

was the view of Tennyson's "fat-faced curate, Edward Bull," who was fond of repeating that

God made the woman for the
Use of man,
And for the good and increase
Of the world.

The founder of Positivism, Auguste Comte, held a very high estimate of the moral influence that women are adapted and destined to exercise; but even he could not rise above the idea of woman's dependence on man; he had no prescience of what time had in store as regards the emancipation of woman.

Now strange and *outré* as the views expressed in my former article appear to the very competent local authorities referred to above, I cannot really discover that they are out of joint with the best thought of our own time. Quite by accident, since writing that article, I have come across a copy of *La Minerve* newspaper (of Montreal) which I had put aside months ago as containing an article to which I might afterwards wish to refer. *La Minerve*, it is needless to say, is not a revolutionary paper, and would not willingly give place in its columns to anything of a revolutionary character. Yet the article, for the sake of which I preserved it, is one in which an abstract is given of an address delivered in Paris at the Continental Hotel, by a M. Maréchaux, on "The Rôle of Woman in Society." M. Maréchaux is far from thinking that woman yet occupies her proper position in the world. "There will be no true cohesion," he declares, "in society, there will be no reciprocal respect, there will be no *family* in the highest sense of the word until we shall have recognized the equality of man and woman—their absolute equality." Referring to the dangers that threaten society to-day, he says that it is high time, and of urgent necessity, to put into requisition a powerful resource hitherto too little prized—the intelligence of woman. It is in the matter of marriage particularly that moral reform must begin. Young women are not properly prepared for marriage, and men regard it only as a diversion from the monotony of an earlier life spent in degrading pleasures, which leave as their result a stupid contempt for woman, whose true nature they have never given themselves an opportunity to understand or appreciate. M. Maréchaux, however, hails the appearance of a powerful movement in favour of woman, a movement that is destined to carry all obstacles before it. So far is *La Minerve's* version of M. Maréchaux's address, the whole drift of which I make bold to say was in the same direction as my former article.

But in the current (October) number of the *Forum*, I find what is still more to my purpose in an article by a lady, Mrs. H. E. Starrett, on "The Future of our Daughters." This writer welcomes as a boon to the world "the necessity that forces young girls and women from the shelter of the home to become bread-winners for themselves and for their children." "Considering," she says, "the case of fairly well educated young women who now, in cities and villages the civilized world over, go forth every morning to specific, money-earning work, what do we find in all the higher occupations? Generally bright faces, cheerful countenances, neatness and daintiness of attire and person, modest, self-respecting manners, faithful industry, and comfortable remuneration." Formerly the appearance of a woman in the street or other public place arrested the attention of men, and subjected her to unpleasant remarks, whereas the result of the constant association in our own day of men and women in all the ranks of organized industry has been that "men accord to women that quiet, unobtrusive respect which is the best possible expression of a normal relation." The women themselves, on the other hand, have been similarly "educated into unconsciousness and self-respect." The conclusion is drawn, and rightly as I believe, that *all* girls should be "educated to be independent, self-sustaining workers, as a condition not only of their safety in this world of vicissitudes, but of their happiness as rational beings." In the words I have italicized we come to the root of the matter. "Not more imperious," says Mrs. Starrett, "is the necessity for those who must earn their own living, than for those who spend weary hours in homes of comfort and wealth, and who sit with hungry hearts longing for some worthy aim to come into their lives and fill them." But what, for a woman, are too often the diversions of an empty and aimless life? Surely coquetry and social frivolity, conduct that is lowering to the female sex, and which, if it eventuates in marriage, seriously discounts the dignity, if not the purity, that ought to belong to it.

The "coming reform," then, consists primarily in the elevation of women through education and work to a position that will enable her to exert the full influence of which the potentiality resides in her nature. The aforetime depression of woman has bred certain vices in men which her elevation will not less naturally correct. One of my critics—the one who finds my line of thought verging on impiety—has declared that "the lust of man will continue to be tempered by the laws of that society in which he happens to find himself." He has added the delicate remark that "ugly women will continue to be patterns of abstemious virtue." Evidently there are regions into which the idea of any other than a legal or police control of "lust" has never entered. That reason, that a careful study of the laws of nature, that a voluntary regard for the rights of others, including a progeny yet to be, could have anything to do with the matter—all these are conceptions still below the mental horizons of some people even of some who undertake to instruct the community. Yet all these considerations and many others are *verae*

causae, and are destined to become more and more efficacious as civilization develops. Read E. B. Lanin's article, in the September *Fortnightly*, on "Sexual Morality in Russia," and compare the condition of things, which he describes, with what obtains in freer and more enlightened countries. Have our police regulations made all the difference? Or is it a question of intellectual and moral advancement? Well, if we have not yet reached the goal of a *true* sexual morality, it is well we should know it. If we have, let the fact be stated; or, at least, let those who think so say so, and give reasons for their opinion. If they can manage to do this over their own signatures, the public would perhaps on the whole be better satisfied.

Well does Mr. Lanin say, in the article just referred to, that "the social position of woman is admittedly the key note of a nation's civilization." Ibsen has powerfully taught us in his "Doll's House," that a woman's first duty is to herself, and that she is not to trust to wifehood or motherhood to raise her to her true level, but should see that she occupies her true level, and has grounds for a true self-respect before she consents to become either wife or mother. All the greatest voices of the present age are, indeed, striking the same note, of which nothing more than a poor diminished echo is to be heard in aught that I have myself written.

Since writing the above I have read Mr. Alfred Russel Wallace's article on "Human Selection," in the September *Fortnightly*. One or two of his observations bear so strongly on the matter now in hand, that I beg leave to reproduce them. Speaking of a certain proposition of Mr. Grant Allen's, he says that it would tend to increase pure sensualism, "the most degrading and most fatal of all the qualities that tend to the deterioration of races, and the downfall of nations." He does not believe that only "ugly women"—to repeat the chivalrous phrase of the *World*—are "abstemiously virtuous." He says that already there is a considerable number of women who feel no strong inclination to marriage (page 335), and that were our social arrangements such as to give women in general greater independence, "the number of unmarried from choice would largely increase." He anticipates that in future "a large selective agency will rest with the female sex." This is precisely the position I took in my article of the 5th ult.

Ottawa, Oct. 4, 1890,

W. D. LESURER.

AUTUMN.

RESPICE—ASPICE.

NATURE'S masque is all departing,
And across the grassy land
Where bright fairies, dancing, darting,
Tripp'd their sunny saraband,
Dull grey spirits, chill and cheerless,
In a solemn measure slow,
March in silence, wan but tearless
And the wind moans sad and low;
Drooping ferns are turning yellow,
Brush and brake are red and brown,
Berries dry and late fruit mellow
With dead weight are dropping down;
Shrivell'd leaves in coloured showers
Fall incessant from the trees,
And a few belated flowers
Breathe their dying fragrances;
All the birds have ceased their calling,
And the bees no longer hum,
All is falling, falling, falling,
Farewell, Summer! Winter, come!

SAREPTA.

PARIS LETTER.

THE military operations of 65,000 men in the north of France were the nearest approach possible to what the actual fighting of the future will be. The teachings of the manoeuvres were important. Many popular errors have been corrected, and much of the new strategy will be a surprise. Contrary to the general impression, red is not a dangerously showy colour in smokeless shootings. Dark and brilliant colours were those most easily distinguished. The infantry were the most, relatively, invisible; their red caps and red pantaloons were not discernible, while their busts, that is, their dark blue tunics, were perceptible—at long distances understood. Between 1,200 and 1,800 yards no colour is visible. The conclusion of the experts is that red is the best of uniform colours.

Anything white and shining is fatal. Regiments were discovered and their strength ascertained by the shining sword scabbards of the officers. Henceforth the scabbards are to be "browned," or made of leather. The tin cooking utensils of the soldier's kit are terrible tell-tales of his presence; they are to be blackened. The brass handles of the bayonets must be darkened. The white nose-bags, etc., of the cavalry are to be dyed chocolate-shade. Officers and soldiers, who are in the habit of employing white pocket handkerchiefs from beneath their caps to protect the neck, by hanging down, against the sun, have to select dark-coloured material.

Napoleon said the spade was as important to the soldier as his musket. That is truer to-day than ever. The best battle-ground henceforth is that possessing most undulations. A region where little hills skip with joy is admir-

able. A wood, unless very extensive, is objectionable: it can be raked with cannon and machine guns. Dry ploughed land is a drawback: the movements of artillery and of men raise dust. Meadows, corn-fields, vineyards, etc.—these are covers to be sought out. The balloon observatory did not realize anticipations, as scouts, cavalry are at the mercy of concealed out-posts. Reconnoitring work must be entrusted to picked men—active, *rusé*, intelligent and full of resources. They will creep forward like Indians to scale the summit of an undulation, or worm forward to an entrenchment. They are to be divested of top-coat and knapsack; their rifle and cartridge belt will be all their impediments.

In the actual fighting there will be less noise: *sang froid* will replace the yelling and shouting of the past. Not only officers but even the men will have to rely more on themselves. The new field wagons were a success; they carry at once ammunition, pick-axes and spades, knapsacks, etc. The selection of a battle-field will be the great aim of a commander: how to bring the enemy to fight in a chosen region will be the measure of his tactical skill. It is in defence that strategy will, for the future, be displayed. It is not how to attack your enemy, but how to beat him off, that constitutes the new science of war. To attack the adversary on his flank, since a direct front assault is next to impossible with smokeless powder and repeating rifles, and having once shaken his lines to rapidly press forward, such constitute the chief secret of success. To these must be united reliance on trenches, above all, behind the crests of undulations, and temporary fortifications, with a good map of the district and a well-arranged compass to detect the whereabouts of artillery. The unanimous opinion is that in the next war the burial will have more to do than the medical corps.

September is a month not favourable to the enemies of the Republic. It was in September, 1792, that the convention abolished royalty, and gave birth to the Republic. September, 1870, recuscitated the Republic, and September, 1889-90, saved it from the monarcho-Boulangist conspiracy. It is time for the dead-beat parties to bow to the manifest will of the country, and labour for the development, not the destruction, of France. President Carnot intends to carry the war into the social midst of the royalists; the latter have their aristocratic days and nights at theatres, operas, concerts, and circuses. Henceforth M. Carnot and his suite will put in an official appearance at these manifestation-gatherings of the fashionable world. It is this stalwart move on the part of the President which has compelled the Princesse de Sagan—as enthusiastic a royalist as the Duchesse d'Uzès, only she will never pay a franc, much less three millions, to restore the sly and slippery Comte de Paris—to vacate the State box that she rents at the Theatre Français. The Jacobin party in England, the Secessionist party in the States, had the good sense to bow to destiny, and become frankly a constitutional opposition. The played-out royalists ought to do the same. Whether they do so or not the Republicans have decided to ride rough-shod over all adventurers and pretenders for the future, and energetically take in hand the labour, social and financial ameliorations so long held in check by pseudo-Conservatives and marketable patriots.

Trouville is the most fashionable seaside resort in France. The upper crust honour it with their presence during August; on their departure the village is occupied by the well-to-do professional classes. Ten days ago the latter filled every vacant department; at present there is not a soul in the place. Typhoid fever broke out, smote several, and destroyed a few, the most notable being the actress, Madame Jeanne Samary, of the Theatre Français, a loss not only for that house, but for dramatic art. Young and very popular, she had a great future before her. She interpreted nature, while never omitting to study. Pailleron divined her talent, and wrote for her the delicious *role* of "Antoinette," in "l'Étincelle"; she was equally successful as "Suzanne de Villiers," in the "Monde où l'on s'ennuie." In her domestic life she was a model wife and mother; it was to spend a few days more romping with her two dolls—as she called her little girls—on the sands, that she caught the infection. The detritus of the town is run into a small stream, presumed to empty itself in the sea and to be tided away; the filth lodged in the sand decomposed rapidly by the late great heat; the disease germs lodged in the atmosphere and drinking water, and with the natural consequences. It is one more proof that drainage cannot be played with.

"*Similia similibus curantur.*" It was a maxim among Roman juris consults, that in every crime, "Seek the Woman." In every disease at present the rule is: find the bacillus or microbe. To cure cholera by inoculating a patient with the virus, or microbe of typhoid fever, does not appear less strange than Dr. Bahtchinski curing diphtheria by inoculating with the virus of erysipelas. He has so operated upon his own son at St. Petersburg, and several other children, with success. The irreconcilable microbes attack and destroy each other—leaving the battle-field, the patient, free. The eminent physicians of the Children's Hospital, of Paris, give no opinion on the subject; they admit the experiment is curious, but that it will require to be carefully controlled and for a long time repeated. They add that one of the most curious features about diphtheria is that many of the cases are cured spontaneously.

A very close eye is being kept on Portugal. She cannot raise money in France till she redeems her repudiated bonds of 1832, and that the Chamber of Deputies in July, 1880, declared the Government ought to sustain the defrauded in being indemnified, both in capital and