

shall not attempt to discuss. We cannot help thinking, however, that a document which appears to have been framed upon the model of a charge delivered to a jury by an extremely cautious judge who is anxious to avoid any very decided expression of opinion, was scarcely the kind of address which the gravity of the crisis demanded. However this may be we most heartily sympathize with those citizens of the great republic who, disregarding their material interests, are honestly desirous (unfortunately there are many clamourers who are not honest) of righting the wrongs inflicted upon an oppressed and misgoverned people by a nation which still lives in the darkness, superstition and cruelty of the Middle Ages.

---

By the recent decision in *Pedigo v. Commonwealth*, the Kentucky Court of Appeal may be said to have given a new meaning to the adage which tells us that "every dog has his day," etc., and indeed to have raised one species of our faithful canine friends to a position of wholly unprecedented dignity. A majority of the judges have held that the mere fact of a bloodhound's having taken up the trail of the defendant at the scene of a crime and followed it to his residence, is admissible in evidence against him, although as there was nothing else to show that he had actually been at the spot, and, for aught that appeared the scent might have travelled a considerable distance before it struck the animal's sense of smell. The "bloodhound witness case," as it is now commonly termed, has naturally excited a good deal of attention in the United States. That the instincts of dogs may often furnish valuable testimony under appropriate circumstances is not to be denied, and the same remark may be made with reference to their sense of smell. But it is rather startling to find a decision even by a divided court to the effect that the liberty of a citizen may be jeopardized by information procured in the manner described in this case. The only redeeming feature of the majority opinion is that it restricts the use of such evidence within very narrow limits, and requires so many conditions precedent to be satisfied that if