

extent, in all of the states. The American practice of writing long opinions in almost every case, a vice which few of our appellate courts are free from, is probably the chief reason for this condition of litigation, as well as for the fact that the reports of the appellate courts in this country do not, as a rule, compare favourably with those of the higher courts in England. The review of the year 1894, in the *London Law Times*, contains such expressions as these: "At the close of 1894 all the judicial business done in the House of Lords has been disposed of," and, referring to the Court of Appeal, the judges "have not allowed the sittings of the court to be interrupted for a single hour. The result is that there are absolutely no arrears of business at the close of 1894." In no appellate court, we dare say, of this country has such a record been made at the close of any year, except, perhaps, in some of the United States Courts of Appeal, and they have not been in existence long enough to accumulate arrears of business. Most of our courts are months behindhand, and in almost every appellate court there are large arrears of cases undisposed of. The trial dockets are large, and the inevitable delay in litigation continues to be a source of annoyance to litigants. The addition of new courts and judges in many of the states has afforded some relief, but it will not be permanent unless the judges can be persuaded to desist from wasting so much time in writing uselessly long opinions. In this regard we commend the decisions of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts, which are models of brevity and wisdom. And there are a few other courts about whose opinions the same thing might occasionally be said, but such belong to a hopeless minority.—*Central Law Journal*.