

nor interest in having the reasons for the decisions read aloud and at length. But if they must be so read, let them be read in an ante-room by the crier, *sotto voce*." The writer, in our opinion, is partly right and partly wrong. It is a waste of time for solicitors or counsel to attend in court, to hear a lot of judgments read in which they have no interest whilst they wait for those in which they are interested. It is also a waste of time to listen to lengthy reasons for a decision; but it is not a waste of time—on the contrary, very necessary—that the judgment should be pronounced in open court, so that any manifest mistake may be corrected, omission supplied, or unsettled matter determined, etc.

---

ELECTRIC STREET RAILWAYS.—The case of *Detroit City Ry. v. Mills*, 48 N.W. Rep. 1007, decided by the Supreme Court of Michigan, and very recently affirmed by the case of *Dean v. Ann Arbor St. Ry. Co.*, 53 N.W. Rep. 396, almost convinces one of the perfect elasticity of the common law. But in spite of the court's appeal to the progressive tendency of the times, common experience and observation arouse a feeling of dissent from the proposition that "the use of a street by an electric railroad, with poles and overhead wires, is not an additional servitude for which abutting owners may demand compensation."

It seems well established that at the present time an ordinary steam railroad imposes a new burden, and that a horse railroad does not; and the distinction, which is one of degree, turns on the different effects produced on the streets occupied by the railroads, and on the beneficial use of abutting property. In allying the legal position of the electric railroad to that of the horse railroad, the Michigan court seem to have made assumptions and statements of fact which will not bear close examination. Grant, J., tells us that electric cars are not more noisy, do not cause greater obstruction of hindrance, impose no greater burden, except by their poles, than horse-cars; and that they do not occupy more space than horse-cars with the horses that draw them. From these propositions we must, with all deference, dissent. The noise and jar of the ordinary electric cars, often joined in trains, the speed with which they run, the danger of driving along and upon the tracks, or even across them, the risk of injury or death from contact with broken wires, the unsightliness of the poles and cars