

E. & N. A. R. Co. v. Thomas, 1 Pugs., 52, and *The Queen v. Dow*, *Ibid.*, 300, the former of which was not appealed, and the latter of which was reversed on appeal to the Privy Council; I was of the opinion, and still am so, that Ritchie, C. J., in his judgment in these two cases, in the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, was wrong. See *Canadn. Cons. Law*, pp. 14 & 15. And, in his celebrated case, in that court, of *Regina v. The Justices of King's*, I questioned (*Ibid.*, p. 54,) whether he would now use such language as he then employed; and also questioned his accuracy in doing so, if he would now employ such language as that to which I took exception. Again, in *The Queen v. Chandler*, he uses language which I did not hesitate to say (*Ibid.* p. 14,) was "not strictly critically accurate." Enough, however, on these points.

I shall now, more directly, refer to the article in the **February** number of this journal, entitled "Mr. Travis justified and condemned." It strikes me that the justification of Mr. Travis would, as far as *The Legal News*, referred to, is concerned, have been even more marked, had the sentence immediately preceding that quoted by the JOURNAL, been also quoted. I beg to supply it, as follows:—

"Mr. Travis has evidently studied his subject with much care, and his examination of the decided cases, whether his readers agree with his conclusions or not, will be found interesting and valuable."

The tables are very fairly turned, in the JOURNAL's article, against *The Legal News*, in showing that while that journal deprecates "the trenchant style" in which, it alleges, I deal with adverse views, its own style is not, by any means, less trenchant.

Perhaps, after all, the editor of *The Legal News* has been, unwittingly, more favorably impressed with the "trenchant style," to which he refers, than he has been inclined to admit; and the statement of one of the able journals of Ontario,*

* *The Advocate-Adviser*, of Watford, of June 27, 1884.