

in another way; but in any case let us not introduce greater evils than those sought to be remedied. If judges have, week by week, to travel from Toronto to the two favoured spots already spoken of, why should not other districts receive like favour? What is to be the end of it? Decentralization is not an experiment. If we want a warning against it, we need go no farther than the Province of Quebec. Some of the best men there are already deploring the decentralization that there exists. On the other hand, it does not exist in England, and when that is said a volume is written in favour of retaining our present system. When once a change has been made, and it is found to be a mistake, it will be almost impossible to return.

It would, of course, be very convenient for many members of the profession to have the attendance of judges in the manner proposed; but may we not be permitted to suggest that the thought which inspires the change is somewhat selfish? Such thought should not be allowed to influence the minds of the profession in a matter of this kind. If the Attorney-General should, unhappily, carry out the proposal, it might be suggested that one peripatetic judge should be appointed. It might be possible to find some one on the present Bench who likes railway travelling, and who has been accustomed to spend a considerable portion of his time in this manner. One of the judges has, on the other hand, we are told, stated that he would resign rather than be compelled to make these weekly trips.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

Some interesting information regarding that tribunal in the United States from which there is no appeal is given by a writer in the last number of the *Albany Law Journal*.

In our own Dominion we often complain of the delay caused to suitors by appeals, but we seem to be well off when we contemplate that court of final resort, the United States Supreme Court, which the writer referred to calls "the great mechanism of procrastination." It is stated that nine out of every ten cases submitted to that tribunal are carried to it, not for the purpose of obtaining a reversal of the decisions of the lower courts, but purely and simply for the sake of delay. Although a speedy