

Re A. M. Bullock & Son, Coaticook.—First dividend, payable Aug. 29, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint-curator.

Re J. B. S. Day.—First dividend, payable Aug. 29, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint-curator.

Re Edith M. Matthews.—First and final dividend, payable Aug. 27, J. L. Ross, Montreal, curator.

Re H. Gobeille, Drummondville.—First dividend, payable Aug. 29, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint-curator.

Re P. A. Morin, Quebec.—First dividend, payable Aug. 29, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint-curator.

Re Edmond Poulin.—First and final dividend, payable Aug. 21, A. Lemieux, Levis, curator.

Re H. Prudhomme, Brompton Falls.—First and final dividend, payable Aug. 29, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint-curator.

Re J. & H. Taylor.—First dividend, payable Aug. 20, W. A. Caldwell, Montreal, curator.

Re N. Trahan, Nicolet.—First and final dividend, payable Aug. 29, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint-curator.

Separation as to Property.

Angèle Boulé dit Dalphand vs. Magloire Masse, tanner, Joliette, July 29.

Marie Louise Bouthillier vs. Cyrille Lafortune, Montreal, Aug. 8.

Marie Julie Gougeon vs. Théophile R. Prudhomme, gardener, Coteau St. Pierre, Aug. 7.

Proclamation.

Disallowance of 52 Vict. ch. 30 (Q.) proclaimed by Lieutenant-Governor.

GENERAL NOTES.

THE REREDOS CASE.—In the St. Paul's reredos case the four inhabitants of the diocese of London have succeeded in their application for a *mandamus* commanding the bishop of London to take proceedings under the Public Worship Regulation Act. As Mr. Justice Manisty said, the question before the court was not the legality or illegality of the reredos, but simply whether the Public Worship Regulation Act conferred on the bishops power to practically decide that ornaments in a church are legal by a refusal to take proceedings in respect of them. The bishop of London based his refusal to take proceedings on the case as to the reredos in Exeter Cathedral. *Phillipotts v. Boyd*, 32 L. T. Rep. (N. S.) 73; L. R., 6 P. C. 435. The reredos, as is well known, is a sculptured work in high relief, the centre of which represents the Ascension. Lord Hatherly, in delivering the judgment of the Privy Council, said: "It is not suggested that any superstitious reverence has been or is likely to be paid to any figures forming part of the reredos, and their lordships are unable to discover anything which distinguishes this representation from the numerous sculptural and painted representations and portions of sacred history to be found in many of our cathedrals and parish churches, and which have been proved by long experience to be capable of remaining there without giving occasion to any idolatrous or superstitious practices." The St. Paul's reredos contains a sculptured representation of the Crucifixion and of

the Virgin and Child. Of course the decision in the Exeter case does not necessarily imply, as the bishop of London seems to have assumed, the legality of the figures in the St. Paul's reredos. It was not denied that under the Public Worship Regulation Act some discretion is vested in the bishops also. Mr. Baron Pollock pointed out in his judgment that if the bishop of London did not exceed the discretion so conferred on him, a writ of *mandamus* could not lie against him, for "a discretion which is capable of review is not known to the law."—*Law Times (London)*.

NO RECIPROcity.—At the Court of Bankruptcy, Dublin, in the matter of an arrangement, a gentleman stated that he was an English solicitor, representing a large number of English creditors, and desired to speak on behalf of his clients, but an Irish solicitor objected, on behalf of the Irish profession, to an English solicitor being heard. The judge stated that he could not hear an English solicitor, who, however, protested that as a solicitor he had a proxy and represented his clients, and this was a meeting of creditors which he had come to attend, and he should be heard. The judge replied that he would allow him to vote, but could not listen to him as a solicitor. An Irish solicitor would not be heard in any English Court. Of course, any creditor attending in person could be heard.

PHILISTINISM AND THE SPREAD EAGLE.—Judge Seymour D. Thompson has written a paper in the *Green Bag* entitled 'Putting New Wine into Old Bottles,' describing the state of England three hundred years ago, which thus concludes: 'In fact, our ancestors of those days were barbarians, not as far advanced as the Bulgarians of our own time. When, therefore, we have a new question of law to study, why should we go back and try to find what the opinion of Lord Coke, whose infamous prosecution of Sir Walter Raleigh can never be forgotten, was on the question? Why should we try to find what Sir Francis Bacon, who sold justice, thought about it? Why, in short, should we not stop rummaging the old books, and do a little thinking for ourselves? Our ancestors in their day did their parts as well as they could, with the light they had and amid such surroundings as they had. But as compared with us, they were barbarians compared with the civilized man. In intellectual stature they were children compared with the moderns.' To this the *Harvard Law Review* replies: 'If, as Judge Thompson tells us, our ancestors of the Elizabethan period were, compared with us, "barbarians compared with the civilized man," it would certainly be unadvisable to spend too much time over their productions. But Judge Thompson's argument would be stronger if he would designate a few of the "moderns" compared with whom Lord Coke and Sir Francis Bacon were "children" in intellectual stature.' The answer comes from the *Albany Law Journal*: 'There are at least four greater lawyers on the present bench of the Federal Supreme Court. Rapallo was a greater lawyer. He is not worthy of mention in the same day with Mansfield, or Kent, or Story, or Marshall, or Comstock, or Nicholas Hill, or Cowen, either as an intellectual power or as a repository of legal learning. Parsons knew more law; so did Wharton; so does Bishop.'—*Law Journal (London)*.