

If the principle is that the workman is entitled to follow and retain an interest in his wares, and in the object benefitted by his work, why not provide for the butcher and baker a special mortgage, on, let us say, on the stomach of their customer, giving them the right, in case of default of payment, to cast such customer into prison, as under the old law, and exact their pound of flesh?

There seems no more reason why one of these claims should be specially favoured by the Legislature than the other.

Possibly some of our ingenious legislators will even yet devise some form of lien or mortgage, which will apply to the butcher's and the baker's case. Then, no doubt, everybody will be happy.

Then again, why treat mechanics and contractors as in the same class as infants and imbeciles, and require for them special protection, even against themselves.

The Mechanics and Wage-Earners Lien Act, R.S.O.C. 140, as every lawyer will remember, opens as follows:

"Every agreement, verbal or written, express or implied, on the part of any workman, servant, labourer, mechanic or other person employed in any kind of manual labour, intended to be dealt with in this Act, that this Act shall not apply, or that the remedies provided by it shall not be available for the benefit of such persons, shall be null and void."

"(2) This section shall not apply to a manager, officer or foreman, or to any other person whose wages are more than \$5.00 a day."

Let it be remembered that every one of these workmen and contractors, before his services were accepted, and when he was desirous of being employed upon the work, was extremely solicitous that it should be *his* services that were accepted and not those of his rival across the way. At that period he would have scouted the idea that it should be necessary that a special mortgage on the employer's realty be provided for him before he entered upon the work. If the owner or contractor has said to him, "Do you want to do this work for me, trusting to my