

unlawful act or unlawful conduct for a physician to advise a parent that he has no duty to care for the life of his child, and he, with his parent's consent, will withhold from the child the means of life? It is a principle of law that one who from domestic relationship has the custody of an imbecile child, or any child having any incapacity of mind or body, is guilty of manslaughter, "if by culpable negligence he lets the helpless creature die." *Reg. v. Cox*, 13 Cox C. C. 75. If such a ruling could be made in a monarchical government, *a fortiori* might it be made in a country where its constitution is framed to secure the inalienable right to life. This editorial is suggested by the recent determination by a physician in a Chicago hospital, upon consent of a child's parent, to withhold from a child the benefits of an operation, that would have saved its life. The reasoning to this conclusion was that the child was a monstrosity in deformity and probable lack of brain power. It was only agreed that this course could be taken as to such a child, and not as to a normal child. Waiving, however, the question of ultimate benefit to society in the child's not being permitted to live, first it is denied that there is any distinction under our law in the right of a defective child to life and of one that is normal. Secondly, if there is such a distinction, law should provide the means for its application. Until this is done the distinction is non-existent. Theorists as to what will benefit society, more should be bound by the rules that society makes for itself than others are. Back, however, of all statute on this subject, our contention is that any statute, which contemplates the depriving of another of life except as a forfeit for crime, would be unconstitutional. In conclusion, we may say if the physician assumes to act for the parent, he stands in *loco parentis* and is bound as the parent would have been bound for neglect to save the life of the child. If this doctor's position is right and lawful, then the eugenics may urge that, for moral defectiveness, a child may, upon consent of a parent, be neglected though he surely will die from the neglect. The upshot of all of this is that physical or moral defectives may be submitted to vivisection as the supreme requirement of science. And so the fame of Herod will "pale its ineffectual fires." We do not wish to assail this doctor's moral