

and to promote the formation of a sustentation fund for the partial endowment of the clergy of the Diocese. He performed a great deal of patient drudgery in making up a schedule or cadastre of the properties belonging to the several parishes and missions in the Diocese in order to show where and what more was needed to be done, and investigated the titles, and set those which were imperfect right. He was a leading member of both the Diocesan and Provincial Synods, where he will be much missed. The last public business he transacted was to rise off his sick bed against the remonstrances of his family to appear in his place in the Diocesan Synod to see some business carried through which he deemed of importance. When remonstrated with about his imprudence, he replied "What matter? It is duty: and sooner or later I must die in harness." His last judicial business was undertaken in the same self-sacrificing spirit. Owing to the illness and over-tasking of several of the Judges, the Beauharnois circuit had been on several occasions neglected, and the matter was brought up in Parliament by the representatives of that district. When urged by the Attorney-General to take the duty there for one term, and the difficulties of the Government pointed out to him—the blame, in fact, cast upon them by Parliament for neglect,—he replied, "I will go if it kills me." He held the last term there, and returned home ill. It will be thus seen how continuous and multifarious have been his labors for the public, in how many places his presence, and counsel and assistance will be missed. But not alone in the public places he was wont to labor in will he be missed. Gifted with refined tastes, fond of pictures, statuary and books, as well as flowers, of a most happy and genial disposition, affable and courteous in his manners, he made himself beloved in private and social life, and leaves behind him almost numberless friends in different parts of the country, who will read of his departure hence with heartfelt and unqualified regret. He was married in 1832 to Miss Ross, (daughter of the late David Ross, Q.C.) who survives him, and by whom he leaves a family of three sons and two daughters.—The funeral ceremonies took place on the 1st of July.

SINGULAR CHARGE.—The Times' Paris correspondent, May 13th, cites a passage from the charge of Judge Metzinger, at a recent trial, before the assize court of Paris, of a man who attempted to murder a married woman with whom he had had a *liaison* :—

"What is this man who is exposed to face it, (the guillotine)? You have witnessed his attitude during the trial. You wished to draw something from him. I have sounded him in every sense, but there was no response. I have found in him only weakness, cowardice and fear, and this desolating spectacle has doubtless inspired you, as it has me, with disgust and contempt." "These words," adds the *Gazette des Tribunaux*, the special organ of the law courts, "exercised great influence on the decision of the jury, who, after a quarter of an hour's deliberation, brought in a verdict of guilty."

CALLS TO THE BAR—DISTRICT OF MONTREAL, SINCE JAN. 1, 1865.

2nd January, 1865.—Napoleon Legendre, Adolphe Nadeau, Magloire Desjardins, Chs. Auguste La Rue.

6th February, 1865.—Prisque Letendre, Louis Renaud.

3rd April, 1865.—Honoré Mercier, Joseph A. McLaughlin.

1st May, 1865.—F. X. Desplaines.

5th June, 1865.—J. A. Simard, H. A. Turgeon, Louis H. Collard, W. R. Kenney, F. E. Gilman, J. C. Gagnon, J. Napoleon Mongeau, Pierre P. Daunais.

L. W. SICOTTE, *Secretary*.

APPOINTMENTS, CHANGES, &c.—T. K. Ramsay, Esq., Q. C., to be Crown Prosecutor for the District of Montreal, in the room of F. G. Johnson, Esq., promoted to the Bench. F. G. Johnson, Esq., to be Assistant Judge of the Superior Court. Mr. Justice Smith, of the Superior Court, has obtained eight months' leave of absence, dating from 1st June, 1865.

CHANGE OF SURNAME.—Since the celebrated Jones—Herbert case, the change of surname by mere publication of an intention to do so, seems common. Can any of your readers inform me whether this act does or does not *legally* change the name of children *living at the time* when their father indulged his innocent fancy by giving himself a new name? It strikes me they retain the one to which they were born.—CAMBRIAN.—*Notes and Queries*.