

## INSOLVENT NOTICES, ETC.

Quebec Official Gazette, Dec. 28.

## Judicial Abandonments.

James G. Armstrong, doing business under the name of "The Armstrong Photographic Co.," Montreal, Dec. 19.

Pierre Blais, trader, Ste. Flore, Co. of Champlain, Dec. 24.

Didace Bonin, contractor, parish of St. Antoine, Dec. 20.

Aldéma Bourbonnais, tanner, parish of Ste. Marthe, Dec. 12.

J. Emile Caron, dry goods merchant, Quebec, Dec. 23.

Onésime Cartier, jr. grocer, Montreal, Dec. 24.

P. C. d'Auteuil & Co., dry goods merchants, Quebec, Dec. 21.

Eluire Duperré, doing business as E. D. Marceau, l'Isle Verte, Dec. 19.

James Stewart Kennedy, trader, Knowlton, Dec. 20.

Napoléon McCreedy, trader, St. Romuald, Dec. 24.

Antoine Trahan, mill-owner and trader, township of Weedon, Dec. 24.

## Curators Appointed.

Re Clovis Arcand, wheelwright, Portneuf.—H. A. Bedard, Quebec, curator, Dec. 23.

Re Samuel S. Armstrong, trader, Cranbourne.—H. A. Bedard, Quebec, curator, Dec. 21.

Re A. S. de Carufel, Maskinongé.—Bilodeau & Renaud, Montreal, joint curator, Dec. 21.

Re Emery Faneuf, St. Hugues.—J. Morin, St. Hyacinthe, curator, Dec. 21.

Re L. L. Gailloux, Three Rivers.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, Dec. 18.

Re Hormisdas Gendron, trader, St. Dominique.—J. O. Dion, St. Hyacinthe, curator, Dec. 21.

Re Maxime Guérin, St. Philippe.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, Dec. 14.

Re Fabien L. Guertin.—John Fulton, Montreal, curator, Dec. 26.

Re Valois, Lusignan & Co.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, Dec. 21.

Re H. Macfarlane & Son, contractors, Toronto, and Carleton, P.Q.—A. F. Riddell and Thomas Watson, Montreal, joint curator, Dec. 23.

Re Alex. Maheu, St. Chrysostôme.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, Dec. 23.

Re John C. Moore.—C. S. Millette, Richmond, curator, Dec. 14.

Re Mullarky & Co., boot and shoe manufacturers, Montreal.—W. A. Caldwell, Montreal, curator, Dec. 19.

Re Robert Neill, Sheffington.—A. W. Stevenson, Montreal, curator, Dec. 21.

Re George St. Jorre & Co., grocers, Quebec.—H. A. Bedard, Quebec, curator, Dec. 23.

## Dividends.

Re Hormisdas Bachand, St. Liboire.—First and final dividend, payable Jan. 14, J. Morin, St. Hyacinthe, curator.

Re J. W. Barrette.—First and final dividend, payable Jan. 15, C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator.

Re Frank and Thomas Décost, pump manufacturers.—First and final dividend, payable Jan. 13, R. S. Joron, Salabery de Valleyfield, curator.

Re J. A. Leguerrier, Ste. Thérèse.—First dividend, payable Jan. 5, Bilodeau & Renaud, Montreal, joint curator.

Re Sénécal & Frère.—First and final dividend, payable Jan. 14, C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator.

## Separation as to Property.

Emilie Chalifoux vs. François Xavier Trudeau, tailor, Montreal, Dec. 23.

Azilda Côté vs. Jean Baptiste Dubreuil, trader and mill-owner, parish of St. Dominique, Dec. 26.

Evelina Picard vs. Louis Bigras, Montreal, Oct. 31.

Angelina Sabourin vs. Salomon Adams, trader, Montreal, Dec. 23.

## GENERAL NOTES.

THE BURIAL ACT AND A 'FELO DE SE.'—In a village near Manchester recently, a person shot a bank manager and then, in order to escape capture, shot himself. Of course an inquest was held, and the jury returned a verdict of *felo de se*. Such a suicide would in former days have been buried in a very unceremonious manner. Since the Burials Act, 1880, however, such a case has been provided for by section 12 of that Act. That clause provides that where the ordinary service may not be used, and in any other case at the request of the relative, friend, or legal representative having the charge of or being responsible for the burial of the deceased, it shall be lawful for any minister in holy orders of the Church of England to use at the burial such service consisting of prayers taken from the Book of Common Prayer and of portions of Holy Scripture as may be prescribed or approved by the Ordinary. Such a service has been used in some dioceses, and of course its use is a great solace to the deceased's friends.—*Mr. Utley in London Law Journal*.

PUNISHMENT SUITED TO OCCUPATION.—In the recent English case of *Gardner v. Bygrace*, which was an action of assault and battery brought by a pupil against his school-master for caning him on the hand, Mr. Justice Mathew made a joke which the *Saturday Review* regards as a "shining instance of how the tedium of legal proceedings may be profitably relieved, and the principles of law aptly illustrated by a really ready and witty observation." It was admitted on all hands that assuming caning on the hands to be a proper mode of punishment, the caning in question was a good and lawful one. The plaintiff's counsel, in an argument of a distinctly *à posteriori* character, contended that the lawfulness of caning on the hand depended on the occupation of the boy when out of school, and that the defendant ought to have enquired into the plaintiff's employment. "If he worked with his hands, such a punishment might seriously interfere with his occupation. Punishment might be inflicted elsewhere"—whereupon the court asked, "What if his occupation were sedentary?" It was ultimately decided that caning on the hand, when properly done and for a proper reason, is lawful.—*Harvard Law Review*.