

FLOTSAM AND JETSAM.

ON one of the many official excursions made by boat to Fortress Monroe and Chesapeake Bay, Chief Justice Waite of the Supreme Court, Judge Hall of North Carolina, and other dignitaries of the bench were participants. When the government steamer had got fairly out of the Potomac and into the Atlantic, the sea was very rough and the vessel pitched fearfully. Judge Hall was attacked violently with sea-sickness. As he was retching over the side of the vessel and moaning aloud in his agony, the chief justice stepped gently to his side and laying a soothing hand on his shoulder said: "My dear Hall! can I do anything for you? just suggest what you wish," "I wish," said the sea-sick judge, "your honour would overrule this motion!" It is said that Henry Ward Beecher was once crossing the ocean in company with a sea-sick clerical friend, who complained bitterly of the voyage. To whom Bro. Beecher responded, "why, you know in grace we are always a-bounding." A clerical friend of ours, in crossing the English Channel, remarked to a sick friend, "This is a nasty bit of water." His friend, sadly gazing over the side of the vessel, replied, "It ought to be by this time."

ONE has to go away from home to learn the news. An exchange (which is very much distressed that Canada is part of the British Empire and not one of the States of the Union) tells us almost in tears that "the Governor General (of Canada) is a foreigner; so is the able Prime Minister, Sir John A. McDonald; so, unless we are misinformed are other members of the Cabinet. Our information is that many commercial houses in Canada are merely branches of English houses; that the best situations in these houses are filled by young Englishmen sent out for that purpose, and we certainly know that young and enterprising Canadians are crowded out into the States in large numbers where they find more elbow-room and less English competition." As our contemporary apparently desires to "believe a lie" rather than otherwise, it is a pity to undeceive him, but a little investigation would have shown him that there is a false statement in every sentence in the above absurd paragraph. We are surprised that the editor of a really excellent and most readable periodical should allow some joker to make his pages ridiculous.

SOME twenty years ago it was held in *Reg. v. Collins*, that if a pickpocket puts his hands into your pocket with intent to steal whatever he finds there, he cannot be convicted of an attempt to

steal, if the pocket has really nothing in it. On the authority of this case, Mr. D'Eyncourt the other day refused to commit for trial a "well-known London pickpocket," who was so overwhelmed with surprise at this view of the law as to fall into a fit at once. But was the magistrate quite right? Mr. Justice Stephen, in his "Digest of the Criminal Law," "submits" that in such a case the pickpocket, although he does not in law attempt to steal, commits an assault on the owner of the pocket with intent to commit a felony; and, looking to the expediency of discouraging pickpockets as much as possible, we cannot but think that a committal would have been justified. Again, even in *Reg. v. Collins*, it was admitted that had a question been submitted to the jury whether there was anything in the pocket which might have been taken, and they had found that there was, the indictment might have been sustained. Now the evidence before Mr. D'Eyncourt appears to have been that of a policeman, who said not that the pocket was empty, but that he did not know it to contain anything. The pickpocket, be it remembered *had pleaded guilty*.

AN extraordinary instance of the peculiarity of Chinese notions of justice, as embodied in the law of the land, has occurred at the Mixed Court at Shanghai. An old man, clothed in rags, was brought before Huang and Mr. Giles, and charged with attempting to commit suicide by drowning himself in Soochow Creek. The accused's son, a cleanly looking youth, appeared to give evidence against his father, and was at once ordered by Huang to go down on his knees before the bench. Mr. Giles remarked that it appeared to be the Chinese custom when a son charged his father with any offence to make him go down on his knees like an accused person, and this being so, he thought it best not to interfere. The circumstances of the case were then explained to the court. It was stated that the son was an assistant in a barber's shop, earning the munificent salary of 900 cash a month in addition to his food. Out of this he helped to support his father; but the old man was not satisfied with what he got, as his son had promised to let him have 12,000 cash a month—an amount rather difficult for the boy to pay out of a monthly salary of 900 cash. The old man upbraided his son for walking about in good clothes, while his poor father was in rags, and announced his intention of committing suicide in consequence of his son's unfilial conduct. The son, fearing that the old man would carry out his intention followed his father to the edge of Soochow Creek, when the father seized hold of the boy and jumped into the