AT the recent sitting of the Divisional Court a case came before the court in which the facts were very similar to those in *McDonald* v. *McDonald*, 44 U. C. Q. B. 291, and counsel cited that case and relied on it as an authority, and the Court felt itself very much pressed by that decision, and would probably have given judgment in accordance with it, had not Mr. Moss, Q.C., who happened to be on the other side, been able to satisfy the Court by reference to the books of the Registrar of the Court of Appeal, that the case had been reversed by the latter Court. In giving judgment the learned Chancellor drew attention to the inconvenience which may result from the decisions of the Court of Appeal not being reported when they reverse or vary the reported decisions of the inferior tribunals. We think that it ought to be an inflexible rule with the reporters of the Appellate Courts to report every decision of those Courts which reverses or materially varies the reported decision of any inferior court. It is sometimes concluded, because a decision is delivered orally, that therefore it is unimportant, and not worth reporting, but whenever the decision materially affects a previously reported case, there can be no doubt that it ought to be reported. It is here that the intelligence and industry of the reporter find a field for their exercise. It is but fair to add that the responsibility for the omission to report *McDonald* v. *McDonald* in Appeal does not rest with the present learned reporter of that Court.

OUR ENGLISH LETTER.

To an era of sensational t has succeeded one of peaceful a: energetic work. At the present moment there is not, so far as your correspondent is aware, a single case, either in progress or in prospect, which is of such a character as to fascinate the public mind. Nor has there been such a case during the present sittings of the courts, unless *Allcard* v. *Skinner* can be brought within the category; but if the truth must be told, that case was watched chiefly with the view of ascertaining the judicial capacities of Mr. Justice Kekewich. It had been said, in no measured language, that the appointment partook of the nature of a "job," and, of a truth, there seemed to be no particular reason for the choice of the Lord Chancellor. Now, however, it appears to be generally admitted that whether or no, strong reasons existed for the elevation of Mr. Justice Kekewich, the Lord Chancellor made a good selection, and added to the list of Equity Judges a man thoroughly capable of doing his duty in a satisfactory manner. The rumours of judicial changes hinted at in my last communication turn out to be, as I anticipated, without foundation. Justices Grove, Field and Denman still sit upon the bench, and are likely to sit there as long as any of their brethren for all that is known to the contrary. In fact, there is but a single new appointment to chronicle; that is to say, Mr. Macnaghten, Q.C., has become Lord Macnaghten, and now sits in judgment upon the propositions of law laid down by the very men before whom he lately practised. It is somewhat early to attempt a criticism upon the appointment; but there can be little doubt concerning the ability and the learning of the appointee, a man who is said to have declined more than once the honour of an ordinary judgeship.

The mention of this appointment brings