

INSOLVENT NOTICES, ETC.

Quebec Official Gazette, Sept. 13.
Judicial Abandonments.

Napoléon Rousseau, baker, Quebec, Sept. 10.

Curators appointed.

Re Henrietta Mousseau, milliner, Montreal.—Bilodeau & Renaud, Montreal, joint curator, Sept. 10.

Re J. H. Dubois, Drummondville.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, Sept. 6.

Re Charles Lemire, l'Assomption.—Bilodeau & Renaud, Montreal, joint curator, Sept. 10.

Re S. Jacques Ornstein, doing business under name of S. Jacques, Montreal.—J. McD. Hains, Montreal, curator, Sept. 6.

Re Louis Robert.—Bilodeau & Renaud, Montreal, joint curator, Sept. 9.

Dividends.

Re Anselme Asselin, St. Joseph d'Alma.—Second and final dividend, payable Sept. 22. D. Arcand, Quebec, curator.

Re E. Beaulieu et al.—First and final dividend, payable Oct. 1, Millier & Griffith, Sherbrooke, joint curator.

Re Bernard Sauvage, St. John's.—Dividend, payable Sept. 25, A. L. Kent, Montreal, curator.

Re Stanislas Gendron.—First and final dividend, payable Oct. 1, Millier & Griffith, Sherbrooke, joint curator.

Re F. A. Lallemand. Dividend, payable Sept. 30, A. W. Stevenson, Montreal, curator.

Re F. X. Lepage, dry goods, Quebec.—Second and final dividend, payable Sept. 29, H. A. Bedard, Quebec, curator.

Re W. E. Potter, Montreal.—Dividend, payable Sept. 25, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator.

Re Leandre Proulx.—First and final dividend, payable Oct. 1, Millier & Griffith, Sherbrooke, joint curator.

Re Anthime Robert et al.—First and final dividend, payable Oct. 2, F. Fafard, Upton, curator.

Re "The Hibbard Elec. Mfg. and Supply Co.," Montreal.—First dividend, payable, Sept. 30, A. W. Stevenson, Montreal, liquidator.

Separation as to Property.

Domitilde Matte vs. Eusébe Leclair, laborer, Montreal, Sept. 8.

GENERAL NOTES.

HEADS NOT TO BE MIXED.—Mr. Charles Kemble on entering Brussels found that there was preparation making for an execution that occupied a good deal of attention. Three men were to be executed; but one man was remarkable for having committed almost twenty assassinations—having broken prison, etc., and for being a person of remarkable talent. Mr. Kemble determined to witness the spectacle. Now it is to be remembered that at Brussels they do not (or did not) execute any criminals after a certain hour in the day; and in order not to run too near this hour, the culprits are taken to the block some considerable time beforehand. The two undistinguished rogues were melan-

choly enough; but the notorious one was anything but chap-fallen. He was well dressed, had a good carriage, hummed a popular air, and in all other things exhibited the extreme of self-possession. On his way to the guillotine (or when he arrived there) he said, 'Now, don't mix my head with those fellows'; keep it apart. I would not for the world have it supposed that I had such a rascally look as either of these vagabonds.'

IN THE STOCKS.—Lord Camden, when a barrister, had himself fastened in the stocks on top of a hill, in order to gratify his curiosity on the subject. Being left there by the absent minded friend who had locked him in, he found it impossible to procure his liberation for the greater part of the day. On his entreating a chance passer to release him, the man shook his head and passed on, remarking that of course he was not there for nothing.

WEBSTER.—When Daniel Webster, in attacking the legal proposition of an opponent at the bar, was reminded that he was assailing a dictum of Lord Camden, he turned to the Court, and after paying a tribute to Camden's greatness as a jurist, simply added, 'But may it please your Honor, I differ from Lord Camden.'

PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL-PLAYERS.—Mr. Everitt, Q.C., had a hard task on Saturday last to try and persuade the Court of Appeal, consisting of Lord Esher and Lord Justice Lindley, to say that Mr. Justice North's refusal to grant an injunction in *Radford v. Campbell*, the football case, was wrong. The plaintiffs, two officers of a football club, claimed an injunction against Campbell, a professional football-player, to restrain him from playing for any other club than their own, in breach of his agreement to play for them, and also to restrain a rival club from employing him. The Court sat beyond the usual hour for rising, and listened with good humoured impatience to the arguments on behalf of the appellants. Lord Esher asked Mr. Everitt what use an injunction would be to his clients if they got it. They would only secure a sulky player who would, his lordship thought, very probably kick their football the wrong way. 'But,' said Mr. Everitt, 'it is a very important question of principle.' 'Principle,' said Lord Esher; 'do you mean to tell me that professional football-players have any principle? I think the game would be much better without them.' The Court agreed with Mr. Justice North that it would be a great advance upon the older decisions to grant an injunction in such a case, and dismissed the appeal.—*Law Journal* (London).

NOT SO EASY.—A heavy appeal case was being argued in the Second Division of the Court of Session by a juvenile but very self-possessed advocate. 'The case,' said this youthful Hortensius, 'turns to a large extent upon the voluminous correspondence which I am about to read to your lordships.' Lord Young, who masters documentary evidence as rapidly as Mr. Justice Kay, interrupted him: 'If you refer to me to the pages of the record, I can soon pick up the relevant parts of the letters for myself.' 'Oh no, my lord,' retorted the young lawyer, 'it is not nearly so easy as all that!' Everybody enjoyed the joke, but no one laughed at it more heartily than Lord Young.