

Before leaving this subject it will not be amiss to add that, to some extent, the same kind of mischief to which we have adverted, as a regrettable consequence of reporting dissenting judgments, results from reporting concurring judgments also. The advantage of such additional light as is thrown upon the grounds of the decision by the latter description of judgments is often more than counterbalanced by the fact that the reasoning by which different judges are conducted to the same conclusion is apt to disclose a diversity of views as to one or more of the various fundamental doctrines which are dealt with in passing. It is sufficiently obvious that any such intimations of individual opinion are very likely to furnish both suggestions and material for future controversy whenever a case arises to which they seem to be applicable.

---

*THE PRIVY COUNCIL AND NEW ZEALAND.*

The Chief Justice of New Zealand, Sir Robert Stout, has justified his surname by some recent utterances in connection with a criticism of the Judicial Committee upon the judgment of his court in the case of *Wallis v. Solicitor-General for New Zealand*, 8 S. & T. Rep. 65. It appears that their Lordships of the Privy Council stated that in their opinion the appellant had been denied justice and intimated that the Colonial Court must have been led away from the justice of the case by a desire to be subservient to the Executive Government. The Chief Justice strongly denied this statement, saying in conclusion: "A great Imperial judicial tribunal sitting in the capital of the Empire and dispensing justice even to the meanest British subject from the uttermost parts of the earth, is a great and noble ideal; but if that tribunal is unacquainted with the laws which it is called upon to interpret or to administer, it may unconsciously become a worker of injustice. It is the duty of an appellate tribunal to consider and, if necessary, criticise the judgments of the courts below, but we are not surprised that the remarks made by the Judicial Committee have caused intense indignation throughout the colony."

In reference to the above observation as to a tribunal the judges of which are unacquainted with the laws they are called upon to interpret, it may be remarked that highly trained legal minds can readily apprehend laws which are different from those