

that which would as between individuals be properly designated as lawlessness.

The sad part of all this is not so much the monetary loss to private individuals or their feelings of outraged justice, nor that a Government may have brought discredit upon the country: but, more than all this, is the fact that most people seem to be perfectly indifferent, some of them even applauding acts which, if done to themselves, would be most strongly reprobated. We talk very loudly about the country's prosperity and perhaps do too much bragging, forgetful that the lax tone and departure from the old paths of national righteousness, the indifference of the public as to the fundamental principles of *meum* and *tuum*, and the false sympathy above referred to point to national disaster in the future. Surely this is a matter of too much moment to pass unnoticed.

DISSENTING JUDGMENTS.

It is not mentioned as a matter of news, for it is as old as the hills, that those who occupy judicial positions are always subject to and receive ample criticism from the Bar. Peculiarities of mind, manner, temper and person constantly and naturally come up for discussion and comment. In this respect judges might naturally be expected to seek the gift to see themselves as others see them, a gift which, by the way, would be as useful for us as for them. We are led to this midsummer mauling by reading the judgments of the Court of Appeal for Ontario which appear in some recent numbers of the *Weekly Notes*. More than one judge has in days gone by established for himself a reputation as a "hanging judge." Why should not others be known as a "dissenting judge" or as a "dilatory judge." We remember a well-known counsel in former days who was nicknamed "Stephen the unread," but perhaps fortunately, although an excellent lawyer, he never arrived at the Bench. As to those who have acquired the "dissenting habit," one learned judge of the Court of Appeal dissented not less than