

Certain well-known houses have never been troubled. A list shown to me during the investigation is proof of this. Why have these houses not been raided? Since it is admitted that they are well known; since they were placed on a list that was shown to the court, it was the city's duty to bring them before the Recorder.

Why has this not been done?

It will be stated, perhaps that those houses have been *better kept* than others against which proceedings have been taken—that there were no complaints and no scandal; that is to say, no noise.

But, is not the house of prostitution, or rendezvous, well-known as such, a scandal in itself? Is it less dangerous because obliging neighbors consent to tolerate it, or because the keeper is smart enough or prudent enough to prevent noise or boisterous scandal? Prostitution takes place there openly.

Is that not enough?

Besides, by the tolerance given to such a house you expose the police to be suspected and charged with partiality and corruption. Recent experience must have convinced you of this.

There is, then, no such distinction to be made. Suppression in order to be efficient must be general and without exceptions, in every case where this can be carried out. Naturally, in cases of doubt, and in the absence of positive proof proceedings must be avoided.

Another abuse is the too frequent condemnation of the keepers of such houses, for the most part habitual offenders, to a fine instead of imprisonment. Those women come periodically, two or three times a year, before the Recorder. With the exception of very few cases they are, each time, sentenced to pay a fine, which they do easily from the proceeds of their vile trade. They expect it, anyhow, and have a reserve fund for that object. The fine is paid, and, after paying also the fines of the girls arrested with them, they return triumphantly to their dens, the doors of which are re-opened the same afternoon. The trick is played and the same woman is sure of impunity for three, four or six months, if she is *very good*, that is to say, does not too often attract the attention of the police during that period. After a certain number of months she will again come to their mind (she expects it), she will be arrested anew; she will pay once more and return to the old life again.

An ex-chief of police candidly admitted that such a system had the advantage of supplying the city with sure, periodical revenue. Remember, I speak of what I know; and I relate facts proven and admitted in open court.

It strikes me that such a state of things needs no comment.

Did the authorities ever consider the infamy of such a system?

Can the city of Montreal lend itself to such a calculation and rely on such a source of revenue?

Can this city authorize toleration, for a money consideration, payable periodically, after regular arrests for public prostitution?

Can Montreal thus license vice and infamy (for that is what it does) upon the payment of a fee?

I denounce that abuse with all my power. The keepers of houses who are *habitual offenders* should *all* be sentenced to imprisonment without the option of a fine. I would be less severe for the girls, and I would make a distinction between incorrigible habitués and those who are only on the threshold of shame and may be redeemed. On that point the