

building on the north side of Downing Street, Westminster, round a table in the middle of the room. They are not dressed as Judges with gowns, bands and wigs, but in the ordinary costume of an English gentleman. The number sitting to hear appeals is not fixed—I have seen four and I have seen seven (three exclusive of the President form a quorum.) One end of the room is raised—here are desks with pens (the villainous quill, of course) and ink for the Bar and the Solicitor. The barristers are all clothed in the conventional English style, black clothes, gown, wig and white bands, and when addressing Their Lordships, the Barrister stands opposite the end of the table at which the members of the Committee are sitting. Every English (and Canadian) Judge is "Your Lordship," "My Lord," but the Committee are addressed as "Your Lordships" not because the members are Judges, for they are not, but because they are members of the Privy Council.

But there is a more important consequence than that of clothes (*pace* Herr Teufelsdröckh) following from the fact that the Committee is not a Court. The House of Lords is a Court and as a Court is bound by its own previous decisions; but the Judicial Committee is not so bound—it is not bound by any decision. Of course, its former decisions are treated with proper respect but the case is not without example that they have not been followed.

That reminds me of an incident that occurred when I was myself arguing before the Privy Council, and I mentioned a certain proposition of law. Lord Macnaghten said, "Where do you get that?" I replied, "I took that