

FLOTSAM AND JETSAM.

The Governor—"Certainly; he has become entirely restored to his reason."—*The Central Law Journal*.

A LAWYER in Western Tennessee asked one of his four ebony-hued clients, indicted jointly for hog-stealing:—"How many of you are accused?" "Fo', sah! but I tell you, lawyer, dey got dis ting all wrong. I ought to be one of de witnesses, but dey got me down as one of de men dat done de 'dultury."

"My dear fellow," said an Indiana sheriff to his prisoner, "I must apologize to you for the sanitary condition of this jail. Several of the prisoners are down with the measles, but I assure you that it is not 'my fault.'" "Oh, no excuses," replied the prisoner, "it was my intention to break out as soon as possible, any way."

MAGISTRATE—"The serious charge of chicken-stealing is preferred against you, Uncle Rastus." Uncle Rastus—"Do de indictment say chicken-stealin', yo' Honah?" Magistrate—"Yes." Uncle Rastus—"Den de indictment am defecktive, yo' Honah. It war a turkey I stole. I demands a *habeous corpeus*, and takes advantage ob de tecnumcalities of de law."

A JUDGE's first charge is thus reported by the *Medical and Surgical Reporter*:—He said—"Gentlemen of the jury, charging a jury is a new business to me, as this is my first case. You have heard all the evidence, as well as myself; you have also heard what the learned counsel have said. If you believe what the counsel for the plaintiff has told you your verdict will be for the plaintiff; but if, on the other hand, you believe what the defendant's counsel have told you, then you will give a verdict for the defendant. But if you are like me, and don't believe what either of them has said, then I'll be hanged if I know what you will do. Constable, take charge of the jury."

SATIRICAL.—A lawyer cannot always trust his witnesses with impunity, any more than they can him. A coloured man once sued a neighbour for damages for the loss of his dog that the neighbour had killed. The defendant wished to prove that

the dog was a worthless cur, for whose destruction no damages ought to be recovered.

The attorney for the defence called one Sam Parker (coloured) to the witness stand, whereupon the following conversation ensued:

"Sam, did you know this dog that was killed by Mr. Jones?"

"Yessah, I war pussonally acquainted wid dat dog."

"Well, tell the jury what kind of a dog he was."

"He war a big yaller dog."

"What was he good for?"

"Well, he wouldn't hunt, an' he wouldn't do no gyard duty; he jes' lay round an' eat. Dat make 'em call 'im wat dey did."

"Yes. Well, what did they call him?"

"Well, sah, I don't want ter hurt yer feelin's, sah, an' I is mighty sorry you ax me dat, sah, but er fack is, dey call 'im 'Lawyer,' sah."—*The Central Law Journal*.

"THE herders on the ranch," writes a Texas traveller, "were all Mexicans, save an old Scotchman, who was a solitary instance to the contrary. He was a most markedly benevolent-looking old man, and had about him that copious halo of hair with which benevolence seems to delight to surround itself. He carried a crook, as seemed fitting, and had with him two sheep dogs, one of which the kindly man assured us he had frequently cured of a recurrent disease by cutting off pieces of its tail. This sacrificial part having been pretty well used up, the beast's situation in view of another attack was very ticklish: and it had in fact the air of occupying the anxious-seat."

This recurrent caudal-clipping was a desperate remedy even when applied to save the poor beast's own life—would it have been less desperate if the repeated sacrifice had been made to save the life of the other beast? If Gladstonian statesmanship continue to offer up clippings from the British lion's tail to cure the intermittent fever of the Irish beast, will not the life of that once noble animal speedily become very ticklish? Is it not indeed now occupying the anxious-seat?