

in the arms of the mothers of the race.

For ten years (at least) of a boy's life the influence of his mother is paramount. If a woman cannot in these ten years instil principles of reverence for womanhood, of the dignity of self-control and purity of life, she is not worthy to hold a child in her arms.

The blame for the depravity of the West End of London, for houses of ill-fame, for ruined girlhood, may largely be laid at the doors of the richer mothers of England. . . .

When the mothers of the race have shown that they can rule their own families with loving sympathy for their daughters as well as their sons, then give them the vote.

But look to your sons, you mothers of children, or in the Day of Judgment on your shoulders will fall the responsibility of souls sent down to hell."

Yours truly,

KATE HORN,

Author of "Columbine at the Fair,"
etc., etc.

June 28, 1913.

To take the first important statement Kate Horn makes: "Women bear an equal share with men in that awful traffic."

She is evidently referring to female procurers, whose existence is so frequently quoted to argue that women are equally responsible for the White Slave Traffic.

Not a female procurer is first of all a prostitute. For her, there is no redemption, no place for her in this world; she is a hopeless outcast; the hand of everybody is against her. What wonder is it that her heart is turned to stone? If she is clever, she turns to her profit that very thing which has caused her own downfall. Why should she have pity for man or woman? Can you blame her?

Again, demand creates supply. What woman would be a procurer or a prostitute if the demand was not so great? Statistics have shown that the great majority of prostitutes come to the life through betrayal, or extreme poverty. If they followed such a profession by voluntary inclination, procurers would

not be necessary, and the fact that there are such people proves that the demand is greater than the supply. The blame lies in the demand, which shows that women do not bear an equal share in the disgrace of the White Slave Traffic.

It is true that in early childhood the mother's influence is paramount; but no matter what splendid ideals of womanhood she has instilled into her son's mind (if one can instill them into a child of ten years), they will soon fly away when he goes out into the world unless his father has something to say to him. As soon as a boy leaves his mother's apron strings and mixes with men, he learns about the double moral standard, and naturally thinks that his mother's ideas of morality do not apply to him; and with the present state of affairs, he is right. He will find that reverence for women is confined to jumping up to open a door, or some such trifle; and as for other things, he concludes that "mother doesn't know."

The respectability of the middle-class Englishwomen, which means the average women, is so well known, that it has even been phrased "the respectable middle-class," so I think it is rather superfluous to request further qualifications from the mothers of the race in that direction. As for women ruling their families with sympathy, etc.: study the laws and find that legally a woman is not the parent of her legitimate child, and has no authority over it.

Why all this talk that women should be this and that before they are given a vote? If everybody had to be fully qualified to vote according to the ideas of these women critics, what a lot of men would have to be struck off the voters' list.

As I have said before, it is not the opposition of men that is checking the extension of the Suffrage to the women of Britain and Canada, it is the disloyalty of women who do not seem to understand that economic more than moral conditions have brought about the necessity for Woman Suffrage.