

144902

3 Lakeview Terrace,
Ottawa, Ontario,
January 11th, 1946.

K. C. Wheare, Esq.,
The Law Quarterly Review,
c/o Stevens and Sons, Limited,
119 & 120 Chancery Lane,
London, W. C. 2.

Dear Mr. Wheare:

I have just read with the greatest interest your long and careful review of my book in the Law Quarterly Review for October. I think it is easily the most interesting and entertaining review I have had, and also the one from which I may profit most. I appreciate very warmly the kind things you have said; and I think I can learn a good deal from the others.

I need hardly say I am highly flattered to be mentioned in the same breath with Locke, even though in a not very flattering context. I think my only comment on this paragraph of your review is that both Locke and I had a job of intellectual slum clearance to do. How necessary it was in this country I think no one in Britain can have any conception. The amount of nonsense that had been talked and written on the subject here (on both sides) would fill half the dust bins in the country. If you could see the long series of violent articles with which the late J.W. Daffoe, of the Winnipeg Free Press (whose influence was very considerable), greeted my book, you would get some idea of how much trash had to be cleared out of the way before anyone could do the "lucid, impartial and constructive" exposition for which you call. The old man hammered me for weeks on end, column after column, accusing me of half the intellectual crimes in the calendar, and even going to the length of berating me for failing to quote a speech of Pitt's which Pitt never made!

I think you exaggerate in saying that "there is seldom a page where Keith's name is not mentioned more than once." But it is certainly mentioned very often. Again, my excuse must be that, in this country at least, Keith's numerous slap-dash, pontifical and inconsistent statements had acquired enormous prestige, which not even Dr. Evatt's work had done much to lessen.

Of course the space I devoted to the 1926 business must appear disproportionate, especially to you in Britain. But: (1) that particular case had been so bedevilled by careless, unfounded and sometimes deliberately mendacious discussion (which the South African

MEIGHEN PAPERS, Series 6 (M.G. 26, I, Volume 222)

PUBLIC ARCHIVES
ARCHIVES PUBLIQUES
CANADA