

gone unheeded. Three times Mr. Asquith, in response to their written request for a hearing, had declined to grant it, but these persistent Scotchmen took the stand that they possessed a constitutional right to present a petition to the Prime Minister, and finally announced that they would accept no refusal from the Government to see them, and would appear on a certain day. Appear they did, and when they marched to Downing Street the streets were lined with people who wanted to see what would happen. The Prime Minister was not at home, and had left a secretary to receive them. They succeeded in holding a small indignation meeting on the Prime Minister's doorstep, and that spirit percolated throughout London on the days which followed. They were entertained at luncheons, teas and dinners, and although they came as the special guests of the Men's and Actresses' League, meetings were held for them by all sorts of suffrage societies, the programme closing with some great gatherings in Hyde Park. Upon all occasions they told their story and voiced their outraged feelings, two or three being endowed with decided gifts of oratory. It was stated that about two-thirds of them were Liberals in politics, the others being Unionists and Labor men. Some were constitutional and some militant in sympathy, but they were all agreed on the proposition that their constitutional right to a hearing had been ruthlessly violated, and upon all sides they made threats of the loss of Liberal seats in Scotland because of it. The paragraphs in the Press about their comings and goings, the great audiences indoors and out which gathered to hear and to greet them, kept their mission in the list of chief topics of interest for some days. The speeches they would have made to the Prime Minister, had the opportunity been offered, were sold to thousands of people on the streets in a penny pamphlet, which will find its way into the permanent records of the movement. The refusal of the Scotch Prime Minister to meet this deputation

of his fellow-countrymen, who in the capacity of "councillors and bailies" were no ordinary men, resulted in a tremendous suffrage agitation over the entire country. Thus the blind, unwary opponents of our great and just cause all the world over, while meaning to defeat it, in reality contribute mightily to its coming victory. Suffragists under these circumstances should find it easy to "Love your enemies."

Every woman should try to look her best. Read Page 16.

CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Editors,—

If any of your readers wish to write something about Woman Suffrage but do not feel any special inspiration, let them take up some English paper and read the letters to the editor. They will find some man's letter (and sometimes a woman's) that will make them seize a pen and write quickly to repudiate the trash that they have seen.

I have just read in an English paper a letter by a lady authoress, who says she is not an avowed Suffragist, though she has the Cause enormously at heart, or "the woman's question," she calls it. There we have a lukewarm woman; a woman who will not stand wholly by her sex in spite of their failings, even when she knows they have a just cause. This is where women are weak. They will not back each other up. Space permitting, I will quote the greater part of her letter:

"Moved by curiosity, I attended the other evening a meeting on "The White Slave Traffic," conducted under the auspices of the W. S. P. U. . . . The speakers at the meeting were excellent, but not one sentiment enunciated that night could have been spoken by a mother of sons. Men were monsters of iniquity, warring against women, but no mention was made of the fact that women bear an equal share with men in that awful traffic. . . . Not one of these clever woen realized that the whole future of England lies