

as equal a right to have his marriage, the birth of his child, or other *acte* of civil status, in which he is interested, properly and legally celebrated and acknowledged, as has the most professed religionist. A clergyman is not obliged to celebrate or register the marriage of a man who does not profess his religion; and we find, as a matter of fact, that men who cannot conscientiously ally themselves to any of the known religious dogmas, have to throw themselves upon the mercy of a neighbouring minister in order to procure a legal certificate of what should primarily be a civil ceremony. The marriage must be performed under the cloak of some religious belief. Is, then, the object of the law to foster hypocrisy? For such, in reality, is the effect.

One would think that, so palpable is the injustice of our legislation upon this subject, agitation would have been long since rife for its amelioration; but so strong a hold has the Church, even at this day, upon this benighted Province, that any attempt to assimilate our law in this respect, to that of all civilised countries, would be futile. Until the average intelligence of our people equals that attained years ago by other nations, so long will this outrageous state of things exist.—“*Nemesis*,” *Montreal*, in the “*Week*.”

RESPONSIBILITY FOR A POTMAN.

A case of interest to licensed persons was heard at the Epsom County Court, on August 19, before His Honour Judge Lushington, having been remitted from the High Court. Jane Crawford, a married woman, of Sutton, sued Mr. J. H. Brown, landlord of the Robin Wood Hotel, Sutton, for 250*l.*, damages claimed for the wrongful act of the defendant's servant. The facts were briefly as follow: On February 2, plaintiff went to defendant's house, and after staying some time was put out by the potman, it being alleged on her behalf that she was thrown out by the man, who kicked her and broke her leg; and on the defendant's behalf that she was put out quietly, but being intoxicated slipped and fell. His Honour held that there was no case to go to the jury, seeing that there was no evidence to show that the landlord gave instructions for the potman to be violent, or

that, even supposing the violence alleged was used, which was not admitted, it was of such a nature as could have been prevented by the defendant, and the plaintiff was therefore nonsuited.—*Law Journal*.

INSOLVENT NOTICES, ETC.

Quebec Official Gazette, Sept. 10.

Judicial Abandonnements.

Déry & Larue, traders, St. Charles, Sept. 6.
Hogle & Co., carriage manufacturers, Sherbrooke, Aug. 30.
Ovila St. Charles, Montreal, Aug. 31.
Richard Swallow, Montreal, Sept. 5.
Louis O. Villeneuve, dry goods, Quebec, Sept. 5.

Curators appointed.

Re Beaudet & Chinic.—D. Rattray and E. W. Methot, Quebec, curator, Sept. 6.
Re Ferdinand Biron.—C. Millier and J. J. Griffith, Sherbrooke, curator, Sept. 6.
Re Desjardins & Martel.—L. G. Lepine, Quebec, curator, Sept. 6.
Re Marie Euphemie Laforce (P. E. Labelle & Co.), Terrebonne.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator, Sept. 2.
Re William Garbutt, butcher.—Fulton & Richards, Montreal, curator, Sept. 8.
Re Ovila St. Charles.—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, Sept. 8.

Dividends.

Re Jas. A. Douglas.—First and final dividend, payable Sept. 28, A. W. Stevenson, Montreal, curator.
Re Patrick Thomas Gibb, wire-worker.—Dividend, Seath & Daveluy, Montreal, curator.

Separation as to property.

Marie Louise Goyer vs Jean Bte. Langevin *alias* Lacroix, St. Laurent, Sept. 7.
Marie Malvina Grenier vs Jean Baptiste Garneau, farmer, Notre Dame de la Nativité de Beauport, Aug. 31.
Sophie Laurier vs. Victor Théodule Daubigny, veterinary surgeon, Montreal, Sept. 8.
Victoire Meunier vs. Isaïe Choquette, blacksmith, Iberville, Sept. 7.
Ezilda Therrien vs. Jean Bte. Paquet, St. Vincent de Paul, Aug. 8.
Eugénie Warrieur vs. Louis Riendeau, Montreal, Aug. 6.

Appointments.

John Sleep Honey, Arthur Bononi Longpré and Adolphe Cherrier, to be joint prothonotary, Superior Court and clerk of Circuit Court for district of Montreal.

GENERAL NOTES.

Nous avons le regret d'annoncer la mort de Me Bonenfant, ancien avoué près le Tribunal civil de Nogent-sur-Seine.

Me Bonenfant avait exercé ses fonctions pendant près de cinquante-sept ans: il ne s'en était démis en 1885 que malgré lui, vaincu par l'âge. Il laissera le souvenir d'un homme profondément loyal et honnête: il avait le culte du droit et à une expérience consommée des affaires il joignait un talent de parole auquel tous s'accordaient à rendre l'hommage le plus mérité. Me Bonenfant est décédé à Nogent-sur-Seine à l'âge de quatre-vingt-cinq ans.