

and well cared for. All the conditions that he deprecates, marriage without love, the risk of disease, unwilling motherhood, the double burden of child-bearing and industrial work, are the conditions of a man-governed world which Woman Suffrage will be the first step towards remedying. Does Dr. Saleeby, in his eloquent plea for the race and his regret that Suffragists do not put eugenics before the vote, not realize that the first thing women will do with their power will be to change the conditions that make life intolerable for so many of their sisters? And when he reproaches the "brilliant young lady" whose name has been so prominent in the fight for the vote because she resented the idea of new legislation for women whilst the Suffrage was withheld, does he pause for a moment to think how he would like the passing of laws affecting medical men—or eugenists—by a well-meaning Government which did not trouble to consult them?

We were not aware that prominent Suffragists discourage marriage and motherhood; it is because the Suffragists preach the same high ideals as are put forward in this book and will not take a second-best that they prefer the happiness of work to the unhappiness of a loveless marriage. If women do not now fly blindly to that estate, the reason can be found in the author's own words: "How many men would be willing to marry on the conditions with which marriage is offered to a woman . . . scarcely any men would marry, and men would very soon see to it that these conditions were utterly altered."

On the subject of motherhood, however, Dr. Saleeby has a real bee in his bonnet; it is a queen bee, and he shows her to us triumphantly as an example of supreme motherhood, breeding only, not working, and honored for her destiny. But if we are to learn from the animal kingdom, we will produce the lady spider—she eats her husband. Would this not be a simple solution of the whole question?

Dr. Saleeby wants all girls educated for motherhood, their ideals restricted

to this, their physical exertion carefully regulated, their natural inclination encouraged—and then, met with the fact that many of them will not be mothers, he finds a brilliant solution—they can be foster-mothers! He hints—though he never dares actually to say—that the work of unmarried women should be restricted to the two great "foster-mother" professions, nursing and teaching. All other work, presumably, is too intellectual, and would detract from the "factors" of motherliness.

We do not want it to be thought that we are in disagreement with Dr. Saleeby's fine plea for a perfect race. The truth is, we are a little tired of being preached at! Why was this book not called "Parents and Parenthood"? Almost everything applies to men as well; they should be taught from boyhood to be good fathers; over-exertion, physical and mental, are as injurious to them as to girls; and in order to develop in a boy a real love, pride, and tenderness towards his children that the author desires in a father, must we consider—when we get the vote—the desirability of restricting his occupations? No doubt many occupations undesirable for future fathers would occur to us if we set ourselves seriously to the problem!

We would say, with all respect, to Dr. Saleeby: "You leave woman alone; she will work out her own destiny once she has the power; and then she will see to it herself that there is good motherhood and fatherhood too."

Meantime, after a long series of books on Woman, we absolutely pine for one on Man: it must deal with the boy, the youth, the lover, the husband, and the father, and it must be written by a medical woman.

—S. B., in "Votes for Women."

The timorous souls who fear that women would not have the strength to walk up to the polls and deposit a ballot are referred to those representatives of the sex who walked 1400 miles, from New York to Albany, to remind Governor Sulzer of the Suffrage Bill.