

it is sought to influence, nor by combining to undersell them for the purpose of destroying their competition in order afterward to raise the selling price.

The law exists for the purpose of holding the scale of equal justice between such contentions as these. It is not easy for one looking upon these questions with the interest of a jurist, to believe that the courts will announce any conclusion inconsistent with itself. The ultimate result must necessarily be, so long as jurisprudence stands upon its present foundation, to define a rule upon the question of legality of combination, which will be consistent with itself and equal in its justice to all classes and interests. Whatever may be the current of public discussion, no one familiar with the foundations of the law in this country can expect that intimidation, which has within the present generation been rendered absolutely and forever illegal on the part of masters and employers, will be legalized on the part of employees; nor can it be expected that the law will sanction boycotting for the purpose of raising the price of services, and condemn it for the purpose of raising the price of merchandise, unless some new distinction as yet unrecognized is shown to have a substantial and legal existence. On the other hand, it cannot be expected that combinations of sellers to ruin the business of another seller will be legalized, while combinations of workers to stop the employment of another worker or ruin the business of an employer are not legalized.

However separate and distinct, therefore, these questions may appear to be in a business point of view, and however different may be the interests of the classes concerned in them, the legal questions which they involve are necessarily for the most part, if not wholly, identically the same.

Where the line will be drawn by the courts, as the final result of the full litigation of these questions now going on in various forms, is yet uncertain. The point of professional interest to which we now advert, is the necessary probability that the course of decision will tend to finally settling one simple general rule applicable to all the varied aspects of the subject.—*New York Daily Register.*

INSOLVENT NOTICES, ETC.

Quebec Official Gazette, Oct. 18.

Judicial Abandonments.

- George F. Chisholm, trader, Montreal, Oct. 8.
 Clerk, Terroux & Co., merchants, Montreal, Sept. 29.
 Davies & Morris, contractors and builders, Sherbrooke, Oct. 5.
 James Guest, wine merchant, Montreal, Aug. 14.
 Brodie Jamieson, varnish manufacturer, Montreal, Sept. 24.
 A. Renaud & Cie., merchants, Montreal, Oct. 8.

Curators Appointed.

- Re* Clerk, Terroux & Co.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, Oct. 10.
Re Mary Amelia Stobbs.—John Ryan, Three Rivers, curator, Sept. 22.
Re Jules B. Fortin.—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, Oct. 10.
Re Alphonse Gravel.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, Oct. 10.
Re James Guest.—A. F. Riddell, Montreal, curator, Aug. 11.
Re Jenkins & Co., Stanstead Junction.—S. C. Fatt, Montreal, curator, Oct. 10.
Re Jenkins & Parker, Stanstead Junction.—S. C. Fatt, Montreal, curator, Oct. 10.
Re Legendre & Leblanc, traders, Kamouraska.—H. A. Bedard, Quebec, curator, Oct. 6.
Re Henry J. Lyall, Sorel.—J. B. Hutcheson and W. J. Lunan, Sorel, joint curator, Oct. 5.
Re Edward Murphy.—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, Oct. 10.
Re J. Raseoni & Co., Pierreville.—A. A. Tailon, Sorel, curator, Oct. 5.
Re Thomas Cantwell Struthers, Russelltown.—John Boyd, St. Chrysostôme, curator, Sept. 29.

Dividends.

- Re* Walter W. Beckett *et al.*—First and final dividend, payable Oct. 31, A. McKay and J. J. Griffith, Sherbrooke, joint curator.
Re Onésime Boulianne, Tadoussac.—Third dividend, payable Oct. 24, T. Lawrence, Quebec, curator.
Re J. E. Clement & Co.—First and final dividend, payable Oct. 26, Bilodeau & Renaud, Montreal, curators.
Re Philomène Keroack, (V. Coté & Cie.).—First and final dividend, payable Oct. 28, J. O. Dion, St. Hyacinthe, curator.
Re J. E. Godin.—Dividend, payable Oct. 21, F. Valentine, Three Rivers, curator.
Re Marcotte, Perrault & Co.—First and final dividend, payable Oct. 29, J. McD. Hains, Montreal, curator.
Re Pierre Ricard, Coaticook.—First dividend, payable Oct. 28, C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator.

Separation as to property.

- M. L. Elmina Achin vs. Isidore Trudeau, St. Hyacinthe, March, 1888.
 Marie Céline Cloutier vs. Frs. X. Bilodeau, Montreal, Oct. 11.
 Cécile Dion vs. Louis Napoléon Poulin, travelling agent, Montreal, Oct. 1.