

none. Sometimes, of course, the period of seven years is a sufficiently close date for the purposes of the succession to the dead man. If his heir was the same person at the beginning of the seven years as at the end, he must have been his heir when he died, because the law presumes that he died during that period. If his wife was alive during the whole of the seven years she would have her half share, because, whenever he died, as it is presumed he did, she must have been his widow, although, if no one of the next-of-kin occupied that potential position during the period, the other half would go to the Crown.

The law, in fact, was fully settled in the case of *Doe v. Nepean*, 7 Law J. Rep. Exch. 335, by the decision of the Exchequer Chamber. It disposes by anticipation of the view of Vice-Chancellor Malins by saying: "Of all the points of time the last day is the most improbable," which is no doubt true. If he considers a man dead after a silence of seven years, it is because of an experience that a man does communicate with his friends once in seven years, and the nearer the seven years are to elapsing, the more likely is it that he would have communicated if he were not already dead. Lord Justice James's proposition that "if anything is to be presumed it would be that the death took place on the first day of the seven years" was evidently intended to clinch the proposition that the last day is the least probable, but it is more epigrammatic than true, because it cannot even be said that the first day is the most probable. All that can be said is that the probabilities are in favor of the date being in the course of the first year, but even that would depend on the habits of the deceased in writing home. The law, however, does not encourage speculations of this kind. Other systems of law, desiring to be universal, invent ingenious tests to decide the survivorship of commorientes and the like, but the English law does not pretend not to have gaps, and is content in many cases, when there is no reasonable evidence or presumption one way or the other, to leave legal rights as they stand.—*Law Journal (London)*.

INSOLVENT NOTICES, ETC.

Quebec Official Gazette, Nov. 5.
Curators Appointed.

Re Alphonse Lafontaine, hotel keeper, Montreal.—
J. A. Porlier, Montreal, curator, Oct. 27.
Re Damase Moineau, trader, Montreal.—W. A. Caldwell, Montreal, curator, Oct. 27.

Dividends.

Re Dery & La Rue, St. Charles.—First and final dividend, payable Nov. 19, H. A. Bedard, Quebec curator.

Re Irving & Sutherland, Montreal.—First and final dividend, payable Nov. 23, A. W. Stevens, Montreal, curator.

Re Ferdinand Jobin.—First and final dividend, payable Nov. 26, Ed. Begin, Quebec, curator.

Re Pinkerton & Turner, Montreal.—Second and final dividend, payable Nov. 23, A. W. Stevenson, Montreal, curator.

Re Sharp & McKinnon, Montreal.—Second and final dividend, D. L. McDougall and David Seath, Montreal, joint curators.

Re Chas. A. St. Pierre.—First and final dividend, payable Nov. 26, Ed. Begin, Quebec, curator.

Quebec Official Gazette, Nov. 12.
Judicial Abandonments.

Eugène Pommier, St. Chrysostome, Nov. 3.

Curators appointed.

Re Audet & Robitaille.—W. H. Brown, Quebec, curator, Nov. 2.

Re F. J. Cross.—James Alexander, Richmond, curator, Nov. 8.

Re Marie Barlow, widow of F. Beauchemin, Becancour.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curators, Nov. 2.

Dividends.

Re Louis Collin & Frères, dry goods, Quebec.—First dividend, payable Nov. 25, H. A. Bedard, Quebec, curator.

Re A. T. Constantin & Co., dry goods, Quebec.—Third dividend, payable Nov. 23, H. A. Bedard, Quebec, curator.

Re S. Desormeau, Buckingham.—First and final dividend, payable Nov. 25, John McD. Hains, curator.

Re McDougall, Loxie & Co.—First dividend, payable Nov. 29, A. F. Riddell, Montreal, curator.

Re McKenzie & Co., Buckingham.—First and final dividend, payable Nov. 17, J. McD. Hains, Montreal, curator.

Re James Murray & Co.—First and final dividend, payable Nov. 17, J. McD. Hains, Montreal, curator.

Re L. F. Rhéume.—First dividend, payable Nov. 30, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator.

Re Jacques Villeneuve.—First and final dividend, payable Dec. 1, C. Desmarreau, Montreal, curator.

Separation as to property.

Elizabeth Chrétien vs. Joseph Rivais, farmer, St. Norbert, Oct. 31.

Marie Louise Gagné vs. Louis Philippe Pleau, merchant, Three Rivers, Sept. 21.

Catherine Smith vs. James Farrell, clerk, Montreal, Sept. 17.

Appointment.

Edwin Ruthven Johnson, advocate, to be registrar of Sherbrooke vice Daniel Thomas, Nov. 9.