

its decisions, now still further to be examined, in this connection show anything else than sound legal knowledge; but in some respects, Truth compels the statement, are supremely ridiculous" (37). The Ontario judges are no better: "Considering that holding in the Ontario Court of Queen's Bench, and the equally absurd *scmble* from another Ontario case we have named (*Regina v. Taylor*), . . . we are almost forced to the conclusion that there are other Courts in the Dominion of not much higher authority than that extremely weak Court, the Supreme Court of New Brunswick" (125). The Thrasher case is enough to condemn the British Columbia judges. Out of the Supreme Court, the Chief Justice may remain, and Mr. Justice Gwynne, if he brushes up a little, but the others will surely be plucked. The Privy Council are by long odds the worst. They are "as utterly ignorant as children" (169). "Their ignorance (to be perfectly candid and strictly just); actual, stupid, stolid, ignorance of the matter they are examining, when we consider that *that* is our highest, authoritative appellate Court, is positively painful" (168); their judgment "on the validity of the Canada Temperance Act was even worse than the judgment which we had previously thought was the worst judgment we had ever examined (and we have critically analysed many thousands of judgments—over three thousand in one treatise alone, we once wrote)" (165). After this damaging *exposé* of crass stupidity what can be the use of continuing appeals to England? Why not merely mail copies of judgments complained of to St. John, N. B., for critical analysis? It should not cost very much more than the present system of appeals, and then the result being attained scientifically would be necessarily apparently correct to both sides, and all parties would thus be satisfied, if not pleased.

Three reasons for continuing the present practice occur to us. First, the oracle might die, and it would then be better for us that we had never known anything better than the Privy Council. Second, legal analysis does not show that any of the decisions of the Privy Council are wrong. The judgments are illogical, ungrammatical, and