

tainment of a guest, even so distinguished as Lord Coleridge, and that idle or unemployed professional men are not the safest escort for a Chief Justice. Lord Coleridge, however, without any fear of wearing out his welcome, left himself at the disposition of his hosts for a six weeks' visit. The latter, *avec grande connaissance de cause*, proceeded to map out a programme which, some weeks before his Lordship touched these shores, we ventured to characterize as rather extensive (p. 249). The programme embraced a visit to all the principal cities in Canada. But it is well known now that the Chief Justice has not crossed, and is not likely to cross the border. While he has devoted days to places like Portland and Albany, and while he endures philosophically long journeys like that from Boston to Chicago, the old historic cities of Quebec and Montreal remain unvisited, in spite of the announcement which mapped out a Canadian tour for his Lordship. It is not for Canadians to complain of this. The visit, as we have said, was to New York hosts, and his Lordship might very properly choose his own time and opportunity for visiting the great and growing Dominion which is now attracting so large a share of the world's attention. But at all events the people of Canada cannot accuse themselves of being over-forward in pressing their courtesies upon his Lordship. If the invitation was given it was in consequence of a very plain suggestion. We take the letter sent to Toronto by Mr. E. F. Shepard, chairman of the committee of arrangements, as a proof. He writes:

"We consider it our pleasing duty to acquaint you with these facts in order that you might have the opportunity of extending to Lord Coleridge any civilities which you may desire.

"We understand that there will accompany him to this country his son, as his secretary, and Sir James Hannan and Charles Russell, Esq., M.P. for Dundalk, Ireland, but whether they will be with his Lordship in Canada we cannot now say, and it is probable that but one or two of our committee will accompany his Lordship in Canada.

"As he has left in our hands the arrangement of his appointments and acceptances we should be very much obliged if you should tender him any courtesies by having such invitations sent to us for his Lordship and party. We are very much gratified at the interest which his visit is exciting, and hope that it may be the occasion for expressing and increasing the good-will which has so long and happily obtained between the two great English-speaking nations of the earth."

Where the fault lies for the fact that after Toronto and other Canadian cities had taken some pains to prepare for his Lordship, an excuse was sent for non-attendance, we do not pretend to say. We attach no importance to current reports, to the effect that Canadian invitations were ignored because Canadian railways refused to "dead head" his Lordship's party. We cannot believe that his Lordship's entertainers would place themselves or their guest in such a false position, for English gentlemen who may be invited from London to the country or elsewhere, whether it be in England, Ireland, or Scotland, do not expect a free pass on the railways from any one. We hope that Canada may yet have the honor of a visit from the Chief Justice on a fitting occasion in the near future. In the meantime we can only admire the enthusiasm which our American cousins have developed in his reception,—even the serious professional journals feeling the breath of excitement, the *Albany Law Journal* printing the names of those who sat down at a private dinner with his Lordship, while the *Chicago Legal News* rivals village newspapers by reproducing the entire bill of fare.

#### THE LANGUAGE OF THE CODE.

To the Editor of the LEGAL NEWS:

Having been occupied at College with the study of English, my attention has been naturally attracted, since engaging in law, to peculiarities in the composition of legal works; and considering that the professional jurist does not pretend or need to be a litterateur, and considering furthermore the bareness and unmistakableness which is generally the quality in their expressions to which every other quality must, if necessary, be sacrificed, the correct style of leading authorities strikes me as evidence of a high artistic level in the profession. Our Code, however, especially the English version, is not all of this level, nor does some of it fulfil very perfectly even the requisites of bare legal style. For example, a conspicuous fault is the use of several different terms to express one thing—a want of homogeneity of expression throughout—as in the phrases:—

1. "labor, trade, or business" (1891),  
"mercantile, mechanical or manufacturing business" (1871),