Had Mr. Labatt read the other articles in my series (courteously, he calls them "lucubrations") he would have understood what I intended by "such gross errors." I did not mean, of course, that the Supreme Court never goes wrong. In my judgment, it sometimes does. But it never bluntlers because of unfamiliarity with common Canadian knowledge. For example, no judge in our Supreme Court would say, as Lord Halsbury said in two important cases, that there is no such thing as an unconstitutional (in the sense of an *ultra vires*) statute. There is, of course, no such thing in England, and unfamiliarity with the federal system led Lord Halsbury into very surprising error. Other examples may be found in my "lucubrations."

I take strong exception to Mr. Labatt's assertion that I have launched against the Privy Council "sweeping censures and rhetorical diatribes." In self-defence, but with much regret. I think it proper to say that there is not the least foundation for that statement. The extent of my guilt is that I published the opinions of other persons. For example:—

> "The result has been that though the Privy Council is considered good enough for the colonies, it is not allowed in Great Britain and Ireland to be good enough for us."

That language was used by the present Lord Chancellor, in 1900.

> "Again the state of the Supreme Court of Appeal is unsatisfactory. Just now it is split into the House of Lords, which acts for England, Scotland and Ireland, and the Judicial Committee . . . which acts for the rest of the King's dominions. The neglect of statesmen has led to the second being starved for the sake of the first. It is no part of the business of the Colonial Office to look after it, and there are murmurs, loud and long, every now and then, over the state of what, after all, is an important link between the colonies and the mother country."

That is the language of the same man, in 1905.

> "Since those events the Government and, I think, the great majority of the Parliament and people of Australia have not altered their attitude upon this question. They are no more contented with the present condition of appeal cases than they were in 1900 or 1901. Nor are their sentiments likely to alter after the judgment given lately in an Australian case, in which two matters of vital importance came before the consideration of the Judicial Committee."

Those words were used by the Premier of Australia in 1907.