

work in many directions than either men or women can do apart. Of course there are limits outside of which each must of necessity proceed without the assistance of the other. But within these limits, why should not men and women think and act together in respect to public matters as well as to private business? The question is certainly worthy of consideration; for all will admit that there are public wrongs, to the righting of which the intuitive perceptions and refined minds of women might be brought into action with good results. It has been objected that if women take any part in public affairs they must, of necessity, lose the respect and the high consideration which is accorded by men to women. I question this statement. We know that the women who show that they are possessed of talents in respect to literature or art, music or the drama, do not lose the esteem of the men with whom they co-operate, or of those who are spectators or critics of their works,—provided always that they are careful to keep their personal honour unstained. Patti is not disreputable because she sings in public; on the contrary she is honoured by all mankind. I have never heard a whisper in derogation of the character or position of any lady who has shown that she is in possession of talents enabling her to succeed in any sphere of action outside the family and the home, provided only that she has been circumspect in her behavior. Consequently I am not prepared to admit that women must of necessity lose caste if permitted to take part in the deliberations and influence the decisions of the School Board. But, it is urged, that women when in public assemblies, talk all together and set forth ridiculous reasons. This I deny *in toto*. The difficulty in all mixed assemblies at which I have been present, is to induce women to publicly express their opinions. But we all know that they can do so