

ought to never split an infinitive" it looks wrong, it is wrong and is ungrammatical. If one writes "you ought never to split an infinitive" it looks right, it is right and it is grammatical. As it entails no extra trouble one might just as well be right as wrong.

To leave grammar and to deal with words and phrases: the next crime in the calendar is the use of the word "same". Very often, instead of referring to an article by its name or even using the pronoun "it", it is referred to as "the same". For example, "A lady reported the theft of her hand-bag. After taking the description of same I proceeded to Woolworth's where I made inquiries as to whether the same had been discovered. It appears that from Woolworth's the lady proceeded to Marks and Spencer's, but on inquiry no trace was found of same". This is irritating to the reader, ungrammatical, mentally lazy, and not English.

This brings me to the use of our old friend "proceed". Some may remember the earnest request by the Director of Public Prosecutions to banish the word "proceed" from the police vocabulary. I believe that this is the word which is more commonly used than any other in police evidence, and is the word which most often produces a derisive smile on the face of the general public hearing it. What is the point of our laying ourselves open unnecessarily to the patronizing criticism or supercilious comment of others, be they Bench, Bar or public,

when it can be so easily and properly avoided?

The other aspect of this question is the use of a long word where a short word will do, or a long sentence where a short sentence will do. So often one reads. . . "Further inquiries have been pursued but with a negative result". . . it is much easier to say. . . "Further inquiries have been made without result". So often we "give chase" instead of "pursue", we "request" instead of "ask", we "take into custody" instead of "arrest", and—an expression which is becoming increasingly popular in police circles—we say that somebody's statement is "worthy of credence" whereas we mean it is true.

There is just one note of warning: simplification does not mean bluntness and, still less, rudeness. If anyone is ever in doubt and thinks that the use of some simple word will sound blunt, then that simple word should not be used. There are, of course, shades of meaning and it does happen that a less simple word or phrase may sound softer or kinder than a more simple word or phrase; but it means, generally, that the right word is not being used and there is no doubt that, in the main, we can remove a great many of our stock phrases and simplify our speech with no loss of politeness, but with a great gain in clarity and effectiveness.

(Reprinted from *The Police Journal*, London, England.)



The following is a reply to an advertisement for a "Mess Assistant" received at a division headquarters:

"Gentlemen:

"Would you kindly accept my application for position 'Mess assistant'.

"As I have always respected and trusted . . . postal station, I can assure you, that I am capable to sorted out any kind of a mess, papers and parcels, also writings.

"Many times I have almost land to a mess myself and have nicely been able to handled situation, 'mess'.

"I was born in . . . and here in . . . I have gain honor diploma at 1939 from Ontario College of Art.

"If any kind of recommendation is necessary I shall be pleased to find some-one who would tell you, You, 'You can trust her work'."