

Archibald McNair, trader, New Richmond, May 5.
Charles Tellier, Joliette, May 14.

Curators appointed.

Re Polycarpe Bernard, trader, Deschambault.—H. A. Bedard, Quebec, curator, May 10.

Re Cyprien & Edouard Dessaint dit St. Pierre, Ste. Hélène.—P. Dessaint, Ste. Hélène de Kamouraska, May 7.

Re Henry Thomas Farley, Drummondville.—J. McD. Hains, Montreal, curator, May 16.

Re Arsène Gaudreault, trader, Les Eboulements.—H. A. Bedard, Quebec, curator, May 10.

Re Philippe H. Gélinas, Shawinigan.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, May 13.

Re Charles Guimond, trader, Cap St. Ignace.—H. A. Bedard, Quebec, curator, May 4.

Re David Hambleton, bobbin manufacturer, Lachute.—W. J. Simpson, Lachute, curator, May 13.

Re H. Prud'homme, Brompton Falls.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, May 13.

Re V. Roberge, Warwick.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, May 15.

Re Gédéon Rousseau, Shawinigan.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, May 13.

Re Lucy A. Spooner.—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, May 15.

Dividends.

Re P. Rival dit Bellerose, St. Alexis.—Dividend, payable May 5, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator.

Re Elie Brodeur.—First and final dividend, payable May 29, Bilodeau & Renaud, Montreal, joint curator.

Re Henri Dussureault, St. Narcisse.—Dividend, payable June 5, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator.

Re Louis Doyon, St. Francois.—Dividend, payable June 5, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator.

Re Joachim Laberge.—First and final dividend, payable June 5, Gauthier & Parent, joint curator.

Re The Montreal Moulding and Mirror Manufacturing Co.—First dividend (20c.), payable May 23, A. F. Riddell, Montreal, liquidator.

Re Toussaint & Co., grocers, Quebec.—First and final dividend, payable June 4, H. A. Bedard, Quebec, curator.

Re Laurent Toutant, Gentilly.—Dividend, payable June 5, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator.

Separation as to Property.

Justine *alias* Odile Archambault vs. Pierre Pelletier, builder, Montreal, May 16.

Sarah Ann McCarthy vs. William G. Dumas, painter, Joliette, May 14.

GENERAL NOTES.

HABEAS CORPUS.—In Perry county, Ohio, a horse was once restored to its rightful owner under a writ of *habeas corpus* issued by a justice of the peace. A's horse broke into B's pasture, whereupon B. put it into his stable, locked the door and refused to give it up. A. secured the services of the celebrated Shep Tinker as his legal adviser. Shep knew that his client could not give the necessary bail in an action by re-

plevin, so he decided to bring a different sort of an action. With this intent he went before a justice of the peace in old Straitsville, and took out a writ of *habeas corpus* and literally brought the horse into court. Lawyer Saunders, a most brilliant practitioner at the Logan bar, and long the prosecuting attorney of Hocking county, was called on the other side. He didn't know the nature of the case until the constable made his return upon the writ. "Why," exclaimed Mr. Saunders, with a look of blank astonishment, "this court can't issue such a writ, and no court could issue one for a horse!" Shep was more than equal to the emergency. "Your honor," he said, "a wise and just court can do anything that is laid down in the books. The writ of *habeas corpus* has been recognized as sacred for centuries. To say that this court can't issue it is to say that it is ignorant of Magna Charta." "But this court kin issue it," interposed the justice, "and it has issued it already." Mr. Saunders saw his mistake and apologized to the court for having doubted its ability to do anything it chose. It is needless to say that the horse was restored to its owner.—*Cincinnati Enquirer.*

A CODE OF EVIDENCE.—The commissioners appointed by the State of New York to prepare a code of evidence have just completed their final report and submitted it to the Legislature in the form of a statute. The commissioners were Mr. David Dudley Field, Judge William Rumsey and Judge Follett. The high legal standing of the commissioners is a guaranty that their labor has been well done, and will be satisfactory to the Legislature and the bar. The commissioners were appointed in 1837, under authority of the general laws of that year. They prepared a preliminary draft of the Code, copies of which were placed in the hands of all the lawyers and judges of the State for examination and criticism. A large number of valuable suggestions were received from them, many of which were engrafted in this Code. The commissioners say: "The Code herewith submitted is intended for practical use in the field of actual litigation. While it has been constructed in the light of the accepted logical theory of the law of evidence, it contains nothing abstruse or speculative. It is far from the intention of its authors to please a curious few by new or original views, or to impose on lawyers a special theory or novelty." It is evidently the intention of the authors of this proposed Code to embody the best portion of the statutory law of the State, with such interpretations as have been put upon it by the appellate courts, to reconcile conflicting decisions, and to prepare, as nearly as human foresight can provide, a rule or guide to every problem of evidence which may arise in actual litigation. Simplicity and lucidity are two of the most important ingredients of every law, and the commissioners have apparently attained these attributes in every section of their Code. Should New York adopt this Code, it will have taken a long stride forward in the march of legal science and set an example which the other States will doubtless not be slow to follow. The notes of the commissioners to the Code prove that they have made careful and full research for precedents, and the notes form a valuable brief to the Code.—*Central Law Journal.*