

planatory of the general law on the subject, and so we quote a portion of the article.

The writer of the above article contrasts a monarchical government with the republican form of government which exists in the United States, and implies that life is (or ought to be) more sacred in the latter country than in the former. Statistics amply prove the contrary. The sacredness of life is one of the traditions of the British people, and it would be well if other countries were to follow our example. The difficulty in the United States is, of course, the enormous inflow of emigrants from countries outside the British Isles, and the foreign element overtakes the digestion of the Anglo Saxon portion of the community.

We quote as follows:—

"If a parent has merely a duty to preserve the life and health of a child, it certainly would not seem to be the arbiter of its death. And one agreeing with the parent that neglects to care for its life is to be in pursuance of a purpose that its death without care will probably occur, appears to us opposed to every principle in our law. If our government regards the right to life as preserved, instead of further endangered by our law, what right has any citizen to agree for the benefit of society that a particular child is not entitled to the blessing of life? And may anyone determine that there is no deprivation of the blessing of life as to any being? If he has a reason that satisfies him, may not another have another reason that satisfies him, that there is no blessing in a particular life? The result of such reasoning would not be in furtherance of government, but in direct support of anarchy. We have shown, we think, that an agreement with a parent for a child to be permitted to die from neglect is one to accomplish a crime. It therefore excuses no one that he makes such an agreement. But it may be evidence against him of deliberation to perpetrate a crime. What crime may this be if death results? It has been laid down as a principle in criminal law that taking the life of one affected with an incurable disease in no way extenuates the guilt of his slayer: 21 Am. & Eng. Encyc. Law 93, citing authorities. It is also a principle that punishable homicide may be the involuntary result of any unlawful act or conduct. Is it not an