

The Auditor states that he was engaged in the work 186 days, which at the rate of charge allowed by law, amounts to the sum claimed.

I do not propose now to decide finally upon this exception. I am not aware that any case has ever occurred before in the court in which the fees of the Auditor amounted to so large a sum, and I shall, therefore, leave the point open for explanation and proof on both sides.

It was observed in the course of the argument that the defendant was not consulted, and indeed had no notice, that the appointment of a special Auditor would be applied for, or who would be nominated, until after the decree of the 1st of August had passed.

The Chancellor was under a different impression, but in consideration of the statement now made by the defendant's solicitor, and without in the slightest degree intimating that the appointment was an injudicious or improper one, the case will not now be sent back to the same Auditor, it being deemed best to give the parties an opportunity of presenting their views upon the subject.

A reasonable time will be allowed for that purpose, after which an order will be passed, giving such directions for stating the accounts as the present condition of the cause may seem to justify.

PRATT and GLENN, for Complainants.

WILLIAMS and SCHLEY, for Defendants.

ESTATE OF LORIMAN CHEW,
A LUNATIC.

} JUNE TERM, 1849.

[LUNATIC—LUNACY.]

IF the committee of the person and estate of a lunatic has given a well secured bond for the faithful administration of his trust, and is in other respects a fit person to have the custody and estate of the lunatic, his insolvency, in fact, (not having taken the benefit of the insolvent laws,) is not cause for removal.