

asked for the bread of instruction, and my "guide, philosopher and friend," has given me the stone of reproof. Unless I am much mistaken, however, the readers of our respective articles will scarcely regard this as a satisfactory way of settling the matter. Immunity from criticism is a privilege to which Lord Herschel has no special claim. Besides this, not a few persons, I fancy, will be inclined to think that there is a certain inconsistency in the attitude of a disputant who, as will be seen from his article, admits that the phraseology under discussion is "novel and unusual," and at the same time can find nothing but what is ludicrously irreverent in my refusal to accept his conclusions, until he has furnished me with some other instance of a similar use of the word "possess." One who shelters himself behind the dogma of judicial infallibility places himself in a rather awkward dilemma by virtually confessing that his own faith is not sufficiently robust to preserve him from some qualms of doubt as to the correctness of the *ex cathedra* utterances to which we are invited to listen with unquestioning veneration.

The manner in which Mr. Lefroy has dealt with my linguistic criticism renders it unnecessary for me to examine in detail the remainder of his article, even if the editor were willing to allow me the necessary space for that purpose. Until it is determined whether Lord Herschel's words are to be taken literally, or, as I ventured to suggest, he has inadvertently been guilty of a solecism, it is not worth while to pursue the secondary inquiry whether his words really contain the germ of a doctrine which would revolutionize the constitutional law of Canada in some very important respects. But I dare say I shall not be regarded as taking an unwarrantable advantage of the editor's license if I point out that my theory that Lord Herschel does not really mean to make the possession or non-possession of proprietary rights by a legislature itself the test of its capacity or non-capacity to confer such rights upon others is strongly supported by some language which he uses elsewhere. The inference that in the sentence which is the bone of contention between