

tolerable, worse even than bloody war, and we will pay the price. Our sons on the battlefields of Flanders and France shall be avenged. We, the unprepared, have found ourselves, a nation, ready and willing to fight for life and the liberty of other nations and to fight again. The stake is worth it, and we shall conquer, and, dying, live again a greater and united people."

The President towards the close of the meeting when "Womans Suffrage" came up, struck out boldly in its favor and asserted it was never intended that by mere incident of form at birth any distinction in civil rights should prevail and only brute force had brought about such a condition. Let us be men and not cowards and afford our sisters all the rights we as men enjoy, and by whole, not by half measures, as in the past.

*HAS AN ACCUSED PERSON THE RIGHT TO MAKE A
STATEMENT AT HIS TRIAL WITHOUT BEING
SWORN OR SUBJECT TO CROSS-EXAMINATION?*

A divergence of judicial opinion appears to exist in Canada as to the right of an accused person to make a statement during his trial without being sworn or subjected to cross-examination, since the passing of s. 4(1), Canada Evidence Act, R.S.C., c. 145, which provides that "Every person charged with an offence . . . shall be a competent witness for the defence, whether the person so charged is charged solely or jointly with any other person."

Until this enactment, an accused person was not a competent witness in his own defence, but he had a right, if not out of course of the common law,* at least long established by judicial opinion and practice to make an unsworn statement during his trial.

In the recent case of *Rex v. Krafchenko*, 22 Can. Cr. Cas., p. 277, Chief Justice Mathers, after discussing various decisions o

*Halsbury seems to regard the statement not on oath as a common law right. Vide Halsbury's Laws of England, vol. 9, p. 402, par. 771.