

children have been brought into the Dominion through the agency of such philanthropists as Miss Rye, Mrs. Macpherson, Dr. Barnardo, Mr. Fegan, and many others. These children, rescued from the alleys and slums of Great Britain, are cared for, or are supposed to be, and trained, physically and mentally, and, above all, morally, in the Homes provided for the purpose in England, before being brought across the ocean. On being landed on our shores some are immediately distributed in families, whether by adoption or for hire, all over the Dominion. Others are received into branch Homes provided for the purpose in Canada, where they undergo further training until they are gradually distributed in the same way, leaving their places to be filled by fresh arrivals. Now this is either a most blessed work of philanthropy, by which these poor waifs are rescued from lives of almost inevitable degradation and crime, and given opportunities, which thousands of them do not fail to improve, to become honest, industrious men and good citizens, or it is a crime, committed in ignorance, perhaps, but none the less pernicious in scattering the germs of vice and criminality of the very worst and most hopeless kind all over the country. We have often expressed our opinion that altogether too much importance is attached to the doctrine of hereditary transmission of moral or immoral qualities, by many who have adopted the ultra-scientific doctrine, and are, as a consequence, strenuously opposing the admission of the unfortunate classes of old-world children to the opportunities and privileges of the new world. We have, therefore, read with great pleasure the able articles which Mr. Ernest Heaton has been contributing to our columns, especially that in our last number, in which the evidence from fact is so clear as to be practically conclusive. Surely, as we were going to say before we read the article referred to, if, as a matter of fact, the taint derived from criminal parentage and environment in infancy were ineradicable, it would be the easiest thing in the world to prove the fact, after so many years of trial, with so many thousands of immigrants, from the records of our courts, jails and penitentiaries. Mr. Heaton has done a service to the country, to the poor children, and to humanity by his careful examination of the question.

Unanimity in Juries.

Should unanimity be required in the verdicts of juries? This is an old question.

It has generally been answered in the affirmative in English-speaking communities, but whenever, as is often the case, the "holding out" of a single jurymen makes a verdict impossible, in some important case, and thus renders all the time and labour which may have been expended of no avail, the thoughtful begin to doubt the wisdom of the old practice which thus enables one man's opinions, whether honest or purchased, to negative those of eleven, as sound in judgment and as intelligent as himself? Here, however, it becomes clear that the question is too broadly put. There is a radical difference between criminal and civil cases, and it is not easy to see why the practice of the courts should not vary accordingly. In a suit between two citizens, over some question of property, it is not clear why the decision of the majority of the jury should not rule. The plaintiff has precisely the same interest in the decision as the defendant. The wrongful acquittal of the defendant inflicts injustice and wrong upon the plaintiff precisely of the same kind which the wrongful verdict in favour of the plaintiff inflicts upon the defendant. Why should not the rights of the one be just as carefully guarded as those of the other? If nine good men and true are convinced by the evidence that the plaintiff is entitled to the property in dispute and only three unconvinced, it is surely reasonable to believe

that the probabilities are nine to three that the plaintiff's cause is just, and the opposite. But in the case of a criminal charge the conditions are very different. The fact that even one honest juror believes the evidence insufficient to convict, argues that there is room for doubt, and, in accordance with the time-honoured charge of the judge, the prisoner should have the benefit of the doubt, since, by almost universal consent, it is better that many guilty should escape punishment than that one innocent man should suffer the penalty of guilt. Hence it seems to us possible to make out a strong argument in favour of decision by a majority vote in civil cases, while still requiring practical unanimity in criminal cases. In either is there not an element of unreasonableness and of danger in the custom of shutting up jurors for whole days and even nights in order to force them, if possible, to agree upon an unanimous verdict? What is this but an effort to induce, not to say compel, some one or more to change or modify conscientious convictions?

What Do Anarchists Want?

This question must have very often suggested itself to the curious and the thoughtful, in view of the seemingly senseless and purposeless crimes and attempted crimes with which Anarchists from time to time seek to terrify civilized communities. The aims of the Socialists can be understood in a general way, and, whatever may be our opinion of the morality or the feasibility of those aims, they are certainly not without features which are adapted to command the respect, even the admiration, of many. Certainly it is a calumny to confuse the principles of the one organization, as so many seem to do, with those of the other. But what can induce any class of human beings to devote their energies and risk their lives for the propagation of what seems to be a purely negative purpose, passes comprehension. When it was announced that the London Anarchists had published a pamphlet for general distribution in connection with their May-day parade, it was natural to hope that, having now broken silence, they would give the world an idea of what they wish for and how they propose to attain their object. But the pamphlet is utterly disappointing, so far as any revelation of coherent ideas and understandable methods is concerned. A few sentences will make us all equally wise in regard to Anarchism as an intelligible political scheme. After the usual denunciations of the State as an authority which enslaves and tyrannizes over the workingmen; of religion as the greatest curse of the human race, and so forth, the manifesto goes on to say:—

"What the Anarchists want is equal liberty for all. The talents and inclinations of all men differ from each other. Every one knows best what he can do and what he wants; laws and regulations only hamper; and forced labour is never pleasant. In the state aimed at by the Anarchist everyone will do the work that pleases him best, and will satisfy his wants out of the common store as pleases him best."

And if a dozen or a hundred happen to want the same thing, when there is only enough of it for two or three—what then?

The Evil of Great Bazaars.

What is, on the whole, the moral effect of a great international exposition, like that of 1889 in Paris, or that of 1893 in Chicago, or those now projected for 1900 in Paris and some future date in New York? That they have a stimulating effect upon trade, education, and invention, and are a god-send to the multitudes all the world over who are in search of something new in the way of recreation and excitement, may be admitted, though whether the effects even in these directions are wholly healthy may, perhaps, be open to question. The *Literary Digest* translates a somewhat remarkable article from *Le Figaro*, of Paris, entitled "Objec-