needles and the less the degree of elevation, the less will be the pain to a conscious patient. The rapidity of the infusion will be correspondingly slow.

When the patient is suffering from shock—usually due to great loss of blood in railroad cases—the surgeon may set the apparatus in action in a few moments, and leave it almost without further attention, while he and his assistant are employed about the various steps of the operation.

I carry an infusion appliance in my emergency surgical case, and another in my obstetric bag—I have more than once saved women in postpartum hemorrhage by its prompt use—while a third is kept hanging in position in my hospital operating-room.

Hypodermoclysis can not act on the heart as instantaneously as if the veins or arteries are filled directly, but the simplicity of application and the greater safety to the patient more than outweigh the slight difference in time in most cases. I question, indeed, whether the additional time required in properly isolating the vessel, etc., does not occupy a greater amount of time even when one has every convenience at hand. There are but few railroad surgeons, too, whose experience with intravenous infusion has been sufficient to warrant them in searching for, and attempting to open, a partially collapsed vein amid the hurry and confusion attendant on most railroad work.

LEGISLATIVE PROBLEMS IN THE REGULATION OF MARRIAGES.*

BY HON. C. W. PARKER.

BEREA, OHIO.

Of all the obstacles the legislator has to combat, the most sure and omnipresent is the antagonism of many minds to anything and everything *new*, from the legislative standpoint. This bias of many men, this inborn conservatism which arouses in the majority an unreasonable antagonism to all measures which are out of the ordinary—an antagonism which has nothing to do with reason, or with the real value of the proposed legislation—is always to be met, when, to the mind of the average legislator, the measure brought forward is new. That is quite sufficient with some of our conservative brethren, to damn it beyond all hope of redemption, and to take from the enactment their interest and support, but, when to this conservative objection to new ideas is added the abhorrence of many individuals to everything relating even remotely to the tabooed subject of the sexual relation, the latent opposition is changed from a passive lack of interest and non-support of the measure into an unceasing hostility and open and active warfare.

These good folks turn up their eyes piously to the skies, and devoutly declare that "marriages are made in Heaven," and refuse to believe that there is any connection with this mundane sphere in this "sacred tie," notwithstanding the immutable proofs before their eyes, that in too many instances the "match" is of the earth, earthy, and the result a foregone conclusion. It is indeed an absurdity, in this day of ever-increasing divorces, separations, and notable cases of marital infelicity, to imagine for a moment that marriage, as it exists to-day, is a covenant made by Heaven, and that sentiment alone should be considered in regard to this union of the two sexes, so fraught with tremendous significance, not only to the present, but to the generations yet to come.

* Presented in a Symposium on Regulation of Marriage, before the Section on State Medicine, at the Fiftieth Annual Meeting of the American Medical Association, held at Columbus, Ohio, June 6-9, 1899.

Next to the obstacles mentioned, as standing in the way of needed marriage laws, is the honest but misguided opinion of the male prude, who allows his sentimental regard for what he is pleased to call "the weaker sex," to so bias his judgment and reasoning powers that everything must be subservient to a sort of chivalric adulation of the female, on account merely of sex. To this worshiper of sex, the very thought of "an examination" is abhorrent and a desecration of divinity, but while all men have in common a love and veneration of all that is distinctly pure and feminine, there are certain limits beyond which the wise and prudent man refuses to allow his sentiment to carry him. Every physician knows the universal procrastination in the majority of families, in the matter of medical examinations for the afflicted females in the home, and every one also knows that, until this fallacy, this absurd and dangerous mock-modesty, is overcome, a cure is often impossible. So is it also a fact that, until the necessity of health in marriage is recognized, the inalienable rights of progeny can not be secured, nor the home and wife protected from the ravages of disease and their perpetuation.

To the number of males who view with abhorrence a physical examination for the female candidate for matrimony must be added the large percentage of women who are factors of importance in moulding the minds of legislators against all measures looking to this end. Conscious, in many instances, of their own unfitness and inability to pass the medical requirements of freedom from such inherited or acquired taint as science now proclaims as detrimental to the welfare of not only the pair, but the community at large, women, I may say the majority of women, by their lives of fashion and folly, as well as by their having no real knowledge of the importance of the purely feminine part ordained by Nature to be theirs, as wives, as well as mothers, are antagonistic to all legislation seeking to put marriage on a practical and reasonable foundation. Many women have been brought up to think ignorance of all sexual matters a certificate of innocence, and even pride themselves on a lack of information absolutely criminal in its result. We see these women bringing into the world daughters as unsexed as themselves, frail, sickly, inane creatures who from the cradle to the grave are without the vital sexual stimulus that alone can fit a woman for wifehood and maternity. Knowing nothing of the requirements of marital life, nothing of the ravages of disease as transmitted from generation to generation, nothing of the responsibilities of wifehood, and nothing of the God-given possibilities involved in an educated maternity, these women in their ignorance and folly put forth all their efforts to discourage any discussion of what they term "a delicate subject, unfit for discussion," without the slightest realization that such restrictive legislation is of vital importance to them individually and collectively, and has as its chief object nothing less than the protection of the home, the wife and her children.

Having spoken of the public sentiment against restrictive marriage laws, as briefly outlined, which we may sum up as conservativeness, ignorance, and mock-modesty, we must also consider the obstacles confronting the man with the new bill, entirely from the legislative standpoint.

The first one to confront the new measure will be the "log-roller," who listens approvingly to all arguments, and then proceeds to give the outline of "a little bill" in which he is interested, and slyly intimates that he "will vote for the new measure gladly, but"—there is

always a but, and a *quid pro quo*, which is a vote in return for his bill. This "you tickle me, and I'll tickle you" policy is known to every legislator and is a greater factor in passing bills than the lay mind realizes, but there are men who refuse to buy success at any such price, preferring to see their bills fail to pass, rather than to have to support "deals and steals," to effect that consummation.

Next we shall find the obstacle of political enmity in the path of the reformer. There are "many men of many minds" in all parties, but some of the smallest individuals are those who can see nothing good in any measure which is presented by the "other side." This political narrowness bands men together against a measure, simply because they desire to "down" the other side, and be the bill good, bad, or indifferent, it matters not, it must be "killed," one way or another, if it has been presented by a political rival.

Then there is the poor fellow afraid of what his constituents may think. He is always in a "peck of trouble," and never to be found twice in the same place. He recalls the old fable of the man, his son, and the donkey, who tried to please everybody and failed ignominiously—and lost the donkey in the bargain. This timid legislator is anxious to be returned, and has no confidence in his own judgment; he wonders what this man and that would think of the measure, and dares not risk their displeasure by voting for it. He may be in sympathy with the measure personally, believe it to be good and necessary legislation, but when the time for a vote comes, he will get uneasy in his seat, and slip out opportunely to "see a man," or even screw up his courage to vote in the negative if he thinks those constituents in "the S'teenth District" will approve his bold opposition to such new and unheard of legislation. Close beside this sort of statesman sits another timid individual, who dreads being asked for his reasons for voting for the new measure. He may feel it is a wise and necessary enactment, but he has not the courage of his convictions, and falters when it comes to putting himself on record as favoring an unpopular bill, or one about which there will be discussion.

Another class must not be forgotten who are vitally concerned in the proposed law, as it will personally affect their own prerogative of marrying. There is a large number of men, both within as well as without the legislative halls, who have the very best reason in the world for wishing to utterly defeat any such restriction, as they secretly know that it would debar them from marriage. These individuals will give you every other reason in the world why such legislation is "unnecessary," "an outrage," "a crime against the freedom and rights of the individual," etc., but in their own person the real cause of their opposition is evident. No man is more violently opposed to a physical examination than he who knows he could not pass it. No man is more outspoken in his antagonism to all restrictive legislation than he who secretly knows he has no right in the sight of God to perpetuate his own condition. No man is more sure to harp on the rights of all, than he who is deceiving the world and the woman who loves him, and denying her the right to know the truth as to his absolute unfitness to father her child. Take the dipsomaniac! Shall we expect him to applaud legislation which shall disbar him from matrimony, or, think of the poor, puny, starved progeny he will be responsible for bringing into being, cursed with the hereditary infirmities of their progenitor? Drunkards have no love for any legislation affecting their privilege of making brutes of themselves, and

it is, alas, equally true that those poor miserable specimens of humanity, cursed with the foulest and most loathsome diseases, due to the "sins of the father," are most violently opposed to any restriction which will reveal to the world their own condition, and prevent them passing on the scourge to the generations yet to come.

As a rule there are very few consumptives, if a recognition of tuberculosis in the patients themselves is to be taken as a criterion. Every medical man knows that the consumptive will admit he has anything else but consumption, and many die without ever being brought to a realization of their malady. No wonder then that members of this class continue to marry and bring into the world a horde of weaklings, a constant menace to the health of the community, and by whom seeds of the disease are sown broadcast. The tuberculous legislator, like the one addicted to strong drink, and the unfortunate victim of syphilis in any of its stages, is therefore averse to all legislation favoring health and requiring a physical examination for all applicants desiring to enter matrimony, but such opposition must only the more forcibly emphasize the necessity for restrictive laws, if we would protect the home and our nation from the fearful ravages of the ever-increasing army of the diseased and their imperfect offspring.

Last in the list of obstacles we may put the jealous, envious little specimen, whom it is almost an absurdity to call "a man." He wishes he had thought of the purpose of the bill himself, but as he did not, he has not soul enough to be willing to let any other legislator get any small credit which may accrue for having fathered it. He jealously views everything which may in any way be supposed to lessen his own prestige, and is vehemently opposed to the new measure, be it good or bad, simply because it is not his bill, and he dislikes to see another succeed where he himself has failed. But he is a small personage, and we shall not waste time considering him, for he is not worthy of it.

When we consider all the obstacles and difficulties in the way of needed legislation regarding health in wedlock, we must not overlook the vital opposition based on a real ignorance of what is meant by the term "physical examination." There are many men who have an entire misconception of what the term implies, and on the part of the average female the thought is full of some horrible indecency and indignity at the hands of the physician, at which her soul revolts, and many exclaim that death would be preferable to an "examination," without having the slightest idea of how delicately, and with what uniform respect for womanly modesty and decorum, the examination is conducted by the experienced physician. Here again is ignorance, and such as can only be made to yield by enlightening the masses.

Having given some consideration to the obstacles in the way of needed legislation; having, as physicians say, diagnosed the disease, we may see what can be given as a remedy.

First of all, and chief in importance, is education, not only of legislators but of all men; not only of men but of women as well; and education not only of the masses but of the classes, to an appreciation of the necessity of curbing present dangers and eliminating, as far as possible, the spread of those noxious diseases which menace not only the marital partner but the offspring and the community at large by their propagation. Women as a rule have no knowledge of the terrible dangers menacing them and their children, through the contamination of syphilis and other diseases of like nature; few of them realize the inevitable result of marrying a consumptive,

and still fewer are taught to think of the crime against progeny which such a marriage involves. While many may applaud the womanly love which makes a wife cleave unto her tuberculous mate, ministering to him in the long years of his slow death, the world begins to question this "devotion," when it sees the woman a party to the crime against the offspring of such a union, which she is responsible for bringing into the world, cursed before birth with as slow and immutable a doom as the victim who dies by the loathsome ravages of leprosy.

Education alone can enlighten the world as to the necessity of lessening the spread of the hereditary taints now sent broadcast by millions of diseased couples procreating their own kind; their children in turn, by the enormous increase of each generation, endangering the health of the very nation; the time has come for legislation to prevent such a union as menaces by its consummation the welfare of the community.

While it may be true that the woman who marries a consumptive is conscious of all her act involves, while she may know that he is doomed sooner or later to succumb to this dread malady which each year claims its thousands of victims, while she may possibly appreciate the sin committed against her unborn children, by marrying a man who can not father healthy offspring, she is not entirely ignorant as in those other and far more terrible diseases, which polite society refuses to discuss. But while society may refuse to name syphilis, Nature writes it on the faces and bodies of millions, every year, and if marriages indeed are all made in Heaven, one shudders at contemplating "the joy of the angels" when the miserable imperfects born of such a crime against Nature are forced into being, under the curse which the scriptures pronounce shall continue until the third and fourth generation.

Sentiment in regard to a love marriage between a healthy male and his mate is very pretty, and we applaud all the congratulations, flowers, and marriage festivities, but these things do not end matrimony, they begin it, and it is well to look a little ahead, and to view the union of the man and his bride in its relation to the community, for it has a bearing on the welfare of the community at large, which the sentimentalist overlooks. If the wedded ones are not pecuniarily able to be self-supporting, if the male or the female are persons of known inebriety and dissolute character, their union becomes an added burden to the charitably inclined, and to the thrifty tax-payer who must support their ever-increasing progeny. If the man or woman is of weak mind, an imbecile, or pauper, the county will have, before many years, a very tangible proof of its interest in the "union of the two free souls," who are indeed free to thoughtlessly bring a horde of imperfects into being, to prey on the pockets of those who must support them from the public purse. But there is a far more vital reason than any mere financial question, in regard to this unrestricted propagation of all who desire to marry. When the union of the two is a danger to the health and well-being of every individual in the community, it is time to put aside sentiment and to reason logically.

But this brings us back to the last proposition: How can "this end devoutly to be wished for" be consummated? It appears to me that while education must be insisted on as the best means to secure the end aimed at, it is also necessary to "make haste slowly," and I therefore suggest that it might be well, where it would not be possible to at first pass an effective measure, to exempt the woman from the operation of the bill, it being recognized that in most instances the man does not marry, nor

desire to marry, a diseased mate, and this exemption of the woman will do away with all the sentimental objections of those who consider such an examination for her a kind of profanation, but who are sensible enough to offer no objection to it for the man. Then again, I see now that I should have been more successful in securing advocates for my bill had I exempted those who feared the measure might strike themselves. Instead of the original bill as drawn, I should offer, as a substitute, a measure not only freeing women from the examination, but making the measure less stringent, so as to only include those with tuberculosis when actually developed, dipsomania when positively proved, and syphilis in all its stages, together with actual imbecility. While the original bill, to my mind, was none too stringent to meet the requirements of our day, it behooves us to accept in a tacit way the conservative spirit which will not be pushed, but which must be coaxed on step by step. As the old schoolmaster well said: "The cure for a little education is more education."

THE LEGAL RESTRICTION OF MARRIAGE FOR THE PREVENTION OF PAUPERISM, CRIME AND MENTAL DISEASES*.

BY DANIEL R. BROWER, A.M., M.D., LL.D.

Professor of Mental Diseases, Rush Medical College, in affiliation with the University of Chicago, etc.

CHICAGO.

Pauperism, crime and insanity have in their etiology most important relations to heredity, that great fundamental law of Nature by which like must produce like, not in never-ending sameness, but in variety, tending on the one hand to improvement by environment, or by the same ever-powerful modification to destruction.

The child comes into the world with life and certain gifts from parents, often loaded with encumbrances so burdensome that they prove a curse to their possessor, sometimes so free that the heir at law has nothing to fear in the race of life. How the minute cells, that by their union make conception, microscopic as they are, should contain within themselves all the possibility and all the minutiae of a life of pauperism on the one hand or of exalted statesmanship on the other is a mystery that can not now be solved.

The farmer recognizes the great law of heredity, that was declared to the children of Israel amid the thunder of Sinai, and governs himself accordingly. The animals that he selects for propagation are always the best of their kind, and the seeds that he sows are carefully selected. Under our higher civilization abnormal man, be he defective, dependent or delinquent, is propagated, cultivated and protected; his feeble and crippled offspring are nursed to manhood and sent forth to produce their kind. Under savage and semisavage conditions, these abnormalities are speedily relinquished, the deformed and weaklings have no place in their system, and some way or other are soon cut off.

Under savage and semisavage conditions no restrictions of marriage are necessary, the speedy destruction of the degenerate prevents damage to their social fabric by any amount of fecundity, but our higher civilization, by the protection it gives to all such and by the absence of restrictions, is constantly endangering its own integrity by such multiplications as follow, the only safeguard being that the women early become sterile, by reason of infections, the product of filth and careless habits.

* Read in a Symposium on the Regulation of Marriage, before the Section on State Medicine, at the Fiftieth Annual Meeting of the American Medical Association, held at Columbus, Ohio, June 6-9, 1899.