

leader of the Bar in London and Western Ontario generally in those days. He speedily attained a high position more especially as a pleader and consultant, though his friends would scarcely claim for him the possession of those special gifts which qualify their owner to shine as a leading counsel in the strenuous arena of *nisi prius*. His reputation however as a consummate lawyer steadily increased, and in 1883 he was created a Q.C. by the Marquis of Lorne. It is said also on good authority that in the same year he was offered a Superior Court judgeship, but refused for the reason that he was not satisfied that his knowledge of criminal law was adequate to the requirements of the position. This fact illustrates alike the modesty and the conscientiousness which were such strongly marked elements in his character, but fortunately these scruples were overcome a few years later, and on November 30, 1887, he was raised to the Bench as a puisne judge of the then Queen's Bench Division, a few days after a similar dignity was conferred upon the present Chief Justice of the Division. About the same time the late Hon. J. D. Armour became the Chief Justice of that division, and members of the Bar who are also graduates of our National University will long be glad to remember that for many years that notable Court was made up of three men who were gold medallists of the University in classics, modern languages and law, respectively.

Our limits will not permit us to refer in any detailed way to Mr. Justice Street's judicial career. It was soon felt by all who came before him that in him were united many of the characteristics that go to make up the ideal judge. Rapid and keen comprehension of facts, wide and accurate grasp of legal principles, unflinching courtesy to all with whom he came in contact (including even the "younger" or "youngest members of the Bar") tempered by a dignity on which none could presume, and a firmness which all were forced to respect—all these good judicial gifts were his by common consent. It has been said that he was too "technical" in his application of legal principles and there may be some force in the criticism. Every one has