

icious," and assures its readers that "the people of Orangeville mock at this statement," and "refuse to rest assured that no consideration other than those of the interests of justice influenced the decision." The organs of the other party are not slow to retaliate on their opponents with accusations of adopting the methods of "yellow journalism" and discrediting for unworthy ends the fair fame of Canadian justice.

Into the political Donnybrook it need scarcely be said that this Journal does not propose to enter, but it is our duty to endeavour to point out as clearly as possible the true nature of the issues involved in a case like the present, which is so liable to be affected by the prejudices and passions of men.

We think, then, the public and profession will agree with us in repudiating any imputation that may have been cast upon the absolute good faith and integrity of the presiding judge and the prosecuting counsel, who were responsible for the Crown's action in the case of Jackson. The grounds of that action are not far to seek, and are such as have been not unfrequently acted upon in former cases of a similar nature, viz.: the great difficulty in obtaining satisfactory evidence of the crime, and the equally great difficulty of obtaining a conviction from a jury in such a case, even on the plainest evidence and the clearest instruction from the Bench. In this case the Crown counsel was disappointed in the evidence given by some important witnesses; and, as a conviction was apparently impossible, he thought it was better in the interests of the public that the prisoner should be allowed to plead guilty and then to go on suspended sentence, than that he should be acquitted and go free of the stigma of guilt, as well as its legal punishment. It may well be doubted whether upon the whole this mode of dealing with such cases is desirable, but it is one which has been often acted upon by those who have had in their guardianship the interests of British justice, by men whose characters are above suspicion and whose opinions are entitled to respect. Such bargains are in the public mind inconsistent with and detract from the dignity and forcefulness of the criminal law, but no hard and fast rule can be laid down.