efforts made to procure the same. It must be apparent that it is most necessary in justice to the Court below and the parties, especially the party in whose favour judgment below has been given (and which it is sought to reverse), that the Court should be in possession of the reasons which led to the conclusion at which the Court below arrived. This is required in all cases by the Privy Council. (*See* Imperial Statute 7 and 8 Vict. c. 69, section 11, and Rule of Privy Council No. xvi.) Rule 3 of the Supreme Court requires the case to contain a copy of any order made by the Court below, enlarging the time for appealing. This is necessary that it may appear to the Court that it has jurisdiction to hear the appeal. Rule 4 provides that the case may be remitted to the Court below in order that it may be made more complete by the addition of further matter. This is obviously necessary as it may happen and has happened that at the hearing it has been discovered that the case did not contain all that had taken place in the Court below and which was necessary for the hearing and determination of the matters in controversy. Rule 7 provides for the printing of the case, and Rule 8 for the form of the case. The form adopted is the same as that used in the Appeal Court of Ontario; this was done for the express purpose of enabling the practitioners in that Court to use the cases printed for that Court, should such be the case agreed on or settled under section 29, to which nothing would be required to be added but copies of the reasons of the Judges under Rule 2, and the order enlarging the time under Rule 3. At the time this Rule, as to the form of the case, was promulgated, there was no rule in Quebec on the subject. Since then we are informed that the Court of Appeal of Quebec had adopted a rule similar to the rule of the Supreme Court. So far from the Court having ever refused to receive the printed matter used in a Court below, when it contained the matter appealed, the attention of the Bar has been repeatedly called by the Bench to the advisability of utilizing the cases printed in the Courts below, when it could be done consistently with the requirements of the Statute, and so saving a large amount of printing. Rule 10 provides that certified copies of all original documents and exhibits used in evidence in the Court of first instance shall be deposited with the Registrar. The same rule provides that the production may be dispensed with by order of a Judge of the Supreme Court, so that if either or both parties think the depositing such copies unnecessary, and shall make the same appear to a Judge in Chambers, an order can be immediately obtained for dispensing with their production. It will be observed that nothing in this rule requires the exhibits to be printed. The Court has had repeatedly to call attention to the unnecessary amount of printing of matter not required by the rules, and has been compelled, in several cases, to direct the Registrar to refuse to allow such unnecessary printing to be taxed as costs in the cause. The statute requires that the contents of the printed case shall be settled by the parties, or by a Judge of the Court appealed from, and the only additional printing which the Supreme Court, by its rules, has prescribed is that of the opinion of the Judges in, and the judgment of the Court below. It may also be noticed that the form and size of the case established by the Supreme Court Rule is precisely the same as that prescribed by section 2 of the schedule annexed to the Order of the Privy Council of the 24th of March, 1871; and in one case from this Court the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council directed that the printed record of the procendings in this Court should be allowed to be used in the hearing of the appeal.

Mr. McCarthy, Q.C., said, in reference to the case which gave rise to the observations in the House of Commons, there appeared to be a great misapprehension. He unfortunately was not present when the matter was referred to, but could say in reference to the case of *McLaren* v. *Caldwell*, that neither their Lordships nor the Court below were to blame for the printing of the books. They were printed by parties now respondents. The only thing that was objected to by the appellants was about printing the plans, and that a Justice of the Court of Appeal said he had no power to dispense with their printing as they were documents necessary to the case. That, he hoped, he would have the opportunity of stating in the House.

Ritchie, C. J., said, with reference to the amount allowed for printing, at the time the tariff was established the greatest possible pains were taken to see what would be a fair remuneration for doing so, and the matter was laid before Parliament, and he presumed the Minister of Justice of that day had examined that tariff, and he had heard of no complaints until now. As far as he was concerned he had done all he could to keep down expenses.