

"Hamlet." The reasoning which is supposed to confound me utterly is precisely the kind to which his clincher, "argal," is adapted. To everybody but Mr. Ewart I suppose it will be quite obvious that, when I spoke of a similar disposition of the fund, I simply meant that any money which is deposited in a bank in Montreal might be appropriated by the Quebec Legislature for the benefit of the Province, or even, *pace* my critic, for the protection of persons in the position of the depositors. Even he will scarcely go to the length of denying that, *if* the money was so deposited—and that is my contention—this Legislature would have been acting within its powers, if it had solved the controversy between the Province of Alberta and the bondholders by the enactment of a statute, declaring that the proceeds of the bonds should be returned to the persons who had subscribed for them.

In the paragraph which follows this marvellously inept specimen of an attempted *reductio ad absurdum* we find this statement:—

"If Mr. Labatt be correct in asserting that the decision of the Privy Council really was influenced by 'the circumstance that the special account was retained under the control of the head office,' he has furnished us with another example of the 'handicaps' under which their Lordships labour in applying their attention to Canadian cases. Every Court in Canada knows that there is no part of the work of a bank agency which is not under the control of the head office. And no Court, therefore, would hold that the situs of a fund could depend upon whether cheques were to be honoured under general instructions from the head office. If, according to the memorandum given by the bank to the government (in the present case) the fund was in Edmonton, what possible effect upon its situs could the nature of the general or special instrument from the head office to the local manager have as between the bank and the government?"

The first emotion excited by a perusal of this passage was one of profound chagrin. Is it possible, I asked myself, that, in my well-meant advocacy of the Privy Council, I have blundered so deplorably as to disclose a hitherto unsuspected proof of its incompetency as a Court of Appeal for Canadian cases? But presently I perceived that the situation was really not so bad as Mr. Ewart suggests. I received much comfort from the reflec-