

felt by this Parliament that the remuneration should be more than it is at present. It is well known that the cost of living in this country has almost doubled.

Hon. Mr. Dickey—That answers the £600 argument.

Hon. Mr. Dever—Yes; I believe that when the judges were appointed at £600 they could maintain as good a position in society on that salary as they can to-day on \$5,000. What the reason is I do not know, but I know the general opinion is that judges' salaries are too low, and I hope the Government will see their way to make them more uniform and more satisfactory to public men. I have no particular interest in one judge more than another. I am not fortunate enough to have any relation for whom I speak. I simply speak for the whole judiciary, and I trust that they will be treated in such a manner that they can live comfortably, and not have reason to complain, as many of them do, that their salaries are too small.

[Concluded in next issue.]

INSOLVENT NOTICES, ETC.

Quebec Official Gazette, Oct. 24.

Judicial Abandonments.

Joseph Edouard Alain (J. E. Alain & Co.), furniture dealer, Quebec, Oct. 19.

Blondeau & Gravel, Quebec, Oct. 14.

Joseph Benjamin Dagenais, contractor, Montreal, Oct. 15.

Dery & Cie, traders, St. Charles de Bellechasse, Oct. 20.

Dugrenier & Gagnon, traders, township of Ely, Oct. 12.

J. B. Fortier, trader, Ste. Clair, Oct. 21.

O'Farrell Gagné, brickmaker and trader, St. Jean Deschailions, Oct. 19.

Jacob Gagné, trader, Rimouski, Oct. 16.

Joseph Giroux, hardware and paint merchant, Montreal, Oct. 17.

Edouard Morency, lumber merchant, Quebec, Oct. 16.

W. H. Larue, trader, Malbaie, Oct. 22.

Joseph Smith, trader, Cedar Hall, County of Rimouski, Oct. 20.

Curators Appointed.

Re C. E. Carter, Montreal.—G. H. Trigge, Montreal, curator, Oct. 19.

Re Dame Annie Meyers, trading under the name of Harris & Co., Lachine.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, Oct. 22.

Re The Chateau St. Louis Hotel Co.—Owen Murphy, Quebec, curator, Oct. 14.

Re Martin L. Connolly, Lennoxville.—Millier & Griffith, Sherbrooke, joint curator, Oct. 15.

Re Cloutier & Cerutti, Three Rivers.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, Oct. 21.

Re Dumaresq & Co., Montreal.—W. A. Caldwell, Montreal, curator, Oct. 19.

Re Joseph Dorais.—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, Oct. 15.

Re Léonard & frère.—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, Oct. 16.

Re Moodie & Graham, Montreal.—J. McD. Hains, Montreal, curator, Oct. 16.

Re Leude et Gustave Potvin, brickmakers, parish of St. Jean Deschailions.—A. Gaumont, Quebec, provisional guardian, Oct. 19.

Re Alfred Robinson, Montreal.—J. McD. Hains, Montreal, curator, Oct. 16.

Re Cléophas St. Jean.—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, Oct. 16.

Re A. C. Verreault.—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, Oct. 16.

Dividends.

Re Armand Boyce.—Dividend sheet prepared, Henry Miles, Montreal, curator.

Re Isaie Charbonneau.—First and final dividend, payable Nov. 12, C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator.

Re Gaspard Germain.—First dividend, payable Nov. 6, D. Guay, Quebec, curator.

Re Pierre Leroux.—First and final dividend, payable Nov. 11, C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator.

Re Frank Ouellet.—First and final dividend, payable Nov. 12, C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator.

Appointment.

R. S. Joron, N. P., to be clerk of the Circuit Court for the County of Beauharnois.

GENERAL NOTES.

THE OATHS ACT IN ENGLAND.—“Every person upon objecting to being sworn, and stating as the ground of his objection, either that he has no religious belief, or that the taking of an oath is contrary to his religious belief, shall be permitted to make his solemn affirmation instead of taking an oath, in all places and for all purposes where an oath is or shall be required by law.” So says the Legislature in the Oaths Act, 1888 (51 & 52 Vict., c. 46). Yet it has been stated on good authority that one of the coroners in the district of the administrative county of London has refused an atheist to “mix among jurors.” We suppose that the comprehensive generality of the enabling words has made them less intelligible than they would otherwise have been. That they apply to jurors, whether summoned on a coroner's jury or any other jury, there is no shadow of a doubt. The admitting of atheists as jurymen and members of Parliament were the two main reforms effected by the Oaths Act. The Evidence Act, 1869, which admitted atheists as witnesses in a Court of law, did not apply to jurors, who before the Act of 1888 were, by 30 & 31 Vict., c. 35, s. 8, allowed to substitute an affirmation for an oath only in cases where they could declare that the taking of an oath was by their religious belief unlawful—i.e., that they were possessed by an abundance of religious feeling—which is a very different thing from suffering from a complete want of it.—*Law Journal.*