

of the profession to the other be made as easy as possible. Let those at the bar who think they can work better as solicitors and let those solicitors who think they can get on at the bar have every means of changing afforded to them. But do not, in the interest of our great profession, break down those distinctions which have worked so well hitherto. I need not refer to the mutual confidence and trust that is engendered by the relations between solicitor and client and solicitor and barrister, but I feel sure that most members of the profession will be satisfied that it is to the interest of all its branches that we should remain as we are.

#### INSOLVENT NOTICES, ETC.

Quebec Official Gazette, June 18.

##### Judicial Abandonments.

Joseph Corrivault, Sherbrooke, June 13.  
Obéline Lefebvre (Jos. Giroux & Co.), Montreal, June 8.

Louis Lavertu, Sherbrooke, June 8.

##### Curators appointed.

Re Obéline Lefebvre.—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, June 16.

Re Napoléon Fauteux, Upton.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator, June 8.

Re Alphonse D. Parant, cashier, Montreal.—David Seath, Montreal, curator, June 14.

Re William H. Parsons (W. H. Parsons & Co.), commission agent, Montreal.—S. C. Fatt, Montreal, June 18.

##### Dividends.

Re Albert P. Benoit.—First and final dividend, payable July 5, J. J. Griffith, Sherbrooke, curator.

Re Edouard Hudon, St. Octave.—First and final dividend, payable July 1, H. A. Bédard, Quebec, curator.

Re Wilson & Cowley.—First and final dividend, payable July 7, J. M. M. Duff, Montreal, curator.

##### Separation as to property.

Margaret Maria Bond vs. George Barry, Montreal, trader, June 14.

Elizabeth Bruce Gardner vs. Harry Maclaren, trader, Montreal, June 10.

##### Minutes of Notary transferred.

Minutes of late Robert Trudel, Ste. Geneviève de Batiscan, transferred to David T. Trudel, of same place.

#### GENERAL NOTES.

Mr. David Dudley Field, at the age of eighty-two, sails for Europe to attend a convention of the Associ-

ation for the Reform and Codification of the Law of Nations, to be held at the Guildhall, London, July 25th; one of the Institute of International Law, to be held at Heidelberg early in September; and one of the Commercial Law Congress, to be held in Antwerp the last of July.

WAS HE PROPERLY BRIEFED?—In the case of *Missouri v. Jump*, decided by the Supreme Court of Missouri, December, 1886, 7th Western Rep. 280, the Court said: "Appellant's counsel has not furnished us with a brief on his behalf, and we have been compelled to search the record without such aid. If counsel thinks a cause of sufficient importance to appeal it to this Court, and the errors committed by the lower Court of sufficient magnitude to warrant a reversal of the judgment, he does not discharge his duty to his client if he fails to file an abstract and brief in the case, and has no right to complain if this Court overlooks some point upon which the judgment might have been reversed."

CITIZENS AND CITIZENESSES.—In *State ex rel. M'Campbell v. County Court* it was held by the Supreme Court of Missouri, February, 1887, that the word 'citizens' included persons of both sexes in determining whether a majority of the 'assessed taxpaying citizens' had signed a petition for the granting of a dram-shop license. 'The rule of construction,' said the Court, 'forbids us to accept the proposition so earnestly and ingeniously contended for by counsel for the relator—viz.: That the word citizens as used in the above section only includes such male citizens as have the right to vote. To give the word this meaning would be in plain disregard of the rule, by restricting its application to a fractional part of the persons falling within the customary meaning of the term citizen.'—*American Law Record*.

A CURIOUS CLAIM.—According to the *Albany Law Journal*, a jilted suitor recently sued the father of a young lady named Sarah, in the Court of Common Pleas of New York, and alleged that the defendant agreed with the plaintiff, in consideration of the plaintiff, upon the request of the defendant, marrying Sarah, to give his consent to the marriage; and that the plaintiff had expended large sums of money in entertaining Sarah, making costly presents to her, preparing for housekeeping, and incurring other expenses necessary and incident to entering upon family life, at the request of defendant; but that the defendant had refused his consent, and induced Sarah not to marry the plaintiff, and the plaintiff claimed \$10,000 damages. While the action was pending Sarah married another man, and the plaintiff married another woman. Upon the eve of trial the plaintiff's presents were returned. A few days before the trial the plaintiff moved for leave to amend his complaint, but the Court denied the motion; and the cause being called for trial a day or two later, the plaintiff's counsel moved for a discontinuance, which was granted on the usual terms, the Court remarking that the case was unprecedented, and that the defendant's contention that the action was not maintainable was correct.