

elections of guardians is not favourable to them (women), and with regard to women on School boards and other public bodies, where are the cases in which they have been of service? And confidently assuming that his query answers itself, he proceeds to account for the state of things he describes:—

"Unfortunately," he says, "in public business as in private life, it is found that women are apt to form their opinions by their likes and dislikes, and to be moved by personal reasons rather than by the merits of the question at issue, and this has made them often the cause of discomfort and ill-feeling on the boards on which they have sat. Were I prepared to yield the correctness of the assertion thus made, I might say in excuse, that having been disallowed the right of forming an independent opinion on any subject during an indefinite past, and having been expected to guide their actions by 'likes and dislikes,' it would be no wonder did women act in public life upon the only ground that has been allowed them. But I do not admit that such has been the general result of women's presence on boards, while I am quite willing to allow that there may have been exceptional cases of the kind, though I do not know of any. But I have had experience of men on boards and committees, and I know that 'personal,' and above all 'party' reasons, and 'likes and dislikes,' interfere quite as much with the due consideration of the question at issue as if they were all women of the type 'A Good Liberal' objects to.

In reply to the query of "A Good Liberal: 'Where are the cases in which they have been of service?'" which I will couple with his closing assertion: "They have done nothing which could not have been as well or better done by men," I will give two instances that recur to me in which a woman has done what men did not discover required doing, though they had been undisturbed possessors of the opportunities up to the time that women went upon the several boards. The most notable case is that of Mrs. Surr, a member of the London School Board. As one of the committee appointed to visit certain schools this lady felt dissatisfied with the result of her official observations at St. Paul's School, an industrial institution where boys and girls, orphans or otherwise uncared for, are prepared for useful lives. Something in the expression of the children's faces, especially of the girls', convinced Mrs. Surr that there was an evil somewhere which did not appear on the surface. Despite the objections of many members of the Board, who scowled and scoffed at such "woman's reasons" as Mrs. Surr advanced in support of a special enquiry, for which she asked, and in face of a certain amount of persecution from those who did not hesitate to tell her that she was a "cause of discomfort and ill-feeling" on the Board, the lady persevered until an enquiry was ordered, when a system of management was discovered, the heartlessness and brutality of which aroused the indignation of the whole nation, and amply justified the "woman's reasons" which forced the enquiry.

Miss M. B. Willard, a sister, I believe, of Miss Frances Willard, of Women's Christian Temperance Union fame, gives the other instance of the value of women on boards, which I will adduce. She says: "On Saturday last Miss Florence Hill, a niece of Sir Rowland Hill (and daughter of Matthew Davenport Hill, so well known in judicial circles), kindly showed me over St. Pancras parish workhouse, of which she is one of the guardians. It was a clean, airy place, full of the comforts suggested by the heads of women-wise women, too, who are making it a study how to prevent as well as care for pauperism." Here, then, are two cases in which women have done and are doing what men cannot do, with all their authority and experience. Who should tell so well as a woman when children and women are well and duly cared for? It is a truism formulated by men themselves, that a man cannot make a home, though he may provide all the material it seems to require. And correspondingly a man cannot tell what the needs and rights of women and children are, because he is not one of them. He will remember well enough, however, that he did not run to his father but to his mother for comfort in his infancy; and this will be a sufficient argument, if he is a fair-minded man, to show him that in the management of women and children, women ought to have an authoritative say.

From the assertions of "A Good Liberal," to which I have endeavoured to reply, your correspondent "Sex" draws some very unfair conclusions. He speaks of the "decided retrogression of Female Suffrage in the British House of Commons," where, he says, "the regular Bill has 'shrunk to a mere resolution.'" The "mere resolution" in place of the Bill was occasioned by the action of Mr. Gladstone in bringing in a Bill for the extension of the franchise. In England they do not play at legislation any more than they can help, and therefore, when the Government announced a Franchise Bill, it was no longer desirable to carry on a Bill for Women's Suffrage, but, instead, to get in a resolution on the lines of the Government Bill which would give what the former Bill had embodied.

It is hardly fair of "Sex" to call the Leeds Conference "Radical," since it was composed of delegates from three Federal Liberal Societies—the London and Counties Liberal Union, the National Liberal Federation, and the National Reform Union; and as the 540 delegates "Sex" cites did not attend in the interest of Women's Suffrage, but took it as one of the resolutions at one of the meetings, experience tells us that, if 200 delegates were present at the meeting and voted in favour of the resolution, they were no insignificant majority.

As to "Sex's" further assertion that "among the mass of the wives and mothers of England the movement evidently finds no support," I can only say that if the presence in thousands of the women of any town and neighbourhood where a great meeting is arranged for, and the hearty applause and assent they always give to the question mean anything, the mass of the wives and mothers—and of the widows and spinsters too, who will alone be benefited directly by the franchise—do approve of Women's Suffrage, decidedly.

And has not Matthew Arnold lately shown us that the minority are always the conservators of the right? and there was a time when peeresses sat in the House of Lords in their own right, and women were not only the guardians of the poor, but churchwardens and justices of the peace, also.

I am, Sir, yours respectfully,
S. A. C.

Toronto.

GRANT AND JULIUS CÆSAR.

To the Editor of The Week:

SIR,—“A Canadian,” writing in reply to my article on “Grant and Julius Cæsar,” said very truly that the standard by which military heroes are judged will always differ. I fancy that no amount of writing will lead us to take the same view. I admitted that Grant had done some good service in the Western Campaigns, but still nothing that would justify placing him in the highest rank among generals. Space forbids my discussing this.

My object in writing this letter is to reply to the following statement of “A Canadian”:—“The ‘fact’ is not ‘undoubted’ but absolutely untrue that he (Grant) refused to exchange prisoners. It was purely a political question, with which he had nothing to do.”

I referred to the prisoners at Andersonville specially, and this was in the latter part of the war, when Grant was in chief command, and there is undoubted evidence as to his refusal then to exchange prisoners. General Benjamin F. Butler was the Federal Commissioner of Exchange at Fortress Monroe in 1864, and he made an official report to the “Committee on the Conduct of the War” appointed by Congress. In this report General Butler states:—“General Grant visited Fortress Monroe on April 1st—being the first time I had ever met him. To him the state of the negotiations as to exchange was verbally communicated, and most emphatic directions were received from the Lieutenant-General not to take any step by which another able-bodied man should be exchanged, until further orders from him.”

The report then details the plans adopted by General Butler to prevent an exchange being agreed upon. In one place he says:—“This argument set forth our claims in the most offensive form possible, consistently with ordinary courtesy of language, for the purpose of carrying out the wishes of the Lieutenant-General that no prisoners of war should be exchanged.”

The conclusion of the report is as follows:—“I have felt it my duty to give an account with this particular carefulness of my participation in the business of exchange of prisoners, the orders under which I acted, and the negotiations attempted, which comprises a faithful narration of all that was done, so that all may become a matter of history. The great importance of the questions; the fearful responsibility, for the many thousands of lives which, by the refusal to exchange, were sacrificed by the most cruel forms of death from cold, starvation, and the pestilence of the prison pens of Raleigh and Andersonville, being more than all the British soldiers killed in the wars of Napoleon; the anxiety of fathers, brothers, sisters, mothers, wives, to know the exigency which caused this terrible, and perhaps as it may have seemed to them, useless and unnecessary destruction of those dear to them, by horrible deaths, each and all have compelled me to this exposition, so that it may be seen that those lives were spent as a part of the system of attack upon the rebellion, devised by the wisdom of the General-in-Chief of the armies, to destroy it by depletion, depending upon our superior numbers to win the victory at last. The loyal mourners will doubtless derive solace from this fact, and appreciate all the more highly the genius which conceived the plan, and the success won at so great a cost.”

This official report, written by a subordinate, and avowedly in Grant's interest, justifies every word I said as to Grant's responsibility for the refusal to exchange prisoners, and if the Northern stories of the horrors of Andersonville are true, they prove the heartless cruelty of the policy.

Yours, etc.,

GEORGE T. DENISON.

Toronto, Feb., 1884.

THE ADVENTURES OF A WIDOW.

By EDGAR FAWCETT, author of "A Gentleman of Leisure," "A Hopeless Case," "An Ambitious Woman," "Tinkling Cymbals," etc.

VII.

PAULINE now began in excellent earnest the preparations for embarking upon her somewhat quaint enterprise. During the next three or four days she saw a good deal of Kindelon. They visited together the little editorial sanctum in Spruce Street, where Mrs. Dares sat dictating some of her inexhaustible "copy" to a pale and rather jaded-looking female amanuensis. The lady received her visitors with a most courteous hospitality. Pauline had a sense of shocking idleness as she looked at the great cumbersome writing-desk covered with ink-stains, files or clippings of newspapers, and long ribbon-like rolls of "proof." Her own fine garments seemed to crackle ostentatiously beside the noiseless folds of Mrs. Dares's work-day cashmere.

"We shall not take up much of your valuable time," she said to the large-eyed, serious, little lady. "We have called principally to ask a favour of you, and I hope you will not think it a presumptuous request."

"I hope it is presumptuous," said Mrs. Dares, "for that, provided I grant it at all, will make it so much pleasanter to grant."

"You may be sure," cried Kindelon gaily to Pauline, "that you have made a complete conquest of Mrs. Dares. She is usually quite miserly with her compliments. She puts me on the wretched allowance of one a year."