To the Editor of The Westminster Gazette.

Dear Sir,—I was just thinking, after an attempt to make some foreign friends understand the political situation in England, that this is a moment when it is hard upon a woman not to possess a vote. While making this unoriginal reflection, my eye was caught by an item in the London correspondence of my Italian newspaper: the Militant Suffragists had, once again and in solemn assembly, declared their intention of going against the Liberals. The coincidence set me musing. Here is a woman who would like to vote for the Liberals, but to whom the Liberals will not or cannot give a vote—a foolish enough dilemma, towards which the irrationality of many of the world's other arrangements must teach patience. But behind this first absurdity comes a second one: here is a woman keenly desirous of the vote prevented from joining the organisations in its favour (non-'militant' as well as 'militant') because they insist upon hostility (or at least hostile neutrality) towards the political party to vote for which is her chief reason for wanting the suffrage. Now I may as well say that I do not like the attitude of the Liberal Government about this matter of Woman Suffrage, although I grant it may have twenty unanswerable and even unavoidable reasons for maintaining that attitude, chiefly the excellent one of refusing to be bullied. I do not like the repressive measures by which the Liberal Government has turned a number of cases of hooliganism (and some which were not hooliganism also) into minor martyrdoms. I do not like hooligan suffragetism, although I think it were better to treat it with disdainful courtesy; and I like still less (because it seems an offence against something greater than mere taste) I like still less the deliberate policy even of the most decorous Suffragists in making their political support depend upon the promise of the vote. But I do like the Budget, I do like the Liberal programme, I do like everything for which English Liberalism stands; and I should like to have a vote, or, failing that, to be able to say that I want one.

Is this not a comic, but also a rather lamentable, dilemma in which we find ourselves, we Liberal women who are Suffragists exactly because we are Liberals, and might not some practical-minded (but not too practical-minded, for there has been too much party practice and too little citizenly conviction) person devise some method for registering the wishes and names of such English women as ask for the political vote because they have political opinions sufficiently strong to make them stick to their party, even if it never should give them that vote?—I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully,

December 14.

Vernon Lee.

What Lord Curzon Does Not Know.

To the Editor of The Westminster Gazette.

Sir,—Lord Curzon is reported to have said, at Derby last night, "Take the cautious Liberal, who was brought up on the doctrines of Gladstone and John Stuart Mill, what will be think of a Budget that rests on State Socialism, and is so destructive of the old theories of individualism and private liberty?" Lord Curzon has been Viceroy of India, but he apparently does not know what is known to every selected candidate for the Indian Civil Service—that J. S. Mill proposed, as Mr. Lloyd George does, to tax the "uneared increment."" Only Mill would have taxed all land and at all times, and up to the full extent of the "uneared increment." Mr. George exempts agricultural land, and would tax building land only to the extent of 20 per cent., and only at such times as the land passes by death or transfer.

Mill's proposals are therefore far more drastic than those of the present Chancellor of the Exchequer. They will be found in Book V., Chap. ii., §5, of his "Principles of Political Economy."

—Your obedient servant,

Anglo-Indian.

December 18.

Mr. Edward Stanford has published topographic maps of Quebec. They have been compiled and produced by the Geographical Section, General Staff, War Office. The prices are 2s. each.