

I gave there was for the cause, which was most ably argued by Sir Charles Maclaren, Emmott and others, and carried by a good majority. Of course, it is quite fair to say that the conduct of a certain number of screaming hysterics should not necessarily prejudice the cause advocated by their more level-headed sisters. This is logical, of course; but the world is largely ruled by sentiment, and the too-numerous opponents of the vote urge what guarantee is there that the more ardent spirits, thousands in number, will not resort to the same tactics when they are allowed to enter the polling booths, and will destroy property and assault ministers and break up meetings, if things don't happen to go as they wish? And if they ever were elected to the House of Commons—and I can hear of not one regulation to prevent them—then Heaven help it, for chaos must inevitably set in, and the chance of doing business would be remote indeed, for reasons which I will give presently, and which are to be observed in any public or private assembly where women have to take a responsible part. It is the fashion to say that all the peculiarities of conduct and demeanour which we notice and sometimes deplore in the other sex, are due to education and training, and that if they had the same opportunity for intellectual development as men they would be their equals. This is not my opinion. I strongly hold that there are constitutional and fundamental physiological and racial distinctions which dig a deep gulf between men and women. To begin with, child-bearing must be taken into account; and there are certain periods culminating in what is called the "change of life," which profoundly