

might be secured. But speaking for myself, I am not aware that there is any particular necessity for refining politics in this country. I believe that our political campaigns in these days are conducted in a very orderly manner already. Do these people mean that if women were to engage in political struggles there would be less quarrelling, less anger, less disputing in our assemblies? I fear that such would not be the result if the experience of the present time is a criterion. I took a couple of clippings the other day out of the same paper which bear directly upon this point. One comes from Chicago, and reads thus:—"President Mrs. Potter Palmer surprised the board of lady managers this morning by arising as soon as the meeting was called to order, and saying that she would have to resign if the ladies did not quit quarrelling and behave in a more dignified manner." That looks as if they were in need of some men in that assembly rather than more women to give it a refining influence. The other comes from across the sea. It is a cable, and reads as follows:—"The meeting of the British Women's Temperance association to-day was of a very exciting character, and attended by evidence of temper and even ebullitions of passion. The delegates seemed hardly able to control their feelings and their tongues, and a feverish feeling seemed to pervade the assemblage. It is expected that owing to the vote of yesterday re-electing Lady Somerset as president, and thereby virtually endorsing her proposition to bring politics into the association, 175 branches of the association will secede. It is stated that the secretary of the convention, feeling that she has been insulted, has gone home in a passion."

How does that corroborate the idea of a refining influence by manly women taking part in public discussions? No; man is not and cannot be refined in that way. He has been refined in the past rather by attentions and courtesies paid to woman because of her recognized dependence on him as being his weaker and more helpless companion than by any act of woman herself. And thus it will ever be. When woman stands apart from man, and assumes independence; when she assumes to control him by force of numbers, she will then lose her refining influence and add fuel to the flame instead of decreasing it.

But my strongest objection to the bill of my hon. friend is the evil effects which in my judgment would result to society and to woman herself. These results would not be seen immediately; they would not be observed at the first few elections, but probably would take years to work out, but in the end the result would be evil, and evil alone. The right to cast the ballot carries with it the right to be elected by the ballot. If woman is part of the people, as is alleged, if she stands on an equality with man, having the same rights in the body politic, having equal intelligence, equal education, equal business training, by what process of reasoning can you show that the right to vote in her case does not carry with it the right to be voted for? The right to vote in a temperance lodge carries with it the right to be elected to preside. The same result would follow here. The right to vote for a member of the legislative assembly would carry with it the right to be elected a member of this assembly, the right to preside here, the right to take part here in all its deliberations. I think I hear the question coming to my ears. And why should they not take part? My answer is, not because woman is not intelligent, nor because she is not sufficiently educated, but because she is woman, because by putting her thus out of her sphere you unsex her. you are seeking to make her a man; to induce her to fill the place of a man; it is an attempt to compel man to perform that class of work requiring physical strength, while woman sits in parliament making laws and governing the

stronger sex—sitting as judge on the bench and as juror in the box.

A LOW TYPE OF WOMANHOOD.

I am well aware that this is the ambition of some women, masculine in character, disliking their own sex, having only selfish ambitions, deploring the fate that brought them into the world as women, and determined at all hazards to break the bonds of womanhood, and to take the part of a man. Such a woman says, Give me a chance and I will show you that I am not dependent; I refuse to take the place of humble submission which nature has assigned me; I am as able as any man; I can fill his place anywhere. Such a person I describe as a manly woman—the lowest type of true womanhood. An effeminate man or a manly woman are not the ideal types of

humanity. They are nowhere in demand. The masculine, manly woman is not respected by her own sex—they generally despise and mock her—and I am certain that she is not strongly admired by many men either. It is not her misery that she cannot be a man, but rather that she cannot be a woman. I appeal to true womanhood if its highest joy is not to know that in man they have a protector, one who loves them, provides for their needs, not by force, but willingly, because he delights to do it, and I appeal to true manhood if the strongest incentive to active exertion to do their best in every way is not the fact that there is dependent upon them a loving, dutiful wife, or a mother, daughter or sister.

Can you not see that when you have brought woman into the rightful sphere of man you will have revolutionized society, and changed altogether the relationship of man and woman? Will such a course bring greater harmony? Will the happiness of the people be thereby increased? Will, as these people imagine, all sin thus be stamped out? How will such a course affect the home life? Suppose that men and women voted differently, the mother against the son, the husband against the wife, and so on. If they did not thus vote differently, according to the argument, all these wrongs could never be righted, and no object would be gained by adding this enormous number to the list of voters. If they did vote differently, is it possible that this would add to the joy of the home? Will it permit in many cases harmony and love to continue?

Women are more strongly partizan than men; they admire more strongly, and when one has become the idol of their choice there is nothing they would not do to secure his election. This was instanced in the case of the duchess of Devonshire, who, it is stated, arranged with a butcher on whom she called to vote for her candidate on the condition that she allowed the butcher to kiss her, which she did. Imagine the female portion of a household the members of one partizan committee and the men arrayed on the other side. Imagine the men of the opposite party holding consultations with the women of this household in the heat of a party contest. It is impossible under such circumstances that bitterness should not come into that home. Its harmony would be gone; it would no longer be a place of joy and love and trust; these would certainly give place to jealousy, hatred and malice.

I am firmly convinced that one of the curses of this age is that there is not enough of home life. I think that home life is the strength of any nation. Scotchmen, whom we find in almost all parts of the world taking a front rank, owe more than most people think to the power and influence of home life. The demand for women's suffrage is a blow at this power. If I had the power to do it, and wished to bring the greatest blessing possible to our people, I should choose to increase and develop the influence of the home, to endeavor to change the tendency of the times, and to encourage young people together to build homes where mutual companionship, harmony and love might prevail—such homes as would prove a greater attraction than the street parade, the saloon or the theatre; homes where character would be built which would increase right conduct and prove a shield from temptation.

WRONG IDEAS OF WORK.

One reason urged why women's suffrage should be granted is because so many women are without homes. I know that this is true, and that the tendency in that direction is increasing, but it is largely the result of the prevailing fashion among young people to desire neither to be mistress of a home nor to work in the home of another. They choose in preference the factory, the counter of a store, and the tailor shop—anywhere to be entirely independent, and to live unto themselves. I have no quarrel with them if they wish to do this, but I want to say that it is certainly not conducive to increasing morality. Intemperance is spoken of as the greatest evil, but I ask those who have observed more closely the workings of society whether or not the tendency to forsake home and home life does not lead directly to that end? I ask whether the prevailing vices of our cities and towns are not the direct outcome of forsaken homes, and do not lead directly in the way of the saloon and the grog shop? To introduce women into the political arena is to add to this tendency, and those who advocate it are incurring a great responsibility. I certainly shall not be one of them. The home is woman's place of power; if she is a true woman she rules there, although she does not assume that place. This is her queenly station in