

out of the window—I use a vague word on purpose—and in her fall broke her leg. Now that might have been caused by an act which was done accidentally or deliberately, in which case the prisoner would not have been guilty. It appears from the case however that the prisoner had threatened his wife more than once, and that on this occasion he came home drunk, and used words which amounted to a threat against her life, saying, 'I'll make you so that you can't go to bed;' that she, rushing to the window, got half out of the window, when she was restrained by her daughter. The prisoner threatened the daughter, who let go, and her mother fell. It is suggested to me by my learned brother, that supposing the prisoner had struck his daughter's arm without hurting her, but sufficiently to cause her to let go, and she had let her mother fall, could anyone doubt but that that would be the same thing as if he had pushed her out himself? If a man creates in another man's mind an immediate sense of danger which causes such person to try to escape, and in so doing he injures himself, the person who creates such a state of mind is responsible for the injuries which result. I think that in this case there was abundant evidence that there was a sense of immediate danger in the mind of the woman, caused by the acts of the prisoner, and that her injuries resulted from what that sense of danger caused her to do." The other judges concurred.

INSOLVENT NOTICES, ETC.

Quebec Official Gazette, March 8.

Judicial Abandonments.

Narcisse Edouard Morissette, dry goods dealer, Three Rivers, March 3.

Curators appointed.

Re Théop. Alain.—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, March 4.

Re Charles Beaulieu, tailor, Quebec. —H. A. Bedard, Quebec, curator, March 1.

Re Zephirin Champoux, St. Sylvère, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, March 1.

Re Marie Louise Picault (J. N. T. Lafricain & Co.), St. Ambroise de Kildare.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, Feb. 27.

Re Ephrem Durocher et al.—A. F. Gervais, St. John's, curator, Feb. 26.

Re John Griffith, Carmel.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, March 5.

Re Joseph Lavallée, founder, St. Charles.—J. Morin, St. Hyacinthe, curator, March 3.

Dividends.

Re Fraserville boot and shoe Co.—Dividend, payable March 13, F. Gourdeau, Quebec, liquidator.

Re John Burns, Montreal.—First dividend, payable March 25, W. A. Caldwell, Montreal, curator.

Re J. A. Coté, St. Wenceslas.—Dividend, payable March 26, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator.

Re William M. Fuller, Montreal.—First and final dividend, payable March 25, W. A. Caldwell, Montreal, curator.

Re Edmond Labelle, Montreal.—First and final dividend, payable March 25, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator.

Re M. Lepage, St. Tite.—First and final dividend, payable March 25, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator.

Re J. O. Massicotte.—First and final dividend, payable March 25, C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator.

Re George White McKee, Coaticook.—First and final dividend, payable March 25, W. A. Caldwell, Montreal, curator.

Re Morency & frère.—Second and final dividend, payable March 24, G. O. Taschereau, St. Joseph Beauce, curator.

Re J. P. Morin, Stanhope.—Dividend, payable March 26, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator.

Separation as to property.

Elise Boisvert vs. Joseph Edouard Martin, saddler, Louiseville, Feb. 20.

GENERAL NOTES.

LEGACY.—The late Mr. Justice Manisty left his clerk a legacy of £2,500.

TRADE MARK.—A trader cannot, in the absence of fraud, be restrained from adopting as his trade or business name his own name if trading alone, or his own in combination with those of his partners, merely because the name so adopted may, by its similarity with that of another, make it probable that inconvenience may arise, and the goods of one trader be bought by mistake for those of the other.—(*Thomas Turton & Sons v. John Turton & Sons*, 58 Law J. Rep. Chanc. 677).

BACK HAND.—An English journal says:—"Lord Justice Cotton and his two colleagues in Court of Appeal No. 2 experienced grievous annoyance from the peculiar handwriting of a document placed before them for perusal on Monday last. The peculiarity consisted in the fact that the words and letters were written sloping backward to the left instead of being sloped in the usual manner. Without seeing a document so written, it is hard to realize its unpleasant effect on the eye. The strictures of the learned judges on this unusual calligraphy almost amounted to a threat of pains and penalties on the offender."