

lusive; and, when even a word can be questioned, the authority of that article opens the door for its own criticism. It was, indeed, to avoid similar mistakes that, in the earliest draft of my Constitution, I provided for a Historian and Standard-Bearers, the one to tell the story by a faithful record of the work, and the other to uphold the Constitution, its Aims, its Platform, and its Heritage. Had this "Standard-Bearer's" Article not been signed by an authorized officer of an important society, I should not have taken the trouble to read it. In itself, with its "supply force of electricity," "withdrawn from materializing into action," "failure," "disaster," "wavering and flickering out," "breakdown," "collapse," "great disorder," "ruin and disaster," "sorrowful details," it is flippant and childish, whilst as a criticism of a high and serious work, undertaken by capable and responsible women in Canada and elsewhere, it is nothing short of sacrilege. Hardly a single sentence in it deals with the period which it is supposed to criticise, and, when criticism is indulged in, it is accomplished by false statements, and the insinuation which generally lies ready for the eager tongue and the irresponsible pen;—*eager*, because this champion sprang into the arena without her armour, and *irresponsible*, because she as promptly sprang into cover again.

#### ANOTHER AUTHORITY.

But "Standard-Bearer" is not the only self-constituted authority that has failed to distinguish fiction from fact. In *Canada* (London, November 3, 1906) there is a signed Article, "specially contributed," with portraits, from which I select mis-statements for revisal by the writer and her authority.

"The first movement," and later, "The preliminary meeting" —"took the form of a general meeting," in Toronto, "called by Mrs. Clark-Murray of Montreal,"—"Miss Mowat, whose warm interest Mrs. Murray had secured, hospitably threw open the doors of Government House."

This meeting was not the "first," nor the "preliminary" movement, nor even, by a very long way, was it the first movement in Toronto. The work had already been actively promoted in Toronto, in close connection with the Head Office in Montreal. The meeting was not called by me, nor had I seen Miss Mowat to interest her in the subject. The meeting was called by the Toronto ladies themselves, who were already members, who had been constituted Provincial Chapter for Ontario, and who had invited me from Montreal to be present;—the very identical committee which, later, I asked to assume the authority of Head Office for me, namely:—President, Mrs. Nordheimer; First Vice-President,