

that a man should be finally rejected because he was found disqualified at the first trial. He might be sent back, and told that he must learn to read respectably at least before he could be received as a candidate for holy orders; and if he had any real enthusiasm for the work to which he proposed to give himself, he would do his utmost to surmount the hindrances which lay in his path.

We believe that most of our divinity schools have a lecturer on elocution who professes to train the students in reading and recitation. But we have some doubts of the efficacy of this system. Judging it by experience, we should say it does not produce good readers. Looking at its methods, we fear that it attempts a superstructure before a solid foundation has been laid. Declamation may be all very well, but it is slightly ridiculous as attempted by a man who pronounces or articulates badly, and who puts no meaning into his ordinary reading. We believe in the necessity of beginning at the beginning. If a man has the patience and the humility and the perseverance to learn the right pronunciation of every vowel and consonant, to practise the careful articulation of every syllable, and then to submit to corrections of the monotony, artificiality, unthoughtfulness of his reading, he will certainly improve; but hardly otherwise.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

BY PROFESSOR F. P. NASH, M.A., HOBART COLLEGE, GENEVA, N.Y.

(Continued from last week.)

Again, as the law now stands, a man is bound to support his family if he can. If he fails in this duty, the law will step in and compel him. It is clear that when your "perfect equality" is established the duty of bread-winning must also be divided. Grant that only a woman can bear children, and, if you please, that she alone has natural facilities for suckling them—though, now-a-days, that can be done with a bottle. Suppose, however, that the offspring has passed that period of infancy. What right, on your thoroughly business-like and unsentimental theories of marriage, has the woman then to say to the man, "Go out and work all day, in all weathers; buffet the storms of the elements and of life. I shall stay here and take care of my child." Why, if the equality is perfect, cannot the man reply, "I did so when you had to stay at home and I could not do the work which you were doing. Now that part is over, and there is no reason why I should work while you sit at home. Turn about is fair play. The next child you get, it will be my watch on deck again." And if she rebels, why then should not the law compel her to do her share, as it now compels the man to do all?

And, after all, about this same child-bearing which is to offset all other duties, is it sure that it is a service analogous to man's services to the State? Most men are well content to smell gunpowder once a year on the fourth of July, or the Queen's birthday; a good many have no longing for a life of drudgery at the desk, or behind the counter. Is it so with women in regard to child-bearing? Is the average old maid happy and healthy? Is she contented with her waste of the special capabilities which nature has given her? Is there no reality in that joy of the mother "that a man is born into the world"? I say nothing of the sexual instinct in other respects; and yet something might be said on that point, though perhaps not much that would not be equally true of men. But when the children have come—particularly the boys—whose are they? Who is it that feels

the keenest sense of ownership in them? So then this pain of child-bearing, besides all other rewards and exemptions, must confer this one too of special ownership in the fruits of marriage. Really it is a veritable Fortunatus' purse, this maternity of yours.

But suppose the State to say, "We have an army of 400,000 men. The war is over. In times of peace we need at most 25,000. Quick, there, you superfluous fool for powder, get out of your uniforms and trudge home." Home they all go. And what might it say to the women? "The population"—say of Ireland, or Belgium, or Germany—"is increasing too fast. We are overcrowded. It is undesirable that we should have any more children. Let an edict, therefore, go forth that no woman may breed, no girl marry, until further orders." When the army is dismissed it has to go. If a man continues the war, he is a bandit, an outlaw, a "bush-whacker." He will be taken and shot. The woman who presumes to breed when the State wants no more babies shall go to jail, where she can sin no more. This begins to look like equality. And, indeed, if the State is to pay a large price in exemptions for its needful supply of babies, it seems only fair that, like any other buyer, it should decide for itself how much of that particular commodity it wants. Does it not?

I said that Mrs. Staunton and her friends desire more than mere equality. I have yet to learn that while claiming superiority for themselves in regard to many things, there is any province in life in which they are willing that man should be superior. He must work; they may, if they choose. He must fight: they need not if it does not suit them. Thus in every field they are to have all the rights of man, besides a list, longer than the new tariff-bill, of exemptions based upon the heroic act of child-bearing, which they are never happy until they have performed.

And how is it in the family? Mrs. Staunton claims that the laws of marriage, if they favour either party, ought to favour the wife (whatever wife may mean in the new order of things) and the mother. It is true that she demands perfect equality. But it is too easily demonstrable that perfect equality in this matter is absolutely impossible. Let us see why. Given a man, his wife—no, I beg pardon—given a woman, her husband and her child, over which theoretically both parents have an equal right. The man determines to emigrate to a distant place. The wife has an indefeasible right to refuse to emigrate to any place whatever. What is to be done? Why, clearly, let him go, and let her stay. Well, then, they have certain common property. That is easily arranged: let him take half. But the child? What are we to do with the child? "Oh," says King Solomon, "cut it in two, and each take one half." Unfortunately the right and left halves of modern babies are of unequal value. Moreover, modern ideas are as opposed to division, in this matter, as they are favourable to multiplication. Let them, then, cast lots. But suppose the man or the woman refuse to leave it to chance or to a hand of poker. What? Am I to be forced to stake my very heart-strings on the chance of a "straight-flush"? Clearly not. The difficulty has no solution, and it is at this very point that comes in Mrs. Staunton's dictum, "If the law favours anybody it should favour the wife and mother." It follows, then, that she keeps the child, and he sacrifices his will and his prospects, if he sufficiently loves his offspring. We wish him much happiness in his household after this equitable arrangement.

I know that one might here suggest that the sex of the child should determine the matter. On what principles then? Clearly, all common sense supports the usual rule of the courts in cases of separation. The girls remain with the mother, the boys go with the father. For, here the State has something to say, because of its own interest in the children; and, as between a man and a woman, the latter is evidently better fitted to educate a girl; and, though Mrs. Staunton will not perhaps admit the converse proposition, it seems clear that the man will do better by a boy than he would by a girl. Now, then, if such were the law, how would the wife and mother like it? It would be an evident indignity to pretend that even ten boys are an equivalent for one girl. Are they not the stuff of which those men are made who disfranchise women by a "monstrous crime" in New Jersey and also outside? And yet, such is this same wife and mother, that one puny, rachitic, scrofulous apology for a boy is more precious in her sight than a whole bevy of buxom daughters. What would be her idea of a law which might, in certain cases, give her husband her first-born boy—nay even a whole quiver-full of boys—while it left her with no child at all, or with a girl or two for whom she would not give, so to speak, the parings of her darling's finger-nails. I know that this is gross exaggeration; but I am trying to realize a state of irritation, on the part of such a "wife and mother," to express which nothing short of exaggeration seems adequate.

And what would be the inevitable sequel of all this? It seems plain that, under such laws as Mrs. Staunton suggests, no sane man (nor, perhaps, any sane girl) would marry at all, except under the safe-guard of a legal contract which should determine in the clearest way which party should ultimately decide all disputed questions. And the last state of that woman would be worse than the first. For it needs no proof that no sane man would surrender his own liberty and, what is more precious still, the liberty of his conscience, for a thing which Mrs. Staunton herself describes as "a mere incident in his life;" while it seems probable enough that many a woman would surrender her equality for that which, in Mrs. Staunton's own words, "as a general thing, is all of life to woman; where all her interests and ambitions centre."

Is it not clear that the contract would, "as a general thing," be in favour of the man? "*Naturam expellas furca, tamen usque recurret.*"

SOME LITURGICAL STUDIES.

BY REV. DR. GAMMACK, EAST TORONTO.

No. 9.

The history of the Church's life in the days of British rule in what is now the United States of America, is one of the saddest tales that any one can read, and must moderate our disappointment at many features in her present system. The Church on both sides of our line of lakes was struggling to overtake the work among the colonists, but had her hands weakened by the want of what is meant to lead on the way to order, energetic action, and prosperity. She was the only religious body that had no centre on the soil, and that had to send her clerical candidates across the ocean for ordination to their office and work. Organization and oversight there could have been none, and the faith that carried on the Church's ministrations amid such discouragement, poverty and persecution, entitle the clergy to the honours of martyrdom. They were loyal to the Church of