to believe that it could be generally adopted, and even if it were the result might merely be to increase rash early marriages, instead of somewhat wiser later ones. But whatever might prove to be the result of any experiment such as that outlined by Mr. McDougall, I should welcome any agitation which might cause people to consider the national dangers of existing conditions, and think more of their social responsibilities and less of personal luxury.

FROM MR. FRANCIS GALTON.

The probability that any Government would consent to raise the salaries of their higher officials, because they had reared large families, seems to me too remote for profitable discussion; but I should be glad to diverge into a somewhat similar question. It is as to what might be accomplished by a substantial sum, set apart for a special venture, and entrusted to an influential society who were eager to promote eugenics. The question must be discussed on the basis of definite figures, in order to judge of its cost and of its effects, both direct and indirect. The figures to be taken will be £50 for each selected married couple, and another £50 to defray all administrative charges, which would include the maintenance of a brief life-history of every child, annual reports, and careful statistical discussion. Therefore, each £100 of the capital sum is supposed to satisfy all requirements connected with one average family: a father, mother, and five children. I will suppose the total capital sum to be spread over four years, and to amount to £20,000. That would be enough for the registration, etc., of the children of 200 families, mainly of the upper artisan class—say of 1000 children. This would be a very valuable experiment on an adequate scale, and would rank as of equal importance with other scientific ventures of somewhat similar cost. Fifty awards are roughly at the rate of one per million of the entire British population. This, at the total cost of £100 per award, would amount to one-fortieth part of a penny per head—no great extravagance for a national object, even if continued, as suggested, during four years. Preliminary details would have to be discussed and re-discussed with minute care, whose frequent publication would familiarise the public with the scheme, and render it more easily carried out when the time arrived. The selection of the couples would be by committees and sub-committees, out of a list of those proposed and seconded, with a brief list of qualifications, for the truth of which the proposer and seconder will be severally responsible. It would be conducted on the same general principles as those by which the elections of officials, of medallists, etc., are conducted,
partly by testimonial, partly by private information, and towards the last by inspection. Those who are provisionally selected would be still subject to a well defined medical examination that takes heredity into account. Vacancies caused by failure to pass would be filled up from the next on the provisional list. The inducement to candidates would be partly the £50, partly the public recognition, and largely the assurance that the children will be hereafter favourably regarded by many persons, not a few of whom might give influential help at a critical moment. The fact of being "eugenic" would often turn the scale when other merits were equally balanced, and the consciousness of the boy that he was noticed, and his sense of noblesse oblige, would be a stimulus to do his best. It would be long before the success of the experiment could be fully known, but probably enough would be learnt in a few years to encourage or discourage its repetition, or to suggest new ways of forwarding eugenic ends.

FROM DR. ARCHDALL REID.

With the object of Mr. McDougall's paper I have the fullest sympathy. He seeks to base sociology on biology, and so, delving to the depths, to find a sure foundation. But his premises appear to me highly debatable. He declares that "mental and moral qualities are inheritable in the same sense as physical qualities." Well, but supposing a child of refined and educated English parents were reared from birth by African cannibals. Then, in body, when grown, the child would resemble his progenitors more than his captors; but does any one believe that the same would be true of his mind? We have historical evidence that Anglo-Saxon children, reared by American Indians, have been every whit as ferocious, treacherous, and ruthless as their captors. All Anglo-Indians know the disastrous effect of too much association with native servants on the plastic minds of white children, and we all dread the influence of bad companionship on our own offspring. The English child I speak of as reared by cannibals would certainly display no hint of the language and general knowledge of his parents, no tincture of their moral, social, political, and religious ideals and aspirations. He would ruthlessly murder and enjoyingly eat the stranger. He would harry the strangers' property and annex the strangers' wives by the wool of their heads whenever practical. He would treat his own wives as beasts of burden, and thrash them as a matter of routine. His æsthetic ideals would be satisfied by plenty of grease, a little paint, and a few beads; his moral ideals by a homicidal devotion to the tribal chief. His god would be the native fetish, to whom he would