a "patent" is something very much more important than a "grant;" and in one case the difference in phraseology led to misunderstanding during the argument.

X. In the preceding exposition, I have but supplied evidence of the correctness of what has been said, at various times, by persons whose authority will hardly be disputed. For example—

(1) Lord Haldane, while yet at the Bar, said that the judicial strength of the Privy Council was "starved" in order to keep up the House of Lords.

"Until," he said, "you make the colonials feel that the tribunal to which they come is the same as that to which you yourselves appeal, you will never get their confidence. The result has been that though the Privy Council is considered good enough for the colonies, it is not allowed in Great Britain to be good enough for us."

(2) Prof. Pollard said that

"it is really not plausible at this day to assert that the working of the Judicial Committee gives general satisfaction."

(3) The London *Times* reflected upon the practice by which

"a Court of three or four members reviewed, and perhaps overruled, the decisions of half a dozen colonial Judges."

(4) Mr. Deakin, when Premier of Australia (1907), said that the people of Australia

"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."

(5) Mr. Hughes, as Premier of Australia, referring to the tendency on the part of the Dominions to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Privy Council, said (1918):

"One reason for this tendency is clearly that the present system of appeal is not regarded by the Dominions as satisfactory . . . . Especially in relation to its decisions on the Commonwealth constitution, the Privy Council has not proved a satisfactory tribunal. That constitution has special features of its own —features which differentiate it from the Canadian constitution, and some of which bear close resemblance to the constitution of the United States. It is a complex instrument, almost every line of which has its roots in Australian history, and bears the marks of an ultimate compromise between conflicting views. The eminent Judges ordinarily available on the Judicial Committee, for all their legal learning and judicial experience, have not among them a single man who is intimately familiar with this constitutional document, or with the vital processes underlying it, a knowledge of which is, in the case of any constitutional document, necessary to a full appreciation of both letter and spirit."