

clever critic to throw discredit on the result of much valuable thought and patient research?

The work is valuable to us in Canada as a reference to a number of cases in our own courts, and will, we expect, soon be found, where it ought to be, in the libraries of all who desire the most recent, and to us probably the most valuable, work on this subject.

Correspondence.

THE APPEAL GRIEVANCE.

To the Editor of THE CANADA LAW JOURNAL:

In your now last number (2nd May instant) I find a very interesting editorial about the Ontario system of the administration of justice and the courts and judges composing it, and I agree with you in that it would be greatly improved by the adoption of the changes you suggest. Some time ago you inserted a letter of mine in which I denounced the great abuses arising from heaping appeals on appeals and making it so easy to multiply them on trifling grounds, and so increasing the expenses in a suit to an extent amounting to little less than a denial of justice, and the probability of a suitor's being ruined by having obtained a judgment in his favour, and cited an article from a leading London paper to the same effect, of which I sent you a copy, and now inclose another. The writer, evidently a lawyer who knows well the matters he deals with, says: "The expense of litigation is enormously increased by the facilities which the law still gives for appeals, and appeals not only from the ultimate decision, but also on minor and interlocutory points. Before a case gets into court at all it is possible for half a dozen appeals to have been made and heard, decided and overruled, on the question of whether the plaintiff who has brought an action to recover fifty thousand pounds for breach of a trade contract shall be forced to disclose some highly unimportant particulars connected with some subsidiary part of his claim. The retention of two courts of appeal is another fruitful cause both of delay and expense. When the Judicature Acts were framed it was proposed to take away the appellate jurisdiction of the House of Lords, and to create one strong court of final appeal instead. The spirit of compromise intervened, with the result that we have both the Court of Appeal and the appellate jurisdiction of the House of Lords—a profusion of judicial blessings which is more than the litigant expects, and a good deal more than he in any way desires." Would not Ontario be better for a reduction of the number of appeals and of courts of appeal, and for the adoption of the provision in the English Judicature Acts, that the judges shall meet from time to time and point out the defects found in them, and suggest amendments for simplifying and cheapening the administration of justice? Your editorial very clearly answers this question in the affirmative.

Another thing of which the English writer complains is that "for some reason or