

understood to mean a person who preyed on society and spent most of his time in prison. It was contended that the libel was as gross as it was possible for a libel to be. Counsel for the defence stigmatised the action as a most impudent one. He admitted, however, that there had been a technical libel in describing the man as a convicted felon instead of a misdemeanant, and for that one shilling had been paid into Court. Undoubtedly the man might have been tried on an indictment for felony, but that of misdemeanour was chosen in order that the jury might not be kept from home for months.

The judge, in summing up, said, as to the difference between the words 'felony' and 'misdemeanour,' he was sure most of the jury would find it difficult, as laymen, to give any sound reason why an offence as wicked and bad for the interest of the state as perjury should be classed with misdemeanours and not with felonies. It would, therefore, be no injury to a man who had been convicted of perjury to describe his offence as a felony. As to the word 'gaol-bird,' he could not conceive that it was meant to allege that the plaintiff had been frequently in gaol. If the facts were true in the paragraph all the rest that was complained of was comment.

A verdict was given for the defendants.

INSOLVENT NOTICES. ETC.

Quebec Official Gazette, Dec. 5.

Judicial Abandonments.

Dame Zénaide Brisson, public trader, doing business under the name of D. Desjardins & Co., Montreal, Nov. 28.

Arcadius Gosselin, hotel-keeper, Montreal, Nov. 20.
Alfred Rousseau, trader, Lyster Station, Nov. 26.

Curators appointed.

Re L. E. Anctil.—J. P. Royer and R. R. Burrage, Sherbrooke, joint curator, Dec. 3.

Re John C. Bédard.—J. P. Royer and R. R. Burrage, Sherbrooke, joint curator, Nov. 26.

Re David F. Bédard.—J. P. Royer and R. R. Burrage, Sherbrooke, joint curator, Nov. 26.

Re Léopold Clapin, Sherbrooke.—Millier & Griffith, Sherbrooke, joint curator, Nov. 26.

Re A. S. Daoust.—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, Nov. 26.

Re Edouard Dupuis.—E. Donahue, Farnham, curator, Nov. 20.

Re Frank Farley, trader, Bulstrode.—A. Quesnel, Arthabaskaville, curator, Nov. 30.

Re Jules Giroux & Cie.—J. M. Marcotte, Montreal, curator, Dec. 1.

Re Arcadius Gosselin.—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, Nov. 28.

Re Hansen & Schwartz, Quebec.—D. Ratray, Quebec, curator, Dec. 2.

Re Martin, Fils & Cie., Rimouski.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, Dec. 1.

Re N. E. Morrissette.—F. Valentine, Three Rivers, curator, Dec. 2.

Re Michel and Conrad Ringuet.—J. A. Talbot, Rimouski, curator, Nov. 24.

Re S. Robitaille.—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, Nov. 19.

Re François Xavier St. Pierre.—A. Quesnel, Arthabaskaville, curator, Nov. 30.

Dividends.

Re Aug. Bourdeau, Montreal.—First and final dividend, payable Dec. 23, C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator.

Re François Xavier Comptois, Coaticook.—First and final dividend on proceeds of real estate, payable Dec. 28, Millier & Griffith, Sherbrooke, joint curator.

Re Dame Zélie Carignan.—Dividend, payable Dec. 21, F. Valentine, Three Rivers, curator.

Re Dame Alice Wesly (A. Rae).—Second and final dividend, payable Dec. 21, H. T. Cholette, Montreal, curator.

Re L. W. Gauvin, Notre Dame de Stanbridge.—First and final dividend, payable Dec. 29, E. W. Morgan, Bedford, curator.

Re A. L. Laeroix, Montebello.—First and final dividend, payable Dec. 24, C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator.

Re F. E. Lamallice & Co.—First and final dividend, payable Dec. 16, Bilodeau & Renaud, Montreal, joint curator.

Re G. Lewis & Co., Montreal.—First and final dividend, payable Dec. 22, A. W. Stevenson, Montreal, curator.

Re Thomas Mercier.—Dividend, payable Dec. 21, F. Valentine, Three Rivers, curator.

Re John Shaver, marble-cutter, Cote des Neiges.—First dividend, payable Dec. 22, C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator.

Separation as to property.

Aimée Vanier vs. Gonzague Dubuc, laborer, Montreal, Nov. 25.

GENERAL NOTES.

A CENSOR OF THE BENCH.—A young barrister, and a member of the Kent Sessions, rebuked the chairman for telling the jury they had acquitted a man of bad character. *Truth*, and similar publications are in ecstasies. To flout a magistrate is in their eyes an effort of genius. What was the *locus standi* of the youthful unemployed? None. He was not acting as *amicus curiæ*; he was a stranger to the proceedings. And if barristers, sitting in the back rows of the courts with nothing to do, are to give audible expression to their opinion of the sayings and doings of the judge, the courts would soon become insufferable. Some day or other we should have Briefless lecturing the Court of Appeal and being slain by the Master of the Rolls. The idea is absurd.—*Law Times (London).*