

Félix Arthur Chagnon, grocer, Montreal, Oct. 17.
 Jos. E. Hallé, flour dealer, Quebec, Oct. 21.
 J. Bte. A. Lambert, tobacconist, Quebec, Oct. 25.
 James F. Stuart, trader, Montreal, Oct. 17.

Curators appointed.

Re Thomas Barry, grocer, Quebec.—H. A. Bédard, Quebec, curator, Oct. 24.

Re Andrew Cassils, Montreal, trading under the name of Boucher & Co.—A. M. Cassils, Montreal, curator, Oct. 15.

Re Joseph Caron, Montreal.—T. Gauthier, Montreal, curator, Oct. 17.

Re Thos. Connolly, Montreal.—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, Oct. 22.

Re Olivier Demers, tinsmith.—J. O. Dion, St. Hyacinthe, curator, Oct. 18.

Re Fortin & Morency.—A. Lemieux, Levis, curator, Oct. 11.

Re Jarret Frère—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, Oct. 23.

Re L. Marquette.—A. Lemieux, Lévis, curator, Oct. 11.

Re Francois Perron, shoemaker, parish of Verchères.—F. C. Larose, Verchères, curator, Oct. 18.

Dividends.

Re A. F. Caron & Co., Quebec—First and final dividend, payable Nov. 3, D. Arcand, Quebec, curator.

Re La Compagnie de Chaussures de Fraserville.—First dividend, payable Oct. 29, Z. Gourdeau and W. Gauvin, Quebec, joint liquidator.

Re H. Gagnon & Co., dry goods merchants, Quebec, second dividend, payable Nov. 11, H. A. Bédard, Quebec, curator.

Re Philippe Richard, St. Pierre—Dividend, payable Nov. 11, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator.

Re Amable Rufange.—First and final dividend, payable Nov. 13, C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator.

Separation as to Property.

Regina Chaput vs. Amanda Vadnais, trader, Ibberville, Oct. 16.

Marguerite Daigle vs. Joseph Dégré, Granby, Oct. 22.

Notarial minutes transferred.

Minutes of late Geo. David, N.P. Nicolet, transferred to H. R. Dufresne, N.P. Nicolet.

Minutes of late Ovide Leclair, N.P., Montreal, transferred to J. A. Charet, N.P., Ste. Geneviève.

Appointments

J. G. Colmer, C.M.G., London, Eng., to be commissioner to receive depositions under oath to be used in the courts of the province of Quebec.

Proclamation.

Thursday, Nov. 7, proclaimed as a day of public thanksgiving.

GENERAL NOTES.

ILLICIT TRADING AVOIDING A POLICY.—The policy provided that it should be void in case the situation or circumstances affecting the risk should be so altered as to increase the risk without the company's consent:—Held, that an illegal use of the premises for selling liquor, which continued for fifteen months without

the knowledge or consent of the company, did not merely work a temporary suspension, but avoided the policy (*Kyte v. The Commercial Union Assurance Company*, Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts, May 9, 1889, 18 Insurance L. J. 558).

COURT OF REVIEW IN CRIMINAL CASES.—Mr. Matthews appears to have called in the Lord Chancellor and Mr. Justice Stephen to form a sort of irregular tribunal for the purpose of assisting him in the exercise of the prerogative of the Crown in the *Maybrick case*. In 1878 Sir James Stephen suggested a Court of Review, consisting of the Home Secretary, the judge who tried the case, and an independent judge, which should consider the whole case, with power to call for any fresh evidence, to summon any witness, and, if they pleased, to summon the convict, so that they might form a fresh judgment based on the trial. That suggestion seems to have been followed as closely as was possible in the absence of an Act of Parliament. It was further suggested by Sir James Stephen that the witnesses should be examined on oath and in public, and a formal judgment passed. It is not every Lord Chancellor who, like Lord Halebury, could represent Sir James Stephen's 'independent judge,' and it was not inappropriate that the Keeper of the Queen's Conscience should have a voice in the exercise of the prerogative of mercy.—*Law Journal* (London).

THE CASE OF GENERAL BOULANGER.—On August 13, the High Court of Justice at Paris met at one o'clock. There was a very long discussion, at the close of which M. Bérenger moved the first resolution, the effect of which was to recognise the general competency of the Court to deal with plots, with offences against the State (*attentats and complots*) and with facts connected with these two crimes. This resolution was adopted by 201 votes against seven, there being two abstentions. The Court then proceeded to vote on the various other questions submitted to it. The second resolution was that General Boulanger should be considered guilty of *attentats and complots*. It was carried by 206 votes, with six abstentions. By the third resolution M.M. Dillon and Rochefort are declared guilty of complicity. On the High Court of Justice meeting on August 14 the president put to the vote the question whether the presence of General Boulanger in Paris on the night of December 2, could be charged against him. The Court replied negatively, by 100 votes against ninety-six. With regard to the attempt against the State on July 9 and 11, M.M. Dillon and Rochefort were declared guilty. M. Dillon was found guilty by 124 against nine votes, and M. Rochefort by 183 against eighteen. The Court then considered the charge against General Boulanger alone of the embezzlement of 242,000 francs. The Court declared General Boulanger guilty of the crime of embezzlement by 195 votes against five, there being ten abstentions. The suggestion of extenuating circumstances having been rejected, the president said that in case of default the custom was to inflict the highest penalty, deportation to a fortified place.

SO LONG THAT THE MEMORY OF MAN RUNNETH NOT TO THE CONTRARY.—Mr. Clair James Greco, LL.D., solicitor, of Redhill, Surrey, asks to be permitted to point out what might possibly be overlooked, that on September 3 was accomplished the seventh century of what is still known to lawyers as the term of legal memory. This, as is well known, dates from the commencement of the reign of Richard I.; but, as reigns were then deemed to begin, not at the demise of the last sovereign, but with the coronation of his successor, September 3, 1189, or 700 years ago on September 3 last, when the Crown was placed on the brow of the Lion-hearted Monarch at Westminster, marks the exact epoch from which legal memory is computed.—*Law Journal*, (London.)