

cial duty lay in upholding their personal dignity, then the love of luxury would claim less victims.

A young, infatuated girl who, in a moment of *passion* falls from the path of virtue, has an extenuating circumstance in her favour—she at least erred through her love. But the woman who so far forgets her womanhood as to lower herself day after day, lower than the animals, has not a shade of an excuse.

As there are temperance societies, so should there be societies for the protection of young girls—societies where they would be taught the material difference between right and wrong, as well as the sad after-effects of this glaring moral wrong.

Louis Andr e, of Florence, founded a home for these social outcasts, trying to redeem them, and calling them her children. Why can we not establish an institution of a similar nature for the guidance of ignorant young girls who have no fond parent to put them on the path of virtue—girls who are born and reared in an atmosphere of moral corruption. Let us teach them that women's mission is a noble one—that woman was destined to be man's companion, not his slave,—not an object for man's animal gratification, but the mother of his children, the mother of humanity.

As already explained, the mission of the intellectual woman of the present century must be the education of the masses. It will only be when this is accomplished that higher ideals can be aspired to. The present day feminist aspires to the granting of the same liberty to women as that which men enjoy, but never thinks of asking to what use would the majority of women apply this liberty.

If a large quantity of money is left within reach of a poor, though honest man, he will not touch a cent of it, knowing that if he did, he would lose his good name, and that it would be a dishonest action. Leave the same money before a person of bad principles, and what happens? He appropriates it and thereby becomes a thief.

Such would be the case with complete liberty for women. Some would be true to the trust placed in them, but many would abuse their liberty.

The *ultra feminist*—the woman who has studied more than her neighbour—looks with scorn on her less fortunate sister, and does not deign to help her—such a person is not a feminist—rather let us call her an egoist.

Our duty should be based on the law of the love of humanity, charity and mutual help.

The European woman has achieved much progress, but she has yet much to overcome—that is if we take into consideration the great undercurrent of corruption that exists in the old world. Properly speaking the women who have evolutionised the most, are