

# The Country Homemakers

Conducted by Francis Marion Beynon.

## ANOTHER ANSWER TO WOLF WILLOW

Wolf-Willow, you are a good sport and I like you, but I don't agree with you even a little bit. Experience has proved that your statement, that if women had voted on the bill for raising the age of protection for girls the result would have been the same, is not true. Wherever women vote they have shown themselves much more interested in social and moral questions than men. Indeed, I was appalled a few years ago when the question of vice-segregation was uppermost in our civic election to find that the average city man regarded at least the results of the white slave traffic as a necessity.

It is absurd for us to talk of giving our men a chance when they have had all the chance there is since Canada had a constitution and especially absurd in view of the fact that we have both hands tied behind our back and can't give them anything. Colorado women have given their men and themselves a chance for better government by helping to pass the Initiative, Referendum and Recall.

In your complaint that women don't write about anything but household problems, you are absolutely inconsistent. You insist that a home and children is their business first, last and all the time and that they should leave all public questions to the men, and when they do what you want them to you find fault with them.

The answer to your statement that ambitious women will disgrace themselves by grabbing for position is to be found in the State of Colorado, where, in their twenty years of the ballot, only ten women have sat in Parliament. Judge Lindsey says that for many years after they acquired the franchise "They were content with the ballot, speedily engrossed in its good use and entirely disregarding of office."

Most anti-suffragists would rather be judged before a tribunal of men than of women, because they are willing to use their sex appeal to influence the decision. I believe there is a judge in this country so susceptible to this appeal that I have heard men say it was useless to have a case against a pretty woman tried before him. To me this is exceedingly revolting.

Personally, desiring only plain justice and not sex-partiality, I would be perfectly willing to submit any case of mine to a tribunal of such broadminded women as I have the pleasure of numbering among my friends.

FRANCIS MARION BEYNON.

## WOMEN'S VOTE AS BAD AS MEN'S

Dear Miss Beynon—I must thank you for your fair and just criticism of my letter and for the valuable information concerning the victories gained by the women of Colorado. I am glad to see the world getting better, by any agency, either men's or women's, or both. And we are all proud of having so able a lady editor on the Grain Growers' Guide, and "won't play" at all if she is consigned to St. Helena.

Now to my main reason for asking for space. One of the things you mention as having been accomplished by the women of Colorado is raising the age of protection for girls from fourteen to eighteen years. Now let me quote from the Tribune's account of the meeting of the Trades and Labor congress, a non-political body.

"The fault found with the senate lay in the refusal of that body to pass legislation, which had carried the House, along the lines of protection for employed girls and women, in keeping them out of the clutches of white slavers. The first attack was made in the morning session by the Rev. Dr. Shearer, of Toronto, Secretary of the Social Service Council of Canada. He told the congress about the legislation the council had succeeded in passing the lower chamber. This was, among other things, to provide for the raising of the age of consent to eighteen years, and the making of all employers criminally responsible for the seduction of a girl in their employ. This had been killed by the senate and the doctor was sharp in the criticism of that body."

Now, if women had voted on this question, it would have been thrown out just the same. And were women dotards in the senate with the men, they would show just such senile obstinacy. Perhaps the people of Colorado have not an appointed body of rotten derelicts that senilely quash the mandates of the people's representatives. Our men will not be encouraged to try to make any more reforms along these lines until they abolish the senate.

So long as we have not a government by the people, for the people, it does not look as though anybody's vote, either men's or women's, is of much account. Only, of course, whatever party happens to be "in" can fill up the vacancies in the Old Man's Home for rocks on which a succeeding ship of state may founder. Let us get at the root of things and give our men a fighting chance. Abolish the senate, give the power to the people, and then see what happens.

I am open to conviction on the suffrage movement, but I want to be convinced first; and when I am convinced, I will not be afraid to say so, and why. I read the women's pages of all the Winnipeg papers and others, and most of the correspondents to the pages, after a lot of talk and tittle-tattle and a most explicit recipe for raisin pie, add a remark saying that they want the vote, the same as though it was a new bat or a package of corn-starch. They do not say why they want it, or what they intend to do with it when they get it. The lady editors, of course, and some correspondents, are well informed and abreast of the times. But I would be more quickly convinced of the necessity of the female vote if I read in the correspondents' letters any discussion of the topics of the hour; but there is just the same old sing-song that, I understand, used to come from the quilting bees of fifty years ago. There is not much progress. Now, under these conditions, unless women interest themselves in the questions of the day, they will not be potent voters, but just pale echoes of someone whom they admire.

And then again there is enough intrigue and graft in politics without introducing the element of difference of sex. I tremble for the state of affairs when clever, ambitious and unscrupulous women (and there are many of these) get into the arena. The thoughtful, conscientious "high-brow" will have no show, any more than has the conscientious man today. Now, women, do preserve a sanctuary. Then both sexes will be engulfed, which looks badly for the welfare of the race. An ambitious man will stop at nothing; neither will an ambitious woman. Ambition, let us remember, cast Lucifer, Son of the Morning, out of Heaven, and I predict a somewhat similar fall when women get the vote. For my part, I would, if in trouble, rather be judged before a tribunal of men than of women. The women will surely, under the female regime, get it, to be poetic, "in the neck," and the Harry K. Thaws will have the fatted calf, as evidenced by the women of Coaticooke and Sherbrooke.

Women may be very condescending and play the Pitying Angel and Lady Bountiful to their inferiors, but wait until it comes to dealing with their equals or superiors in public life. How a lady who has been "snubbed" by another would scheme for her revenge! And I foresee the class that would get the "plums." We would not only have the wives and daughters of prominent men (the people's servants) shining by reflected radiance, and patronizing "the people," but self-illuminated female suns, beaming upon a toadying world. Ask a "hired man" and a "hired girl" who gets the most "bossing?"

"A nice letter," you say, "for a woman to write about her own sex." Nevertheless, I still sign myself,

Yours, for the welfare of the race,  
WOLF-WILLOW.

## A WOMAN WHO SUPPORTS HERSELF

Dear Editor:—It is a proof that evil laws will be bettered at least if women are given the ballot, as in the territory where she has the right of franchise,

whenever the availability of an aspirant to office is being considered, the very first question that is asked is, "How does he stand in with the ladies?" Well they know that if his character will not stand the test of the criticism of the women that the whole woman vote will be against him, regardless of political party, as good men for office are more apt to make good and just laws.

It is easily understood the cause of evils existing in our lands. Lack of legislation and enforcement of laws. Men are worse than the law allows them to be in that the law winks at and ignores oftentimes the execution of law in regard to evil conduct. Men want and make laws that allow them to be evil or they would not always be making compromises with the liquor traffic, cigarette habit and other deadly evils. Men must admit that they purposely make evil laws.

Let the interests work, of which you speak in the disfranchising of both men and women, and let us urge that the eligibility of franchise of both men and women shall rest with the capability of the citizen. One asks what are most of our Canadian elections but a huge farce? What could we expect them to be when only one-half of our people is represented?

Let the power of the other half take hold and together create a logical practical reality instead of a ridiculous sham, in which you men admit that you have been unable to remove evils. It is but just and proper to say that women are just as fit and capable to govern as men, though men, regardless of their failure, will hardly admit this fact.

Women are greatly wronged because women's advent into this world is just as important and as necessary as that of men and they enter this life with an equal inheritance, and there is nothing after birth to justify the supposition that the women do not know right from wrong, truth from fallacy, clean politics from the opposite, patriotism from self-interest or indifference, altruism from egotism, large thought for the future from an inattentive resting on the past, or a ruinous delay with the present.

It is not the law-abiding individuals and societies that are against woman suffrage, but the law-breaking elements, the liquor traffic, gambling dens, dens of vice and infamy and the white slave traffic are all dead set against woman suffrage.

We refuse to submit to man-made laws because they are made in the interest of men and are narrow and selfish in the extreme. Abraham Lincoln truly said: "No man is good enough to make laws by which another shall be governed, without his consent."

Why the agitation to have the word "only" stricken from the marriage ceremony? Because it is unjust and illogical in more respects than one. Woman is a responsible being as much so as man. It is high time that our women be more independent and that laws be made to prevent the husband from disposing of their joint property without her consent or signature, and that she be treated as the equal of man as to responsibility and worth, a fact which appears to some to be both against the command of God and nature. Show us one command of God that says that women shall not be an equal creature of humanity. As to nature, we possess the same rights that men do. We have not purchased our freedom with a price. We were born free; born believing in the full rights to all privileges and positions accorded in common to other human beings, perfectly equal rights—human rights.

You say it is the duty of man to protect and support the weaker sex. There is the rub! A great army of men have played out on their job, and there are millions of women on the North American continent alone who are supporting themselves; a large number of those supporting their children into the bargain, owing to the desertion, indolence, drunkenness, or misfortune of their husbands, who should be the one to support the family. A correspondent says, "We have laws to punish the man who fails to support his wife."

Only a few months ago a mother, through The Guide, was asking for a

home for her little boy, 13 months old who had been deserted by her husband, saying she could keep the little girl, who was older, where she worked, 30 miles from Winnipeg, but they did not want the little boy too. This is only one case in thousands. Such being the case, would it be fair to give women the right to vote or to create the conditions under which man shall support her?

Please show us one woman in this or surrounding communities who is being supported by her husband. They are all earning their board and keep, and many times more in valuable service to their home and country, often shamefully and criminally working beyond their strength, many of them, with not a moment to call their own, rearing children, performing arduous and daily repeated labor that the homes and farms on these wide prairies demand.

Have we not a right to know something beyond the confines of home? Certainly, a perfect right to possess a knowledge of and to control that which affects our interests outside the home, as to health, prosperity, the protection from evil, and secured happiness of our families and our fellow beings.

Yes! women do impart their share of refining influences to humanity in the high standard of civilization. Dr. Stanley Hall tells us that the perpetuity of all that is divinest in human nature depends upon the equal development of true manliness and true womanliness, and Edwin M. Thornton, the psychologist, says that the refining influence or sentiment of society is a feminine characteristic, and that it reaches its highest and richest expression in feminine character, and that if women were to succeed in starving out their capacity for sentiment, every trait that makes humanity humane, every tie that binds humanity to God, would finally disappear. And as feminine talents are invaluable everywhere else in life, they will be equally useful in politics.

We are not in the least particular to be judged in this country by existing conditions in England, as our energies are, and always have been, in the interest of our homes, advancement, purity and secured welfare of our citizens.

Don't worry anything about the "coarser elements," or the loss of refinement or sex, as we will assure you that the elements will be of much finer and more excellent texture with our influence and power in government. As to sex, it is God's manufacture. It is dyed in the wool and will take care of itself. The women of Saskatchewan are equal to any emergency.

The agitation of women to enter the sphere of life that man has usurped and now holds is because of his failure to meet or reach the happy medium and the time is now opportune when she should come into her own and aid and guide in reaching the desired goal in the banishment of existing evils and reforms, and women, as well as men, need the ballot to protect them in their special interest. And let no man suppose in his arrogance he can give woman her rights. I tell you men you have no rights to give us; naturally we possess the same rights that you do and if we do not enjoy them, someone is a robber. Who is the thief? Let you make restitution with the full understanding that you are entitled to neither reward nor thanks. A just man will accord to every human being, even to his own wife, the rights which he demands for himself.

Are the women who are advocates of this reform and working for it, those who are taking the duties of home and motherhood lightly? Never. They are the most conscientious, serious, earnest-minded women the age produces, intensely interested in all matters pertaining to the home, school, church and society, not only working to their utmost strength in their own homes, but for the alleviation of sorrow, suffering and poverty in others and at the same time taking a long look towards measures for establishing society on a better, firmer basis by throwing women's view point into affairs of government.

Now I would very much like to go to St. Gregor, Saskatchewan, and many other places throughout the province and say

Continued on Page 22