unnecessary to say to whom or when it was payable; or its date, or its amount, or the rate at which interest was to be calculated upon its principal. Or, after giving a copy of the first note, one would have supposed that a copy of the others would have been deemed necessary too.

I am told the petition was *not* (as the Reporter alleges) dismissed by the County Judge *with* costs, but *without* costs, the question involved being new; so that, if I am correctly informed, there was here an inaccuracy, or an unnecessary statement at all events.

It is said the petition was dismissed "*as well on the law as on the merits.*" We have no report of what the merits were, except that the petition stated that the defendant's estate had not become subject to compulsory liquidation and the notes mentioned were not due. As to the merits, the Judge in appeal is made to say "*the application to have the proceedings set aside, because the* 'RESPONDENT' was not, in fact, insolvent, or amenable to the Act." Surely there is something wrong here. Who was the "*Respondent?*" Was it the party who appealed? In the Court below, and in the Act of Parliament, the debtor (or supposed insolvent person) is called a "*Defendant,*" not a "*Respondent,*" and he becomes by appealing the Plaintiff in appeal, or the "*Appellant,*" and the Plaintiff below becomes the Defendant, or "*Respondent.*"

Then, again, it is not explained why evidence of the facts were not given in the first instance, so that the Court of Common Pleas ordered that proceeding to be taken afresh. The report should, I think, explain this.

Yours respectfully,

L. L. B.

Ontario, 12th Oct., 1868.

[Whatever may have been the case in former years, the Common Pleas reports have, of late, been such that a temperate criticism of a defective, or supposed defective, report may be looked upon as evidence that, as a rule, the work is now well done.

Reporting is not, as some persons imagine, the easiest thing in the world, nor is every one possessed of those qualities that, combined, make an efficient reporter. We are, therefore, disposed, for our part, to make due allowance for occasional shortcomings.

The gravamen of the complaint of our correspondent is that the judgment of the judge of the court below, which, by the way, was the County Court of the County of Elgin, was not given *in extenso*, or at least sufficient of it to give readers the benefit of the arguments adduced by the Judge of that Court.

Whilst agreeing with our correspondent that it would have been well if the Reporter had exercised his discretion in publishing, as part of the report, the judgment of the court below, because it was, as remarked by the court above, "very carefully prepared, and is *fully and satisfactorily sustained by his* (the County Judge's) *reasoning,*" we cannot admit either the necessity or advisability of publishing, *as a rule*, judgments appealed from. Many judgments appealed from are intrinsically not worth reporting; others again, carefully prepared and evincing learning and research, are either upheld or reversed on grounds which are not the subject of the argument in the court below, or the appeal goes off on some point not affected by the judgment. In such cases it certainly is not the duty of the Reporters to do more than give such a general outline of the effect of the judgment as may make the report of the case case clear and intelligible—for it must be borne in mind that the Reporters are Reporters of decisions in the *Superior Courts*, and not of those in the *County Courts;* and we speak, we think, for the profession at large, when we say that the desire is not for a multiplicity of cases, simply as such, or for opinions either devoid of weight or finality, or only repeating former decisions, or affecting only a particular state of facts without the possibility of general application—but, for binding authorities, elucidating the fundamental principles of law or equity in their application either to the general business of the country, or to the interpretation of ever-recurring doubtful points under Acts of Parliament.
