

jury were for conviction and two for acquittal, amounting, morally, to a verdict of guilty. It is a little bit wonderful, notwithstanding its frequency, that such results in the face of plain evidence can be. There were several witnesses on either side and all that any of them knew must have been brought out, since the hearing occupied a long time and nothing in it was hurried or pressed, while the lawyers in charge of the case pro and con, as well as the judge on the bench, are all men of marked ability. Of course, Curtis is guilty or innocent, and with all the aids to a result showing one or the other condition at hand, why should the proceeding be without a result?

It is going violently into the face of reason, if not of decency, to say that ten-twelfths of the jury were either intimidated or corrupted by the State, or that they had a special grudge apart from the case itself against the defendant. It is also illogical to thus conclude for several reasons; if the State wanted a suborned jury and had the power to place ten men on the panel within its power, what was there to prevent its overcoming the other two in the same manner? And if it had been attempted on them and failed, would not the same virtuous impulses which prompted the men to resist the temptation or unlawful dictation also cause them to lay bare so infamous a proceeding, so dangerous a condition of things as that? Unhesitatingly we should say yes. Again, what possible motive could a sovereignty have in thus seeking the life of an accused subject—especially one who, apart from the alleged offense for which he was tried, had not made himself conspicuous as a serious offender, who was more noted as a merry-maker than for anything else, and who, after all, was almost a stranger within the gates of the commonwealth, at least no more a resident there than elsewhere? None at all. Adopting this view of the case, those ten men must have acted upon their best judgment and with a due regard for the sacredness of their oaths; and this does but raise to view the other phase of the question; Is it possible the other two men were not so actuated? That they plunged themselves headlong into perjury in order to save the life of a guilty man? Or that they were infirm of mind and unable to correctly weigh the evidence placed before them? This is almost as violent a supposition as the other.

In summing the matter up, the more or less hackneyed conclusion again thrusts itself upon us that the jury system is either perverted or carried wide of the mark aimed at by Alfred the Great, or else it is a failure inherently. We do not say this because of the failure to agree when facts are patent, altogether, because some of the agreements reached by juries are more infamous if possible than any of their disagreements. In a practical sense justice has another chance when a verdict is not reached in a criminal case, but none whatever when one is reached. There is evidently something wrong somewhere, and it would seem to be high time that practical steps in the direction of reform were taken.

OBJECTIONABLE TO CHILE.

LIEUT. HARLOW, World's Fair Commissioner in Chile, has damaged the interest of the exposition in that country. The government received his advances on the subject with undisguised coldness. The reason for this is that, according to evidence that appears to be indisputable, Harlow, during the trouble between Chile and this country, acted as correspondent for an American newspaper and supplied its columns with a number of inflammatory anti-Chilean dispatches. The objectionable correspondence appeared over the *nom de plume* of "Reamer" and it has been proved that Lieut. Harlow used that name. If this is the real situation it would only seem to be common courtesy to withdraw the commissioner who has made himself objectionable to the Chilean authorities and people. If this is not done the interests of the exposition, so far as relates to the participation of Chile, will undoubtedly suffer.

TWO KINDS OF POLYGAMY.

UNDER the above heading the Detroit, Michigan *Times* give the following particulars and offers the accompanying reflections on a subject that is not now very much discussed:

"There was a remarkable scene in a Port Huron court room on Tuesday, when a convicted bigamist, or rather polygamist, was surrounded by his five wives. Each woman vied with all the others in flashing on the felon the fires of her indignation, wrath and displeasure."

"The true cause of all this wrath would not be divined at first blush by any ordinary observer."

"Was it the sense of womanly modesty which shrank in horror at the thought of a relationship with a man when there are still other living women who have sustained that same relationship with him? In other words, was it a moral revolt against a polygamy that degrades both man and woman?"

"We may charitably trust that in some cases it was so, but the likelihood is, judging from the common sentiment of this age and country on the subject, that all the indignation arose out of the bigamist's neglect of a certain small formality in a chancery court before marrying the next wife. Probably not one of these women would have declined to marry this polygamist if he had only 'put away' the former wife in a certain legal way instead of putting her away in his own way. It was only a matter of form."

"No better proof of the truth of this could be given than to point to the scenes that were occurring in Judge Gartner's court at the very time that the Port Huron polygamist was undergoing trial."

"How many suitors for divorce before Judge Gartner already had other living wives and husbands besides those from whom they are suing for divorce, only the public records would reveal; but certain it is that many of them were in that court to obtain licenses to take unto themselves still other wives and husbands."

"There is much in a name. If we call it a 'divorce,' it covers up the real nature of the transaction and satisfies the conscience. If we call it a license to marry another wife or husband, it exposes the nature of the transaction and stirs the conscience."

"Mormonism permits polygamy, but

abhors polyandry. Our Christian civilization permits both."

"The *Times* is not here reasoning that divorcement under any circumstances is not permissible, but has stated the case in its logical bearing to show into what abuses our forty-four divorce systems have run."

CANADIAN RECIPROCITY.

IN the United States Senate, on yesterday, a resolution was agreed to calling on the President for information relating to the late proceedings to arrange for reciprocal trade with Canada. This has reference to a conference held in Washington between Canadian and United States representatives for the purpose of devising a scheme of trade reciprocity. It came to an end rather suddenly on Monday, the 15th inst.; the Canadians immediately leaving for home.

The State Department has given nothing official regarding the progress of the negotiations. Versions of the proceedings, however, have been published, but unofficially, and consequently not reliable. This is why, perhaps, the Senate desires authentic information on the matter.

It is stated that the Canadians demanded the removal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854, with modifications to suit themselves. They also demanded a reconsideration of the 1888 treaty relating to Atlantic fisheries. In this they wanted likewise the lion's share. Demands were made involving relaxation of United States laws relating to Atlantic fisheries, inland waters, seaboard coast laws, and the fixing of boundaries between Alaska and Canada.

The magnitude of the demands made by the wily Kanucks caused the Secretary of State to ask whether they came in the capacity of authorized British Government negotiators. Then it was learned that they had not so come, and Mr. Blaine dropped the negotiations immediately.

It is said that Mr. Blaine is not enthusiastic over the consummation of a reciprocity treaty with Canada. He is of opinion that the latter country will not enter into the terms requisite to make a profitable, or even an equitable, reciprocal trade basis for the United States.

HIS ELECTRIC FORT.

THOMAS A. EDISON is one of the most remarkable geniuses of all times. His achievements in the utilization of electricity are so wonderful that when he makes a statement ahead of what he can and intends to do, it is not safe to discredit his assertion. He has furnished a description of his new invention for either paralyzing or killing an army by electricity. Its application might either put an end to war or to the human race. Here it is:

"It is simple as A, B, C. I have never spoken or written about it before. With twenty-five men in a fort I can make that fort absolutely impregnable as far as assault is concerned, and I should only need twenty-five men in the fort to do it. This is not guess-work, but a matter of absolutely scientific certainty. In fact, twenty-five men would be a very liberal