

from the orphanages of Great Britain, and the principal reason for this restriction is that many native-born Canadian orphans have been committed to the orphanages with the expressed understanding that they must be kept there and not given out for adoption into private homes. This arrangement is not approved of by Dr. Smith, who says: "No matter how kindly cared for they may be in these institutions, there is lacking some of the elements that make for rugged upbuilding of character."

It must be admitted, on the other hand, that the desire of a widow to have the society of her own daughter, or the assistance of her own son, after some years of institutional life, is a very commendable one. Besides, looked at even from the standpoint of those who invest in other people's children, the character of a child is not simply the outcome of environment, and some Canadian orphan children, sprung from weakly or dissipated parents, may not turn out well, or may even do discredit to the best of foster parents. The adoption of children whose ancestry on both sides is not known must be regarded as a venture.

The fact that in Ontario such ventures in foster parenthood are cheerfully, even ardently, made, shows that love for children lies deep in the human breast, and that a home, even a luxurious one, is considered incomplete without children. If we are justified in believing that the low birthrate of Ontario, viz.: 25.6 per 1,000 of population (1908), is due to the voluntary limitation of families, it is just as fair