

This would seem to have been what the Legislature was trying to accomplish, but like some other legislative experiments, it seems to have been a failure.

---

The article which began our number for September was written for the purpose of drawing attention to what the writer considered a weak spot in our constitution, and which, it was thought, might be amended. Whether such a change as there suggested would be beneficial is a matter of opinion; but, as to the law as laid down by the Privy Council as well as in this country and emphasized in the judgment spoken of, there is no question. The learned judge whose language we quoted simply expressed in his own terse way how that law stands (see ante pp. 499, 553). The remarks of the writer of the article do not question the accuracy of his judgment, which is constitutionally correct, but draw attention to the position thus graphically portrayed, and enlarge upon the difficulty of the situation, and suggest a possible remedy; a remedy, which, by the way, could only be had by legislation and that of a character necessarily very difficult to obtain, as it would involve an amendment of the B.N.A. Act. It may be that the remark of the learned judge which has caused this discussion might, by its very terseness, and taken by itself, lead to an inference which the context shews is not warranted. It may also be noticed that he guards himself from any inference that in this particular case the legislature had violated the moral law.

---

A paragraph recently appeared in the daily papers to the effect that the driver of an automobile had only a second to choose between killing a young girl and a street labourer, and that he chose to kill the man. The thought in the mind of the writer of the paragraph seemed to be that much credit was due to the driver in the choice of the person whom he should murder. He had no comment whatever on his statement that the chauffeur was driving a wealthy New Yorker through the centre of the