

the month of March we printed a lively and detailed attack on Feminism by Mr. H. G. Wells, and this month we propose to notice two books on the subject written from the two opposing points of view.

The Foregoing Article.

Meanwhile a word is necessary with regard to the article from M. A. M. M. which appears in this number. The lady who contributes it sent us a letter protesting against some of the anti-suffrage arguments used in our March issue. We asked her to reply to them. She sent an article which was in no sense a specific reply. This we returned, suggesting that she had not done herself justice, that she could do better, and must try again. The article now printed represents the second essay, and has been freed sub-editorially of some of its more obvious irrelevancies. As our correspondent was asked to reply to a certain article, it was natural to suppose that she would address her remarks to the specific points made in that article ; but even at a second asking she has chosen to regard these as of no particular moment, and delivers herself instead of a rehash of well-worn and originally pointless generalities. The chief of these is that a woman is not a "person" in the eyes of the law, and that the possession of the Parliamentary vote would give her this legal status. Our correspondent further argues that women are without Parliamentary representation because they have not the power to vote for a representative.

Woman's Legal Advantage.

Neither of these claims is true in the spirit, and the first is not true even in the letter. A woman is a very formidable "person" indeed in the eye of the law. The law secures her in her own property and gives her claims on her husband's property and income as well. What is his is hers, and what is hers is her own. She can sue for divorce, say, and even if she lose, he is liable for the expenses of the action. Should she be unfaithful, and he be able to prove it, he may divorce her, but he is still liable for her maintenance unless she marry again. A wife may run into debt, and even if she be wealthy in her own right, it is the husband who is responsible and who will be sued in the last resort. In affiliation cases the bare word of the woman—often a slut—will be taken as against that of the man, even when his denial of putative parenthood is supported by circumstantial evidence. These are only some of the many special privileges and immunities which woman as a "person" enjoys in the lawcourts. I do not grudge them, bless her ! She needs special privileges. But the power to govern man and to feminise life generally would be just a trifle too much.

What our correspondent says as to woman having no legal status as a parent is not true. An unmarried mother and a widowed mother are the legal parents of their offspring, and have to stand the racket which falls on the married man. M. A. M. M.'s indignation that the wife cannot appear instead of the husband is as amusing as the resentment of the trawling skipper at not being asked to pay income tax. A brother master-of-craft had spoken in his hearing of his income tax, and when he had gone, the first man said to a bystander, "I've as good a right to pay income tax as 'e