

— Je viens, dit M. Z.... faire rectifier mon acte de naissance. Je suis porté comme étant une fille, et vous pouvez vous rendre compte immédiatement que c'est une erreur.

— Cela ne me regarde pas, répond l'employé. Pour moi, vous n'êtes pas un homme, du moment que les livres disent que vous êtes du sexe féminin.

— Mais, sapristi, la mention est inexacte; je vous affirme qu'elle est inexacte.

— Adressez-vous aux tribunaux; la justice décidera.

— C'est ce que je vais faire. Au revoir, monsieur.

— Au revoir... *mademoiselle*.

M. Z... dut, en effet, présenter une requête devant le tribunal pour faire rectifier son état civil, et il l'a soutenue lui-même à la barre.

Après un court délibéré, le tribunal a ordonné la mesure sollicitée.—*Gazette du Palais*.

INSOLVENT NOTICES, ETC.

Quebec Official Gazette, Dec. 4.

Judicial Abandonments.

Henriette Dubeau, *marchande publique*, Montreal, Nov. 24.

Charles Arthur St. Pierre, St. Germain de Rimouski, Nov. 24.

Curators appointed.

Re Butchart Bros. & Co., Rimouski.—H. A. Bedard, Quebec, curator, Dec. 1.

Re Elzéar Chouinard, Quebec.—M. Joseph, Quebec, curator, Nov. 27.

Re Painchaud & Vincent, Montreal.—James Shearer, Montreal, curator, Dec. 2.

Re Joshua D. Westgate, Lachine.—J. McD. Hains, Montreal, curator, Nov. 29.

Dividends.

Re J. S. Beaudette, Tingwick.—Second dividend, payable Dec. 29. Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator.

Re A. E. Desilets, Three Rivers.—Dividend, payable Dec. 29. Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator.

Re Fréchette & Cie., Ste Marie Magdeleine.—Dividend, G. Daveluy, curator, Montreal.

Re D. E. Morin, Kamouraska.—Final dividend, payable Dec. 23. E. Begin, Quebec, curator.

Re Louis Rouillard, Pierreville.—Dividend, payable Dec. 29. Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator.

Re W. A. J. Whiteford, Montreal.—Final dividend, payable Dec. 29. Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator.

Separation as to property.

Clotilde Braseau vs. Alfred Meunier, farmer, Massham, Ottawa district, Nov. 26.

Mary Ann Emilie Caldwell vs. Téléphone Samoisette, St. John's, Iberville, Sept. 23.

Louise Huard vs. Pierre Boucher, Iberville, Nov. 8.

GENERAL NOTES.

Some ten years ago a young lawyer made his *début* at the Troy bar, in the defense of a criminal, at a session presided over by the late Judge H—. The writer said to the judge: "I understand young So-and-So produced a very good impression." "Why, y-e-s," drawled the judge, who was a great stickler for forensic etiquette, "but he had one habit that annoyed me very much. He had a lemon, and was continually sucking it. I didn't like the looks of it, but I didn't want to hurt the young man's feelings by a public reprimand, and so I addressed him a little note, intimating that unless the lemon was essential to his health, it would be more in accordance with the received etiquette of courts to desist from the exercise, or postpone it until recess. The lemon disappeared; but they told me afterwards," continued the judge with a grin and an indescribable squeal, "that it contained w-h-i-s-k-y."—*Albany Law Journal*.

The judges of the land are certainly a many-sided body. On Lord Mayor's Day in the morning the Chief Justice delivered a speech of the highest literary finish, while in the evening the Master of the Rolls responded for the judges with a breadth and easiness of style which must have been fully appreciated by the aldermen. On the other hand, to turn from manner to matter, Lord Esher kept clear of politics, while Lord Coleridge's speech was not altogether free from the taint introduced into the occasion by the last of the chief barons.—*Law Journal*, (London).

As a rule, people who bet and game act towards each other with far more honesty than they do in ordinary business transactions in life. To be a defaulter in bets, or to have been found endeavouring by any means to avoid a debt of honour incurred in gaming, inflicts on a man a far worse stigma than to be a bankrupt or up to the eyes in debt. Hence the law as to the relations of principal and agent in betting transactions, despite the decision in *Read v. Anderson*, is by no means clearly established, and the law with regard to gaming at cards is neither definite nor intelligible. *Perry v. Barnett* and *Seymour v. Bridge* will most likely leave the speculator in bank shares, who would naturally think that they are reconcilable and conclusive, in a more hopeless muddle than before the two cases were decided. The fact is that the law as to betting, gaming, and Stock-Exchange bargains is in a most unsatisfactory and kaleidoscopic condition. Bookmakers are shrewd enough as a rule, but they certainly are not lawyers enough to see their way through the law of betting and gaming as it now stands.—*Id.*

THE PRINCE OF WALES AND HIS INN OF COURT.—On November 19, Sir Thomas Chambers, Q.C., announced in the Middle Temple Hall that the Prince of Wales had been elected treasurer of the Honourable Society of the Middle Temple for the ensuing year, and that his Royal Highness had graciously consented to assume that office. He thereupon proposed the Prince's health, and congratulated the members of the Inn upon the fact that they would, during Her Majesty's jubilee year, be presided over by the Heir Apparent to the Throne.—*Id.*