

(regard being had especially to the importance of its carrying with it the greatest weight) could not be accomplished by private enterprise, and that it must be executed by public authority and at the national expense.

With respect to the means of accomplishing it, we have considered various plans. Any plan must, we think, involve the appointment of a Commissioner or Body for executing or superintending the execution of the work. It is obvious that, whatever arrangement is adopted, a certain number of functionaries must be employed, at a high remuneration, in the capacity of commissioners, assistant commissioners, or secretaries, and that there must be a considerable expenditure on the services of members of the Legal profession, employed from time to time in the preparation of the materials to be ultimately moulded into form by or under the immediate supervision of the Commission or responsible Body.

We are anxious to avoid any recommendation that would involve the necessity of immediate outlay on a large scale; and we therefore recommend that a portion of the Digest, sufficient in extent to be a fair specimen of the whole, should be in the first instance prepared, before your Majesty's Government is committed to an expenditure which will be considerable, and which, when once begun, must continue for several years, if it is to be at all efficacious.

We are not authorized, by the terms of your Majesty's commission, to undertake the execution or direction of such a work, but we are of opinion that it might be conveniently executed under our superintendence.

If this should be your Majesty's pleasure, we humbly submit that the necessary power should be conferred on us to enable us to carry this recommendation into effect, and that means should be furnished to us of employing adequate professional assistance for this purpose.

In the progress of the work thus done, light will be thrown on the question of the best organization of the Body to be constituted for the completion of the Digest. A fair estimate will be formed of the time that will be required for the whole. Difficulties, not

now foreseen in detail, will doubtless be encountered, and the best way to overcome them will be ascertained. The solution of questions which have already occurred to us will be attained, or at any rate promoted. Some of these questions are the following: What is the best mode of dealing with Statute Law in the Digest? How should conflicting rules of Law (if any), and doubts that have been authoritatively raised respecting particular cases or doctrines of Law, be treated? And what provision should be made on the important point of the nature and extent of the authority which the Digest should have in the Courts, and how that authority can best be conferred on it?

We propose, in this our First Report, to limit ourselves to the conclusions and recommendations we have now stated. The consideration of other questions arising from the terms of your Majesty's Commission, and a fuller treatment of some of the subjects here adverted to, we reserve for subsequent Reports.

All which is humbly submitted to your Majesty's gracious consideration.

Dated this 13th day of May, 1867.

CRANWORTH.

WESTBURY.

CAIRNS.

JAMES PLAISTED WILDE.

ROBERT LOWE.

W. P. WOOD.

GEORGE BOWYER.

ROUNDELL PALMER.

JOHN GEORGE SHAW LEFEVRE.

T. ERSKINE MAY.

W. T. S. DANIEL.

HENRY THRING.

FRANCIS S. REILLY.

—*Weekly Notes.*

—The recovery by Mr. Rufus Lord of \$1,400,000 of bonds stolen in 1865 was effected through a New York banking-house, which received them from Baring Brothers, of London, who had them from a London lawyer, a sort of Mr. Jaggars, who forced the guilty one, who was his client, to give them up.