

decision into which prejudicial error has crept, and that without undue appeal *costs or delay or travel*.

The watchword is, reform in appeal procedure. It is argued that delay is the sole purpose of appeal in many of the clearest cases; in which appeal is wrong and ought to be denied. It is argued too that in many clear cases the sole purpose of appeal is to "freeze out" the poor but honest suitor; where again the privilege of appeal is wrong.

It is a matter of comment, that individual and conflicting opinions in appeal might wisely be supplanted by a reform, under which a majority and a minority decision, respectively, for and against the appeal would suffice if the court were not of one mind, and that an *odd* number on an appeal bench shortens the litigation.