

view—we have nothing in a law journal to say about that. We do say, however, that he seems never to have asked himself how he, as arbiter of death, would stand as to the law of the country where he lives.

LAW REPORTING.

Lord Reading, Chief Justice of England, a member of the Anglo-French Commission seeking the great war loan lately negotiated, is reported to have said, at a reception in his honour by the New York Bar Association:—"I am strongly impressed with the undesirability of the constant reporting of decisions which lay down no new principles, but only repeat the application of old principles to new facts. To make one's self familiar with your law, it is necessary to look up not only all the decisions, but all the statutes of your 48 states. I wonder how you surmount this mountain of legal knowledge. The system of citing corroborating cases has been changed with us. We now strive to get at the merits, to allow no technicalities to prevent the court from perceiving the true facts and arriving at a just decision, notwithstanding all the learned counsel that appear before the judge."

The *Central Law Journal* remarks that, had the Chief Justice said "opinions," instead of "decisions," he would have more accurately portrayed the evil of which he spoke; but the context induces the thought that he meant "opinions" rather than "decisions," in the strict sense of the latter word. The immense output of language in opinions by judges, rather than the rendering of decisions, which only repeat the application of old principles to new facts, is said to be the real burden of American jurisprudence.

Another burden laid upon us is what we would venture to call the pernicious practice of individual dissenting opinions of appellate judges, certainly of judges of Courts of last resort, being reported. What is needed is to have reported the decision arrived at by the Court; in other words, what the majority of the judges decide. The desideratum is certainty and conciseness.