

court (it is given *verbatim* in the newspapers of the day) from the uncle (senior trustee) to one of his nieces, reproaching them in very gross language for their action, making a charge against their dead father of having systematically for years defrauded the customs of large sums, and saying that he could "put the government in possession of information which would justify them now or at any time within fifty years in seizing the books and property of the estate, and leaving you all simply paupers, with the reputation of the family irretrievably ruined, and the public astonished with a revelation of twenty years of most successful fraud, not only on the government themselves, but on customers." Then came the details of this fraud, as charged, after which the writer continues: "I do not intend that either you or any of your sisters shall become trustees . . . and you shall not, as you impertinently express it, deprive Ronald of a livelihood, although you may well blush at the source from which you obtain your own. Wealth accumulated by fraud and the misery of others will probably eventually prove to be more a curse than a blessing," etc.

We give prominence to this letter, because it is a mystery to us how a trustee who displays such a bitter *animus* toward these unfortunate girls, whose father had placed him *in loco parentis* to them, should still be allowed to remain in the same position, though upwards of two years and a half have elapsed since the petition to remove him was presented.

We must here, *par parenthese*, say that the charges this model guardian thus made against his wards' father and his own brother-in-law are pronounced to be absurd and impossible by both the collector and inspector of customs there.

The petitioners further set forth that they had always acted on the advice of their uncle, but that now they had lost all confidence in him, and could not meet him on business or have any correspondence with him, and that his threats would keep them in a constant state of anxiety and unrest.

Now for the proceedings thereafter. On the 4th of December, 1890, the case came before the judge, when an annuitant who lived in Australia was directed to be served, and over six months was thus lost. Early in August, 1891, the case was ripe for hearing, but the trustee's counsel were not ready (one of them the judge's son), and it was not till the 10th of December following