

ability to pay you for it, in the ordinary way, and relying solely on my financial standing?" he would undoubtedly have replied instantly in the affirmative.

It must be remembered also that there is nothing to compel a workman to undertake the job. He can take it or leave it, as he thinks best.

That being the case why not leave the parties to the ordinary law of contract.

As between the owner of the land who is perhaps building a house for the first and only time in his life, and the contractor or workman, who is anxious to be employed upon it, it would seem to be the case that, in the immense majority of cases, it is the contractor or workman, whose ordinary business is to perform services of that kind, who is the practiced hand, while the owner occupies more the position of the novice, and, if any protection at all is to be introduced, it would, in our opinion, be much more appropriately applied to the owner.

But why introduce protection at all?

Why incumber our statute books with these unnecessary and unreasonable enactments?

We are a patient and long-suffering people, and we have become accustomed to seeing our statute books burdened, year after year, with novel and unnecessary legislation at the beck of every experimentalist who has succeeded in finding his way into our legislative halls. But surely there is a limit.

Then again, let us consider the following inequitable aspect of the Act.

Let us suppose a case:

John Jones is a householder, possessing a well-kept lawn. Let us suppose that a handful of rowdies call upon Mr Jones and inform him that they have fallen out among themselves, and have decided to settle the rights and wrongs of the matter by indulging in a limited bout of "rough house," and request that he allow them the use of his lawn for that purpose.

What would John Jones—what would the average man think of such a request? To go a step further, what would the average