

deemed necessary to send even such questions as these to England for final determination.

With great submission the writer maintains that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council ought not to interfere with the decision of the courts of any part of the Empire in cases of any other description than those above mentioned, that when it interferes with judgments of courts of last resort in the colonies in cases of minor importance such as *Gordon v. Horne*, if it does not inferentially belittle such courts in the estimation of the public it at all events puts litigants to a burdensome and grievous expense, and that it misconceived its functions in granting leave to appeal in *Gordon v. Horne* and in reversing the judgment of the trial judge and of the Supreme Court of Canada in that case.

I have written this letter with a view to suggesting the desirability from a Canadian point of view of some understanding being come to if practicable as to how far the "grace" of the Sovereign ought to be extended in the matter of reviewing decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada and of pointing out the difficulties the Canadian litigant labours under if the decision of two concurrent courts in his favour upon a pure question of fact is to be reviewed by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and, as happened in this instance, reversed.

Eight thousand miles is a long distance for a party to travel for the purpose of endeavouring to demonstrate that the judges in his own country correctly estimated his credibility.

Yours truly,

W. S. DEACON.

Vancouver.

[We refer to this in our editorial columns.—Ed. C.L.J.]