

since the B. N. A. Act, passed laws recognizing the right assumed by the provincial legislatures to pass such laws, and the appointments made under them.—An order nisi to quash a conviction made by a police magistrate appointed by the lieutenant-governor of Ontario under 48 V. c. 17 (O.), on the ground that such statute is *ultra vires*, was therefore discharged with costs.—*Regina v. Bush*, Queen's Bench division, in Banc, March 9, 1888.

Company—Winding-up Act, R. S. C., c. 129—Shareholders' and creditors' nominees for liquidators—Interested liquidators—Parties mostly concerned in realizing assets—Liquidators' compensation.

Under ss. 98 and 99 of the Winding-up Act, R. S. C., c. 129, meetings of shareholders and creditors respectively were held. The shareholders' meeting recommended the appointment of C., G., and S. as liquidators; the creditors' meeting recommended C., G., and H. On the application to the Court for the appointment of three liquidators it was not denied that it would be necessary to resort to the double liability of shareholders to satisfy the claims of creditors under R. S. C., c. 120, s. 70.

Held, that the choice of the creditors, they having the chief and immediate concern in realizing the assets, would be adopted by the Court, and their nominees C., G., and H., should be appointed.

As between H. and S., preference should be given to the former, because he was neither a creditor nor a shareholder, while S. was both, and so at a disadvantage; the general rule being that it is desirable that liquidators should be disinterested persons.

S. 23 of the Winding-up Act intends that the remuneration of liquidators is not necessarily to be increased because three are to be paid instead of one. The recompense for service is usually a percentage based on the time occupied, work done, and responsibility imposed, and when fixed, goes to the liquidator, and if more than one, is distributed amongst them.—*In re Central Bank of Canada*, Chancery Division, Boyd, C., Dec. 16, 1887.

INSOLVENT NOTICES, ETC.

Quebec Official Gazette, May 5.

Curators Appointed.

Re Irénée Choquette.—J. O. Dion, St. Hyacinthe, curator, May 2.

Re P. E. Gannon & Co.—A. L. Kent, A. Turcotte and A. Desrosiers, Montreal, joint curator, May 2.

Re Noonan Giblin & Co.—A. W. Stevenson, Montreal, curator, May 2.

Re Arthur Pagé.—Omer Perreault, Joliette, curator, April 10.

Dividends.

Re P. L. Bergeron, Ste. Eulalie.—First dividend, payable May 28, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator.

Re Dame Elizabeth Smith (Mrs. P. Lemieux).—First dividend, payable May 28, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator.

Re Vilbon Savard, Quebec.—First and final dividend, payable May 28, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal joint curator.

Separation as to Property.

Georgiana Lavallée vs. Prosper Duteau de Grandpré, trader, Berthier, May 1.

Marie Léda Jalbert vs. Arsène Ambleau, moulder, Montreal, April 26.

Special Terms.

Special term of Circuit Court for the County of Beauce, to be held at St. Vital de Lambton, from 31st May to 2nd June, inclusively.

Special term of Circuit Court, for district of Chicoutimi, to be held from June 30th to 3rd July, inclusively.

Special term of Superior Court, for district of Chicoutimi, to be held from 4th to 9th July, inclusively.

Special term of Circuit Court, for county of Chicoutimi, to be held at Hébertville, on 11th and 12th July.

GENERAL NOTES.

CONTEMPT OF COURT.—On April 12, before Mr. Justice Kay, an application was made on behalf of a solicitor for his discharge from Holloway prison. The solicitor in question was ordered by the Court to deliver a bill of fees and disbursements incurred to him by a client. This order he had failed to comply with, and on a motion to the Court he was ordered in November last to be committed to prison. He was not arrested till January 27 last, when he was taken to Holloway prison, where he has remained ever since. The bill of costs is still undelivered, but in support of his application for release he filed an affidavit, by which he informed the Court that his practice had been ruined by his imprisonment, that he had a wife and several young children dependent on him for support, and that he was desirous of obeying the order of the Court, but could not do so while he was in prison, as he had not there the proper materials. Mr. Justice Kay ordered the applicant's release on his undertaking, within three weeks, to deliver his bill, and in all other respects to obey the order of the Court.—*Law Journal (London).*