

*INSOLVENT NOTICES, ETC.**Quebec Official Gazette, April 17.**Judicial Abandonments.*

Louis Bachand, Jr., of St. Joachim de Shefford, Sweetsburg, April 9.
 Regent Fortin, trader, of St. Alexandre, Quebec April 13.
 J.-Bte Gascon, trader, of St. Jérôme, April 10.
 L. J. N. Gauthier, St. Hyacinthe, April 5.
 Pettigrew & Paradis, traders, of Isle Verte, April 8.
 Arthur Talbot, Scotstown, April 14.

Curators appointed.

Re Joseph Bilodeau.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator, April 8.
Re Sophronie Boulois, Chambly Canton.—J. Barnabé, Montreal, curator, April 13.
Re George Dugas, Jr.—A. Daigle, Montreal, curator, April 14.
Re Amable Godin, St. Michel d'Yamaska.—Louis Morassé, Sorel, curator, April 12.
Re Lucien Godin, Sorel.—L. Morassé, Sorel, curator, April 12.
Re Louis Joseph Latour, Lanoraie.—Seath & Daveluy, Montreal, curator, April 10.
Re F. X. Leovalier et al.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator, April 15.
Re Olivier Lefebvre.—J. O. Dion, St. Hyacinthe, curator, April 9.
Re Joseph Lemieux.—Kent & Turcotte, curator, April 12.
Re Philiat Piché.—C. Millier, Sherbrooke, curator, April 6.
Re Antoine St. Martin, Jr., St. Louis de Bonsecours.—T. Marchessault, Sorel, curator, April 8.

Dividend Sheets.

Re Egger & Co.—W. A. Caldwell, curator, Montreal, April 14.
Re Mulligan & Moore.—1st and final div. at office of Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, April 13.
Re I. Villeneuve.—L. Rainville, Arthabaskaville, curator, April 14.
Re A. S. Vinet, Bedford.—1st and final div., Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator, April 13.

Separation as to Property.

Emélie Coursolles vs. Hormidas Boucher, carriage-maker, Cote St. Michel, district of Montreal, Jan. 29.
 Marie Bouchard vs. Pierre Côté, undertaker, Montreal, Jan. 23.
 Adelina Villemaire vs. E. B. Boucher, carriage-maker, Mile-End, Montreal, Jan. 15.
 Marie Anne Chabot vs. Théodule Foisy, Quebec, April 15.
 Helena Butler vs. John Quarm, trader, Montreal, April 9.
 Marie Annie Aurélie Franchère vs. Oswald Chaput, L'Assomption, April 12.

GENERAL NOTES.

For a physician to publish an advertisement containing false statements as to his ability to cure disease, knowing them to be false when he makes them, and

intending thereby to impose on and deceive the public, is "unprofessional and dishonorable conduct" within the meaning of a statute.—*State v. State Board*, etc., 26 N. W. Rep. 125.

The office of Corporation Counsel in New York city does most effective work. Last year sixty-three cases were tried involving \$792,441, of which only \$15,551 was recovered, or less than two per cent. When an accident occurs on the streets likely to affect the city, it is made the duty of the police to report it to Corporation Counsel with the names of witnesses who are at once looked up, their testimony secured and photographs of the *locus* made so that the city is well prepared to make defence. It is said that the great efficiency of this office is due to the fact that it is carefully kept aloof from political spoilsmen and such irrelevant influence.

The difference of opinion among the judges as to the legal effect of giving a hand-bag to a porter at a railway station to be put into the train has extended to the Court of Appeal. Lord Justice Lopes, from his decision in *Bunch v. The Great Western Railway Company*, is of opinion that the porter is only authorised by the company to carry the bag to the railway carriage, and that, if the porter takes care of the bag while the passenger is meeting another passenger, he is not acting within the scope of his employment, and the company are not liable as common carriers if the bag disappear. Mr. Justice Day, in the Court below, shared this opinion, but Mr. Justice Smith differed from it, and now the Master of the Rolls and Lord Justice Lindley settle the matter against the railway company. The dissentient opinion restricts the scope of the porter's employment purely to a bee-line between the kerbstone and the step of the railway carriage. If the passenger tell the porter to wait at the train while he takes his ticket or meets a friend, the company are not liable. This seems too narrow an interpretation of the duties of a porter, when read in the light of the ordinary necessities of the process of catching a train.—*Law Journal* (London).

A most audacious bill (says the *Pall Mall Gazette*) has been laid before the French Chamber. A deputy has actually introduced a measure to disestablish the bar. The bill proposes—with a brutal simplicity—to rob the profession of all its rights and monopoly. It is not a question of control or reform, but simply to dip a sponge in water and wipe the whole transaction off the surface of the slate. M. Michelin's proposal is that every litigant should conduct his own case, and if he judges it unwise to do so might trust his defence or the conduct of his claim to one friend who should represent him. All the etiquette of the profession—this revolutionary reformer proposes—is to be disregarded. That friend may charge whatever terms he likes. No robes are to be worn. The dossier and the *tocque* are to disappear. The "privilege of counsel" is to be abolished. There is to be no protection. If the conductor of the case asks abusive questions of the witness whom he cross-examines, he may be proceeded against for libel—that is, presumably, if he has not already been challenged to a duel. To the obvious criticism that a lawyer needs a legal education, M. Michelin replies that he will have no lawyers. All that is wanted is that the facts should be stated. The law is to be studied by the judges, who are well paid for their work.