to the Governments of France and Italy if the women in those countries had the vote.

"A canvass, moreover, even of Sunday school superintendents and local editors in the four Woman Suffrage States, Colorado, Idaho, Wyoming, and Utah, tends to be seriously affected by the fact that the women already possess governmental power.

"But some of the clergymen in America speak out vigorously enough. One of the most striking pamphlets against Woman Suffrage is the reprint of an address entitled "Woman," delivered last December by a distinguished clergyman, the Rev. Charles H. Parkhurst, D.D., of New York, and published under the auspices of the National League for the Civic Education of Women.—I am, Sir, &c.,

"JOHN MASSIE.

"Oxford, October 18th."

### THE LEAGUE'S WORK AT WALTHAMSTOW.

We have received the following note on the work done for the League during the Walthamstow by-election:—

The Suffragists have not had it all

their own way at Walthamstow. We have been there, too. Our League has been capably represented by an indefatigable member, Mr. A. W. Thompson, assisted by Mrs. Agnes Stewart and a staff of workers. This small army has impressed upon thousands of people that the Women's National Anti-Suffrage League is a real "live" institution, and that it was ready to respond in no uncertain way to the challenge of one of the Suffrage societies a few months ago to show its courage by coming out and opposing the Suffragists. The "Antis" have dared to do what the Suffragists dared them to do, and this fact caused irritation and discomfort. The Suffragists are evidently not so confident as they profess to be. We assure them that the walls of Jericho will not fall yet. We read in "Votes for Women" that this campaign has cost the Suffragists something like £200. The news that the "nominee of the Government" has increased his majority is certainly not calculated to make them satisfied with their bargain. Our representatives recognised immediately the slowness of the influence which the Suffragists had on the electors, and therefore we did not aim at holding many meetings, to rebut their arguments, but directed our efforts chiefly to parading the principal streets. Our van was decorated with the colours of the League in the shape of flags and shields, inscribed with the name of the League, and banners bearing the inscriptions, "No Petticoat Government," "No Misrule for Us," "Nature Knows No Equality," "All Government Rests on Force." We also had the posters, "Women do not Want Votes," and "A Warning, &c." Our meetings were held at various points on the main thoroughfares. We also employed sandwichmen carrying posters "Women do not Want Votes," and distributed leaflets. The leaflets were given away outside halls where Suffrage meetings were being held, and at Suffrage outdoor meetings. In some cases we heckled the speakers. Mrs. Stewart, for instance, severely heckled Miss Christabel Pankhurst at the Public Baths on October 18th, to the apparent delight of the large audience. As several thousands of leaflets were distributed each day, they cannot fail to make the readers acquainted with the real arguments against Woman Suffrage. The resolutions against Woman Suffrage were carried with overwhelming majorities at all our meetings. We believe that our small force has more than counteracted whatever impressions the Suffragists made on the electors in Walthamstow.

### LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

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

SIR,—The Women's Suffrage movement has now been before the public in the most prominent way for some years, and it will probably be admitted, both by its supporters and opponents, that there is practically no argument either on one side or the other which has been left unturned. The question, therefore, seems to have resolved itself into the Parliamentary Lobby one of "Aye" or "No," and only one point still remains for final decision.

We may take it that the "Noes," which this REVIEW represents, are opposed to any and every form of Parliamentary Suffrage so far as this applies to women resident in the British Isles, the seat of government of our

Empire. (I am purposely leaving the question an open one in so far as it concerns the local Parliaments of any particular portions of the Empire, such as our self-governing Colonies, for have we not given women full powers on our local governing bodies at home? And, speaking for myself alone, I also regard the question as an open one in its relation to any small community, country, or State which "sits safely" under the protection of its neighbours, and the governing powers of which are limited, in the main, to local affairs.)

With respect to the "Ayes," however, the case is different, and recent events have furnished conclusive proof that it still remains for them to answer the following question:—Which of the three Bills recently before the House do they wish to see passed into law as a settlement of the demand made by a limited number of the women in Great Britain (our statistics give it as one in three hundred) for the Parliamentary vote?

Mr. Stanger's Bill?

Mr. Geoffrey Howard's Bill?

The Conciliation Bill?

If the Women's Suffrage question can be narrowed down to this issue, before the next General Election, much waste will be saved of time, talent, and money badly needed in other directions.

I venture, therefore, to bring before our League the suggestion that we shall, when the time for action arises, address ourselves to Parliamentary candidates on something after these lines:—

1. Are you in favour of extending the Parliamentary franchise of Great Britain and Ireland to women?

2. If your answer to the previous question is in the affirmative, will you kindly state with which of the three Bills recently before the House you are in sympathy: Mr. Stanger's Bill; Mr. Geoffrey Howard's Bill; or the Conciliation Bill?

I am, sir, yours, &c.,

E. MAUD SIMON.

Birmingham, October 26th, 1910.

[We are grateful to Lady Simon for her most useful suggestion, and trust that the Branches of the League will act upon it, or, at all events, offer us their opinions on it. As we have said in our leading article, many members of Parliament have fallen into the practice of purchasing peace and quiet for themselves by giving vague assurances of support to Woman Suffragists. Yet they would not like to see any conceivable Bill for Woman Suffrage passed into Law. Lady Simon's question would, for one thing, force them to a definite declaration which would be all on the side of candour, and would be more satisfactory to both sides.—ED., A.-S. REVIEW.]

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

SIR,—Will you allow me to quote a few typical sentences from an article, lately come into my possession, by Mr. N. Ewer, issued by the People's Suffrage Federation?

"Consider for a moment the position of an Imperialist of the type of Lord Curzon, confronted with a proposal to enfranchise women—ultimately to enfranchise all women as well as all men. What are the questions which he asks himself? Not whether a State so constituted will be more representative of its subjects; not whether it will be in a better position to understand the needs and to meet the wants of those subjects. It is rather this. How would the change affect

### LORD CROMER'S MEETING AT MANCHESTER.

On Friday, October 28th, a large and important meeting, organised by the Women's National Anti-Suffrage League, was held in the Free Trade Hall, at Manchester. Among those who wrote regretting their inability to be present, were the Bishop of Manchester, Mr. G. Agnew, M.P., Mr. Belloc, M.P., Mr. Colefax, M.P., and Professor Capper. Women were not admitted to the body of the hall, as Lord Cromer wished to make a special appeal to the electorate. There were, however, several ladies on the platform. One of these, wearing the colours of the Women's Social and Political Union, rose and put a question towards the end of the meeting, but did not persevere against the good-humoured outcry which followed. During the speeches there were several interruptions, but the resolution was carried by a great majority. Owing to a mistake, Lord Cromer, who was to have moved the resolution, and Lord Sheffield (the Chairman) were late in arriving. In these circumstances, Miss Violet Markham moved the resolution, and Lord Cromer, who arrived during her speech, seconded it.

Miss VIOLET MARKHAM (the report of whose speech we take from the "Manchester Guardian") moved:—

"That in the opinion of this meeting of Parliamentary electors of Manchester, Salford, and district it would be unjust to women, unjust to men, and mischievous to the State if Parliamentary responsibilities were imposed on women, and therefore this meeting calls upon the members of Parliament for this city and district to resist the passage into law of any bill to give votes to women without previously referring the issue to the country."

Miss Markham said that it was not a question of what was good for women or what was good for men, but of what it was good for the State as a whole to have. She did not admit the three great dogmas underlying the demand for Women's Suffrage. She did not admit that anyone had a natural right to a vote. The vote was a function of the State accorded by the State to those classes of citizens who could best use that function for the benefit of the majority of the citizens. She did not admit that taxation ought to go with representation. Taxation was not the price of a vote; it was the price of civilisation. She did not admit that there was any question of justice involved in denying the Parliamentary vote to women. Plato had said that justice consisted in doing your own business. They wanted men to do their business and women to do theirs, because they held that it was by each sex developing to the highest point its own special gifts and genius, and by not interfering with the functions of the other, that they arrived at the maximum of life for the whole community.

"I regard women as superior to men," Miss Markham said, "and therefore I don't like to see them trying to become men's equals. As a matter of fact, what we say is this—that there is no question of inferiority or

superiority, but owing to natural and physical causes the spheres of men and women are different, and therefore they ought to have a different share in the management of the State. You don't set a Derby winner to draw coals. Woman is an infinitely more precious thing than a Derby winner. We assert that woman is debarred by the very fact of her sex from the average political experience which falls to the lot of the average man. She cannot defend the State in any capacity. She cannot take part in any of the heavy industries which are the great industries of the country, and she cannot take part in the government of the 300,000,000 of coloured people who form the great part of this Empire. But it is precisely with these points where women's practical citizenship breaks down that the Parliamentary vote has to do."

Miss Markham admitted that there were large numbers of ignorant men voters, but out of Bedlam was that any reason for doubling the number by enfranchising as many ignorant women? The ignorance of men electors was artificial, and could at any time be cured by experience, while the ignorance of the woman elector would remain a constitutional matter of her sex and could not be swept away as they might in the future sweep away the ignorance of men electors. They were told that possession of the vote would raise women's wages. So strongly did she feel about women's labour that if she thought the vote would raise the wage she would not only be a Suffragist but a Suffragette. But there was no evidence of any kind to show that Parliamentary representation had anything to do with the rate of wages. If a fraction of the energy which had gone into the Suffrage campaign had gone into the organisation of trade unions for women they would have done more to raise the economic position of women than by giving them twelve votes apiece.

Concluding, Miss Markham said that the Suffrage movement was a gamble with the future of womanhood and the future of the race, a gamble regarded with aversion by the enormous majority of women in this country, a gamble which she hoped would be emphatically repudiated by the electors of this country.

The following is a verbatim report of Lord Cromer's speech:—

The last time I spoke in this great hall I was standing side by side with a man whom we all respect, to advocate the cause of Free Trade. That man was Mr. Shackleton, the Member for Clitheroe. I have now come to speak to you on a subject as to which I cannot, unfortunately, claim Mr. Shackleton as an ally, but I do not on that account cease to respect him as a thoroughly honest and straightforward opponent. That subject is Female Suffrage. The gist of what I have to say may be compressed in a very few words. I know what I want. I hope and believe I know what you want, and I feel pretty confident that I know what the large majority, not only of my countrymen, but also of my countrywomen, want. We want that this great British Empire, whose ramifications extend to the uttermost parts of the world, which was made by men, should, in the future, as in the past, be governed by men and not by women. We value the services women render to the State, especially as wives and mothers. We look to them to preserve our family life, on which the greatness of any nation must rest, to train our children and to hold up to us high ideals of conduct in

both private and public life, but we do not want them to govern us, neither do they, for the most part, wish to be governed by each other.

#### THE CASE OF INDIA.

I spoke just now, not of the United Kingdom, but of the British Empire, and I did so advisedly, for if ever there was a strictly Imperial question, it is this. Mistakes in matters of internal policy may generally be rectified. Chancellors of the Exchequer come and go. A tax imposed by one Government may be taken off by another. But a false step made in dealing with Imperial issues may far more probably lead to disastrous consequences which are irremediable. Take the case of India, a country in whose welfare and good government the men of Lancashire are very specially interested. What are the qualities mainly required in order to govern the people of India? I say they are manly, straightforward common-sense and a determination to look the real facts of the case steadily in the face. Extreme sentimentality, vague and undisciplined sympathies, hasty generalisations, based on inexperience and inaccurate information, should all be discarded. I know that these qualities are displayed at times by some men, but they are held in check by the views of other men, fortunately constituting the majority, of more evenly balanced minds. They are qualities which are, broadly speaking, characteristic of a majority of the female sex, and they are sufficient of themselves to disqualify women from directing the policy of an Imperial people. What was the opinion on this subject of the most illustrious English lady that this generation has known? What were the views of Queen Victoria, who was also Empress of India, a title of which she was very justly proud? This is what the great Queen said: "I am," she wrote, "most anxious to enlist everyone who can speak or write to join in checking this mad, wicked folly of woman's rights. We women are not made for governing;" and, remember, this was said by a lady who spoke with an experience of governing not possessed by any of the 10,000 women who recently tramped through the streets of London to the Albert Hall. An American lady, writing on this subject a short time ago, said of Queen Victoria: "This illustrious lady was celebrated for knowing what she was talking about." When there is a question between Mrs. Pankhurst and Queen Victoria, I have no hesitation in saying that my sympathies go with Queen Victoria, and also, I may add, with that very distinguished lady, Miss Octavia Hill, who has done more to improve the lot of women in this country than the whole tribe of Suffragettes put together, and who recently said that she and thousands of other "silent women" earnestly hoped that no Woman's Suffrage Bill of any kind would become law. Think of all those silent women. They are imploring the electors of this country to save them from their more loquacious sisters, and not to impose a burthen on them which they reject, and which they feel they are incapable of bearing.

#### OUR COMPETITORS

Now look at another Imperial aspect of this question. The nation against whom we have principally to compete, whether in point of trade, or in that of maritime supremacy, on which our trade largely depends, is Germany. The German man is manly, and the German woman is womanly. Can we hope to compete with such a nation as this, if we war

against nature, and endeavour to invert the natural rôles of the sexes? We cannot do so. If we are to maintain our position amongst the nations in respect to trade or politics, we must display a virility equal to that of our most formidable competitors. Another trade competitor is America. We are constantly being told that Female Suffrage has been tried with success in America, but what are the facts? Female Suffrage has been carried in four of the least advanced States of the American Union, one of which is Utah, the former home of the polygamous Mormons, a State which sent to Congress a representative who was moderate enough to limit the number of his wives to three. The result appears to have been that the remaining States of the American Union have been warned by the example of these four Female Suffragist communities, and have refused to follow their lead. One of the neighbouring States, Oregon, first rejected the proposal by a majority of 1,800 votes, then by a majority of 10,000, and, on a third trial being made, by a majority of no less than 20,000. The people of Oregon have had constant opportunities for forming an opinion on the subject. These figures indicate pretty clearly that the more they see of Female Suffrage the less they like it.

#### THIN END OF THE WEDGE.

I know that I shall be told that these arguments are not to the point, because there is at present no question of giving votes to all women, but only to a very limited class of women. Gentlemen, of all the delusions prevalent on this question, this is the greatest. It is impossible to give the country a small dose of Female Suffrage. You must either enfranchise all the women or none. You cannot stop short at a half-hearted and wholly indefensible measure such as that which Mr. Shackleton was reluctantly persuaded to father, a measure which gives a vote to about a million women, who are mostly childless, and denies the right of voting to I know not how many millions of women, who, as wives and mothers, are fulfilling the highest and most important function of their sex—that of maternity. The really stalwart supporters of Female Suffrage fully recognise this difficulty. They are quite honest about it. Mr. Shackleton only regards his Bill as the thin end of the wedge—a wedge which I trust the public opinion of this country will never allow him and his friends to drive home. Mr. Snowden, the Member for Blackburn, appears to be much of the same opinion. Mr. Lloyd George wants Female Suffrage all round, and won't vote for anything less, and Mr. Winston Churchill, in one of the most able speeches I ever heard, literally riddled Mr. Shackleton's Bill with searching and effective criticism, and asked for something much more democratic. I greatly prefer this attitude to that of the half-hearted wobblers. It is honest and courageous. I like to see my opponents come out into the open, and tell me what they really want. Now that we know what the most keen-sighted and active amongst them wants is votes for all women, we have a clear issue before us, which has to be fought out to a finish, and it will be the fault of the male electors of this country, with whom the matter rests, if, being forewarned, they consent to petticoat government.

#### A MOMENTOUS ISSUE.

Do not, however, for a moment suppose that it will be possible to stop at giving votes to all women. I know that the most

moderate amongst the women—those who are under the delusion that the measure can be taken in small doses—disclaim any idea of allowing women to sit in Parliament. They may disclaim it as much as they like, and I do not doubt the honesty of their disclaimers, but, once grant votes for women, and not only will that demand inevitably be made, but also the further demand that women shall be capable of holding ministerial position, however exalted. How can the demand be resisted without driving a coach-and-six through the principle of perfect equality for men and women, for which the advocates of women's rights contend, which was advanced by the great women's protagonist, John Stuart Mill—a great thinker, gentlemen; only, it is to be remembered, as John Bright said, that the worst of great thinkers is that they so often think wrong. How can you give any individual, either man or woman, the right to make the laws under which we are governed, and at the same time debar him or her from holding those executive and judicial functions which are created in order to carry those laws into effect? Mr. Gladstone, who, equally with Mr. Bright, was strongly opposed to Female Suffrage, held that it was impossible to make this distinction, and I think the rest of us, if we are in error, may find some consolation in knowing that we err in such illustrious company as that of Mr. Gladstone. I repeat, therefore, that we may sweep aside all the fallacies or arguments which are dinned into our ears about this being a measure of small importance, and similar in character to other changes which have from time to time been made in the machinery of our institutions. A more momentous issue was never submitted to the people of this country. That issue, as I have already said, is whether we are still to be governed by men, or whether we are to transfer the government of this great Empire to women, whose numbers exceed those of the men in the United Kingdom by no less than 1,300,000.

#### OPPOSITION FROM WOMEN.

There is another aspect of the question which I should like to lay before you. Mr. Balfour, who, I regret to say, is a Suffragist, but not apparently a very whole-hearted supporter of the cause, said the other day in Parliament that his whole attitude on this question would be altered if he thought that the majority of women were against the extension of the franchise. I do not say I concur in this view. I rather hold with Mr. F. E. Smith, whose brilliant speech made in Parliament last July almost exhausted the arguments bearing upon the question, that if every woman in the world wanted a vote, it would in no way influence his opinion. Neither would it influence mine. For, in point of fact, leaving aside the contention, which few, if any, in this country admit, that there is a right to vote inherent in every individual, it is clear to me that the question ought only to be decided by a consideration of what is best in the general interests of the community, and, moreover, that it can only be decided by those who have the constitutional right to decide it—that is to say, by the present male electors of the United Kingdom. At the same time, I fully recognise that if there were anything approaching to unanimity amongst women on this subject, the case in favour of Female Suffrage would be much strengthened. But does such unanimity exist? I cannot give figures to prove on which side the majority lies, but I know

that 400,000 women have petitioned Parliament against the measure, and I know the Anti Woman-Suffrage League is accumulating evidence from all quarters which shows that a very large number of women, especially amongst those who already have the municipal vote, are on our side. My belief is that, before long, we shall be able to show that the anti-Suffragist women constitute a majority, and if we can show this, we may look hopefully forward to the conversion of Mr. Balfour. But even without being able to prove an actual majority, consider how the matter stands. When, in 1832, the vote was extended to the middle-classes, did any of those classes object to receiving the gift? I think not. I am old enough to remember the great Reform Act of 1867, under which what are generally known as the working-classes were admitted to the franchise. I certainly never heard at the time of any association of working-men, or of any single working-man, who came forward to protest against being made a voter. I do not believe any such strange phenomenon existed. And the same may be said when, seventeen years later, agricultural labourers were enfranchised. Did they form any Anti Agricultural-Suffrage Leagues? I think not. But here we have Anti Woman-Suffrage Leagues springing up all over the country. Women of every class and of every position in society have enrolled themselves as members of those leagues. Let me again quote Mr. Gladstone. Speaking on this subject, he said: "There has never been within my experience"—and Mr. Gladstone had a pretty wide experience—"a case in which the franchise has been extended to a large body of persons generally indifferent to receiving it." Mark that word indifferent. It hits the right nail on the head. The last General Election showed clearly enough that all the efforts of the Suffragists failed to elicit anything approaching to enthusiasm on their behalf. Broadly speaking, the attitude, not only of men, but also of women, where it was not absolutely hostile, was generally one of apathy and indifference. I say that, in order to justify such a far-reaching change as that proposed, you should have general enthusiasm, and something approaching to unanimity, and not indifference and only the support of an aggressive minority or bare majority.

#### WOMEN'S WAGES.

Now, I pass to another point as to which a great deal of misapprehension prevails. Working women are being constantly told that, if they succeed in getting votes, the result will be that their wages will be raised. I do not think it is right or fair to hold out delusive hopes of this sort to a number of poor, hard-working women. The rate of wages depends mainly on supply and demand, partly also on the skill and capacity of the workers, and partly on the help and protection afforded by trades unions. It does not depend on the Parliamentary vote. The enfranchisement of the working-classes in 1867 has resulted in much useful legislation being undertaken which has benefited those classes, but I altogether deny that it has affected the rate of wages. In the seventeen years which preceded 1867, the average rate of wages rose by thirty-five per cent. There has been a further rise since then, but it has not been proportionately so great as previous to enfranchisement. A recent report issued by the Board of Trade gives some interesting figures on this subject. It shows that, in the United

Kingdom, there are some 1,200,000 workers employed in the textile trades, of whom considerably more than half are women. In the twenty years from 1886 to 1906 the wages of the men workers increased by 16 per cent. They had votes. The women had none, but did they suffer on that account? Not at all. During the same period, the average advance in the wages of women was eighteen per cent., or two per cent. more than in the case of the men. In respect to no class has the rise of wages been so marked during the last twenty years as in that of voteless female domestic servants. In their case the rise has been from forty to fifty per cent. Take, again, the case of the agricultural labourers. Between 1850 and 1878 their wages increased by no less than forty-eight per cent. That was during the time when they had no votes. In 1884 they were enfranchised. Since then the advance in agricultural wages has been much slower—only about nine per cent. These facts and figures prove conclusively that there is no connection between votes and wages. I know that women generally earn less than men, but why is this? It is because, as a producer of wealth, the average woman is less efficient than the average man. Where wages are paid on a piece basis, as I believe is generally the case in the textile trade, there can be no other reason. I am addressing an audience which is much more familiar with the details of this subject than I am, but I daresay there are many present who could bear out the statement made in the Board of Trade report that the average woman can tend fewer looms than the average man, and, moreover, that her earnings at each loom are generally somewhat less than those of the man. Where a daily wage is paid, the case is somewhat different. In those cases, women are often employed because their labour is cheaper than that of men. Once give women the same daily wage as the men, and the result, so far from being of any benefit to the women, would be disastrous to their interests, for it would, of a surety, throw a number of hard-working and deserving women out of employment, their wages being taken by men.

#### TERRIBLE FIGURES.

Now, let me draw your attention to another aspect of this question of women's labour—an aspect which is too often much neglected. We have been hearing a good deal lately about women's rights. Equally with Miss Octavia Hill and other ladies, I should like to hear a little more about women's duties. And what is the chief duty of married women? I say it is to look after their children. But in their ardour to convert women into effeminate men, the advocates of women's rights seem to be heedless of what befalls the children. From 1874, when an attempt was made to get shorter hours of work for women and children, to 1907, when that very courageous and far-sighted reformer, Mr. John Burns, tried to limit the employment of women before and after child-birth, all attempts at legislation intended to protect the true interests of women and children have been strenuously opposed by the women's party. The natural result has ensued. The women have suffered in health and the lives of many poor children have been sacrificed. I ask you to pay special attention to the figures which I am about to give, for they are very remarkable. The average infant mortality throughout England and Wales is about 132 to every 1,000 births. Here, in Lancashire, where many women are employed, the average is 152 per 1,000. At Burnley, where

ninety per cent. of the adult women are at work, it is no less than 208 per 1,000. In the Staffordshire potteries district, it ranges from 178 to 209 per thousand. And yet, in the face of these figures—terrible figures, I call them—we are asked to give votes to women, in order, as they themselves put it, that they may be relieved from the grinding oppression of man-made laws. I say to the men of Lancashire that, if they care for the health of their wives and the welfare of their children, they should insist that, for the future, as in the past, the laws of this country should be made by men, and not by women.

#### GENEROUS "MAN-MADE" LAW.

Now I pass to another point. How about the alleged inequality of women in the eyes of the law? There was a time when the woman had some legitimate grievances, but these were removed by the passing of the Married Women's Property Acts—laws, it must be borne in mind, which were devised and passed by men. If any further grievances exist, by all means let them be carefully considered, and if they are shown to be legitimate, let them be rectified. But, in the meantime, I wish to say, if there is to be equality, let it be equality all round. Are the laws so very equal at present? I am not sure that they are. The English law obliges a husband to maintain his wife. There is no counter-obligation on the part of the wife to maintain her husband. Again, if a wife trespasses, or commits an assault, or publishes a libel, who is liable for damages? Not the woman herself, but her husband. Who does Mr. Lloyd George propose to send to prison if a married woman's income is incorrectly returned for income-tax? Not the woman herself, but her husband. And, if you look, not to the text of the law, but to its application, the case is even stronger. Women often get heavy damages for breach of promise of marriage. Does a man ever get damages against a woman who has jilted him? Rarely, I think. And yet such cases not infrequently occur. Is it not a notorious fact that both judges and juries are disposed to be much more lenient to women offenders than to men? Look, again, at custom, which is even stronger than law. A prominent Suffragist said the other day that she attached no importance whatever to the courtesy shown by men to women. On this, a lady, who was not a Suffragist, very rightly pointed out that the deference shown to women involved something more than mere empty courtesy. Almost on the day her opponent made this foolish statement, an account appeared in the newspapers of the wreck of a great steamer. The boats were manned, and the first order issued was: "Women and children first." I believe that, under similar circumstances, Englishmen, in spite of the follies of the Suffragists, will always allow the women and children to go first. But, then, what becomes of the alleged equality? It vanishes directly it is brought face to face with facts, and with these chivalrous instincts which no Act of Parliament can, fortunately, eradicate.

#### SOME FALLACIES.

Gentlemen, I fear that I have already detained you too long. Yet I would add one word more. Do not be led away by the plausible, but wholly fallacious, argument that we, Anti-Suffragists, wish to place women in a position of inferiority to men. There is no question of superiority or inferiority. What we maintain is that the

difference between man and man is due merely to their social surroundings and economic conditions; whereas the difference between man and woman is organic and has been drawn by the immutable laws of nature. Do not also be led away by the equally fallacious argument that exceptional women have done exceptional things. These individual cases prove nothing. Every man will recognise that, except where physical force is required, individual women have at times succeeded as well as any individual men, and far better than the general run of men. But Parliament has not got to legislate for exceptional cases. The legislature only has to take account of the general interests of the community and of average capacity. I maintain that the general interests of the country point to the conclusion that we should not try a crude experiment which has, so far, been rejected by every other great nation, and, moreover, that the average capacity of women is not such as to render it desirable that the experiment should be tried.

#### NOT A PARTY QUESTION.

Remember, also, that there is one feature about this business which is to my mind eminently satisfactory. The question of Female Suffrage has, so far, escaped from the grasp of the party managers. Distinguished Unionists, like Mr. Austen Chamberlain and Mr. Walter Long, follow the lead of Mr. Asquith, who, I am glad to say, is a staunch Anti-Suffragist; whilst, on the other hand, many Radical members of Parliament recently found themselves, perhaps somewhat to their own astonishment, in the same lobby as Mr. Arthur Balfour. Personally, I rather welcome all this Parliamentary confusion. It shows that a big question is, for once in a way, being considered exclusively on its own merits, and that is a luxury in which, under the party system, the people of this country are not often allowed to indulge. I ask you men of Lancashire, therefore, to consider it on its own merits, and I feel convinced that the more closely and thoroughly you consider it, the more fully will you be convinced that neither Mr. Shackleton's Bill, nor any other Bill, having for its object the whole or partial enfranchisement of women, should be allowed to become part of the law of England.

The last speaker was Lord Sheffield, the report of whose speech we take from the "Manchester Guardian":—

LORD SHEFFIELD referred to a gibe which Lord Lytton had indulged in in anticipation of their meeting. Lord Lytton had called them panic-stricken warriors because they were excluding women from the meeting, but Lord Lytton must know that if women were excluded it was because those on whose behalf he was pleading had shown themselves ignorant of the first principles of political discussion, and had thereby shown to a great extent their unfitness to be admitted to that political power which they claimed. The demand of the Woman's Suffrage meeting was that the Government should find time in their autumn session to hurry through a Bill which had not been considered by the country, and which he had no hesitation in saying would be about the greatest revolution that could be introduced into our political form of Government. The resolution they had carried that night was very moderate, because, although the speakers had pronounced themselves definitely against the extension of the suffrage to women, all that the resolution asked was that

the Government should not touch or meddle with the question until the country had been consulted upon it. He did not think there was any great cleavage between the feelings of men and women in the same class. There were differences between the upper classes and the lower classes; but in the same class the men and women thought much the same in this country. What would happen, however, in neighbouring countries if women voted on an equality with men? They had lately had a revolution in Portugal, and most people thought that the votes of the people in Portugal would confirm the revolution. But, if there was equal suffrage between men and women, was it not extremely unlikely that the women, under clerical influence, would vote in a way diametrically opposed to that of the men. Men would not willingly submit, he thought, if something they held very strongly was to be set aside by a slight preponderance of votes given by women.

Government did not rest entirely upon force. It rested largely upon sentiment and habit ingrained by centuries of experience, and that sentiment and habit enabled them to carry on government quietly without calling in that substratum of force which underlay all government. "I am not going to say," he added, "that the time may not come when women, having proved their fitness in other ways, may come to the stage of voting. What I do say is this, that a great deal more has to be done in the education of women—and by education I don't mean schooling and instruction, but disciplining of the mind, the acquisition of habits of self-restraint and a sense of judgment more than a sense of emotion and kindness—before they can be entrusted with the responsibility of helping to govern this great country."

#### MRS. HUMPHRY WARD AT CROYDON.

A MOST successful and crowded meeting, organised by the Croydon Division Branch of the Women's National Anti-Suffrage League, was held in the Croydon Public Hall on Monday, October 31st. Mr. S. H. Butcher, M.P., who had promised to speak, was, unfortunately, prevented by illness from being present. His place was admirably taken by Mr. C. T. Mills, M.P., and Mrs. Greatbatch also made an excellent speech. The Anti-Suffrage resolution was carried by a very large majority.

A letter from SIR ROBERT HERMON-HODGE, as follows, was read:—

"Dear Mrs. Corry,—I am extremely pleased to hear that the Anti Women's-Suffrage League are holding a meeting in Croydon on October 31st. I am greatly obliged by your invitation to be present, and much regret that my engagements will not enable me to do so.

"You are to be congratulated on having secured such able exponents of our views as Mrs. Humphry Ward and Mr. Butcher, and I am very sorry that I cannot come to support them. I am much interested in the information you send me as to the state of public opinion in Croydon on this question. I find that many men and women who lightly joined in the cry of 'Votes for Women' have, upon reflection, become opponents of the proposal; the serious consequence of which

to our country and our Empire are better realised than they were a short time ago; and will, I am sure, be better realised in Croydon after your meeting, to which I wish every success.—I am, yours very truly,

ROBERT HERMON-HODGE."

MRS. HUMPHRY WARD, who was in the chair, said that she did not always agree with the arguments commonly used against Woman Suffrage. She was not one of those who thought that the Suffrage question was settled when the women who asked for the vote were bidden go home and mind their domestic duties. In the long run it was true to say that opposition to Woman Suffrage turns upon the fundamental question of sex, and rested upon the fundamental fact of maternity. But that was not, perhaps, the argument, or the aspect of the argument, which appealed most to her. She had spent some years in the attempt to help forward the higher education of women, knowing very well, indeed, that anything that develops a woman's powers makes her the more apt for the great duties of motherhood—but having in view, motherhood or no, the development of women as minds and souls, with their own inalienable rights in the world, rights of knowledge and freedom and experience. Those who fought women's battles in the 'sixties and 'seventies desired to see women become doctors, students of science, historians, poets, novelists, artists, teachers—with free access to the opportunities of both the old and the new Universities; they rejoiced in the newly given local government vote, and were always ready to support the movement for making women factory and sanitary inspectors, and removing their inability to sit on County Councils, and so on.

#### A CLEAVAGE.

But on one point there was always a cleavage—between those who adopted Mill's views about Woman Suffrage, and those who did not. And that cleavage had now become a wide and deep one, and, owing to the activity of those on the Suffrage side, those who held the Anti-Suffrage view were forced into a protest and a warfare which was in itself most distasteful to them.

Her own view rested on two convictions:—  
(a) That the Parliamentary vote represents a fraction of the executive power and responsibility of the English democracy, in political affairs—not only the opinion of that democracy, but the power behind the opinion.

And  
(b) that it is not patriotic for women to claim that executive power and responsibility—for reasons that would presently be described.

#### IGNORANT VOTERS.

All the imperfections of male Suffrage, which she admitted, did not do away with the fact that the vote does decide, and must decide, in a democratic community, the immense questions concerned with the Imperial and international position of England, and with a number of great industries depending on the physical strength of men and worked entirely by men. If men were ignorant of, or indifferent to, these things, so much the worse. But they must still vote, and still decide; for the government of this country had got to be carried on. Their ignorance, or their indifference, was a most serious danger to the State, yet democracy was justified, because the men who

voted on these fundamental questions were, roughly speaking, the persons who were *doing the things* that raised the questions; who were serving in the Army and Navy; who were sailing ships and running railroads, and digging coal; who were conducting the diplomacy, and managing the trade and commerce of the kingdom and the Empire. Men, by their work and associations and training, and by the readiness with which large bodies of them assimilated political information, showed the real aptitude of the voter. But were they going to say that, if women got the vote, they would read the newspapers, and belong to political clubs, and run political candidates? Was that what was wanted in our great manufacturing districts? No!—what was wanted there was not more politics, but more motherhood. (Mrs. Ward went on to quote a letter in the "Daily News" of that morning, dealing with the infant mortality of Lancashire.)

#### ADDING IGNORANCE TO IGNORANCE.

Let them, then, think of that indifference and carelessness which prevailed among a minority of the male voters—the bad vote, the ignorant vote—as she would call it—of the modern democratic community, which was a perpetual danger to the State—and was always tending to thwart and neutralise the intelligence and the conscience of the responsible and the good voter. Were they going to add to this bad vote, this ignorant vote of men, the inevitable universal ignorance of women—not on their own affairs; that was another matter altogether—but on strictly masculine affairs? Were they going to make them in all classes—educated and uneducated—pronounce themselves on foreign policy, on naval and military matters, and on the men who were to be responsible for them; on the federal arrangements that must be made during the coming years with our Colonies; on those complicated movements of national and international commerce that determine the policies of Protection and Free Trade; on the issues of peace and war, turning, perhaps, on difficult and distant affairs?

If so, they would, she held, hugely increase the risks of the country, without bestowing any benefit whatever on women themselves; and for women to insist upon such a share in the executive government of England, in regard to subjects where women cannot act as men act, where they cannot know as men know, was, in her belief, an unpatriotic and a selfish claim, to be resisted in the interest, first and foremost, of women themselves, and then of the nation as a whole.

#### DIVISION OF POLITICAL WORK.

If it were possible in the national vote to separate off a certain range of questions and say: "On these women shall vote; and on those others they shall not vote," the question of the Suffrage would be a good deal simpler. If, for instance, in the far future, the local affairs of England, Scotland, and Wales came to be managed by local Councils, and Imperial affairs, including war and peace, foreign affairs, international finance, and that ultimate force which preserves order, were to be the concern of an Imperial Parliament, the question of Woman Suffrage would wear a different aspect. But, to-day, as things were, one could only oppose to it a resolute and determined negative.

#### FALLACY OF "MAN-MADE" LAW.

In the last forty years, all those reforms that Mill said could not be got without the vote had been steadily obtained. They

had been obtained by the force of public opinion, the opinion of the best women and the best men acting on our institutions. Never was the opinion of women so carefully, so scrupulously, consulted, as to-day. A Royal Commission on the all-important subject of Divorce was appointed—two women were placed upon it—and the evidence that women were able to give was welcomed in every possible way. A speaker at a Suffrage meeting in Croydon had talked magnificently about what Suffragists could do for sweated women when they got the vote. But the Wages Board Bill was passed last year, by men, advised and helped by women. Moreover, the Bill was modelled on a Bill passed by the Colony of Victoria, not after women got the vote in that colony, but before the Suffrage was granted to women. Mrs. Pankhurst railed constantly at the absurdity of men passing Midwives' Acts without consulting women. The real truth was, of course, that men had never done anything of the kind. One of the chief women concerned in the passing of the Midwives' Act of eight years ago had written to her to protest indignantly against the common Suffragist misrepresentations on this subject. The Midwives' Act was passed by men and women acting together from the highest motives; and had no more opposition to face than every Act which touches great professional interests.

#### WOMAN SUFFRAGE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

After showing how much had been done for women by the legislation of men, Mrs. Humphry Ward continued: "Women have, at present, under their hands an immense, undeveloped power—in the Local Government vote, and in their newly obtained right to sit on County and Borough Councils. When we have, not twelve, but 1,000 women on the County and Borough Councils of England and Wales—as we ought to have—we shall have obtained for women a public sphere and an administrative power, which to my mind answers to their real place in the national life. Local Government has been called the 'enlarged housekeeping' of a nation. It is in the tasks of Local Government that those unmarried women who are not mothers of families, those married women and widows whose child-bearing and child-rearing years are past, might, as I believe, render a service to the nation of which we have, as yet, but little idea. At present this Local Government activity of women has been destroyed, or almost destroyed, by the Suffrage movement. Not only has the activity of women who ought to be serving in Local Government been diverted to that barren campaign, but the indignation among the masses of the people, excited by Suffragist excesses, has tended to make women afraid to come forward, and electors unwilling to support them. No doubt, also the heat of party politics, which has so disastrously invaded municipal politics, has worked against the large inclusion of women. To my mind, we want two reforms. We want such an alteration of the qualification for women members of County Councils as will make eligibility depend on a residential, and not an occupying, qualification; and we want the creation on every local body of a certain number of seats reserved to women. It is not much to claim that six or ten seats, at least, on the London County Council, with its enormous direct influence on the destinies of women and children, should be filled by women. Yet, at present, there are only two.

#### THE ANSWER TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

"Here, then, is our answer to the Suffragist demand: (a) You have no right, we say, to claim the vote, on matters and questions that are exclusively male, and are, besides, vital to the existence and safety of the whole nation—men and women.

"(b) On those matters where the interests of women are specially concerned, women possess, first of all, their natural influence with their husbands, brothers, and sons. How strong that is, the whole history of legislation for the last half-century shows. As the education of women has progressed, this influence has grown stronger and more beneficent. And it is probably all the more effective, because it is disinterested, and is not entangled with party politics.

"(c) Through the large increase of women in the professions and the public services, they are in command of means of educating public opinion and of affecting measures before Parliament, that they never possessed before.

"(d) In the Local Government vote, and their new right to sit on County and Borough Councils, we women possess a still unexplored and unused power, which, as I believe, would provide us with exactly that share in the public life of England which really belongs to us, and answers to the improved education and the enlarged intelligence of women."

After referring to the very adverse political prospects of Woman Suffrage, Mrs. Ward asked why the Suffragist orators who were going up and down the land presumed to speak in the name of Englishwomen. The largest petition on the subject ever sent up was a petition, not for, but against, the Suffrage, and the Women's National Anti-Suffrage League was extending its branches every week. Finally, Mrs. Ward referred to the astonishing results of the canvass of the woman municipal voters which is being conducted by the League.

[The results of this canvass, so far as obtained, are given on another page.—ED., A.-S. REVIEW.]

MRS. GREATBATCH, in the commencement of a lucid and logical address, pointed out that the Anti-Suffrage League, which had been in existence only a little over four years, had every reason to congratulate itself on the success of its endeavours to overtake and cripple the Suffrage movement. The policy of the Anti-Suffragists was not a destructive one, for they had very definite ideals to restore and defend. Their attitude and that of their opponents were very different. The Suffragists argued from the point of view of the individual and sex; they, the Anti-Suffragists, maintained that the best interests of the individual and of sex were bound up in the interests of the State and community as a whole. The question of supreme importance was the result which the granting of votes to women was likely to have upon the State and Empire as a whole, and not the benefit which women would derive as a sex. If the vote for women would help on evolution, then by all means let them have it; but if there were strong grounds for believing it would introduce a weakness into the Constitution, that the results were likely to be bad, and not good, it was their bounden duty to oppose it. It was no good Suffragists saying that the women's claim was similar to that of the working men. When Mr. Shackleton introduced his Bill, he most frankly declared it was the thin end of the wedge, and Mr. Sidney Webb and Mr. Keir Hardie had prac-

tically expressed the same opinion. This would mean adult suffrage, and an electorate of about 23 millions, with women in the majority. They were asked to transfer one-fifth of the human race from the hands of men to the hands of women, who were largely quite ignorant of statesmanship, and who were less amenable to political education than men. Those most clamorous for the vote had shown themselves lacking in self-government. On the authority of Mr. Gladstone, they had it that the vote would carry with it a seat in Parliament. Our prosperity and superiority depended upon institutions built up by men at great cost of life, and their continuance depended upon the exercise of manly strength. It was selfish and unreasonable for women to demand control of these things. The relative position of men and women in the State had been fixed by nature. In man were found the ruling qualities; in woman were found passive courage, sympathy, devotion, and the inspiring qualities. Mentally and physically, the sexes were meant to be complementary the one to the other. Mrs. Pankhurst had said that women were regarded by men as a servile and sub-human sex. They did not at all agree with that point of view. We heard a great deal of the unfairness of the law with regard to women, but men had grievances calling for redress. The votes of men had been used quite as much in the interests of women as in their own. Suffragists often told us that, because women had the vote in four of the States of America, in Finland, New Zealand, and Norway, it would be perfectly safe to introduce Women's Suffrage into this country. In these instances, women were largely in the minority, and there were no Imperial obligations to consider. The safety of every one of them was guaranteed by some other Power. Not one of our self-governing Colonies, nor any European Power, had transferred the management of its affairs to the hands of women. Men had secured for us a world-wide Empire and a supreme Navy, and had made England honoured and respected throughout the world. What had the women done? How was the mothering work being done? One out of every eight children born died before it reached its first birthday, and, while the death-rate had been steadily declining, death among infants was very little less. As Mrs. Humphry Ward had said, it was not due to poverty, but to want of mothering. Let women enter more and more largely into the field of local government. Let them state their views against the production and reading of unhealthy literature. Instead of proclaiming their value, let them be of real use.

The Hon. C. T. MILLS, M.P., urged the futility of Mr. Shackleton's Conciliation Bill, and pointed out that even friends of Women Suffrage opposed it. They were told that the Suffragists were asking for women's rights. What were women's rights? Women would tell them that their right was to get the vote. If every adult person had a right to vote the whole of the Suffrage movement fell to the ground, for in that case a most heinous moral crime was being committed in not giving the vote to every man and woman in India or Egypt. There was a further argument that possession of property conferred the vote upon men, and therefore should confer it on women. But the vote had been given to a whole class of men, subject to certain qualifications, which qualifications were imposed by the State in order to try to prevent people of insufficient material and intel-

lectual standing from exercising that vote. Property was the only qualification among men. But the vote was given to a man because he was a man, and not because he possessed a certain amount of property. If the possession of a certain amount of property qualified a man for the vote, why on earth should not propertied children and propertied idiots have the vote. They were told that women ought to have the vote in order that they might be able to improve their social status, and more especially give higher wages to women. Yet it could clearly be proved in regard to men than an increase of wages and an increase of the suffrage were not synonymous terms. Women had suffered under terrible and dire hardships, but men's hardships had been at least equally severe, and the Parliamentary vote had not yet succeeded in alleviating those sufferings. The conclusion of that matter was that the grievances under which all women and under which men laboured also could not be cured by Acts of Parliament, but could only be cured by the advance of civilisation and intelligence among the people themselves.

### AN ANSWER TO PRINCIPAL CHILDS.

MISS FRANCES H. LOW contributes to the current number of the "Hibbert Journal" a thoughtful and well-reasoned answer to Principal Childs' recent plea for "Woman Suffrage" in the same journal. She says:—

"So far as I understand Principal Childs' summing-up, his plea for the Suffrage is based upon two main grounds—the growing consciousness of women as citizens, and their new economic condition. As a woman-worker who knows the conditions of the Educated Woman's Labour Market *au fond*, I am greatly astonished at the extraordinary manner in which the words 'economic position' are employed, revealing once more what ninety per cent. of the people who talk of the employment of women (I am not here including women of the industrial class) reveal—a complete lack of knowledge of the utter chaos and anarchy existing with regard to the 'economic position' of the money-earning woman. What does Principal Childs mean by the 'economic independence of women'? Does he recognise that, with the exception of one or two classes, not ten per cent. of women wage-earners are able to maintain themselves wholly? Is it not known that some fifty per cent. of the women whose wages range from the £55 a year of the Civil Service clerk or the £60 of the clerk in the 'Prudential,' are partly supported by their parents, paying a sum at home for maintenance which in no way covers the cost of living? Is it not known that a large proportion of greedy women who have come into competition with the penniless breadwinning secretary, journalist, actress, singer, &c., are subsidised by wealthy husbands or fathers? In what sense, then, is the 'economic independence' of a woman used? Before it is possible to discuss this proposition, the unique conditions prevailing in the Educated Woman's Labour Market must be recognised and understood, when it will be found that, excluding an insignificant number of successful women capable of maintaining themselves in comfort and providing for the future, the words 'economic independence,' as applied to the remainder, are most fallacious."

### OUR BRANCH NEWS-LETTER.

OCTOBER has been a month of many important meetings and frequent debates. Accounts of the two great Anti-Suffrage October gatherings, at Manchester under Lord Cromer, and at Croydon with Mrs. Humphry Ward in the chair, are reported so fully that it is impossible to give the usual amount of space to this Letter.

**Carlisle.**—The annual general meeting of the Cumberland Branch has been held in Carlisle, and was very largely attended. Among others present were the President, the Hon. Nina Kay Shuttleworth; the Vice-President, Mrs. Johnson; the Hon. Treasurer, Miss Thomson; the Hon. Secretary, Miss Howard; and Mr. John Hills, M.P.

The President, in her interesting address, brought forward very strongly the two objects of the League—to resist the proposal to admit women to the Parliamentary franchise and to Parliament, and to maintain the principle of the representation of women on municipal and other bodies concerned with the domestic and social affairs of the community.

Mr. Hills, M.P., spoke in support of these principles, showing the fallacy of the widely spread idea that the possession of a vote is a necessary condition to a larger sphere of work for women.

The Hon. Secretary in her report said that the work of the League had gone on steadily since its formation just two years ago. The Hon. Treasurer reported a balance in hand on the year's workings.

The election of officers and committee then took place.

Miss Howard, Greystoke Castle, Penrith, will gladly give further information to anyone desiring to join the League or to help in the working of the Branch. A subscription of 6d. to 5s. constitutes membership of the Branch.

**Whitby.**—A crowded meeting was held in the Silver-street Lecture Hall, Whitby, on October 3rd, by the Whitby Branch, of which Mrs. G. A. Macmillan is President. Mr. G. A. Macmillan, of Danby and London, presided, and was supported by Miss Fothergill, Mr. F. J. Newman (of London), and Mrs. Priestley.

The Chairman gave sound reasons why he opposed the extension of the suffrage to women. The vote would not stop with a few women, but would have to be given to all, and Adult Suffrage, for which they were not prepared, would follow. This vote would be no advantage to women. They would eventually become members of Parliament and officers of State, and that would bring them down from their present position of privilege into the stormy arena of life.

Miss Fothergill said that women's attitude, generally, to the question proved that they did not want the vote. She also referred to the unconstitutional method by which the Suffrage campaign had been marked.

Mr. Newman spoke well, and pointed out that while agricultural labourers had the vote, they had not, on that account, been able to secure higher wages, though domestic servants had better wages without the franchise. He emphasised the fact that there were laws which favoured women, both in the social and penal code, and challenged anyone to point out a law which was prejudicial to women while it favoured men.

**Epsom Division.**—The Epsom Division Branch of the League organised a very well-

attended meeting, held at the Village Hall, Thames Ditton, on October 12th. Mr. Ellis Hicks Beach presided, and supporting him on the platform were Miss Gladys Pott (Secretary of the Berkshire Branch), Mr. Cuthbert Hall, Mr. T. Calthew, Mrs. Lawson (Hon. Treasurer of the Epsom Division Branch), Miss Sandys, and Miss N. Peachey (Hon. Secretary).

The Chairman having briefly spoken, Mr. Calthew declared that the change in the franchise as proposed by those in favour of Women's Suffrage, would be a disastrous thing for the country. Once they extended the vote to women on however limited a plan, the principle would be established, and it would inevitably lead, not only to adult suffrage, but to the representation of women in the House of Commons.

Miss Gladys Pott, after pointing out the complexity of the duties of the House of Commons, contended that the inherent qualities and virtues of women—their impulsiveness, and a large sympathy—unfitted them in the duties of government in a great Empire. Referring to the argument that the cause of women would be neglected because they had no vote, she spoke of many measures which had been passed, from the time of the Earl of Shaftesbury's Factory Act down to the Children's Act, in the interest of women.

Mr. Cuthbert Hall also delivered an excellent address.

**North Berks.**—A meeting of the Wantage Sub-Branch was held in the Town Hall, Wantage, on October 6th. Lady Wantage took the chair, and Miss G. Pott gave an address, in the course of which she alluded to the encouraging progress of the League in North Berkshire during the past year, over 100 new members having joined, and an Electors' Petition having been presented to Parliament by Major Henderson, in addition to the numerous signatures to the Women's Petition which has been obtained in the constituency. She further announced that a recent canvass of those women in Wantage and a few adjoining villages who possess the Local Government vote, had resulted in 111 having declared themselves Anti-Suffragists, and only four in favour of the enfranchisement of women; thus giving a clear contradiction to the statement so often put forward by Suffragists that such women were demanding the Parliamentary vote. Miss Pott expressed the hope that women who disapproved of the Suffrage movement would come forward and announce their opinion in other parts of the country as they had in Wantage.

**Isle of Thanet.**—An "At Home" for the members of the Isle of Thanet Branch was held at West Cliff House, on October 13th, when the members and their friends were received by Mrs. Murray Smith, the President. After tea a most interesting address was given by Miss Stuart, who outlined the chief developments of the Anti-Suffrage movement during the past year. The Thanet Branch of the League has recently extended its work to Herne Bay, where a successful drawing-room meeting was held at Gundulf House, Herne Bay, on October 6th, by invitation of Mr. and Mrs. J. H. Whitfield. The Rev. E. S. Carter, M.A., presided. Miss Weigall, Hon. Secretary of the Thanet Branch, gave a very interesting address. The speaker, who came over from Ramsgate, was accompanied by Mrs. Murray Smith, President of her Branch, and by Mrs. Fishwick,

Hon. Treasurer. Several questions were effectively answered, and the enrolment of twenty-four new members out of an audience of fifty closed a most enthusiastic meeting.

**Dulwich.**—At a drawing-room meeting held on October 19th, at the residence of Mrs. Parish (Hon. Secretary), 1, Wood Lawn, Dulwich Village, our Dulwich Branch members and friends listened to an interesting lecture delivered by Miss Dorothy Laurence. Mrs. Teall (President) was in the chair.

**Brighton.**—Much activity is being shown by our Brighton Branch just now, and Mr. G. H. F. Nye, an organiser, has been sent from the central organisation to help the enthusiastic committee and officers. A large public meeting is shortly to be held in the Pavilion, and at a recent meeting of the executive committee and their friends, the following resolution was carried unanimously: "That this meeting pledges itself to do all in its power to advance the cause of the Women's Anti-Suffrage League in Brighton and Hove, and calls upon all who sympathise with the movement to communicate with the Hon. Secretaries, at "Queux," D'Avigdor Road, Brighton, who will gladly afford all information and supply literature."

**Bristol.**—We have an interesting note from Bristol to the effect that many members of this Branch, including the Hon. Secretary, have, irrespective of party, supported and canvassed for a lady candidate for Bristol Town Council.

**Nottingham.**—A very strong Branch has been recently formed here under the presidency of Countess Manvers, with Vice-Presidents and a Committee whose names make a widely representative list of the population of their important town and county. Lady Middleton, Lady Belper, Lady Eleanor Demison, and Mrs. F. C. Smith are Vice-Presidents, and on the Committee there are the Very Rev. the Bishop of Nottingham, T. A. Hill, Esq., S. E. Gordon Sackett, Esq., and Montague Williams, Esq. The ladies of the Committee are Mrs. Nigel Madan, Mrs. Sully, Mrs. Cox, Mrs. Marriott, Mrs. Hopewell, and the Misses Iris Bertie and Florence Farmer. Mrs. T. A. Hill has kindly consented to act as Hon. Treasurer, and the Hon. Co-Secretaries will be Mrs. Bumby and Mrs. Mitchell.

**Eastbourne.**—A very successful meeting was held by the Eastbourne Branch on the evening of October 19th in the Town Hall. The speakers were Mrs. Archibald Colquhoun and Mr. Leo J. Maxse, Editor of the "National Review," and the chair was taken by Col. Sir Duncan Johnston, K.C.M.G. Mrs. Colquhoun gave an eloquent address, and was listened to with much interest and enthusiasm. She dealt with the Suffragist arguments as to the effect Woman's Suffrage would have on the moral and social life of women. Mr. Maxse, in a very humorous speech, showed that the Suffrage movement was an agitation engineered by a small minority, and that Parliament had really no mandate to take up the question.

Although there were a small number of Suffragists present, there were no interruptions, and only one lady asked any questions, which were ably answered by Mrs. Colquhoun. Mr. Bowen proposed a vote of thanks to the speakers, and was seconded by Mr. Bolton.

### OCTOBER DEBATES.

Debates have been held at Leeds, Norwood, S. Norwood, Enfield, Cirencester, and at Stamford Hill, Stepney, East Ham, Brixton, Canonbury, and Muswell Hill, and in most cases the vote has been in favour of the Anti-Suffrage resolution.

**Leeds.**—So large an audience put in an appearance at the Leeds Institute on October 4th to hear a debate under the auspices of the Institute Parliament on the question of extending the franchise to women on the same terms as men, that the meeting had to be transferred to the large hall. Miss Mary Fielden (London), Organising Secretary for Leeds of the National Union of Women Suffrage Societies, opened on the affirmative side, and Mrs. Archibald Colquhoun took our case in hand.

Miss Fielden said married women of England were in a worse position than any women in the world, and cries of "nonsense" from the audience greeted this remark. "Well," replied Miss Fielden, "we have the monstrous law which only recognises the father as the parent. The rights of the father are absolute."

Mrs. Colquhoun, who spoke with eloquence and keen conviction, said, amongst other arguments, that the English law did recognise the mother, for if a father abused his trust, the wife could get redress. He could not deprive her of the custody of her child, as Miss Fielden had said. The custom of giving men the responsibility, which had lasted from the time of Adam, had something behind it. There had been one or two savage tribes which had given women equal power with men, but those tribes did not survive today. They had been wiped out. Mrs. Colquhoun added that she regarded the Suffragists as being entirely illogical in regard to violence. They were always talking about the evolution of woman, and stating that the final necessary evolution would be the Suffrage. Why then employ violence?

**Enfield.**—On October 5th a debate was held at the Constitutional Club, Enfield. The speakers were Miss M. Smith, of our League, and Miss Rinder (National Society for Woman's Suffrage).

Both sides of the question received due consideration, and at the end of the meeting only two male hands showed their owner's sympathy with Miss Rinder's point of view, the majority opposing her resolution.

**Cirencester.**—A debate was held on October 4th at Cirencester by the Cirencester Literary and Debating Society, the Rev. H. Pack being in the chair. The speakers were Miss Mabel Smith, of the Women's National Anti-Suffrage Society, and Miss Ransom, of the National Union of Women Suffrage. The preliminary addresses were followed by an open debate, during which members of the audience spoke, and questions were addressed to both speakers.

On the resolution being put, the show of hands was very much against the Suffrage resolution.

**Brixton.**—At a debate held on October 10th at Brixton, under the auspices of the Brixton Political Study Society, Councillor H. Anderson in the chair, the speakers were Miss Packer, Vice-Chairman of the Streatham, Brixton, and Clapham Conserva-



tive and Unionist Women's Franchise Society, and Miss Mabel Smith, of the Women's National Anti-Suffrage League.

After the initial addresses, Mrs. Agnes Stewart stated the objections to the extension of the franchise to women. The rival speakers having replied to each other in speeches of five minutes, the Suffrage resolution was put, and lost by an overwhelming majority.

**Canonbury.**—On October 20th, at a debate between Miss Stuart of our League and Miss Corbett of the London Society for Women's Suffrage, held in the Salter's Hall, Canonbury, the question of the resolution: "Would votes for women be beneficial to the individual and to the nation at large," was answered by a decided negative.

**East Ham.**—At the East Ham Women's Liberal Association, on October 5th, Miss Stuart of our League debated very successfully with Miss Cicely D. Corbett. Miss Stuart said that, if Adult Suffrage came, the helm of State would at once be shifted from the masculine to the feminine hand, and eleven million women would be let loose to arrange the affairs of the Empire.

**Norwood.**—Another animated debate was that held by the League of Young Liberals at Norwood on October 4th. Miss Williams of our League and Miss E. Hill of the London Women's Suffrage Federation opened the discussion, and some excellent anti-Suffrage arguments were advanced.

**South Norwood.**—At the Holmesdale (South Norwood) Baptist Literary Society Debate on October 21st, the Suffrage resolution put by Miss Babbage, and well opposed by Mr. Percy Fielden, was overwhelmingly defeated by the votes of the women present.

**North Hackney.**—The North Hackney Branch of the Junior Imperial and Constitutional League held a debate on "Woman Suffrage" on October 24th, with the result that the Anti-Suffrage resolution was carried by a large majority.

**Muswell Hill.**—In spite of the fact that Miss Wilkie's effort to carry the Suffrage resolution at the debate held at Muswell Hill Presbyterian Church Schoolroom, on October 25th, was a brilliant one, Miss Stuart, on our side, succeeded in convincing her audience that Woman Suffrage was entirely undesirable, and the vote taken was overwhelmingly in our favour.

#### THE BRANCH SECRETARIES' AND WORKERS' COMMITTEE.

The next meeting of this Committee will be held on Thursday, November 17th, at 27, Queen's Gate, at 11.30 a.m.

These meetings will take place in the future on the second Thursday in every month at 11.30 a.m., and due notice of them will be given monthly in the REVIEW. All Secretaries and workers of the Branches, both in London and the Provinces, will be cordially welcomed, and as no other notices of the meetings except this will be given, it is hoped that all who wish to be present at them will make a point of consulting the REVIEW for information as to place of meeting, &c. Hon. Secretary, Miss Manisty, 33, Hornton Street, W.

WILL a lady with small income join another (with one child); cottage, neighbourhood Golder's Green; excellent references.—Apply Mrs. S., Bryn Têg, Tunbridge Wells.

## 25 = GUINEA FUR COATS

The Furs in which these Coats are stocked are those that are now most fashionable, viz., Mole-skin, Grey Squirrel, Seal Musquash, and Natural Musquash. They have been made on the premises by our own skilled men furriers from sound and reliable skins.



SEAL MUSQUASH FULL-LENGTH COAT (as sketch), made from selected Skins, lined rich hot Messaline Silk **25 Gns.**

#### FULL LENGTH FUR COATS.

In Grey Squirrel, lined satin ... 25 Gns.  
In Natural Musquash, lined lock ... 25 Gns.  
In English Mole-skin, lined sa'in ... 25 Gns.

**Debenham & Freebody,**

7, WIGMORE ST., CAVENDISH SQ., W.

### BRANCHES.

#### ASHBOURNE AND DISTRICT—

President: The Lady Florence Duncombe.  
Chairman: Mrs. R. H. Jeff.  
Vice-Chairman: Mrs. Sadler.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Parkin.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss M. L. Bond, Alrewas House, Ashbourne.

#### BASINGSTOKE AND DISTRICT—

President: Mrs. Laurence Currie.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Allnutt, Hazelhurst, Basingstoke.

#### Basingstoke Town (Sub-Branch)—

Vice-President: Mrs. Illingworth, Mapledurwell.

#### Farnborough (Sub-Branch)—

Vice-President: Mrs. Grierson, Knellwood, South Farnborough.

#### Hartley Wintney (Sub-Branch)—

Vice-President: Miss Millard.

#### Minley, Yateley, and Hawley (Sub-Branch)—

Vice-President: Mrs. Laurence Currie, Minley Manor.

#### Fleet (Sub-Branch)—

Vice-President: Mrs. Hornblow, The Views, Fleet.

All communications to be addressed to Mrs. Allnutt, Hazelhurst, Basingstoke.

#### BATH—

President: The Countess of Charlemont.  
Vice-President and Treasurer: Mrs. Dominic Watson.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss M. Codrington, 14, Grosvenor, Bath.

#### BECKENHAM—

Provisional Hon. Secretary: Miss E. Blake, Kingswood, The Avenue, Beckenham, Kent.

**BERKS (NORTH)**—President: The Lady Wantage.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Gladys Pott, The Red House, Stratley-on-Thames; and 7, Queensborough Terrace, Hyde Park, W.

#### Abingdon (Sub-Branch)—

Hon. Secretary: Lady Norman, 36, Bath Street, Abingdon.

#### Wantage (Sub-Branch)—

Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Woodhouse, Wantage.

#### BERKS (SOUTH)—

President: Mrs. Benyon.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Dickinson, Eastfield, Whitechurch, Reading.

#### BERKS (EAST)—

President: Lady Haversham.  
Hon. Treasurer: Lady Ryan.  
Secretary: Mr. C. Hay, South Hill Park, Bracknell, Berks.

#### BIRMINGHAM—

Vice-Presidents: The Lady Calthorpe; Mrs. E. M. Simon; Miss Beatrice Chamberlain.  
Hon. Treasurer: Murray N. Phelps, Esq., LL.B.  
Hon. Secretaries: Mrs. Saundby; Mrs. E. Lakin-Smith; Miss Baker.  
Secretary: Miss Gertrude Allarton, 19, New Street, Birmingham.

#### BOURNEMOUTH—

President: The Lady Abinger.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Drury Lowe.  
Hon. Secretaries: Miss Fraser, Dornoch, Landseer Road, Bournemouth; Miss Sherring Kildare, Norwich Avenue, Bournemouth.

All communications to be addressed to Miss Fraser.

#### BRIDGWATER—

President: Miss Marshall.  
Hon. Treasurer and Secretary *pro tem.*: Thomas Perren, Esq., Park Road, Bridgwater.

#### BRIDLINGTON—

No branch committee has been formed; Lady Bosville Macdonald, Thorpe Hall, Bridlington, is willing to receive subscriptions and give information.

#### BRIGHTON AND HOVE—

President: The Hon. Mrs. Campton.  
Vice-President and Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Curtis, "Quex," D'Avigdor Road, Brighton; Co. Hon. Sec.: Mrs. Shaw.

#### BRISTOL—

Chairman: Lady Fry.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. A. R. Robinson.  
Hon. Secretaries: Miss Long Fox, 15, Royal York Crescent, Bristol.  
Assistant Secretary: Miss G. F. Allen.

#### CAMBERLEY, FRIMLEY, AND MYTCHELL—

President: Mrs. Charles Johnstone, Graitney, Camberley.  
Vice-President: Miss Harris.  
Hon. Secretary and Treasurer: Mrs. Spens, Athallan Grange, Frimley, Surrey.

#### CAMBRIDGE—

President: Mrs. Austen Leigh.  
Hon. Treasurer: Miss Seelye.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Bidwell, 10, Barton Road, Cambridge.

#### CAMBRIDGE (Girton College)—

President: Miss K. H. Brownson.  
Treasurer: Miss D. Watson.  
Secretary: Miss R. Walpole.

#### CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY—

President: C. C. Perry, Esq., M.A.  
Hon. Secretaries: Herbert Loewe, Esq., M.A., 6, Park-street, Jesus Lane, Cambridge; D. G. Hopewell, Esq., Trinity Hall, Cambridge.  
All communications to be addressed to D. G. Hopewell, Esq.

#### CARDIFF—

Acting Hon. Secretary: Austin Harries, Esq., Glantaf, Taff Embankment, Cardiff.

#### CHELSEA—

President: Lady Hester Carew.  
Hon. Treasurer: Admiral the Hon. Sir Edmund Fremantle, G.C.B.  
Hon. Secretaries: Mrs. Myles, 16, St. Leo Mansions, Cheyne Gardens, S.W.; Miss S. Woodgate, 68, South Eaton Place, S.W.

#### CHELTENHAM—

President: Mrs. Hardy.  
Hon. Treasurer: Miss G. Henley, The Knoll, Battledown.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Geddes, 4, Suffolk Square, Cheltenham.

#### CRANBROOK—

President: Miss Neve, Osborne Lodge.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Mordaunt, Goddard's Green, Cranbrook.

#### CROYDON—

President: Mrs. King Lewis.  
Hon. Treasurer: Miss B. Jeffers.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Corry, 39, Park Hill Road, Croydon.

#### CUMBERLAND AND WESTMORELAND—

Chairman: Hon. Nina Kay Shuttleworth.  
Hon. Treasurer: Miss Thompson.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Howard, Greystone Castle, Penrith.

#### DORKING—

President: Mrs. Barclay.  
Hon. Treasurer: Miss MacAndrew.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Margaret Powell, Goodwyns Place, Dorking.

#### DUBLIN—

President: The Duchess of Abercorn.  
Chairman: Mrs. Bernard.  
Hon. Treasurer: Miss Orpin.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Albert E. Murray, 2, Clyde Road, Dublin.  
Asst. Hon. Secretaries: Miss C. H. Pollock and Miss Dickson.

#### DULWICH—

President: Mrs. Teall.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Dalzell.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Parish, 1, Woodlawn, Dulwich Village.

#### East Dulwich (Sub-Branch)—

Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Batten, 2, Underhill Road, Lordship Lane, S.E.

#### EALING—

President: Mrs. Forbes, Kirkconnel, Gunnersbury Avenue, Ealing Common.  
Hon. Treasurer: L. Prendergast Walsh, Esq.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss McClellan, 35, Hamilton Road, Ealing.

#### EALING DEAN—

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

#### EALING SOUTH—

Mrs. Ball.  
All communications to be addressed to Miss McClellan as above.

#### EALING (Sub-Division), CHISWICK AND BEDFORD PARK—

Chairman *pro tem.*: Mrs. Norris.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Greatbatch.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss M. Mackenzie, 6, Grange Road, Gunnersbury.

#### ACTON—

Branch in formation.

#### EASTBOURNE—

Hon. Treasurer and Secretary: Miss I. Turner, 1, Hardwick Road Eastbourne.

#### EAST GRINSTEAD—

President: Lady Musgrave.

#### EPSOM—

President: The Dowager Countess of Ellesmere.  
Joint Hon. Treasurers: Mrs. Godfrey Lambert, Woodcote, Esher; Mrs. Lawson, Bracklenlea, Esher.  
Joint Hon. Secretaries: Miss FitzGerald, Lammas Cottage, Esher; Miss Norah Peachey, Esher.

#### EXETER—

President: Lady Acland.  
Chairman: C. T. K. Roberts, Esq., Fairkill.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Depree, Newlands, St. Thomas', Exeter.

#### GLOUCESTER—

Chairman: Mrs. R. I. Tidswell.  
Vice-Chairman: Mrs. Nigel Haines and Mrs. W. Langley-Smith.  
Hon. Treasurer: W. P. Cullis, Esq.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Naylor, Belmont, Brunswick Road, Gloucester.

#### GOUDHURST—

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

#### HAMPSTEAD—

President: Mrs. Metzler.  
Hon. Treasurer: Miss Squire, 27, Marlborough Hill, N.W.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Talbot Kelly, 96, Fellow Road.

#### North-West Hampstead (Sub-Branch)—

Secretary: Mrs. Reginald Blomfield, 51, Frogna.

#### North-East Hampstead (Sub-Branch)—

Secretary: Mrs. Van Ingen Winter, M.D., Ph.D., 31, Parliament Hill Mansions.

#### HAMPTON AND DISTRICT—

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

#### HAWKHURST—

President: Mrs. Frederic Harrison.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Patricia Baker, Delmonden Grange, Hawkhurst.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Beauchamp Tower.  
All communications to be sent to Mrs. Frederic Harrison, Elm Hill, Hawkhurst, for the present.

#### HEREFORD AND DISTRICT—

Hon. Treasurer: Miss M. C. King.  
Joint Hon. Secretaries: Miss Armitage, 3, The Bartens, Hereford; Miss M. Capel, 22, King Street, Hereford.  
District represented on Committee by Mrs. Edward Heygate.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Sale, The Forbury, Leominster.

#### HERTS (WEST)—

Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Lucas.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Stafford, The Warren, Potten End, Berkhamsted.

#### HULL—

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

#### ISLE OF THANET—

President: Mrs. C. Murray Smith.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Fishwick.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Welgall, Southwood, Ramsgate.

#### HERNE BAY (Sub-Branch)—

**ISLE OF WIGHT**—President: Mrs. Oglander.  
Hon. Treasurer: Miss Lowther Crofton.  
Provisional Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Perrott, Clantagh, near Ryde, Isle of Wight.

#### KENNINGTON—

President: Mrs. Darlington.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Millington, 101, Fentiman Road, Clapham Road, S.W.

#### KENSINGTON—

President: Mary Countess of Ilchester.  
Hon. Treasurer: Miss Jeanie Ross, 46, Holland Street, Kensington, W.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Archibald Colquhoun, 25, Bedford Gardens, Campden Hill, W.  
Asst. Hon. Sec.: Mrs. de L'Hopital, 159, High Street, Kensington, W.

Mrs. Colquhoun is at home to interview members of the Branch, or inquirers, on Tuesday mornings, 11-1. Owing to the extension of the work in Fulham, no office will be opened in Kensington as yet.

#### KESWICK—

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

#### KEW—

Hon. Secretary: Miss A. Stevenson, 10, Cumberland Road, Kew.

#### LEEDS—

President: The Countess of Harewood  
Chairman: Mrs. Frank Gott.  
Hon. Treasurer: Miss E. M. Lupton.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Gabrielle Butler, 8, Ann's, Burley, Leeds.  
District Secretaries: Miss H. McLaren, 15, Otley Road, Headingley; Miss M. Silcock, Barkston Lodge, Roundhay.

**LEICESTER**—President: Lady Hazelrigg.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Butler, Elmfield Avenue.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Valeria D. Ellis, 120, Regent Road, Leicester.  
Assistant Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Waddington, 52, Regent Road, Leicester.

**LIVERPOOL AND BIRKENHEAD**—  
Hon. Treasurer and Hon. Secretary *pro tem.*: Miss C. Gostenhofer, 16, Beresford Road, Birkenhead.

**LYMINGTON**—President: Mrs. Edward Morant.  
Chairman: E. H. Pember, Esq., K.C.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mr. Taylor.  
Hon. Secretary *pro tem.*: Mrs. Alexander, The Old Mansion, Boldre, Lymington, Hants.

**MALVERN**—President: Lady Grey.  
Hon. Treasurer: Miss Sheppard.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Hollins, Southbank

**MANCHESTER**—  
President: Lady Sheffield.  
Chairman: George Hamilton, Esq.  
Hon. Treasurers: Mrs. Arthur Herbert; Percy Marriott, Esq.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Henry Simon.  
Secretary: Miss M. Quarrier Hogg, 1, Princess Street, Manchester.

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

**Hale (Sub-Branch)**—  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Arthur Herbert, High End, Hale, Cheshire.

**Marple (Sub-Branch)**—President: Miss Hudson.  
Chairman of Committee: Mr. Evans.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. G. F. Sugden, 53, Church Street, Marple.  
Assistant Hon. Secretary: Miss Rayner, Stoke Lacy, Marple.

**MARYLEBONE (EAST)**—  
President: The Countess of Cromer.  
Chairman of Committee: Mrs. Moberly Bell  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Carson Roberts.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Markham, 10, Queen Street, Mayfair.

**MARYLEBONE (WEST)**—  
President: Lady George Hamilton.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Alexander Scott.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Jeyes, 11, Grove End Road, St. John's Wood.

**MIDDLESBROUGH**—President: Mrs. Hedley.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Giers, Busby Hall, Carlton-in-Cleveland, Northallerton.

**NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE**—  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Noble, Jesmond Dene House, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

**NEWPORT (MONMOUTHSHIRE)**—  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Prothero, Malpas Court.

**NORTH HANTS**—  
President: Mrs. Gadesden.  
Vice-President: Lady Arbuthnot.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Stedman, The Grange, Woolton Hill, Newbury.

**NORTH WALES (No. 1.)**—  
President: Mrs. Cornwallis West.

**NOTTINGHAM AND NOTTS**—  
President: Countess Manvers.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. T. A. Hill.  
Hon. Secretaries: Mrs. Bumby, 116, Gregory Boulevard; Mrs. Mitchell, Greenholme, Forest Road, West Nottingham.

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

**PADDINGTON**—  
President of Executive: Lady Dimsdale.  
Deputy President: Lady Hyde.  
Hon. Secretary and Temporary Treasurer: Mrs. Percy Thomas, 37, Craven Road, Hyde Park.  
The Hon. Secretary will be "At Home" every Thursday morning to answer questions and give information

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

**PORTSMOUTH AND DISTRICT**—  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Burnett.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Craige, Silwood Villa, Marmion Road, Southsea.

**READING**—President: Mrs. G. W. Palmer.  
Hon. Treasurer: Dr. Secretan.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Thoyts, Furze Bank, Redlands Road, Reading.

**RICHMOND**—President: Miss Trevor.  
Hon. Treasurer: Herbert Gittens, Esq.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Willoughby Dumergne, 5, Mount Ararat Road, Richmond.

**ROCHESTER**—  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Conway Gordon.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Pollock, The Precincts.

**SALISBURY**—  
President: Lady Tennant, Wilsford Manor, Salisbury.

**SCARBOROUGH**—Chairman: Mrs. Daniel.  
Hon. Treasurer: James Bayley, Esq.  
Hon. Secretaries: Clerical, Miss Mackarness, 19, Princess Royal Terrace; General, Miss Kendall, Oriel Lodge, Scarborough.

**SEVENOAKS**—President: The Lady Sackville.  
Deputy President: Mrs. Rycroft.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Herbert Knocker.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Tabram, 3, Clarendon Road, Sevenoaks.

**SHEFFIELD**—  
Vice-Presidents: The Lady Edmund Talbot, Lady Bingham, Miss Alice Watson.  
Hon. Treasurer: Miss M. Colley, Newstead, Kenwood Park Road.  
Hon. Secretaries: Mrs. Arthur Balfour, "Arcadia," Endcliffe, Sheffield; Mrs. Munns, Mayville, Ranmoor Park Road, Sheffield.

**SHOTTERMILL**—  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. R. S. Whiteway.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. H. Beveridge, Pitfold, Shottermill, Haslemere.

**SIDMOUTH**—President: Miss Chalmers.  
Acting Hon. Treasurer: B. Browning, Esq., R.N.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Browning, Sidmouth.

**SOUTHAMPTON**—President: Mrs. Cotton.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Langstaff, 13, Carlton Crescent.

**SOUTHWOLD**—  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Adams, Bank House, Southwold, Suffolk.

**SPILSBY**—No branch yet formed.  
Mrs. Richardson, Halton House, Spilsby, acting as Provisional Hon. Secretary.

**SURREY (EAST)**—  
Hon. Treasurer: Alfred F. Mott, Esq.  
Hon. Secretaries: Reigate—Mrs. Rundall, West View, Reigate; Redhill—Mrs. Frank E. Lemon, Hillcrest, Redhill.

**SUSSEX (WEST)**—  
President: The Lady Edmund Talbot.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Travers, Tortington House, Arundel, Sussex.  
Assistant Hon. Secretary: Miss Rhoda Butt, Wilbury, Littlehampton.

**TAUNTON**—President: The Hon. Mrs. Portman.  
Vice-President: Mrs. Lance.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Somerville.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Birkbeck, Church Square.

**THREE TOWNS AND DISTRICT, PLYMOUTH**  
President: Mrs. Spender.

**TORQUAY**—President: Hon. Mrs. Bridgeman.  
Hon. Treasurer: The Hon. Helen Trefusis.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss M. C. Phillpotts, Kilcorran, Torquay.

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

**UPPER NORWOOD AND ANERLEY**—  
President: Lady Montgomery Moore.  
Hon. Treasurer: J. E. O'Connor, Esq.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Austin, Sunnyside, Crescent Road, South Norwood.

**WENDOVER**—President: The Lady Louisa Smith.  
Hon. Treasurer and Secretaries: Miss L. B. Strong; Miss E. D. Perrott, Hazeldene, Wendover, Bucks.

**WESTMINSTER**—  
President: The Lady Biddulph of Ledbury.  
Hon. Treasurers and Hon. Secretaries: Miss Stephenson and Miss L. E. Cotesworth, Caxton House, Tothill Street, S.W.

**WESTON-SUPER-MARE**—  
President: The Lady Mary de Salis.  
Vice-President: Mrs. Portsmouth Fry.  
Hon. Treasurer: Miss W. Evans.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. E. M. S. Parker, Welford House, Weston-super-Mare.

**WHITBY**—President: Mrs. George Macmillan.  
Hon. Treasurer and Secretary: Miss Priestley, The Mount, Whitby.

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

**WINCHESTER**—President: Mrs. Griffith.  
Hon. Secretary: Mrs. Bryett, Kerrfield, Winchester.

**WOKING**—  
President: Lady Arundel.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Peregrine, The Firs, Woking.

**WOODBIDGE**—  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Nixon, Priory Gate, Woodbridge.

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

**YORK**—President: Lady Julia Wombwell.  
Hon. Treasurer: Hon. Mrs. Stanley Jackson.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Jenyns, The Beeches, Dringhouses, York.

## THE SCOTTISH NATIONAL ANTI-SUFFRAGE LEAGUE.

President: The Duchess of Montrose, LL.D.  
Vice-President: Miss Rutherford, M.A.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Aitken, 8, Mayfield Terrace, Edinburgh.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Gemmill, 3, Deanpark Crescent, Edinburgh.

### BRANCHES:

**BERWICKSHIRE**—  
Vice-President: Mrs. Baxendale.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss M. W. M. Falconer LL.A., Elder Bank, Duns, Berwickshire.

**EDINBURGH**—  
President: The Marchioness of Tweeddale.  
Vice-President: The Countess of Dalkeith.  
Chairman: Mrs. Stirling Boyd.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Paterson.  
Joint Hon. Secretaries: Mrs. Johnston, 19, Walker Street; Miss Kemp, 6, Western Terrace, Murrayfield, Edinburgh.

**GLASGOW**—President: The Duchess of Hamilton.  
Chairman of Committee: Mrs. John M. McLeod.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. David Blair.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Eleanor M. Deane, 180, Hope Street, Glasgow.

**INVERNESS AND NAIRN**—  
President: Lady Lovat.  
Hon. Treasurers and Hon. Secretaries: Inverness—Miss Mercer, Woodfield, Inverness; Nairn—Miss B. Robertson, Constabulary Gardens, Nairn.

**ST. ANDREWS**—  
President: The Lady Griselda Cheape.  
Vice-President: Mrs. Hamar.  
Hon. Treasurer: Mrs. Burnett.  
Hon. Secretary: Miss Playfair, 18, Queen's Gardens, St. Andrews.

**PRIVATE** and Professional Accounts kept by qualified accountant (lady); weekly or monthly according to requirements; town or country; estate work; references to present clients.—Address M. N., The National Anti-Suffrage League, 5, Queen Victoria-st., City, E.C.