ADMISSION TO THE LAW COURTS.

Mr. McVane formally applied to the Lord Chief Justice of England for a ticket of admission to his court, on the ground that, though a judge is 'absolute emperor over his Court, yet his power does not extend to the selection of what body of people shall represent the public in cases which are not heard in camera,' and that, if it be necessary to establish a system of admittance by ticket only, that tickets should be distributed impartially to all applicants. The applicant also maintained that 'if there is room in the well of the Court, any member of one of the Inns of Court has a prior right to a seat therein over an ordinary member of the public, whether provided with tickets from the judge or not.' The Lord Chief Justice pointed out that the majority of persons on the bench have been unknown to him, but, have been persons to whom for one reason or another it seemed proper to grant the privilege of admission, and that exactly the same observations apply to his own small gallery and to a portion of the gallery opposite the bench. 'The rest of that gallery,' added his lordship, 'and the whole of the body of the Court has been absolutely free, but I have given strict orders to prevent overcrowding, with the further directions that the utmost available space shall be given to members of the bar in costume, and that the reporters for the press shall be able to perform their important duty, as far as possible, in ease and comfort. . . . I can make no alteration in your favor. As the person you refer to as a Templar and yourself may perhaps repeat your mistakes, I shall send your letter and my answer to the newspapers.' The point raised by this correspondence is, we believe, quite new. The general right of the public to be present at any trial, so long as there is room, is, of course, undoubted, but the extent to which a judge may go in restricting that right in favour of particular individuals has never, so far as we know, been defined. Nor do we believe that members of the Inns of Court, except after their call to the bar, have any priority over the general public. Perhaps all that can be laid down with certainty is that, if any member of the general public can obtain admis-

sion to any part of the Court not allotted to the bench or the bar, no ticket holder whatever can by right of his ticket eject such member of the public from his place.—Law Journal (London).

INSOLVENT NOTICES, ETC.

Quebec Official Gazette, Sept. 19.

Dividends.

Re Joseph Daigneau.—Final dividend, payable Sept. 30, Bilodeau & Renaud, Montreal, joint curator.

Re Demers & Riverin, Quebec.-First & final dividend, payable Oct. 1, C. Proulx, Quebec, curator.

Re Lamoureux frères.-Dividend, payable Oct. 1, Bilodeau & Renaud, Montreal, joint curator.

Re Raphael Larocque, Upton.—First and final dividend, payable Oct. 15, J. O. Dion, St. Hyacinthe, curator.

Re Edward Montgomery.-Dividend, payable Sept. 26, Bilodeau & Renaud, Montreal, joint curator.

Re Onézime Pauzé.—First and final dividend, payable Sept. 30, Bilodeau & Renaud, Montreal, joint curator.

Re Joseph Arthur Viau.—Final dividend, payable Oct. 2, N. Tetreau, Hull, curator.

Separation as to property.

Margaret Cutter vs. Oliver Worth Winship, manufacturer, Montreal, March 12.

Mathilde Lavallée vs. Alphonse Métras, laborer, St. Henri, Aug. 22.

Delphine Lebeau vs. Honoré Choquette, farmer, parish of St. Grégoire-le-Grand, Sept. 16.

Vitaline Legault vs. Clovis Léger, tailor, Montreal, Sept. 15.

Cadastre.

Subdivisional lots Nos. 138-211 to 138-298 inclusively of subdivision of part of lot No. 138, parish of Montreal, have been cancelled.

Quebec Official Gazette, Sept. 26.

Judicial Abandonments.

Arthur Laperle, Sorel, Sept. 21.

Adelard H. Lemaitre, trader, Thetford Mines, Sept. 22.

Thomas McIntosh (an interdict, by his curator, Wm. Patton), heretofore doing business at Montreal under the name of John McIntosh & Son, Sept. 14.

Richard Robertson, Black Cape, county of Bonaventure, Aug. 29.

Curators Appointed.

Re Joseph Elisée Bourke, St. John.-Lamarche & Olivier, Montreal, joint curator, Sept. 22.

Re Miss Mary Mahon.-H. A. Bedard, Quebec, curator, Sept. 22.

Re J. A. Dubuc & Co., Sherbrooke. - J. P. Royer and R. R. Burrage, Sherbrooke, joint curator, Sept. 22.

Re Ed. Larue & Co.-C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, Sept. 22.

Re J. Mongué & Co.-C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, Sept. 22.

Re Rousseau & Vézina and J. F. Vézina & Co.,