

SUPREME COURT REPORTS.

are here given a very short and very imperfect introduction, which concludes by saying that "The nature of the questions decided, and the manner in which they arose, are fully set forth in the judgments given by their Lordships." Then comes the argument, which, it is not using too strong language to say, is, without first reading the judgments, absolutely unintelligible and meaningless. When the judgment of the Chief Justice has been carefully read, it is possible to ascertain to a certain extent what counsel were driving at. This case concludes with the judgment of Fournier, J., given, as we presume it was pronounced, in French; and this remark also applies to *The Queen v. Taylor*. Though, of course, we are excellent French scholars, and familiar with all other languages, and full of all learning, it may happen that some of our brethren in the various Provinces of the Dominion, except one are not quite as familiar with Lower Canada Law French as they might be. If some of the judgments of the Supreme Court are to be published in a foreign tongue, it will be necessary for those who are in charge of the education of law students in the English speaking Provinces to insist upon the French language being added to the curriculum. The learned reporter forgets that the major part of his readers do not know French, and are not likely to learn it simply for the pleasure of reading an occasional judgment in that language. We notice, however, in the second number that the English version is given. So possibly our remarks on this point may now not be necessary.

In the case of *The Queen v. Taylor*, the statement shews that the reporter does not know the difference between an action and an information. He states also that the "Attorney-General joined in demurrer," (p. 66) without having stated previously that there was a demurrer. The

English language is played tricks with a few lines further on. The last paragraph on the same page is worded so clumsily as to require the reader to "take time to consider."

The cases are cited with about the same uniformity and exactness as they appear in the report of an argument in a country newspaper, *ex. gr.*—we see "M. and W." and "M. & W." beside each other. On another page, "U. C. R." and "U. C. Q. B." The names of cases, of text books and of reporters, are sometimes printed in "Roman" and sometimes in italics. In fact there is a super-abundance of the latter type to be found throughout. "Earl, C. J." is given for *Erle*, (p. 89;) "Lord St. Leonard," for *Leonards*, (p. 95;) "Patterson, J." for *Patteson*. The authorities cited by counsel have not been properly verified, *ex. gr.*—the case of *Holmes the Spiritualist* is referred to, but no citation is given of the report where the case may be found. So, a reference to 14 Ves. should have been given in connection with *Huguenin v. Baseley*, not *Huguessin v. Basely*, as printed. There is, also, a pleasing variety in the style of the type used in these references (compare pp. 109 and 116).

In *The Queen v. Taylor*, the reporter, amongst many minor inaccuracies, has not taken the trouble even to spell correctly the names of the attorneys for the respondent.

The second number begins with the case of *Boak et al. v. The Merchants' Marine Insurance Co.* There is no caption or short heading to the digest of this case. In another case may be noticed such pure carelessness and want of uniformity as this—"Ritchie J." and "Mr. Justice Henry," (see pp. 214, 230,) and other minor matters without end. It may be said that these things are of little consequence, and if the matter of the reporting were well done one might excuse