

the "chronic litigant" may so often wiggle into the unmaking of the "casual suitor." The "chronic litigant" works on the theory that the appeal is rarely shut against any defeated party who has "expert ingenuity."

Relying on that vicious theory the "chronic litigant" flaunts shamelessly through the courts, marking *time* and making *costs*. To him the purpose of the appeal is delay and cost beyond the means of the "casual suitor."

When reform in procedure cures this evil the humble shall be exalted.

Hence we have, right now, thinking judges and thinking advocates asking this very question: "What are the exact purposes of the appeal?" They urge (a) the cutting down of bulky printed appeals (b) the numerical reduction of appeals courts (c) the cutting out of technicalities.

Neither bench nor bar is fully satisfied with the extent to which modern law