

for an indictable offence shall be admitted, after the close of the case for the prosecution, to make full *answer* AND *defence* thereto by counsel learned in the law." The French version is ambiguous; it says: "Avec l'aide d'un conseil versé dans la loi." The two versions certainly differ; in such a case how are we to decide? Is the practice here in favour of allowing such statements or against it? STUDENT.

INSOLVENT NOTICES, ETC.

Quebec Official Gazette, Nov. 6.

Curators Appointed.

Re Perpetus Boileau.—Alex. Pridham, Grenville, curator, Oct. 18.

Re Moïse Champagne, Lanoraie.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator, Oct. 30.

Re Chapdeleine & Duhamel, St. Ours.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator, Oct. 30.

Re A. E. Désilets, Three Rivers.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator, Oct. 29.

Re F. Gélinas.—A. A. Taillon, Sorel, curator, Nov. 3.

Dividend.

Re P. J. Robert, Montreal.—First dividend, payable Nov. 25, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator.

Separation as to property.

Nathalie Clément vs. François Xavier Latour, Montreal, Nov. 3.

Marie Delphine Lesieur Desaulniers vs. Prosper Milot, St. Anne d'Yamachiche, Nov. 3.

Rosa Donnelly, vs. John Williams, saloon keeper, Montreal, Oct. 1.

Marie Anne Dussault vs. Charles Gingras, contractor, Montreal, Oct. 18.

Elodie Labelle vs. Jean B. Thouin, farrier, Montreal, Oct. 20.

Olive Landry vs. Jean Emmanuel Viger, Montreal, Oct. 18.

Dora Theresa Pattle vs. James A. Wright, electrician, Montreal, Nov. 2.

Members elected.

L. G. Desjardins, Montmorency; John McIntosh, Compton; Alex. Cameron, Huntingdon; L. B. A. Charlebois, Laprairie; A. Rocheleau, Chambly; N. H. E. Faucher de Saint-Maurice, Bellechasse; L. Forest, L'Assomption; Jas. McShane, Montreal Centre; R. F. Rinfret dit Malouin, Quebec Centre.

Thanksgiving, Nov. 18, proclaimed.

GENERAL NOTES.

MOTHERS-IN-LAW.—Mothers-in-law are no doubt a nuisance, and some abuse of them is to be naturally expected from all right-minded sons-in-law. One Seymour has, however, now learnt that, although it may be quite safe to call his mother-in-law "a vicious, nasty old cat" to her face, it is not advisable to tell her so on a post-card. Many other dreadful things did

the defendant write about his mother-in-law. Evidently his feelings to her could not have been friendly. Hearing that she had kissed his child in the street, he had the youngster stripped, ducked in water, and cleansed from the pollution of her kiss. The luxury of abusing a mother-in-law in this way cost, however, £100, and probably the defendant will now expend less on post-cards.—*Gibson's Law Notes, Eng.*

THE BELL OF JUSTICE.—It is a beautiful story that in one of the old cities of Italy the king caused a bell to be hung in a tower in one of the public squares, and called it "The bell of justice," and commanded that any one who had been wronged should go and ring the bell, and so call the magistrate of the city, and ask and receive justice. And when in the course of time the lower end of the bell rope rotted away, a wild vine was tied to it to lengthen it; and one day an old and starving horse that had been abandoned by its owner and turned out to die, wandered into the tower, and in trying to eat the vine, rang the bell. And the magistrate of the city, coming to see who rang the bell, found this old and starving horse; and he caused the owner of that horse, in whose service he had toiled and been worn out, to be summoned before him, and decreed that as his poor horse had rung the bell of justice, he should have justice, and that during the horse's life his owner should provide for him proper food and drink and stable.

AN AGNOSTIC IN THE BOX.—In the Circuit Court, Monday, Judge Logan presiding, an incident occurred of more than usual interest. A case involving a small amount (an appeal from a justice), in which Mr. Harvey, a well-known operator in marble in this county, was a defendant, was on trial. When Mr. Harvey was called to the witness stand, Mr. Green, of counsel for the plaintiff, asked to put him on his voir dire, when the following substantially occurred: Counsel—Mr. Harvey, do you believe in the existence of a God? Witness—(Evidently surprised and thinking a moment)—I do not believe in God, but I do believe in God, the power that controls the universe. Counsel—Do you believe in a future state of rewards and punishments? Witness—I believe that every human being suffers in this life for every violation of natural and moral laws. Not accepting the Bible as a divine revelation, I know nothing about the future. I do not know whence I came or whither I am going. Therefore I cannot say that I have any belief as to my future state. Counsel—Do you believe in a conscience? Witness—Most certainly I do. I believe that every sane man has an innate sense of right and wrong to guide his conduct. The Court—Mr. Harvey, do you believe in the binding obligation of an oath in a court of justice, requiring a witness to tell the truth? Witness—I do. The court, after some deliberation, held that the witness was not competent to testify, and he was directed to stand aside. Exception was taken by Capt. Kain, counsel for defendant, and an appeal taken to the Supreme Court. We understand there are several old decisions regarding the competency of "atheists," "infidels," and "free thinkers" as witnesses, but that we have no Supreme Court decision covering precisely the state of facts presented in this case.—*Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal.*