

another, does at first sight seem a breach of the Eighth Commandment. But it is still the law in England as to agisted cattle, and as to all goods except such as are protected by the Lodgers' Act of very recent times. And I remember very well a very honorable man, a friend of mine, who rented a handsome set of rooms in London, and who was also a landlord of a large farm near London. He had duly paid his rent, but some valuable property of his was seized by the superior landlord of the house, to whom he owed nothing, and this he thought oppressive and unjust; but he seized without a pang the cattle of a man who owed him nothing which had been agisted on land occupied by his tenant, who owed him rent, and this he maintained to be a just and proper exercise of the rights of property. I have not invented this example. My friend was a very intelligent man, and I give the facts as an instance of how the point of view may distort the vision, and how hard it is for even the best of us to keep the head cool and the mind unclouded. How the owner of the agisted cattle looked upon my friend's seizure I may guess perhaps, but I do not know.

Again, a great nobleman or a millionaire, who owns half the land in a county, hungers after the possession of the other half; and the indulgence in this land-hunger is a dignified and honorable taste, inspired by high feeling worthy of a man of rank and wealth, and by all means to be encouraged. A poor peasant hungers after the possession of a few acres which he occupies, but his land-hunger for that which is to him, as Lord Chancellor Blackburne said, a necessity of life, for the soil which he has reclaimed, and for the hut which he has built, this is a breach of the spirit and letter of the decalogue, something between petty larceny and highway robbery, to be condemned of all well-educated and rightly-affected men, forbidden by the rules of political economy, and its indulgence to be discouraged, and as far as may be, made impossible by law. Yet surely both hungers are alike defensible, alike permissible; nay, perhaps the hunger of the peasant is the better of the two, so far as the desire for subsistence is better than the love of power.

We may assume that as a rule no changes in the laws of property or the conditions of its enjoyment are likely to be made, or ought to be made, except with the consent of persons affected by the change, or with compensation if his assent is not given. What should be the terms of compensation, and whether any but the actual owners of property should receive it, are details, not principles, and it would be unprofitable to discuss them. The rule, no doubt, will always be what I have stated. But a very slight acquaintance with English history is enough to tell us that this rule has been by no means universally ob-

erved; and the long series of parliamentary resummptions of crown grants from the time of Henry III to the time of William III. proves this statement beyond question. Some of these acts were no doubt procured by the kings themselves; but some certainly were passed by no means to please the reigning sovereign; and when the lands and other revenues allotted for the service of the king and of the State have been parted with, parliaments, at least in England, have seldom failed to relieve and to restore affairs by acts of resumption.

It is very true that all change, or almost all change, of the laws of property affects either existing rights or rights which reversioners might naturally regard as certainly coming to themselves. This is a reason why, as I have already said, every such change should be made with care and tenderness, without unnecessary disturbance, with compensation satisfactory, if it may be, even to the persons unfavorably affected by the change, and doing no violence to the great principle, that right must not be compassed by wrong, nor evil done that good may come of it. But it is not wrong to change the law on good reason and fair terms; it is not evil to vindicate the supremacy of the State over that which is being employed for its destruction.

INSOLVENT NOTICES, ETC.

Quebec Official Gazette, May 26.

Judicial Abandonments.

W. Hawley & Son, general storekeepers, West Point, May 19.

Frank Langlands, Montreal, May 17.

O'Neil & Judd, ship chandlers, Quebec, May 21.

Curators appointed.

Re Wm. Dodd & Co., grocers, Montreal.—J. McD. Hains, Montreal, curator, May 23.

Dividends.

Re R. E. Gannon & Co.—First dividend, payable June 11, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator.

Re Nap. Houle.—First and final dividend, payable June 12, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator.

Separation as to property.

Martine Barrette vs. Edouard Suprenant, Montreal, May 23.

Anastasia Carrier vs. Antoine Godbout, carpenter, Lauzon, May 19.

Adèle Riendeau vs. Albert Hould, Montreal, May 18.

Court Terms.

In the district of St. Hyacinthe, the terms are to be held as follows:—

Court of Queen's Bench, criminal terms on 19th June and 19th December.

Superior Court, from 1st to 6th of February, March, April, May, June, October, November and December.

Circuit Court, for the district, from 14th to 18th of February, April, June, October and December.

Circuit Court, for the County of Rouville, from 10th to 12th of February, April, June, October and December.