

officer's private business would probably have vanished, and he might almost have to begin life again. It has also been proposed that the Attorney-General should be a member of the Cabinet, as he is usually in the colonies. Lawyers, however, do not enjoy the universal popularity in the Legislature which their merits deserve, and most Prime Ministers would think that one lawyer in the Cabinet is enough. Or the office of law adviser might be made non-political. To that there are insuperable objections, and it would be incompatible with our present party system. In the main the existing system probably works best. Anomalous circumstances may now and then arise out of the double capacity of Government official and private counsel, and an individual may be guilty of indiscretion. But such cases have not been frequent, and the public and the profession are too severe critics to allow such instances to pass without animadversion.

The question of salaries, however, is of a totally different character. The two English law officers are by far the highest paid of all our public servants. A man gains rather than loses in the matter of private practice by being Attorney- or Solicitor-General. Yet the public goes on contentedly paying 10,000*l.* a year for part, perhaps only half, of a man's time, or less. No man is worth the money. The work of a foreign secretary, especially when, like Lord Salisbury, he is also Prime Minister, is probably a good deal greater, and is certainly of vastly more importance than that of a law officer; his expenses are far greater, but his salary is only about half, whilst that of the President of the Board of Trade, or of the Local Government Board, both Cabinet ministers, is only one quarter of the Attorney-General's salary. If the official incomes of these two gentlemen were reduced to 3,000*l.* and 4,000*l.* respectively the best man would still be glad to take the post. Such an economy would also make a judgeship relatively a better thing than it is at present. The abolition of the Chief Justiceship of the Common Pleas and the Chief Barony of the Exchequer tended to produce a dead uniformity on the bench. If this change were effected, and an additional 1,000*l.* a year given to each of the Lords

Justices, especially if, as we have on former occasions suggested, the latter were made life peers, men in the largest practice would be more willing to sit on the bench than they are at present. Scotch and Irish law officers habitually accept judgeships; their English brethren rarely accept puisne judgeships. The country loses when men of conspicuous learning and ability are still at the bar, when so many men not their equals wear the judicial ermine.—*Law Journal* (London).

INSOLVENT NOTICES, ETC.

Quebec Official Gazette, Oct. 10.

Judicial Abandonments.

Alexander William Nelson Bell, trader, village of Quyon, Sept. 21.

Dame Eléonore Bailly, doing business as lumber dealer, under name of O. Cossette & Co., Valleyfield, Sept. 26.

Jos. Dorais, trader, parish of St. Jean Chrysostôme, Oct. 2.

L. Drouin & frère, stationers, St. Roch de Québec, Oct. 1.

John Shaver, maker of funeral monuments, Cote des Neiges, Oct. 6.

David Williamson, trader, Grenville, Oct. 1.

Curators Appointed.

Re H. D. Beland, Montreal.—David Seath, Montreal, curator, Sept. 25.

Re Alexander William Nelson Bell.—W. H. Meredith, Quyon, curator, Oct. 2.

Re Ephrem Cinq-mars, dry goods merchant, Montreal.—David Seath, Montreal, curator, Sept. 17.

Re Dame Eléonore Bailly (Cossette & Co.).—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, Oct. 7.

Re Paul Nicoleau.—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, Oct. 2.

Re Arthur Laperle.—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, Oct. 6.

Re Richard Robertson, New Richmond.—L. P. Lebel, New Carlisle, curator, Oct. 2.

Re Joseph G. Walton.—E. F. Waterhouse, Sherbrooke, curator, Oct. 6.

Dividends.

Re Jules Goudron, Montreal.—First dividend, payable Nov. 2, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator.

Re A. Limoges.—First and final dividend, payable Oct. 25, J. M. Marotte, Montreal, curator.

Re Jean Baptiste Paquet.—First and final dividend, payable Oct. 27, T. Lamontagne, Lévis, curator.

Re Quevillon & Lamoureux.—First dividend, payable Oct. 27, Millier & Griffith, Sherbrooke, joint curator.

Re Ananias Renaud, trader, Petite Rivière St. François.—First and final dividend, payable Oct. 28, Jos. Morin, Baie St. Paul, curator.

Separation as to property.

Ellen Georgianna Bowles vs. Robert J. McNally, Montreal, Sept. 17.

Emélie Carrier vs. Théophile Ruel, farmer, parish of St. Joseph de Lévis, Oct. 2.

Léocadie Larchevêque vs. Jean Baptiste Joly, carter, Montreal, Oct. 3.

Marie Zélie Lemay vs. François Xavier Labranché, township of Thetford, Oct. 3.