

sane judgment, a better help-mate to man than the delicate, overstrung woman who was the ideal of our fathers and grandfathers? Does not the brother prefer a sister who is a comrade instead of a stay-at-home? Is not the wife who can walk or ride with her husband, who can discuss as an equal his ideas and pursuits, a fitter companion for him than the weak, irresponsible woman painted by Dickens and Thackeray? Will not the woman whose lungs have drunk deep of the breath of heaven, whose frame has been strengthened by healthful exertion, whose nerves are calm, pass better through the ordeal of childbirth, and give to her sons and her daughters a richer inheritance than the harem-type of woman on whom the maudlin fancy of men has often delighted to dwell? And we "new men," who can claim the privilege of the acquaintance of many of these "new women," know also that they possess more fully than their sisters the essentials of true womanliness—the charm, the grace, and the beauty which, ever since men were men and women were women, have softened and sweetened the intercourse of human society.

Secondly, I believe in woman suffrage because in a democracy the vote is the hall mark of full citizenship, and exclusion from voting rights carries with it a stigma of inferiority. In those countries where women vote they are part of the sovereign people; in those countries where women are forbidden to vote the men are the sovereign people, and the women are a subject people.

This fundamental difference of opinion does not remain merely an abstract idea; it is translated into the realms of practical thought and action. Where women are voters, it is recognized that they are the masters of their own lives; in those countries it is for women to decide what are the essentials of true womanliness, to understand the real meaning of courage,

of truth, of honour, of comradeship, to be free to give or withhold their lives as they in their discreet wisdom shall decide. But where men alone vote, women are frankly subordinate; it is men who set up the standards of womanliness, which women are expected to adopt. Ignorance of life is regarded as a virtue, obedience is claimed as a right, freedom of choice is forbidden or is rendered a farce by the grinding poverty into which the unattached woman is allowed to sink. Of course there are many happily-mated men and women who are free from this obsession of male ascendancy, but for the vast majority it lies at the back of all their thoughts and enters at every point into their daily lives.

Thirdly, I believe in woman suffrage because I know that women need the protection which is given by the vote, and because I find that as a matter of hard fact, they do not get equal justice under the law in those countries where they are voteless.

It is not that the good, decent men who form the bulk of the electorate desire consciously to have laws unfair to women, but that just because they are men they cannot see with the eyes of women how unequal the laws are. Even when they recognize the need for redress, they still care far more for other reforms which touch on their own lives, and politicians, who have no choice but to attend to the most pressing business, are, therefore, apt to leave women's concerns unattended to.

A whole book might be written upon this side of the question, but I will content myself with giving four condensed illustrations of the way in which women suffer at the present time from causes which could be remedied. So far as I am aware, they apply to a greater or less extent in every country where women are voteless, while most of them have been redressed in countries where women vote.