

with reference to my book, that "Those who have hitherto regarded the decision of the Privy Council as infallible and beyond criticism, will change their views after a perusal of the book," may have been literally accurate with respect to the editor of *The Legal News*.

But, while accepting the "justification" of Mr. Travis, as discovered by the JOURNAL, and for which I tender due acknowledgments; the "condemnation" of Mr. Travis, I beg to submit, is by no means so apparent as the JOURNAL seems inclined to think that it is. Of course, not at all unkindly.

With reference to two Privy Council cases, *Dobie v. The Temporalities' Board*, and *Russell v. The Queen*, which I claimed, and still claim, are improperly decided; and my very plain criticism of which has so much shocked some of the weak-kneed members of the profession; Ritchie, C. J. is reported to me, by a prominent lawyer in St. John, as having stated to him just after my book appeared, that "the gravest doubt exists as to the soundness of those two cases." Again. On the argument of the Dominion License case, the same unquestionably learned judge is credited with saying: "I presume it will be scarcely considered high treason in us if we say that *Russell v. The Queen* is not law."

I might here add, on the "condemnation" question, that, in a conversation at Ottawa, in October last, which I had, with, admittedly, one of the ablest lawyers in the Dominion; and from whom I derived the information as to the statement of Ritchie, C. J., as above, the following took place between him and me:—

"Have you read my book?"

"Yes; with great pleasure and profit."

"Do you agree with it?"

"Yes; with every word."

"Including what I say about those two Privy Council cases?"

"Yes; most certainly!"