

HEBERT, Calixte, St. Clothilde de Horton, Nov. 11.

THOMPSON, Wm. et al., doing business as "The St. Timothée Manufacturing Company," Montreal, Nov. 16.

UPTON Shoe Company, Upton, Nov. 15.

*Curators Appointed.*

ARCHAMBAULT, Narcisse, druggist, Montreal.—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, Nov. 11.

BRASSARD, Louis Jean Bte.—E. A. Piché, Drummondville, curator, Nov. 16.

FORTIN, Louis, Ste. Cunegonde.—T. Gauthier, Montreal, curator, Nov. 11.

HEBERT, Calixte, St. Clothilde de Horton.—A. Quesnel, Arthabaskaville, curator, Nov. 24.

PONTBRIAND, Augustin, St. Guillaume.—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, Nov. 2.

SAVARD, George.—G. Darveau, Quebec, curator, Nov. 15.

TISDALE, Dame Emma, St. John's.—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, Nov. 11.

---

*GENERAL NOTES.*

TRIAL BY JURY IN INDIA.—There can be no doubt that the jury system works very badly in India generally, and is almost valueless except as a great factor in educating the masses. In a recent case at Benares a man was tried, by the sessions judge, on a charge of committing a brutal outrage on his sister-in-law, aged eight years. Four out of five jurymen returned a verdict of "not guilty," but the judge refused to accept it, and referred the case to the High Court, who said: "We have read the evidence in this case and the judge's charge. The judge correctly drew the attention of the jury to the material facts and to the law, and having regard to the man's own statement, and to uncontradicted evidence for the prosecution, and to the accused's conduct, we fail to understand how any one of these four jurymen, having regard to his oath, could have returned a verdict of "not guilty." If jurymen, in cases so clear as this was, will not do their duty, it may be necessary, for the protection of the public at large and for repression of crimes now tried by juries, seriously to consider the fitness of the jury system for certain parts of the country. In our opinion the guilt of the prisoner was not, on the evidence, open to any doubt whatsoever; and the only explanation of the finding of those four jurymen was a wilful determination on their part not to do their duty. The judge rightly refused to accept that verdict; we set it aside, and convict and sentence the prisoner, under section 376 of the Indian Penal Code, to be rigorously imprisoned for seven years."

—*Indian Jurist.*