

cram and physical torpidity, and with but one result—physical declension.

For this disastrous state of affairs we would find redress. We would have a system in which, from the ages of twelve to fifteen, or later, as individual cases vary, the mental work should be less,—the physical more. After a year or two of comparative brain-rest, we could then be assured that the young woman was at an age to benefit, physically and mentally, from further study, should she desire to proceed with it. If she does not care to go further, she has secured what she requires—knowledge and skill in household affairs. The theory is easily stated: the practical application is more difficult; but we believe that in remedying the second defect, we will redress this wrong, this great wrong, which is being wrought upon our people.

The second truth now claims our attention. Society has awakened slowly to the fact that intellectual training is not the monopoly of the men. Society has seen and said—“The hand that rocks the cradle rules the world, and it is, therefore, a moral necessity that woman should receive the best intellectual training which the State can give;” and the doors of our schools and colleges have swung wide to receive her. “Not every woman marries; every woman need not marry; therefore, woman must have, with her brother, equal chances to live an independent life,” it has been said; and the professions have bowed to her, and smiled upon her, and offered her the right hand as a fellow-worker.

A third truth, equally important, is now being dimly seen and whispered:—“Many women marry—the greater number of women marry; therefore, every woman shall be trained in all that pertains to wifedom and motherhood.” What, but this, does the cry for schools of cookery, dress-making, etc., mean?

The fact is obtruding itself forcibly

that the solution of not a few of the vexed questions of domestic, aye, and political, economy lies in the wisest education for women *by the State*. Is it a small matter to the nation that each day scores of women become wives without one idea of the true duties of a wife, of the awful responsibility of a mother, or of the practical work of a home? Would such ignorance be tolerated in any other profession? Is it of no vital importance to the nation that this unfitness of women for their great profession produces hovels instead of homes, and that each of these hovels is a breeding place for disease and crime?

Among the many reasons advanced by workers among the poor and wretched for the poverty and wretchedness so rife, is often repeated, “the thriftlessness of women.” How can it be otherwise? The well-worn adage, “a wife can throw out of the window more than her husband can bring in at the door,” is a positive fact.

While Government does much to neutralize the evil effect of poor homes, it has still much to do. The system of compulsory education has wrested from homes of ignorance and vice many a child, and set him on the high places. Why not provide, and compel, education for home-makers, that out of the hovels may be drawn girls who will transform the hovels into homes? If it be compulsory for woman to be able to read and write, should it not also be compulsory for her to know how to cook a meal, and to make and keep a home?

Infanticide is punishable by law, yet how many mothers, true and noble in heart, feel that they are guilty of the death, or the living death, of their children, through ignorance of the relation of a mother to her child, and of the first laws of child life? Yet the State heeds not!

We are met with the argument, “Mothers can best teach their daughters housework.” An extract from an article in the *Century*, by Washington