

## GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE—REVIEWS.

his petition for confirmation came up for hearing, all the papers and notices, &c., were found to be the work of the assignee, who had been the paid retainer of the insolvent, instead of the representative of the creditors; no one appeared to oppose the confirmation of the discharge, or to have the insolvent examined under the 3rd sub-section of the 10th section, the assignee did not do so at all events, and if he had acted in a way which comported with his duty in the matter he would have been there to oppose the confirmation of the discharge. Some of the creditors thought it would be useless to attempt to oppose it with the assignee doing all he could to promote it, and so the discharge was confirmed by the judge, and now the insolvent is enjoying the same property that he occupied before he absconded from the Province. It is a singular feature in the character of most of the assignees appointed by the Board of Trade to which I have before alluded, that, up to a very recent date, they were themselves insolvent in circumstances, or, to speak more plainly, they were nearly all insolvent debtors—persons who have not succeeded with their own affairs set to manage the broken down or disordered affairs of other insolvent people; and the assignee whose acts I have hereinbefore particularly alluded to was himself one of the number.

I observe your correspondent, SCARBORO', speaks of the assignee's certificate as a prerequisite to a proper discharge of an insolvent by the judge. I should be very thankful if he would mention, for the information of your readers in general, and myself in particular, under what section of the Insolvent Acts of 1864 or 1865 he finds or infers it to be an essential, as I apprehend the authorities he refers to are applicable to the English Bankrupt or Insolvency Acts only.

Had I not already made this communication too long I should give my views upon some of the defects of the insolvency acts alluded to by "SCARBORO'."

Yours respectfully,

Union, May 1, 1868.

UNION.

[We shall be glad to have the views of our correspondent on the matters he alludes to.—  
Eds. L. J.]

## REVIEW.

THE SOLICITORS' JOURNAL AND WEEKLY REPORTER. Milliken: 59, Carey Street, Lincoln's Inn, W. C. London.

We are in regular receipt of these excellent publications. The former, as its name implies, is devoted to the interests of the legal profession, and the latter gives a series of valuable reports which, despite the attractions of the new system of Law Reports, still seems perfectly capable of holding its ground in the estimation of the public. The liberal use we make of the columns of both publications is the best proof we can give of our opinion of their excellence.

Speaking of this, we are concerned to find that an article taken from the pages of the *Solicitor's Journal* was copied by us and inserted under the head of "SELECTIONS," without the usual and proper acknowledgment of its origin. We are the more grieved at this, as it has been the unfortunate cause of leading our generally courteous brother, in a recent number, to indulge in some remarks which we should wish to believe were as foreign to the generous, and thinketh-no-evil spirit of our cotemporary, as they were in themselves unmerited. Such mistakes and such omissions as were complained of have been made before and will doubtless be made to the end of time, both by us and by others (and even our mentor is not quite infallible in this matter), but it is quite out of place and unfair to us, and we would respectfully submit, unbecoming in them, to accuse us of want of "decency in this respect," and "short comings in courtesy," &c.; such remarks would be uncalled for if the offence were twice as great.

It scarcely seems possible that even the "most excruciatingly mean of capacities" could imagine for an instant, certainly none of our readers here would suppose that the article alluded to was anything but a *selected* article, though we confess there was nothing to shew the *particular source* from whence it was taken. We, who are "only colonists", may expect an occasional snubbing from across the water, and it is only because we value the good opinion of our "big brothers," that we feel hurt when they go too far with their strictures; we have occasionally had the pleasure of receiving their praises, and we suppose we must submit to take the "kicks with the halpence."

In conclusion—we are as jealous of the courtesy due from one journal to another as our English cotemporary; we are sorry that this or any other omission should have occurred, and hope it may not occur again, but if it should, we trust our cotemporary will be as little inclined to impute improper motives to us as we should be to others, if similarly offended against.