

to a prospective mother. Instead of suicide she killed her cruel enemy, in self-defence.

"No humane consideration prevented her being tried within a month, and on May 9, 1911, she was sentenced to be hanged. The same day the same jury recommended to mercy an Italian man who had murdered another, taking him by stealth at night, who said he had killed the wrong man by mistake. The execution of Angelina was to be deferred till after the birth of her child. Her reprieve from death was probably chiefly due to the protests which came from more humane countries. Angelina's baby was taken from her at the age of six weeks, and died of starvation from lack of suitable food. Her four children were found neatly clothed and are bright and docile, showing the care of a good mother.

"A deputation of ladies from Toronto waited on the Minister of Justice, the Hon. C. J. Doherty, to ask him to release Mrs. Napolitano, and restore her to her children. He promised his attention to the case, but neglected to return any reply. For a number of months it was hoped that the National Council of Women would press for justice and mercy in this case, but they, also, neglected it.

"The Minister of Justice has now again been appealed to, through one of the Cabinet Ministers. In his reply he ignores all the important features of the case, and refuses any further clemency."

#### VOTES FOR WOMEN

The following letter appeared in the "Times," and we think it so excellent that we would like all our subscribers to have the pleasure of reading it:

To the Editor:—Permit me through the columns of your paper to make a few comments on the "eloquent" speech which Mr. A. E. McPhillips delivered against the woman suffrage bill, as reported in your issue of March 1.

The honorable member for the islands, it appears, "yields to no man

in the love, respect and reverence which he has for women." At a later stage of his speech he opposes the enfranchisement of women because they made themselves prominent in France at a time "when all idea of morality and propriety had been lost." They had been the principal factors in bringing about a condition in the fair country of France of infidelity, atheism and lawlessness. This argument, it seems to me, is without point unless Mr. McPhillips believes that the majority of women of our own country at the present day are characterized by immorality, impropriety, atheism, lawlessness and infidelity. If he does not believe this, why does he instance the women of the French Revolution as a reason for refusing the vote to the women of British Columbia? But the question which agitates the mind of the writer is this: Does Mr. McPhillips "love, respect and reverence" women on account of the aforementioned qualities of immorality, impropriety, atheism, lawlessness, and infidelity, or in spite of them? Does he contend that immorality, impropriety, atheism, lawlessness and infidelity are all very well in the seclusion of the home, and in connection with the rearing of children, but that they would derange such delicate and difficult matters as the purchasing of Indian reserves or the awarding of government printing contracts? Of course we knew all the time that it was only the firm stand taken by the male sex which prevented the spread of immorality, etc., through our own "fair country."

Mr. McPhillips apparently would have us believe that had it not been for the aforesaid five deadly sins on the part of the mob of women who marched to Versailles crying for bread for themselves and their starving children, the horrors of the French Revolution would never have occurred. Any perfect lady will admit, of course, that it was very unseemly of these unsexed and hysterical (the inevitable adjectives) French women to go out on the streets screeching for bread, just like common termagants. "We must study history," says the honorable member