

all-absorbing topic—the betterment of the existing relations between Capital and Labour—gives rise to legal theories and speculations on the part of both employer and wage-earner; and is argued simultaneously, but from necessarily different points of view, in the Chambers of Commerce and the Trades Unions. The columns of the daily press are eloquent of this fact. Add to this the circumstance that the philosophic mind of to-day is much given to the exploitation of economic and sociological questions, which often invade the domain of law, and we think our exception to Mr. Lilly's postulate is fairly sustained. We would refer to the well-known works of Herbert Spencer, in support of our statement concerning fin-de-siècle philosophy. Then, too, the present expansionist movement of the Anglo-Saxon race opens up considerations of positive law on its international side, which through the ubiquitous medium of newspapers, are bound to arrest the attention of the average reader. Mr. Lilly seems to evolve his view from what he assumes to be the fact, namely, that physical science is now the supreme field of activity for the "general mind;" and he thinks that it does not lend itself to the promotion of jural conceptions, but rather tends to obliterate them. We believe, however, that sociology per se has more of a hold on the general mind to-day than physical science.

It is due to Mr. Lilly to say, that while he is undoubtedly laudator temporis acti, he does not wholly despair of the future well-being of mankind.

* * * Apropos of the law of Criminal Evidence: The Canada Evidence Act, 1893 (56 Vict., c. 31) s. 3 provides that "a person shall not be incompetent to give evidence by reason of interest or crime." This provision appears to be new, as it was not contained in the Evidence Act, R.S.C. c. 139. By the Imperial Act, 6 and 7 Vict., c. 85, s. 1, it was enacted that the evidence of any witness was admissible "notwithstanding that such person offered as a witness may have been previously convicted of any crime or offence." In *Reg. v. Webb* (1867, 11 Cox C.C. 133) Lush, J., refused to receive the evidence of a felon under sentence of death, holding that the above Imperial enactment did not overcome the old common law disability of civiliter mortuus in such a case. In *Graeme v. Globe Printing Co.* (noted in 13 Leg. News (1890) at p. 409) the Master in Chambers applied the doctrine of