

"But at present, by the long and uniform usage of many ages, our Sovereigns have delegated their whole judicial power to the judges of their several courts \* \* \*"—(1 Blackstone, page 261.)

[To be continued.]

### INSOLVENT NOTICES, ETC.

Quebec Official Gazette, March 15.

#### Judicial Abandonments.

- Narcisse Edouard Cormier, lumber merchant, Aylmer, March 11.  
 George Darveau, merchant, Quebec, March 13.  
 Josephine Valade, doing business as J. Hénault & Co., Montreal, March 3.  
 William A. Douglas, township of Chatham, district of Terrebonne, March 7.  
 Stanislas Gendron, Sherbrooke, March 6.  
 Francis Giroux, trader, Montreal, Jan. 30.  
 Elzéar Gosselin, Sherbrooke, Feb. 18.  
 Ambrose Moussette, hatter and furrier, Montreal, March 6.  
 Ed. St. Amour & Co., boot and shoe dealers, Montreal, March 12.

#### Curators appointed.

- Re Ephrem Bolduc, Joliette.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, March 10.  
 Re John C. Campbell, Montreal.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, March 7.  
 Re Hilaire Chevalier, farmer, parish of St. Elizabeth.—F. X. O. Lacasee, St. Elizabeth, curator, Mar. 10.  
 Re Frs. Côté, Quebec.—Wm. Doyle, Quebec, curator, March 12.  
 Re Esther Dannilivitch.—W. A. Caldwell, Montreal, curator, March 15.  
 Re Josephine Valade (Jos. Hénault & Cie.).—C. Desmarreau, Montreal, curator, March 10.  
 Re Joseph Gélinas.—P. Héroux, St. Sévère, curator, March 13.  
 Re J. H. Méthot.—W. C. Hutcheson, Montreal, curator, March 13.  
 Re Ambrose Moussette.—John Fulton, Montreal, curator, March 13.  
 Re Cyrille Quintal, butcher, Montreal.—N. P. Martin, Montreal, curator, March 8.  
 Re Nap. Théroux.—C. Desmarreau, Montreal, curator, March 4

#### Dividends.

- Re F. Arpin & Co.—First and final dividend, payable April 2, C. Desmarreau, Montreal, curator.  
 Re Ferdinand Bégin, Lévis.—Dividend, payable April 1, Chs. J. Labrie, Lauzon, curator.  
 Re N. Bourgeois & Co.—First dividend, payable April 4, C. Desmarreau, Montreal, curator.  
 Re Joseph Donati, jeweller.—Second and final dividend, payable April 2, N. Matte, Quebec, curator.  
 Re John Henry Hodges.—First dividend, payable April 1, W. A. Caldwell, Montreal, curator.  
 Re J. B. Labelle, grocer, Montreal.—First and final dividend, payable April 3, C. Desmarreau, Montreal, curator.

- Re Robert Neill, Sheffington.—First dividend, payable April 1, A. W. Stevenson, Montreal, curator.  
 Re J. A. Rolland & Co.—First and final dividend, payable April 3, C. Desmarreau, Montreal, curator.  
 Re Hormidas St. Germain.—First and final dividend, payable April 2, C. Desmarreau, Montreal, curator.

#### Separation as to Property.

- Marie Eugénie Boucher vs. Joseph Oscar Héту, trader, Berthier, March 10.  
 Emma Côté vs. Zoël Turcotte, trader, St. Thomas de Pierreville, March 1.  
 Marie C. Dallaire vs. Nazaire Provost, undertaker, Sorel, March 10.  
 Wilhelmine Lucas vs. François Xavier Audett carriage-maker, Sherbrooke, March 7.  
 Marie Louise Niverville vs. Cyrille Collin, Montreal, Feb. 24.  
 Salome Provencher vs. Isaac Dubord, trader, Victoriaville, March 10.

#### Cadastre.

Notice is given of deposit of plans of sub-divisions 1772a and 1772b, and 1475a and 1475b, Jacques Cartier ward, City of Quebec.

### GENERAL NOTES.

SPARKLING WINES.—It is common knowledge that aerated waters, such as soda-water and lemonade, are manufactured by injection of carbonic acid gas; but, until Mr. Hermann Graeger was summoned to the Mansion House, we had no idea that any sparkling wine was made in the same way. Certainly the 2s. 6d. a dozen import duty, levied by the chancellor of the exchequer on champagne and other sparkling wines, has always appeared to us at least an onerous and vexatious impost; but the genius of the tradesman is great, and for contriving to evade this duty without committing any breach of law we are inclined to applaud Mr. Graeger. His method of so doing is extremely ingenious. He gets still wine imported from Epernay, the Moselle district, the Rhine district, and Burgundy, and metamorphoses it at his place at Clapton into sparkling wine by the above simple process. In doing so he has shown himself very clever, and has committed no breach of the law. Unfortunately, for *humanum est errare*, one part of his method has erred. He affixed to the bottles, in which he sold this sparkling champagne, hock and Burgundy, labels, which the court held indicated that the wine was imported sparkling, so that an offense was committed against the Merchandise Marks Act, for which Mr. Alderman Davies fined Mr. Graeger £20. Mr. Goldberg, solicitor, who appeared for Mr. Graeger, promised that every objectionable label should be destroyed, and that in future the labels should bear such indications as would show that the wine was made sparkling in this country. We do not doubt that Mr. Goldberg's promise will be duly observed, but we may be permitted to doubt the allegation made by him that "the wine was not only as good as the other, but better." Possibly it is to his taste. *Esperito credite*. However that may be, it is the duty of our magistrates to see that the Merchandise Marks Act is most stringently enforced, and we are pleased that Mr. Alderman Davies is also of that opinion.—*London Law Journal*.