

Suffragists confidently assume that they are bound to get the vote. If they are so very sure, why do they resort to incendiarism and violence? A House of Commons left with a free hand rejects Votes for Women by a majority of 47, in spite of the fact that one-third of the members, lukewarm or timid on the question, absent themselves from the division. With the country incensed against militancy, and even the constitutional suffragists requiring protection at their meetings, the triumph of Feminism in politics is very far from being assured. The one difficult thing to understand in connection with the movement is the support given to it by the Labour men, more especially in view of Mrs. Pankhurst's public declaration of hostility to the party and its objective in public life. At the Easter Conference of the Independent Labour Party Richard Wallhead, experienced electioneer as he is, referred to the extraordinary sacrifice of its own interests which the party was making in giving its support to suffragism, but expressed the belief that things would come right in the long run. I would fain believe it; but the facts are mostly against it. Anyhow, have we the moral right to gamble with such a fateful chance? It is the health and comfort and safety and peace of mind and continuance of days of men, children, and the women themselves that are the stakes. Do we not know the dark and noisome slum owned by the Whig Mayor, the dustbins and the earth-closets standing in a row before the open doors and windows behind which infants sicken and die of ailments directly traceable to the surroundings which the women's municipal votes notoriously help to maintain. Does "justice" mean the perpetuation of misery and cruelty in order that women may have a vote to give to "Mr. Taylor, because he is such a nice gentleman, and his wife is a perfect lady, and they came round in a lovely motor-car."

In departing from M. A. M. M.'s contribution, we would express the hope that *John Bull* will not present us with one of his biscuits because of our correspondent's closing declaration that all women will be made parents by Act of Parliament!

II.

Are Women Over-Developed Sexually?

Under the title of "Tears and Triumph" an exceedingly clever and almost entirely misleading statement of the case for a New Superwoman comes from an Australian writer, Dowell O'Reilly, who attempts to justify from biology the further intrusion of woman into politics and rough-and-tumble life generally. O'Reilly perversely wants woman to be less of a breeder and more of a worker and an athlete. His theory is that in the long ages of evolution woman has deviated from the primitive type in courage, hardihood, grace, and mental alertness. But to give the moral before giving the story is to begin at the wrong end. "Tears and Triumph" is an allegory written with passion and a paradoxical wit which has led the reviewers to compare Mr. O'Reilly with Shaw. Whether the sense is in proportion to the art we shall presently see.

The plot (such as it is) presents us with a romantic encounter one