

a conventional expression, and was inaccurate when mentioned in an indictment. What ought to be alleged was that certain jurors mentioned by name were corrupted. The learned counsel quoted 'Stephen's Digest of the Criminal Law,' p. 77, and said that the word 'jury' was not used, but only 'a jurymen.' The offence of embracery was the embracing of a juror. He therefore submitted that the indictment which alleged an attempt to influence a jury instead of an attempt to influence certain jurors, and mentioning their names, was bad. He argued also that the nature of the persuasion and entertainment ought to be set out, and that the words 'other unlawful means' were far too vague for an indictment. He therefore submitted that the indictment ought to be quashed as the names of the jurymen were not mentioned in it, and the means of corruption were not stated sufficiently, and the words 'other unlawful means' were too vague.

Mr. Fulton argued that the offence was sufficiently stated. The charge was unlawfully attempting to influence a jury. There was no precedent on which the indictment could be drawn.

The recorder said that this was an indictment at common law, and there did not appear to be any precedent for the indictment. What they found was that where the offence was alluded to in the Act 32 Hen. VIII, in 'Stephen's Digest of the Criminal Law' and in the Report of the Royal Commission, and also in the draft bill drawn in conformity with the recommendations of that report, the language had been singularly uniform, and in every case the allusion had been not to a body as a jury, but always referred definitely to individuals. In his opinion the indictment was bad, and must be quashed.—The indictment was accordingly quashed, and the defendant was discharged.—*Law Journal (London).*

### INSOLVENT NOTICES, ETC.

Quebec Official Gazette, March 7.

#### Judicial Adandonments.

Henri Blanchette, trader, parish of St. Valerien de Milton, Feb. 27.

Dominateur Collins, scale manufacturer, Montreal, Feb. 26.

Alphonse Langevin Lacroix, trader, Montebello, March 4.

Raoul Lavoie, hardware merchant, Quebec, March 4.

Thomas Mailhot, trader, Gentilly, March 5.

#### Curators Appointed.

Re Briggs & Jackson, Stanbridge East.—M. Boyce, N.P., Bedford, curator, Feb. 28.

Re Buckingham Pulp Co., Montreal.—J. McD. Hains, Montreal, liquidator, March 4.

Re John Delisle.—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, March 4.

Re Odilon Desrosiers et al.—L. A. Saucier, Louiseville, curator, Feb. 28.

Re P. Gallery, Montreal.—A. W. Stevenson, Montreal, curator, March 2.

Re J. B. O. Langlois, St. John's.—J. M. Marcotte, Montreal, curator, March 3.

Re A. Lanthier, Waterloo.—W. A. Caldwell, Montreal, curator, Feb. 28.

Re Damase Larche, shoemaker, Athelstan.—James Cameron, curator, Feb. 17.

Re P. Larivière, Ste. Brigitte—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator, Feb. 27.

Re F. X. Mantha.—Bilodeau & Renaud, Montreal, joint curator, March 2.

Re T. Slayton & Co., Montreal.—W. A. Caldwell, Montreal, curator, Jan. 10.

Re R. Tyler, Sons & Co., Montreal.—W. A. Caldwell, Montreal, curator, Feb. 27.

Re Adam Watters.—H. A. Bedard, Quebec, curator, March 4.

#### Dividends.

Re Landry & Frère.—First dividend, payable March 9, H. Langlois, Ste. Scholastique, curator.

Re Joseph Massé, Ste. Angèle de Laval.—First and final dividend, payable March 26, C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator.

#### Separation as to Property.

Barbara Baillie vs. William Minto, trader, Cote St. Antoine, Feb. 20.

Virginie A. Doré vs. Joseph T. Fontaine, barber, Montreal, March 4.

Lucie Lauzon vs. John A. Germain, trader, Sorel, Feb. 28.

Frances Letitia Pridham vs. Wm. Ashburnham Whitefield, Montreal, baker, March 3.

A GREAT LAWYER WHO COULD NOT WRITE.—Mr. Beach, then a resident of this city, was engaged in the trial of an important cause at our court-house; and was keeping his own minutes of the evidence, as it was before the court had a stenographer, and having occasion to step out a moment, turned to Frank J. Parmenter, who was sitting near, and said: "Frank, will you be so kind as to keep minutes for me till I return?" "Certainly, Mr. Beach," replied the obliging young lawyer, "if I am not required to read your own!" In the course of ten minutes Mr. Beach returned, when his big chair was restored to him, and he glanced eagerly at his minutes to see what had occurred during his brief absence. To his horror, not a single note had been made, but instead, at the close of his own unreadable minutes, he saw the following:

EPITAPH ON HON. WILLIAM A. BEACH.

Here lies the great lawyer struck down in h's might,  
Who talked like an angel, but never could write.

Beach, who had no idea of wit or humor, never indulged it himself, or tolerated it in others, was heard muttering to himself: "The d——d rascal!" "the d——d rascal!" The joke was soon known to the whole bar, and at last Beach enjoyed it as much as any. We ought, perhaps, to add that the parties were always good friends and so remained till the death of Mr. Beach broke the relation.—*Troy Times.*