observing that what had been done had been ratified by a general meeting of the shareholders of that company.

(B) They thought that the case of the Government depended upon "the power to issue other bonds than those authorized by the original contract." But there was nothing in the original contract about the issue of bonds; and nobody had suggested the issue of any other bonds than those which had been otherwise authorized.

(4) In another case, appellants' Counsel, on the argument, abandoned one of his two points, and rested his case on the other. This other point was therefore not argued by the Counsel for the respondents. And their Lordships decided in favor of the appellants upon the point abandoned and not argued.

(5) Another case involved the decision of a large number of cases. During the argument, their Lordships refused to permit discussion of each of the cases, saying that some general principle would be declared, and all the cases be referred to the Master for investigation. In giving judgment, their Lordships made a sweeping declaration of all the cases in favor of the appellants. Their attention was immediately called to what they had said during the argument. Nevertheless, they refused to order the reference to the Master. I repeat what I have already said—

> "That is the clearest case of judicial indifference to the rights of a litigant that I have ever known."

IX. Not only are their Lordships' local prepossessions quite contrary to those which obtain in Canada, but difference in ideas and languages is sometimes productive of embarrassment during the argument, and of injustice in the judgment. For example—

(1) In England, the Crown's prerogative enables it to deal with Crown lands as it pleases. With us, the authority of the ministers of the Crown is derived exclusively from our statutes. This difference in ideas induced their Lordships to regard an Ontario statute, not as enabling the Commissioner of Crown Lands to deal with the lands, but as some qualification of the prerogative power of the Crown.

(2) Their Lordships are unaccustomed to deal with "revised" or "consolidated" statutes, and they are not familiar with the rules of interpretation applicable to such statutes. In one case this lack of familiarity led to injustice.

(3) In Canada, we use the phrases "patent from the Crown," and "grant from the Crown" interchangeably. To their Lordships,