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EDITOR'S NOTE

With this issue the Review is inaugurating a new policy. As you have probably noted on our cover, we are printing notes on cases in the 1955 term of the Court of Appeals which were contained in 309 N. Y. Our next issue will complete the Court’s term with cases contained in 1 N. Y. 2d and 2 N. Y. 2d. We feel that this will help our readers, especially those in New York, to find a review of a case whose citation they know. We hope our readers will consider this an improvement and the Review invites your comments upon it. As a more mundane point, we would like to inform our subscribers that we have instituted a new card-filing system for addresses and billing, and trust that this will prevent failures in distribution and accounting.

Several important decisions have been handed down in this term which are contained in this issue. The first of these, N. Y. Telephone Co. v. P. S. C., was the jumping off point, when in its initial stage, for an article by Dean Harold R. Somers of the University of Buffalo in 4 BUFFALO L. REV. This case lays down a new element to be considered in rate fixing for public utilities. In Defiance Milk Products Co. v. DuMond, the Court seemed to establish a trend towards the limitation of the police power of the state; Miss June Murray, who noted the case, promises a Comment on the case for our third issue of the year. Detenbeck v. General Motors, a workmen’s compensation case, called a halt to the expansion of the occupational disease tests by some lower courts. Editor Vincent Furlong hopes to write a Comment on this case for our third issue also.

The Review feels quite fortunate this year in having articles written on an acute problem of our day—congestion in the courts. Chief Judge Conway has pointed out the factors which have led to the condition and proposes a solution therefor, while Presiding Justice Peck shows the economic benefits to be gained by a modernization of our trial practice. Both authors urge the immediacy of needed reform. Indeed, the Appellate Division in the First Department is hard at work at reducing delay, under Presiding Justice Peck’s guidance. See, e.g., “New Court Rules to Reduce Delays,” N. Y. Times, November 5, 1955, p. 33, col. 1. The Review is proud to present these views, inasmuch as Law Schools and Law Reviews have long been the sounding board of new ideas and solutions to judicial problems.