

- GODBOUT, F. X.—First and final dividend, payable April 24, P. J. G. Labbé, Quebec, curator.
- GOUIN & Gouin, Three Rivers.—Amended dividend, payable April 20, T. E. Normand, Three Rivers, curator.
- HOOD, Mann & Co., Montreal.—First and final dividend, payable April 13, W. A. Caldwell, Montreal, curator.
- HUDON, Pierre, Montreal.—First dividend, payable April 18, A. F. Riddell, Montreal, curator.
- LEBLANC, John, Carleton.—First and final dividend, payable April 19, H. A. Bedard, Quebec, curator.
- LEBLANC, Mary Jane, Carleton.—First and final dividend, payable April 26, H. A. Bedard, Quebec, curator.
- MARCEAU, Jr., Evariste, Quebec.—First and final dividend, payable April 25, N. Matte, Quebec, curator.
- MARTIN, A. J.—First dividend, payable April 13, Bilodeau & Renaud, Montreal, joint curator.
- PAQUET, Antoine, Quebec.—First and final dividend, payable April 19, H. A. Bedard, Quebec, curator.
- PAYNE, George.—Dividend, payable April 28, S. C. Fatt, Montreal, curator.
- PITON, Alph., Quebec.—First and final dividend (9½c.), payable April 25, G. Darveau, Quebec, curator.
- QUEVILLON & Lamoureux.—Second and final dividend, payable May 4, Millier & Griffith, Sherbrooke, joint curator.
- ROBERTSON, Richard.—Dividend, L. P. Le Bel, New Carlisle, curator.
- STEWART, George, Montreal.—Second and final dividend, payable May 3, C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator.
- TRUDEAU & Bro., Stanbridge Station.—First and final dividend, payable April 18, E. N. Morgan, Bedford, curator.

THE LAW OF GAMING.—Lord Herschell's bill to amend the law of gaming and wagering under 8 & 9 Vict. c. 109. s. 18, by getting rid of the judge-made law of *Read v. Anderson*, 53 Law J. Rep. Q. B. 532, has passed the House of Commons, and will probably become law. Section 18 of 8 & 9 Vict. c. 109. enacts that all contracts or agreements by way of gaming or wagering shall be null and void, but in *Read v. Anderson* Lord Justice Bowen saw his way to holding that lost bets made by turf commission agents could be recovered by the agents from their principals, notwithstanding the revocation of the authority to pay them. Lord Esher emphatically dissented from this judgment, to which Lord Justice Fry silently assented. Sir James Stephen, both when on the bench and (in the *Nineteenth Century*) after his retirement, pointed out the unsoundness of the judgment, and so did the late Mr. Justice Manisty, in *Cohen v. Kittell*, 58 Law J. Rep. Q. B. 241.—*Law Journal* (London.)