Curators Appointed.

Re Pelletier & Tardif, traders, Quebec.—Henry A. Bedard, Quebec, curator, March 3.

Re Arcade Decelles.—Thos. Darling, Montreal, curator, March 1.

Re John Mooney & Co., Windsor Mills.—John J. Griffith, Sherbrooke, curator, March 1.

Re P. L. Nadeau, Iberville.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator, Feb. 25.

Re Eckersdorff & Co., Montreal.—S. C. Fatt, Montreal, curator, Feb. 24.

Re Cléophas Lenghan.—C. A. Parent, Quebec, curator.

Dividend Sheets.

Re Eugéne Demers.—Div.sheet at office of A. McKay, curator, Montreal.

Re Michael Hayes.—Div. sheet at office of W. A. Caldwell, curator, Montreal.

Separation as to Property.

Emilie Piche *vs.* Ambroise Tellier dit Lafortune, trader, Montreal, March 2.

Rules of Court.

Hudon & Orsali *vs.* Milliken *es qual.*, circuit court, St. Francis. Creditors of defendant es qual. notified to file claims.

Hoadley *vs.* Camperdown Hotel Co. Superior Court, St. Francis. Creditors of defendant notified to file claims.

Chrétien *vs.* Coté, and Guilbault, T. S., Superior Court, Joliette. Creditors of defendant notified to file claims.

Appointments.

Francois Xavier Gosselin, advocate, Chicoutimi, appointed Prothonotary of Superior Court, Clerk of Circuit Court, Clerk of the Crown, and Clerk of the Peace for district of Chicoutimi.

John Henry Sadler Dyke, emigration agent, Liverpool, and William Barrott Montfort Bird, solicitor, No. 5 Gray's Inn Square, London, appointed commissioners to take depositions under C.C.P. 30.

GENERAL NOTES.

There are thirteen prisoners in a Mississipi jail charged with murder. It is feared that the unlucky number may prove fatal to some of them.—*Tribune.*

Herbert Spencer, in his essay on overlegislation, makes the following remarks upon the question of codification :—" Lawyers perpetually tell us that codification is impossible; and there are many simple enough to believe them. Merely remarking, in passing, that what government and all its employees cannot do for the acts of Parliament in general, was done for the 1,500 customs acts in 1825 by the energy of one man, Mr. Deacon Hume, let us see how the absence of a digested system of law is made good. In preparing themselves for the bar, and finally the bench, law-students, by years of research, have to gain acquaintance with this vast mass of unorganized legislation; and that organization which it is held impossible for the State to effect, it is held possible (sly sarcasm on the State) for each student to effect for himself. Every judge can privately codify, though 'united wisdom' cannot. But how is each judge enabled to codify? By the private enterprise of men who have prepared the way for him, by the partial codifications of Blackstone, Coke and others; by the digests of partnership law, bankruptcy law, law of patents, laws affecting women, and the rest that daily issue from the press; by abstracts of cases, and volumes of reports, every one of them unofficial products. Sweep away all these fractional codifications made by individuals, and the State would be in utter ignorance of its own laws! Had not the bunglings of legislators been made good by private enterprise, the administration of justice would have been impossible!"

The ingenuity of a *pédicure* in identifying a thief elicited the compliments of a Judge in a Paris Court a few days ago. The corn-extractor kept a Turkish Bath, and among the clients one day appeared a stranger in a seedy garments who disappeared with a much better suit belonging to another customer. Before he went away, however, he had requested the services of the proprietor in his capacity of *pédicure*, who thus tells the story: "Voilà que cet individu me demande pour lui inspecter les pieds. Naturellement je le fais, je l'examine et je lui enlève trois cors et deux œils de perdrix. (*Hilarité dans l'auditoire.*)" The witness then relates how search was made after the thief, and continues: "C'est trois ou quatre jours après. Un de mes garçons me dit avoir aperçu à l'Hôtel des Ventes quelqu'un qui ressemblait au voleur. Je donnai la consigne de me ramener cet individu à tout prix. Bon! le garçon revient avec l'individu, que je reconnais immédiatement. Mais, pour être plus sûr, je le fais se mettre tout nu et mon œil saute à ses pieds. (*Nouvelle hilarité*). Alors, je ne pouvais plus avoir de doute, car j'aperçus les trois cors et les deux œils de perdrix qui étaient en train de repousser. (*Explosion de rires dans l'auditoire*). Je l'ai fait arrêter." The prisoner then admitted that he had taken the suit because it was better than his own.

Quibbling for a man's life is justifiable if it be ever justifiable, but it was not to be expected that the strong bench of judges representing the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council at the hearing of the petition in the case of *Regina* v. *Riel* would accept the quibbles put forward in behalf of the condemned man. If it be true that the Dominion Parliament, under powers from the Imperial Parliament to "legislate for the due administration and the peace, order, and good government of Her Majesty's subjects in the North-West Territories," cannot put a jury of six in place of a jury of twelve and allow six challenges instead of thirty-five, it is difficult to see what that Legislature can do. Experience in the County Courts in England shows that twelve jurymen are the smallest number from which impartiality and common sense can reasonably be expected, but the Dominion Parliament was allowed its own opinion on such subjects, and it has altered the English common law accordingly, probably to meet the necessities of a sparsely-populated country. To say of a particular alteration of the existing law when made that it is *ultra vires* because it does not in fact conduce to good order and government is to revoke the legislative powers conferred. The stipendiary magistrate presiding at the trial was required to have "full notes of the evidence" taken down "in writing," which was done in shorthand. If shorthand is not writing, what is it? In the middle ages it would, perhaps, have been called magic, but in th se prosaic times it is writing. It is curious but unnecessary to observe that the Act happens to use a phrase peculiarly appropriate to shorthand—namely, a "full note," which is the technical expression for a verbatim shorthand note. No other result than the rejection of the petition could follow, without prejudice, as we are glad to see, to the question of the right of appeal to the Privy Council in criminal cases generally.—*Law Journal* (London.)