

WHAT TO DO WITH THE RAGING SUFFRAGETTES


ANOTHER PROPOSAL to dispense with the presence of the suffragettes in England and let some other locality enjoy them for a while is heard. We recently quoted one advocate of this plan. It is true that transportation as a punishment has for some years been abolished in British legal practise, the most recent example of its use being the imprisonment of the Boer soldiers in the island of Bermuda. Now some are viewing the abolition with regret. Can not a spot like St. Helena be discovered, where "the raging, ramping, roaring termagants" who style themselves suffragettes may be marooned, asks Lord Robert Cecil, in the *London Daily Mail*. Of course they have just cause for being angry with Mr. Asquith. "While a suffragette majority has at last been secured in the House of Commons, which is ready to vote overwhelmingly in favor of the principle of giving votes to women," the Ministry "always contrives to defeat any practical proposal to that effect." Taking up this side of the question, he remarks:

"It is not surprizing that women should refuse to be put off any longer by parliamentary maneuvers obviously designed to deceive them. Where the members of the Women's Social and Political Union are, of course, hopelessly wrong is in thinking that their methods are morally defensible or practically effective. They are fond of comparing themselves to rebels. But they forget that rebellion and terrorism are entirely distinct."

This political wrong does not, however, justify the perverse and malicious conduct of the ladies. The militant suffragettes are anarchists, and society must be protected against them, continues this writer. Transportation would be like a divorce from these fair ones on the ground of cruelty. Imprisonment and forcible feeding have proved utterly inadequate. Why not try banishment, inquires Lord Robert Cecil:

"Why not empower the courts to sentence them to deportation to some more or less distant island, and once there, leave them at large, only preventing them from returning to this country? Food and lodging would be offered to them, but no compulsion would be put upon them to accept it.

"On the other hand, a sentence of deportation should be of long duration—probably not less than a year. It would be politically, tho not physically, a severe penalty. The women themselves could have no right to object to it, for it would be treating them like prisoners of war. Doubtless the high and dry legal purists and pedants of all kinds would disapprove. For would it not be treating these women differently from ordinary criminals? The answer is that they are different; and just as we have provided reformatories and industrial schools for one type of criminal, the Borstal treatment for another, indeter-



**RUINS OF LADY
WHITE'S HOUSE,**
Burned by
the suffragettes.

THE LITERARY DIGEST

April 19, 1913