

a British attack in this section that will correspond with a French attack in the Champagne district. And if the Germans are strong enough to attempt a forestalling movement they will probably attack in the Champagne district in order to prevent the squeezing of the Noyon angle by the British in the north and the French in the east. There can be little doubt that the Somme offensive will be continued on its present lines, but it will almost certainly be supplemented by an even larger offensive elsewhere, and there seems to be no such likely area for a new offensive as in the neighbourhood of Arras. At the same time we have to remember that there are local conditions of which we can know nothing at this distance, of which no one can know anything except those on the spot, and that these may negative the advantages of any particular movement.

AS helping to dispel the submarine mystery imposed by the admiralty authorities, we may note the syndicated article by Mr. Frank H. Simonds, dated March 1st, and written immediately after his return from London. He tells us that twenty-five submarines had been caught during the first two weeks of February, and that five were taken two days before he left London. Averages are apt to be deceptive when used for purposes of prediction, as the Germans have already discovered to their cost, but if the British admiralty can waylay thirty submarines

a month it is evident that the end of the submarine fleet is in sight. The best authorities agree that Germany can produce submarines at the rate of about one a week, but the training of sailors to man them must be a much slower task. No more arduous work could be allotted to a human being, and we may doubt if the men under bombardment in the trenches would have reason to wish to change places with their comrades in the submarine. Reports from England say that the crews of captured submarines are usually in a pitiable state as a result of vitiated air, nerve strain, and intestinal troubles, and there is nothing impossible in the story that Mr. Simonds thinks worth repetition, that two submarines had surrendered themselves in Falmouth Harbour after their crews had mutined and murdered their officers.

Another ray of light on the problem is furnished by Mr. Alfred Noyes, poet and essayist, who is now on a visit to America. Mr. Noyes has something interesting to say about armed merchantmen, and it is based, he tells us, on his examination of hundreds of admiralty records. The vessels that are attacked are almost invariably unarmed. The submarine has a wholesome respect for the swivel gun that can so easily sink her with one well-directed shot, and therefore she leaves the armed ship alone. Mr. Noyes then tells us that between 60,000 and 70,000 fishermen have been enlisted in the submarine campaign, and have been uniformed and trained in gun-

nery. One of these men told him that he had participated in the sinking of ten submarines. Mr. Noyes says, also, that he has actually witnessed the sweeping of the Irish Sea from the English coast to the Irish coast by a continuous line of sixty trawlers dragging great steel nets between them. As a result of this small-tooth-comb work the submarines were being expelled from British home waters, and forced to seek an uncertain prey in the wide ocean.

MR. NOYES confirms the view more than once expressed in this column that a submarine that has once been seen by a motor or patrol boat can hardly escape destruction. She can not submerge quickly enough to escape a shot, and she is in perpetual danger from the nets dropped in her path by some enterprising craft that has observed her wake on the surface of the water. But however interesting may be such general statements as those of Mr. Simonds and Mr. Noyes—and they are necessarily based to a large extent upon hearsay—we have still the substantial facts furnished by the statistics, which show that Germany has attained to less than half of her aims, and that a great army of ships, some nine thousand in the course of two weeks, is passing unmolested into and from British ports. Those who suppose that either England or France is within measurable distance of starvation are either allowing the wish to father the thought or are unaware of the facts.

AND NOW—EQUALITY IN BABIES

I CANNOT understand it at all. I took the trouble some time ago to tell all and sundry, through the columns of your widely circulated paper, that it is impossible for any mere law-makers to confer the franchise on women. IMPOSSIBLE! You get me? Not merely unwise or unstatesmanlike, but impossible! Yet here I see that the Legislature of Ontario has gone and done it. I suppose that, with two such chaps at their head as Hearst and Rowell, they really think that they can "laugh at impossibilities" and cry "it shall be done." They will be abrogating the law of gravitation next. Come to think of it, gravitation is frequently an inconvenient and even dangerous law. Why not amend it so that it can only be enforced by and with the consent of the Attorney-General of each Province? What is this law of gravitation that it should be allowed to have its brutal way with us when the august legislators of an "advanced" Canadian Province—they "the heirs of all the ages in the foremost files of time"—think otherwise?

NOW that our legislators have begun to ignore natural law and do the impossible, there is a little bill of my own that I would like them to put on the statute books. It proposes to wipe out one of the cruellest injustices under which women suffer—and I yield to no man in gallantry to women or in a fierce determination to get for them whatever they may want. This little bill of mine simply proposes to enact that hereafter all male children shall be borne by the father. Fair play for the women—that is all I ask. Turn and turn about! Why should our wives, whom we love better than anything else in the world, and whose happiness is our chiefest object, be compelled to go down into the valley of death every time the family is enlarged? Why not permit Papa to do his share? Equal rights and all that! I somewhat suspect that this measure of mine may have the effect of reducing the birth-rate, but I am prepared to face that alleged calamity rather than see this cruel and murderous injustice upon the better half of creation further perpetuated.

OF course, it will not do for the "advanced" Legislature of Ontario to try to dodge its duty in this regard by pretending that this is one of the few things it really cannot do. Has it not just done "the impossible"? Is it going to put off the ladies by getting for them a privilege that few of them value, while neglecting to get for them a simple act of justice which every mother in the land would hail with joy? They have abrogated by a little act of the

Women Have Ballots in Spite of Monocle Man! What Next?

By THE MONOCLE MAN

Legislature one difference which blundering nature has established between the sexes; and now they cannot refuse to abrogate another—and much more important one. Nature has said that the male shall be best equipped for fighting—so much better equipped, indeed, that the female does not count at all in such a test. Nature has also said that the female shall bear all the children. Nature is a monster of injustice and partiality. But what care we to-day? The Ontario Legislature has set out to abolish nature.

BUT—say some of the ladies, charmed by the new spring styles in ballots—have they not actually given us the vote? Will we not be able to mark our ballots and put them in the boxes just like the men? Surely. And so long as no real test of the capacity of the voters of Ontario to rule comes upon that community, no one will notice the difference? An indulgent father lets his little girl guide the automobile. All goes well till the crisis comes. Then the indulgent father wonders if indulgence is a selfish or an unselfish impulse—that is, if he is able to wonder anything. Even "advanced" Ontario will notice that none of the virile nations of the world are calling in the ladies to guide their destinies in these terrible times when we seem truly to be "rattling into barbarism." A few American states have done it—four, I think, for Federal purposes. But what do they count in Armageddon? Our Australian cousins ventured upon it, along with many another experiment in a time of profound peace. Would they do it now? For further particulars, consult Premier Hughes in private. There is talk that Britain may yield some measure of woman suffrage after the war. Possibly; there is no telling what that "weary Titan" will do when he is nagged enough. But I venture the prediction that, if he does, he will carefully enfranchise about three Tories to one Liberal—will enfranchise property and deny poverty—will, in a word, do what he can to ensure a jingo majority. And I am glad that he will do the latter, if he permits himself to be "Mrs. Caudled" into diluting the stream of force which flows normally through the ballot-box, for that is about the

only thing he can do, in such a case, to safeguard the rule of virility.

BUT what of France—the most intelligent democracy on earth? Is there any talk of woman franchise there? And it is not, mark you, because the French women lack intelligence or capacity for business, or that their men do not respect and honour them. If there is a land on earth where women are treated as equals, it is in France. The French woman is neither the pampered doll of the American "smart set," nor the stuffed culture freak (assertively superior to her mere "meal ticket" of a husband) of the American middle class; she is her husband's partner. But the keen-brained French people know that, in the midst of a barbarian world and compelled to be ever en vidette to save their nation alive, they must keep the government in the hands of the possessors of force. They give their women everything else; but they do not give them the destiny of the nation to play with—they do not permit them to cut their fingers on the edged tools of possible war. A woman with the ballot may, through her instinctive abhorrence for force and all its works, vote blindly in favour of her own exposure to the horrors of the women of Lille. Or the exposure of her innocent daughter. No; the French, with all their gallantry, will not make that mistake.

NOR will any other virile nation. Is Russia talking of enfranchising her women?—is Germany?—is Italy?—is Austria?—is Japan? I know the feeling in Ontario that, so long as Brown's Corners goes "right," it does not really matter what the great Russian Empire does. The poor Russians never had—mourns Ontario—the educational and religious advantages of the happy denizens of Brown's Corners; so, of course, they cannot be expected, etc. Still the Russians are dying to-day by the million for liberty—for their own liberty, and for ours. Is Brown's Corners enlisting? Sometimes, and sometimes not. Moreover, in fixing the destinies of mankind, Russia casts ten—twenty million ballots, delivered on the points of her bayonets. Ontario has just decided against that method of delivery. The result will be that, in the great council chamber of humanity, where they only count bayonets, the Russian vote will be accepted at par, while Ontario—well, who will know whether its voice is the voice of the bayonet or the clatter of tea-cups where bayonets are voted barbarian and out of date. It is a great thing to be "advanced"; but it is perilous these days to advance beyond the protection of the bayonet.