THE
Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XXIX. FEBRUARY 1, 1893. No. 2.

THERE are some things "which no fellow can understand." For instance, why does Strong, J., as appears by the report, begin his judgment in *Barton* v. *McMillan*, 20 S.C.R., at p. 408, by saying that the judgment of the Court of Appeal ought to be reversed, and then wind up his judgment on page 416 by saying, "The appeal must be dismissed with costs"?

WE are glad to observe that the learned reporters of the Court of Appeal have added to the last volume of the Ontario Appeal Reports an appendix showing the cases that have been appealed to the Supreme Court, together with the result of such appeal. So far, so good; but would it not be still better if the reporters would also kindly refer us in future appendices of this kind to the volume and page of the Supreme Court Reports where such cases are to be found? We venture to think it would, and trust they will add to our obligations by following the suggestion.

THE *Albany Law Journal* has the following sensible observations on the subject of exhaustive judgments: "There are very few cases nowadays in which long judgments are required, or even defensible. In new States, where the law has not been declared and the judges have little business to occupy them, such judgments are not reprehensible. So in cases of difference of opinion in the particular court or among the various States courts; and so in cases of grave constitutional importance. But the time has long passed when it was requisite for judges to write down all the mental processes by which they arrived at the conclusion, or to convince the lawyers that they had examined the authorities."