

the Scotch Bar, was commissioned to go to Glasgow and, in Sir George Grey's own words, 'get at the bottom of the matter.' Mr. Young held his investigation with closed doors in the Sheriff Court of Lanarkshire (October 16-18, 1862), and in due time presented his report. Thereupon the Home Secretary commuted the death sentence to penal servitude—justifying his action on the grounds that there was some doubt as to whether Mrs. Maclachlan was not merely an accessory after the fact, and that capital punishment ought not to be inflicted in the face of the strong and clearly expressed opposition of the public. At this distance, in point of time, it is hardly worth while to subject Sir George Grey's 'reasons' or his 'fears' to a minute analysis; and the chief modern interest of the Sandford murder case lies in its curious resemblance to *Regina v. Maybrick*.

In 1865, Mr. Rutherford Clark defended Dr. Edward William Pritchard, who was tried and eventually executed in Edinburgh for the murder of his mother-in-law and his wife by antimonial poisoning. The case for the prisoner was hopelessly bad; but Mr. Clark did all that could be done to save his life. We shall now simply refer the reader to Mr. Clark's cross-examination and comments upon the evidence of Dr. James Paterson, who, having been called in by Dr. Pritchard to see his mother-in-law, Mrs. Taylor, came to the conclusion that Mrs. Pritchard was being poisoned, and yet never went back to see her because 'she was not his patient.'

#### INSOLVENT NOTICES, ETC.

*Quebec Official Gazette, Oct. 25.*

##### Judicial Abandonments.

Damase Bédard, trader, Lachute, Oct. 22.  
Drolet & Co., boots and shoes, Quebec, Oct. 21.  
Hubert Alfred Houde, grocer, Quebec, Oct. 20.  
François Leblanc, Arthabaskaville, Oct. 8.

##### Curators Appointed.

Re A. Beauvais, Montreal, an absentee.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, Oct. 22.  
Re Stanislas Boucher, Marieville.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, Oct. 15.  
Re J. Landsberg, Sherbrooke.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, Oct. 20.  
Re François Leblanc.—A. Quesnel, Arthabaskaville, curator, Oct. 21.

Re Augustin Limoges.—J. M. Marcotte, Montreal, curator, Oct. 13.

Re Archibald McCallum, jeweller, Quebec.—H. A. Bédard, Quebec, curator, Oct. 20.

Re O. Bégin & Co., shoe manufacturers, Quebec.—N. Matte, Quebec, curator, Oct. 18.

##### Dividends.

Re Wm. Gariépy, Montreal.—Dividend, payable Nov. 14, J. Frigon, Montreal, curator.

Re Emerie Lacasse.—First and final dividend, payable Nov. 1, Bilodeau & Renaud, Montreal, joint curator.

Re Jean Lemelin, grocer.—First and final dividend, payable Nov. 10, H. A. Bédard, Quebec, curator.

##### Separation as to property.

Emélie Obé, vs. Joseph Perrault, trader, Lavaltrie, Oct. 18.

##### Separation from bed and board.

Emma Hallé vs. Louis George Bégin, trader and contractor, St. David de l'Aube Rivière, Oct. 16.

##### Thanksgiving Day.

Thursday, Nov. 6, proclaimed a day of public thanksgiving.

**SURPRISES TO COUNSEL.**—The following is said to have occurred in the Cass County (Mich.) Circuit Court during the incumbency of the late Judge Blackburn. Lawyer T. had sued out a writ of *capias*. Lawyer L. moved to quash the writ for the reason that the affidavit upon the filing of which it issued did not sufficiently set forth the nature of the plaintiff's cause of action. At the hearing of the motion the discussion turned upon the interpretation of the word 'nature' as used in the statute which required the nature of the plaintiff's cause of action to be set forth in an affidavit before a writ of *capias* could issue. Lawyer L. was proceeding with his argument when the Court interrupted him with the following query: The Court—What are you reading from, sir? Lawyer L.—From a work on logic, your honor. The Court—Did you give Brother T. notice that you were going to read from a work on logic? Lawyer L.—Of course not, your honor. The Court—Are you aware, sir, of the rule of Court which requires notice to be given of matter which would be liable to surprise the attorney on the other side? Lawyer L.—Yes, your honor, but the rule has no application to a matter of this kind. The Court—I don't know, sir; I don't know. I know of nothing that would surprise Brother T. more than logic, and if you haven't given him notice that you are going to read from a work on logic, why I can't permit you to read it. Lawyer L. proceeded with his argument, and presently he was again interrupted by the Court. The Court—What are you reading from now, sir? Lawyer L.—'Green's Grammar,' your honor. The Court—Did you give brother T. notice that you were going to read from 'Green's Grammar'? Lawyer L., very testily—Of course not, your honor. The Court—Well, sir, I know of nothing in this world aside from logic that would surprise brother T. more than grammar, and if you haven't given him notice that you are going to read from 'Green's Grammar,' why I can't permit you to read it, and I shall have to deny your motion with costs.—*Albany Law Journal*.