

appeals were taken to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and were heard by that Court of final resort. A cablegram having stated that all questions were decided in favour of the company, some of the journals of Toronto thereupon porred out the vials of their wrath upon the law lords of the Privy Council. A writer in *The News* charged that these judges had "robbed the city of its principal rights under the street railway contract." Other papers also made similar reckless charges. No one in this country at that time knew the reasons on which their lordships arrived at their conclusions. In no event would the views of these writers be of any value as to the construction of the contract, which was the subject for adjudication, yet they had the hardihood to accuse some of the most gifted men and most highly trained legal experts in the British Empire of "robbery;" in other words, of wilfully depriving the city of its just rights. This charge was subsequently repeated by the same paper in various forms of words.

These judges, let it be noted, are men of the highest character, and absolutely indifferent to anything except the legal proposition laid before them by counsel. Were it not for the mischief done to the administration of justice and the breaking down of proper respect for the powers that be, hysterical attacks such as we have seen in these articles would only provoke merriment. This judgment not meeting with the approval of these writers, and of the Board of Control and the aldermen of Toronto, the right of appeal to England must of course be abolished, and the whole judicial system changed. It may here be remarked that "yellow journals" and aldermen (and it is the latter who urged on this litigation), frequently hunt in couples, perhaps because too many of them appeal to and live by the favour of the class who from ignorance and want of thought are most easily influenced by claptrap. Fair criticism is one thing, a charge of deliberate injustice is another. No judge would object to the former. His position prevents his replying to the latter, which is therefore very much like striking a man whose hands are tied.