

idiots, lunatics and criminals; but the principle of disqualification in those cases does not apply to women.

"History teaches that women must have votes in order to protect their interests. Men, through all the vicissitudes of history, have shown constant preference to their own interests."

Now, where is the justice?

Chambers' Encyclopedia is not written by women or by one man, but by wise and just men.

Again I quote from the same authority:

"All the terms of the marriage contract are fixed by the law, and the law is made by men.

"By the law of England, the custody of the woman's children after seven years of age belongs exclusively to the husband. After that age she has no right to see them."

I leave you all to answer this question, is it ALWAYS the woman (in case of separation) who is so bad that she is not even to see her children?

Note the Just Equality There Should Be.

We all know that the college advantages, which men enjoyed and monopolized were not accorded to women until very lately. It was a hard struggle before they were admitted to anything like educational equality. But we know, too, that since the colleges have been opened to us the names of Philippa Fawcett, Madame Curie and a host more women of mental power have appeared on the intellectual horizon. It was a sore and rough fight before they gained entrance into the medical colleges. Charles Reade, in his "Put Yourself in his Place," makes you realize keenly something of the indignity and coarseness to which they were subjected after they were admitted to the medical colleges. The laws which now have granted women many educational advantages still withhold from them many distinctions and titles. There is not yet that just equality that there should be.

Edward Bellamy, in his "Looking Backward," represents in the future, women as standing side by side with men in the making of the laws, filling public offices, represented in all political affairs, and wielding their women's power and influence not only in the home but in