

the history of our Constitution. The veto of the Crown has gone. It is as dead as Queen Anne. It has gone by disuse, and so ought the veto of the House of Lords to have gone by disuse." Mr. Dicey, however, in a letter to the *Times*, relies on a dictum of Edmund Burke that the veto of the Crown is a reserved power still capable of being put into operation should occasion arise for its exercise. Professor Hearn maintains that although under the House of Hanover, the power of refusal has never been directly exercised, it must not on that account be supposed that the power is obsolete or inoperative. "On two occasions," he writes, "within the present [nineteenth] century, Acts of Parliament, although they had duly received the Royal Assent, have failed to come into operation from the refusal of the Crown to perform some act which was necessary to give them effect. One was an Act passed in 1794 (34 Geo. 3, c. 4) to enable the Government to carry into effect Mr. Bentham's celebrated project of the Panopticon. It appears that, whether from personal dislike to the author (as Bentham asserted) or for some reason now unknown, George III. disapproved of the plan. Various delays took place until at length all the arrangements were approaching completion, and nothing more remained except the purchase of one portion of ground. It appears that the King refused to sign the proper documents for the issue of the purchase money. Nothing further was done in the matter, but the Government was so much compromised that seventeen years after the first Act a second Act (52 Geo. III., c. 144) was passed by which a different system was adopted and compensation for the breach of contract to the amount of £23,000 was paid to Bentham. In 1850 an Act (13 & 14 Vict. c. 72) was passed under the auspices of Lord Romilly to improve the system of registration of assurances in Ireland. It contained a provision suspending its operation until certain indices were prepared and notice of its commencement consequently thereon was given by the Commissioners of the Treasury. No such notice, however, has yet (in 1867) been published. Probably, considering the advance made in public opinion since 1850 upon the sub-