

duced by this knowledge would, of course, be far greater, if a cheaper procedure were available for injured workmen. Such a procedure might presumably be devised without any serious difficulty; but, however this may be, the conclusion seems to be unavoidable, that the abolition of the right of action in cases where negligence is involved would be even more prejudicial to workmen than to employers. In order to realize fully what such an abolition implies, they have only to consider that, if the section under discussion is adopted as it stands, they will be precluded from maintaining suits not only for injuries caused by breaches of common law duties, but also for those which result from a violation of the various statutes designed to promote the safety and health of employees in factories and elsewhere. The obligations of employers under these statutes would be enforceable only by means of criminal prosecutions. Even if workmen cannot procure immediately the boon of a simple and inexpensive procedure for the recovery of damages in actions at law, would it not be well to ensure that their existing rights in respect of such actions shall be kept intact for the present?

C. B. LABATT.

*GOVERNMENTAL IMPAIRMENT OF A CONCESSION
GRANTED BY THE GOVERNMENT—A REJOINER
TO A CRITIC.*

In the February number of this JOURNAL I dealt with certain aspects of the power conferred by the British North America Act upon the Provincial Legislatures to pass laws "in relation to property and civil rights in the Provinces." Since my article was published I have received from a barrister a letter in which he takes exception to the correctness of one of my statements with regard to the character of a statute to which I alluded in the course of my argument. As this criticism proceeds from a gentleman of high standing in the profession, and may possibly reflect the opinion of other lawyers also, it calls for some notice.