the contract, and E. F. G. at the time of the action, it might be that you could not sue the firm as such: *Ex p. Blain*, 28 W. R. 336.

The Division Court Act brought in by the Government has passed with many amendments—sixty-eight sections in all. The efforts of the "Conservative" Opposition further to subvert the existing order of things was, fortunately, unsuccessful. The Division Court is no longer what it was constituted as—the poor man's court; and the pettifogging peddler has been helped to shove himself one step further into the professional hall-door. The Attorney-General and the learned leaders of the Opposition, together with the Benchers, might as well open it wide and bid him and his conveyancing brother welcome.

The Insolvent Act is no more. The strong feeling evinced against it last session had partly died away this year; but its doom was sealed. We trust it may be an omen of better times. We shall now see how far the Act, prepared by the Attorney-General, will meet the necessities of the case. We have had occasion to say some strong things against Sheriffs, who will be principally concerned in the administration of the new Act; but we are satisfied that nothing could be more unsatisfactory than the reign of official assignees. Creditors will feel now that pleasant sense of relief which comes over the backwoodsmen when the mosquito season is over.

An important case was recently decided in the Supreme Court, which can hardly be considered satisfactory in the result, at least to those who pin their faith to the judges of their own Province. Taking the judgments delivered in the different courts together, there were seven judges in favour of the defendant's contention, and six in favour of the plaintiff. But these six were all from Ontario, where the case arose—Wilson, Moss, Patterson, Burton, Strong, and Gwynne—a formidable array. The others were—Harrison, Morrison, Galt, Ritchie, Henry, Taschereau and Fournier. He would be a bold man who would lay money against the chance of a reversal if there were a fourth court to go to.

The gossip going the round of the lay newspapers touching the alleged strictures of the Master of the Rolls on the judgments of the Lord Chancellor appears to be quite without foundation. The facts are that a passage was cited from one of Lord Cairns' judgments which was found to be unintelligible, whereupon Sir George Jessel said the judgment could not have been revised by the Chancellor—thereby intending to blame, not the judge, but the reporter. The Master of the Rolls afterwards conferred with the Lord Chancellor, who said he had had occasion to blame the reporter for not submitting some of his judgments to him for revision and that he always revised his decisions when they were sent to him by the reporter.

The last number of the Supreme Court reports (No. 2, vol. 3) is just received. There has been a gradual and marked improvement in these reports since the first number was issued. We have had occasionally to point out mistakes in these as well as other reports, and to urge various suggestions for improvements; but it has been done in no unkind spirit. We know also the difficulties which the publisher, Mr. Cassels, has had to contend with. It is, therefore, the more gratifying to see that these reports, which ought to