

rule, occurs. But when the record has arrived at the Privy Council office there is no delay in bringing the matter on for hearing, unless the parties themselves delay it. If the criticism means that there is a delay in delivering judgment, then I must confess that there have been delays. But I do not think that fault is confined to the Privy Council alone. I think that many of our courts in this country, and perhaps in the colonies, are equally open to that criticism. I venture to doubt whether judges are sufficiently alive to the serious inconvenience which is caused to suitors by delaying judgment in an appeal for sometimes many months after the hearing. Another objection which has been made to the Privy Council appeal is its expense. I know that all litigation is expensive, and that law is a luxury of the most expensive nature. I do not think, however, that an appeal to the Privy Council is any more expensive than an appeal to the House of Lords, and I venture to doubt whether it is any more expensive than an appeal will be to the High Court of Australia. Another objection taken — and the most serious one of all — is, that the Privy Council is not a strong enough tribunal; that, in the words of one of the delegates, the Privy Council is not a tribunal that this country would be satisfied with. In answer to the latter part of that criticism I may say that for years past the Privy Council has been a stronger tribunal than the House of Lords, which is the final court in this country. To-day the Privy Council consists not only of all the Lords who sit judicially in House of Lords cases, but of many members besides, including three distinguished judges from Canada, Australia, and South Africa. The real trouble does not lie there,