

be given to the police at Platt Street Police Station for them to be in readiness to send down and arrest the man should he come again. A photograph was shown him which he recognized as Menson, but in the photograph the man had a beard which he had cut off. On March 10 an assistant called Hunniman came to witness and said he believed that the man in question was in the shop. Plaintiff then went in and recognized him. He wished to pledge a revolver the same as before. Plaintiff managed to send Hunniman to Platt Street while he detained the man in conversation, and the police came down and arrested him in the shop. In cross-examination, plaintiff said he had seen the placard offering the reward. He had seen the man some two or three times. He had told him he was a commercial traveller, and he never knew he went by the name of Lee. The police called many times on the matter, but he did not act under their directions at all. After the man had been convicted, he wrote claiming the reward. It was suggested the reward should be divided.

At the conclusion of the evidence Mr. Graham, for the defendants, submitted, on the authority of *Thatcher v. England*, 3 C. B. 254; 15 Law J. Rep. C. P. 241, and *Turner v. Walker*, 36 Law J. Rep. Q. B. 112; L. R. 2 Q. B. 301, that the plaintiff could not recover unless he gave the first information, and that the evidence showed that the first information was given either by Sergeant Rolfe, or Mrs. Salmon, or Mrs. Dredge.

Mr. Witt, for the plaintiff, submitted that the question for the jury was whether the plaintiff gave the first effectual information, but the learned judge refused to withdraw the case.

Counsel on both sides having addressed the jury on the facts, Mr. Justice Denman summed up. He said these cases were very difficult to decide, owing to the vague wording generally used in the placards offering rewards, and he expressed a strong opinion that these offerings of rewards ought to be abolished altogether. After examining the evidence, he told them he should leave it to them to say whether the plaintiff was the first person who gave information which led to the apprehension and conviction of the man Lee; if so, then they should find a verdict for him. If they did not come to that conclusion, then they should find for the defendants.

After deliberating for more than an hour, the jury sent into Court to inquire whether the parties would take the verdict of the majority, and on this being agreed upon they came in and said that the majority found a verdict for the plaintiff, and accordingly judgment was given for the plaintiff for 250*l.*, the amount claimed, and the learned judge refused to stay execution.

INSOLVENT NOTICES, ETC.

Quebec Official Gazette, July 17.

Judicial Abandonments.

Joseph Alfred Claveau, Chicoutimi, trader, July 14.
Patrick Lynch, St. Etienne, trader, July 2.
Jean Baptiste Parent, St. Aimé, saddler and trader, July 8.

Curators Appointed.

Re Joseph Monarque, Montreal.—Seath & Daveluy, Montreal, curator, July 9.
Re Jean Baptiste Parent, St. Aimé.—Seath & Daveluy, Montreal, curator, July 13.
Re H. A. Turgeon.—H. A. Bedard, Quebec, curator, July 10.

Dividends.

Re Alphonse Decelles.—First and final dividend, payable Aug. 2. J. O'Caïn, St. John's, curator.
Re Sulpice Téléphore St. Cyr.—First and final dividend, payable Aug. 2. A. Demers, Berthier, curator.

Quebec Official Gazette, July 24.

Curators Appointed.

Re Alfred Charland, district of Richelieu.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator, July 10.
Re G. N. Brown, district of Athabaska.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator, July 19.
Re Alex. Paré.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator, July 20.

Dividend.

Re Henry Sevigny, Three Rivers.—First and final dividend, payable Aug. 7, at office of H. A. Bedard, Quebec, curator.

Separation as to Property.

Eleonore Lauzon v. Narcisse Olivier Ruel, St. Sauveur de Québec.

Quebec Official Gazette, July 31.

Judicial Abandonments.

Re Chas. Cadotte, manufacturer, Montreal, July 21.
Re Theophile Jean Fradette, trader, St. Prime, Chicoutimi, July 26.

Curators Appointed.

Re Charles Cadotte, manufacturer, Montreal.—A. M. Cassis, curator, Montreal, July 28.
Re Roger Dandurand, restaurant keeper, Montreal.—J. B. E. Mathieu, curator, Montreal, July 22.
Re Patrick Lynch, St. Etienne de Beauharnois.—Seath & Lapointe, curator, Montreal, July 17.
Re John Sexton, jun., St. Nicholas.—H. A. Bedard, curator, Montreal, July 23.

Dividends.

Re Jos. T. Denis.—Second and final dividend, payable Aug. 20, L. P. Bruneau, Montreal, curator.
Re N. Fréchette & Co., match manufacturers.—Dividend, Geo. Daveluy, Montreal, curator.

GENERAL NOTES.

To one who has observed the rapidity with which business is dispatched in an English Court, the slowness of our methods is intolerable. It is certainly a great compensation for the division of the legal profession of England that the Courts are always provided with a body of highly trained counsel who devote themselves exclusively to the trial of causes upon briefs prepared by attorneys, containing an abstract of the pleadings, of the testimony of each witness, and of the legal questions involved.—H. B. Brown in the *'American Law Review.'*