

*Curators appointed.*

*Re* Louis Carpentier, Sorel.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator, April 6.

*Re* Emile Guenette, St. Hyacinthe.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator, April 4.

*Re* Duncan King, district of Ottawa.—J. H. Ireland, Montreal, and J. Kavanagh, Ottawa, curators, April 22, 1886.

*Dividends.*

*Re* L. J. O. Brunelle.—Dividend, payable April 27, P. E. Panneton, Three Rivers, curator.

*Re* Patrick Lynch, trader, St. Etienne de Beauharis.—Dividend, payable May 9, D. Seath, Montreal, curator.

*Re* G. E. Robitaille, Sherbrooke.—First dividend, payable April 21, H. A. Bédard, curator.

*Separation as to property.*

Catherine Alix vs. Eloi Guilmette, St. Césaire. March 3.

Marie Elmire Turcotte vs. Napoléon Charette, laborer, Montreal, April 5.

## GENERAL NOTES.

All who know Judge Bleckley and recall his long waving hair and beard will appreciate this story: He was on his way to the Supreme Court one morning, when he was accosted by a little street gamin, with an exceedingly dirty face, with a customary "Shine, sir?" He was quite importunate, and the judge, being impressed with the oppressive untidiness of the boy's face, said: "I don't want a shine, but if you will go wash your face I will give you a dime." "All right, sir." "Well, let me see you do it." The boy went over to an artesian hydrant and made his ablution. Returning, he held out his hand for the dime. The judge said: "Well, sir, you've earned your money, here it is." The boy said: "I don't want your money, old fellow; you take it and have your hair cut," saying which he scampered off. The judge thought it so good a story that he told it himself.—*Augusta Chronicle.*

PROMPTINGS OF HEAVENLY VOICES.—Probably the most singular defence ever heard in any court was raised the other day in a case at Chester Assizes. The action was a dispute about some shares which the defendant improperly detained from his aunt. On cross-examination the defendant said a voice in his ear told him—"Go with your aunt to fetch the shares." Counsel: Which ear was it? (Laughter). Defendant (seriously): The right ear. (Laughter). Was it a loud voice or a soft voice? Well, it was a voice I could understand very plainly. Do you think your aunt could hear it? (Laughter). I can't say. (Renewed laughter). Counsel (raising his voice): Was it as loud as I am speaking to you now? (Laughter). Defendant: Not quite. (Roars of laughter). The judge: Do you think it was a voice from heaven? That was what I thought it was. Your guardian angel, eh? I don't say so. Well, what do you say? I think it was a heavenly voice. (Laughter). The heavenly voice having told you to go with your aunt and fetch the

shares, you thought you would go? I followed the precept. (Roars of laughter). You went with your aunt? Yes; I went with my aunt, and she gave me the shares freely, but I never asked for them. The judge: Well, if you did not want the shares, why, when she wanted them back, did you not let her have them? Because she carried on so, and behaved disrespectfully. The judge: Did the voice say, "Don't let her have them back?" (Laughter). No. Mr. McIntyre: Did the voice give you any other precept? Defendant: Many a time I have been under conviction, but not of that description. What description then was it? Defendant: That was more in regard to a turn from a sinful life to a better life. (Laughter). But have you been leading a very sinful life? No, not particularly sinful. But the heavenly voice thought you had, and advised you to give it up? Yes. (Laughter). The judge: So long as it is in that light I would not go further, but when a heavenly voice interferes in secular matters then we have a right to inquire into it. (Laughter). If the promptings of voices were once allowed to be raised in courts of justice as defences to actions, we expect they would speedily extend their interference in secular matters.—*Gibson's Law Notes.*

STAGE DRESS OR UNDESS.—A preliminary injunction was recently granted but afterward dissolved, in England, restraining the lessee and manager of the Gaiety Theatre, from preventing the plaintiff, Miss Fay Templeton, from performing the part of Fernand in the play of Monte Cristo, in accordance with a contract entered into in November last; and also restraining him from employing anybody else to perform the part. *Gibson's Law Notes* says: "The affidavits disclosed that the defendant justified his dismissal of the plaintiff on the ground that she wore her dress improperly. This the plaintiff denied, and stated that the dress was supplied by the management. She also stated that when the lord chamberlain complained of the dresses in the piece being loud, she asked for another dress, but her request was not acceded to. Sashes were however supplied, and she said she had always worn one, but it appeared that the defendant alleged that this was not worn in the proper manner. Now, the whole gist of this application was undoubtedly the proper or improper mode of wearing the dress. Of course there are many ways of putting on a sash. But surely this is a question of fact which the judges should have decided. Why did their lordships not make Miss Templeton put on the dress in dispute and appear in court? The holy cardinals have set the example. Is there not an engraving in the shop windows representing the cardinals sitting in judgment on a dancing gypsy girl to decide on the propriety of the entertainment. Some of their faces certainly do not wear a judicial look. We should immensely enjoy being in court during the performance to see the faces of Mr. Justice Denman and Mr. Justice Matthews."

Mr. L. N. Benjamin, a member of the Montreal bar, who has been in ill-health for about a year past, died on Sunday, April 10. Mr. Benjamin was admitted to the bar in 1863, and his name appeared in the list of newly appointed Queen's Counsel published on the day preceding his decease.