

CHITTY, J., held that the purpose of the societies, whether they were right or wrong in the opinions they held, was charitable in the legal sense of the term. Their intention was to benefit the community. Whether, if they achieved their object, the community would, in fact, be benefited, was a question upon which the Court was not required to express an opinion.

---

COURT OF APPEAL.

London, 9th Aug., 1895.

Before LINDLEY, LOPES, RIGBY, L.JJ.

IN RE G. E. BROWN. (30 L. J.)

*Lunatic resident out of the jurisdiction—Master in lunacy of Victoria appointed guardian and receiver—Transfer of stock—‘Vested’—Lunacy Act, 1890 (53 Vict. c. 5), s. 134.*

Gertrude Emily Brown had been found a lunatic in the colony of Victoria, where she resided, and the master in lunacy of that colony had been appointed guardian of her person and receiver of her estate, and the care, protection, and management of her property had been remitted to him. By the Colonial Lunacy Act the master was empowered to undertake the management of the estates of all lunatics, and to take possession of and administer their property; but the property was not vested in the master, nor did the Act provide for the appointment of a committee.

This was a petition by the master, by his attorney in this country, for an order that English stocks belonging to the lunatic should be transferred and the dividends paid to him.

Their LORDSHIPS made the order. They said that section 134 of the Lunacy Act, 1890, gave the Court a discretion, and that it applied to this case, although the stocks were not vested in the master in the strict legal sense.

---

London, 7th Aug., 1895.

Before LINDLEY, LOPES, RIGBY, L.JJ.

RUSSELL v. RUSSELL. (30 L. J.)

*Restitution of conjugal rights—Judicial separation—Cruelty.*

Appeal from a decision of Pollock, B., sitting as a judge of the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division.

The Countess Russell in 1890 commenced a suit against the