This much, though, I will say, with all deference, that I cannot escape the conclusion that they have utterly misconstrued the holding in *Hodge* v. *The Queen*; and that the decision which, "without rhyme or reason," they have given, uncoupled with any statement of their grounds, and by which decision they, in effect, dissent from the holding in their own case of the *City of Fredericton* v. *Barker*, as well as from that of the Privy Council, in *Russell* v. *The Queen;* while it utterly unsettles the law as previously established, is also entirely worthless (given in the bald—not to say "prudent"—way, that it has been) as regards the establishing of any sound or intelligible principle of construction of the B. N. A. Act, 1867.

To my mind, in such a state of affairs, no other course is open to Sir John A. Macdonald, than to refer the whole matter to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, for their decision; when it is to be hoped there will sit, at that Board, such brilliant lawyers as Lord Selborne, Lord Cairns, Brett, &c.; and not such mere nonentities; old broken-down East-India-men, &c., as sat there in establishing the monstrous doctrines laid down in *Dobie* v. *The Temporalities' Board*, and *Russell* v. *The Queen;* holdings which are beneath contempt, and which, it is confidently submitted, can be no more followed by the Privy Council themselves, than they could by the Supreme Court of Canada.

J. TRAVIS.