

methods underhand and essentially immoral. Moreover, the "relic" is not "cherished" when won **merely** for its value as evidence of conquest. In New Zealand there was practically no demand for the Vote, so ready were the men of that country to recognize Justice and forestall the necessity for any women's agitation by offering what they had no right to withhold. Yet the privilege of citizenship is appreciated to the full by the women of that land.

At the same time, we agree with our correspondent to this extent, that women of the Old Country will probably rate their political responsibilities more highly than those of any other, and will fulfil them the more faithfully, because of the tremendous price they have had to pay for that recognition which every man worthy the name of man is ready, once he begins to think of the matter, to accord them as their inalienable right.

♦ ♦ ♦

An Insult

"The Hornet" has surpassed himself in his desire to be smart at the expense of Women Suffragists. In the "Week" of May 17th he says: "That if a few militants had to perform the Jane Shore Act in the public streets their modesty might receive a shock—and then again it might not."

For the benefit of our readers who have not at their finger-tips the details of all the numerous unpleasant facts concerning the private lives of prominent men with which the pages of history are sullied, we may state that Jane Shore was mistress of Edward IV., and one of the most disreputable characters of her day, according to the King and historians. Like other poor women of the same stamp, however, she paid in full for her folly, while the men who associated with her escaped then, as now, the scorn of public opinion. When quite a young girl she married a goldsmith who, when she became the King's mistress, abandoned her. On the King's death she became

the mistress of Lord Hastings, who was beheaded by the Duke of Gloucester, afterwards Richard III. The Duke accused her of sorcery and threw her into prison, robbing her of her property to the extent of about \$150,000, and not satisfied with this, he (himself of course being immaculate and actuated by righteous indignation) induced the Bishop of London to compel her to undergo an open penance at St. Paul's Cross for her vicious life. This she did, walking through London in a nightdress and holding a lighted candle.

The insult of the "Hornet" consists not merely in the implication conveyed by the comparison of such a notorious woman with those who are giving their lives in an effort to insure the greater protection of the girls of to-day from the traps laid for them by men who, when they have made a woman an outcast, are the first to fling mud at her, but it consists also in the open slur on their modesty, and this constitutes an insult to every woman, whether Suffragist or Anti-Militant on Constitutional. It is this sort of cowardly attack on a woman as woman, from a man sheltering under a pseudonym in order to say in print what he would not dare to say under his own name to any woman in person, which makes it sometimes so very difficult for a woman to steer clear of that contempt for men as men which is so frequently and erroneously accredited to Suffragists. This is the "chivalry" on which we are implored to go on relying. This is the "shelter" and "protection" which we are assured all women receive from men already, and which they will lose when they are given the vote. This incident gives us a glimpse of the "pedestal" on which woman as woman is so regally enthroned in the imagination of the typical men of to-day. What wonder if some of us think we could dispense with such a state of chivalry as this and might find a state of human justice afford us more stringent libel laws and a cleaner tone in the press? We waited to see whether there might be one man in Victoria man enough