

does the husband's, even though he gives his work to the outside world for money, and she gives her's to the home for love. Moreover, the *intangible* results of the wife's labours can never be appraised at a pecuniary value, simply because they can *never be bought*. But we have, it is to be hoped, other and higher tests of productiveness than dollars and cents! Man does not live by bread alone, neither do children. 'Hungry little mouths' need something more than bread and butter to fit them for the work of life. They want mother love, watching, training and tending, sympathy and companionship. Every noble man who has had a true mother has felt and acknowledged that he owed her that which no money could ever repay, which no other could ever have supplied, and this without in the least detracting from his father's due.

Furthermore, the work of the true wife and mother is of a far more continuous and exacting nature than that of the great majority of masculine employments, than almost any, if we except doctors and railway brakemen. The husband, however hard he may work, has his hours of labour and his hours of rest. The work of the wife and mother is *never* done. It demands her whole time and vigilance and vitality, in fact her whole self. Under the strain many constitutions, not robust, break down into premature and chronic ill health, if not into premature graves. And the burden is too often made heavier for the wife by the ignorance or niggardliness of the husband in giving her an insufficient allowance for the style of house-keeping which he expects in his home. How often does worrying anxiety how to 'make the ends meet' wear away the wife's brightness and elasticity, when the husband is quite able to supply what would be amply sufficient, to give her a margin, besides, for the charities and other expenses which she should be able to meet easily and cheerfully, though she too often is not.

These things being undeniably true, it seems absurdly superfluous to attempt to *prove* the assertion that 'the wife's contribution of time and labour' are her fair share of the family burden. Men may differ as to the limitation or non-limitation of woman's 'sphere,' but outside of Turkey there should hardly be two opinions as to the dignity and vital importance of her work in the *home*, nor

should any true man desire to 'filch away half the credit' from *her*. The male bird may be very faithful and industrious in picking up worms and 'grub' for his nestlings, but he will hardly be thought a very modest bird if he claim the whole credit of their nurture, ignoring the patient sitting of the mother bird, and the vital warmth she supplies, as necessary a condition of their life as the food he brings. It will never raise the attributes of true fathers on earth, to attempt to disparage and belittle those of true *mothers*.

F.

EXTREME VIEWS ON TOTAL ABSTINENCE.

THE little tempest of disapproval called forth by the protest of the Rev. Mr. Macdonnell against the extreme language of some total abstinence speakers shows how hard it is for even good and thoroughly well-meaning men to be tolerant of those who differ from them in regard to a favourite hobby. For there is no doubt that, simply from a too exclusive gaze on one particular evil, total abstinence *does* become a hobby—nay, even a *religion* with some. To those who know that Mr. Macdonnell has been in practice a total abstainer from boyhood, it is somewhat amusing to see a prominent total abstinence journal 'hoping' that he may not follow in the footsteps of some anti-temperance orator who had fallen a victim to the moderate drinking he advocated! We all know what such '*hope not*s' mean when we hear them from gossips in private life. Is there no evil in such a '*suggestio falsi*,' as the writer might easily have ascertained it to be?

The present writer has fought hard for the trial of prohibition in Canada, and would not be suspected by readers of the CANADIAN MONTHLY, at any rate, of indifference to the evils of intemperance and the safeguard of total abstinence. But, just because total abstainers, under an overpowering sense of the curse of intemperance, so easily glide into fanaticism on the subject, does it seem necessary, occasionally, to protest against the bigotry and narrowness of those who would make total abstinence a virtue *per se*, and the temperate use of wine *in itself* a sin. If this were so, total abstinence would of course be incumbent