noline is to be upheld, it is certain to be limited to the protection of some other personal right than the mere right to an exemption from publicity as such. It is, however, of infinitely more importance that such wrongs as those for which this Georgia action was brought should be prevented or punished, than that the right word should be used in defining the right invaded, since there can be little danger that, if this right is called a right of privacy, the Courts will ever extend it beyond the protection or real wrongs. The actual danger is, as in the Robertson Case in New York (171 N.Y. 538, 59 L.R.A. 478, 89 Am. St. Rep. 828, 64 N.E. 442), that an outrage upon personal rights shall go unpunished on a mistaken theory that there is no rule of law that covers the case.

Advocates of a divorce law for Canada would do well to note the following: Secretary Taft, of the United States War Department, a popular and able man, has been giving his views to the public on the subject of divorce and the propriety of a uniform law throughout the United States regarding it. The text of his remarks is the fact that last year there were in that country 612 divorces for every 10,000 marriages; and he very naturally enquires what is to become of the foundation of our civilization and our State,—the home and the family, if this continues. He also asks whether there ought not to be some adequate provision to prevent the looseness with which the marriage bond is tied, and the ease with which it may be dissolved. He suggests as a partial remedy for the condition of things in the United States that there should be uniform marriage and divorce laws and that the Federal Courts, subject to the supervision of the Supreme Court, should have charge of the administration of the law of divorces. We venture to think that something very much deeper and more far reaching in necessary to touch this admitted evil in the great Republic.