

In France, in fire assurance, the insurer goes free if *faute lourde* of the insured cause the fire.<sup>1</sup> And in Lower Canada, if gross negligence be the proximate cause of the fire, the insurer is discharged.<sup>2</sup>

Where there is fault of the insured leading to the fire, the insurer has to pay if policy do not forbid. E. Persil. 16, "Ass. Terr." No. 33, Roll. de Vill. Grun *contra*, 160. But insured may not be grossly careless.

The insurers are not liable for loss by fraudulent conduct of the assured. No contract can make them liable in such case. Nulla pactione effici potest ut dolus præstetur.<sup>3</sup> Pactis privatorum juri publico non derogatur. Broom's Leg. Maxims, 544.

#### INSOLVENT NOTICES, &c.

Quebec Official Gazette, May 30.

##### Judicial Abandonments.

Joseph C. Hémond, doing business under the name of P. Hémond & fils, manufacturer, Montreal, May 15.

##### Curators appointed.

Re Exias Amyot.—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, May 27.

Re Louis Bernier & fils, Weedon.—J. P. Royer, Sherbrooke, curator, May 18.

Re Isaie Charbonneau.—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, May 22.

Re N. Dubuc, St. Isidore, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, May 23.

Re Joseph C. Hémond.—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, May 23.

Re Edm. Julien & Co., curriers, Hedleyville.—N. Matte, Quebec, curator, May 23.

Re J. F. Parsons, Coleraine.—J. P. Royer, Sherbrooke, curator, May 21.

Re Pierre Rhéaume.—Alfred Lemieux, Levis, curator, May 19.

Re Absalon Thouin, Repentigny.—Bilodeau & Renaud, Montreal, joint curator, May 26.

Re Z. Turgeon, Montreal.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, May 23.

Re James S. Wilson.—J. M. M. Duff, Montreal, curator, May 6.

##### Dividends.

Re Joseph Hamel.—First and final dividend, payable June 17, J. E. Poulin, Montreal, curator.

<sup>1</sup> See Dalloz of 1851, p. 99, 2nd part, where the Cour d'Appel of Paris, finding no *faute lourde* proved, reversed the judgment of the Tribunal of the Seine, in favor of the Chemin de Fer d'Amiens against "La Paternelle" Insurance Co.

<sup>2</sup> See Stuart's Rep., p. 148.

<sup>3</sup> Cullen v. Butler, 5 M. & S., 4 Camp. 789.

Re L. A. Lavallée.—First and final dividend, payable June 16, J. B. A. Richard, Joliette, curator.

Re Pelletier & Roy, Fraserville.—First and final dividend, payable June 15, N. Matte, Quebec, curator.

##### Separation as to property.

Philomène David vs. Joseph Lamarche, manufacturer, Montreal, May 23.

Georgiana Delisle vs. Charles Bedard, manufacturer, Richmond, May 29.

Marie Gagnon vs. Jean Baptiste Gagnon, manufacturer, Montreal.

#### APPOINTMENTS.

Wm. Henry Lovell, Barnston, to be registrar for the registration division of Sherbrooke, in place of E. R. Johnson, resigned.

E. R. Johnson, Q.C., to be sheriff for the district of St. Francis, in place of W. H. Webb, deceased.

#### GENERAL NOTES.

MR. MONTAGU WILLIAMS AND THE WHITECHAPEL MURDERS.—At the 398th page of "Later Leaves," by Mr. Montagu Williams, Q.C., only just issued, will be found a most interesting account of a mysterious circumstance in connection with the Whitechapel murders. It appears that Mr. Williams, foreseeing the possibility of "the assassin," if arrested, being brought before himself, as stipendiary magistrate, "made it his business to personally visit all the scenes of the crimes, and to make what medical and other inquiries he thought desirable." One day a visitor, whose name is not given, called on Mr. Williams and announced that he had set on foot a number of inquiries "that had yielded a result which in his" (the visitor's) "opinion afforded an undoubted clue to the mystery and indicated beyond any doubt the individual or individuals on whom this load of guilt rested." "My visitor," proceeds Mr. Williams, "handed me a written statement in which his conclusions were clearly set forth, together with the facts and calculations on which they were based; and I am bound to say that this theory—for theory it is of necessity—struck me as remarkably ingenious and worthy of the closest attention. . . . This gentleman also showed me copies of a number of letters he had received from various persons. . . . He had communicated his ideas to the proper authorities, and they had given them every attention." This being so, all who have confidence in the proper authorities will probably be satisfied that everything will be done to test the "theory" of Mr. Williams's mysterious visitor. But there is something more strange still to come. Mr. Williams, who had *carte blanche* from his visitor to make any use he pleased of the information afforded him, and who, doubtless, from good and well-considered reasons, declines to take the public further into his confidence at present, winds up as follows: "The cessation," writes he, "of the East End murders dates from the time when certain action was taken as a result of the promulgation of these ideas."—*Law Journal (London)*.