

intellectual and social movements for the benefit of their sex and of children, and even of men. The old type of womanhood had only one object in life, which was to secure a husband, and then either to become an aggressive home-ruler, or a down-trodden household drudge, little better than an upper servant, struggling perhaps to make both ends meet, and exposed to all the sordid worries of a narrow domesticity, which the man successfully evades. Or perhaps the home may be an ideal one, where husband and wife understand each other, and are mutually helpful, and she is an intelligent companion and appreciative, without entering into too active competition with one whom she has promised to love, honour and *obey*. And if she is sufficiently well off, and things run smoothly, and if her family does not consist of plain girls that can't marry, and worrying ones that want careers on the stage and elsewhere, and erratic boys who decline to work, she is probably quite contented with her lot. But then that lot does not fall to all. There are female as well as male bachelors, as well as those who do not get the chance of maternity, and they are apt to become emotional and high-strung, and inclined to take what I may call a priggish view of their actions—as one of the most militant of the suffragists said when asked why she had thrown a bottle into the carriage of a Cabinet Minister, “I did it for a high moral purpose.” What are you to do with people of that sort? And the *reductio ad absurdum* of their proceedings was surely reached when they attempted to break up a meeting at which a Cabinet Minister for the first time took the chair to advocate their cause.