

PULLMAN CAR PROTECTION—ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA.

"Too little respect for the proprieties and formalities of official position is far more injurious than too much, and certainly there can be no position which it is more important should command the very highest respect than that of Judge of the High Courts of both the states and the United States. There is no question, however much the statement of the fact may be ridiculed, that the appearance of the Supreme Court of the United States clothed in their gowns has a salutary effect upon the citizen who goes into the presence of that great tribunal."

"If gowns for the Judges will give more dignity to a court and enable it to command more respect from the public and the profession, why not have gowns?"

THE case of the *Pullman Palace Car Company v. Gardner*, reported in *Albany Law Journal*, vol. 29, p. 8, decides that a sleeping-car company is bound to use reasonable and ordinary care to protect the property of its passengers, the extent of such care being a question for the jury. In this case the watchman was absent from his post for only a few minutes, during which another man who wanted a watch stole one from under the pillow of a passenger. The company was held liable if the jury should find that the theft would not have occurred if the watchman had been at his post. In the course of his charge to the jury the judge made the following rather original observations:—

"A railroad company is under no sort of obligation to keep people from robbing us, except it would be by an onslaught, open violence on the cars. In such cases it has been held that the conductors are bound to protect, not only the persons of passengers, but also their property to a reasonable extent, as for instance, if some boy, fifteen years of age, with a wooden gun in his hand, should come in to rob a car, as I believe it is said they do out west, and the passengers should crawl under their seats, and the conductor and train hands run away, when, perhaps, if they had stood their ground they could have prevented it, the railroad company might be responsible if the jury should not find under the circumstances that the passengers ought to have defended themselves. We used to ride around in stage coaches; if robbed while in them, the company being under no obligation to carry a guard, was not responsible for the robbery, although you

might go to sleep, and they knew perfectly well you would go to sleep, or ought to suppose you would, for a man could not ride half a dozen days or nights without going to sleep; but in the case of a sleeping-car company the great convenience and inducement held out to passengers is that they will give them a comfortable night's rest. They notify them they will make them pay for it, and say to them you may go to sleep."

THE Editor of the *Canadian Law Times* has come to the rescue of his critic and has overwhelmed us with a syllogism. Being struck with the originality of our contemporary's criticism of Mr. Holmsted's latest work, in which he complained of the long list of *addenda* and *corrigenda* appended thereto, we observed that to us a long list of *addenda* and *corrigenda* is an indication of two things, industry and honesty. In the last issue of our contemporary we have our reply, and this time we are struck by the originality of his logic. He says: "we have looked through half a dozen of the later volumes of the *Canada Law Journal*, but have failed to find in them either of these things, that is *addenda* or *corrigenda*." The conclusion suggested of course is that this journal lacks industry and honesty. This is not very polite, but let us examine it a little more closely:

Addenda and *corrigenda* are marks of industry and honesty.

The *Canada Law Journal* has no *addenda* or *corrigenda*;

Therefore the *Canada Law Journal* has neither industry nor honesty.

What startling results this method of reasoning leads us to!

To cook his own food is a mark of a man.

The Editor of the *C. L. T.* does not cook his own food;

Therefore the Editor of the *C. L. T.* is not a man.

To be able to play several games of chess simultaneously and blindfolded is an indication of sanity.

The Editor of the *C. L. T.* cannot play several games of chess simultaneously and blindfolded;

Therefore the Editor of the *C. L. T.* is not sane.