

Edmonton branch of the Royal Bank was retained under the control of the head office."¹ Upon what ground he regards these statements as contradictory I do not understand, unless it be that he considers that the effect of the memorandum was to transfer the situs of the fund to Edmonton. But as my position has always been, that there was no such transfer, it is clear that he has construed my second statement in a manner not justified by anything that I had said. In my point of view the situation resulting from the "retention under the control of the head office" was precisely the same as that which I intended to describe by the words "subject to the jurisdiction of the Quebec Legislature. This theory of the situs may or may not be correct: but Mr. Ewart is certainly not warranted in ascribing to my language a meaning which it manifestly does not bear, in order that he may have the satisfaction of convicting me of inconsistency. He then proceeds, still assuming that, on my own showing, the fund was situated in Edmonton, and not in Montreal, to argue that my statement to the effect that the Quebec Legislature would have been authorized to dispose of the money "in the same manner" as the Alberta statute, virtually committed me to the position that that Legislature had power to pass a law containing all the provisions of the statute by which the control of the money was transferred to the Province. Surely,

"these are but wild and whirling words,"

For a term appropriate to indicate the connection which is here traced between my own remark and the deduction which he draws I really feel constrained to resort to the vocabulary of that profound expositor of the law, the First Gravedigger in

¹ He remarks that the words "in favour of the railway company" are erroneous, because the memorandum, the memorandum which the bank gave the Provincial Government, stated that the money was "to the credit of the Province of Alberta—Alberta and Great Waterways Railway special account—in the Royal Bank of Canada." I must acknowledge that my language was not strictly correct. When I wrote the sentence I was thinking rather of the ultimate destination of the money than of the channel through which it was to reach the railway company. But the error, such as it is, does not in the least affect the argument, the essence of my position being that the situs of the fund was in Montreal, not in Edmonton.