

dangerously ill at Portsmouth; they had saved his life, and he had brought them with him to town, had ever since kept them in a glass, had himself every day given them fresh water, and had formed a friendship for them. He said he was sure they both knew him and were grateful to him. He had given them different names, 'Home' and 'Cline' (the names of two celebrated surgeons), their dispositions being quite different. After a good deal of conversation about them, he went himself, brought them out of his library, and placed them in their glass upon the table. It is impossible, however, without the vivacity, the tones, the details and the gestures of Lord Erskine, to give an adequate idea of this singular scene." Amongst the listeners to Erskine, whilst he spoke eloquently and with fervor of the virtue of his two leeches, were the Duke of Norfolk, Lord Grenville, Lord Gray, Lord Holland, Lord Ellenborough, Lord Lauderdale, Lord Henry Petty, and Thomas Grenville.

**DILIGENT IN BUSINESS.**—Whilst he was presiding at the trial of a thief in the Old Bailey, Sir John Sylvester, Recorder of London, said incidentally that he had left his watch at home. The trial ended in an acquittal, the prisoner had no sooner gained his liberty than he hastened to the recorder's house, and sent in word to Lady Sylvester that he was a constable and had been sent from the Old Bailey to fetch her husband's watch. When the recorder returned home and found he had lost his watch, it is to be feared that Lady Sylvester lost her usual equanimity.—*Jeaffreson.*

**AN INTRICATE QUESTION, LOGICALLY DECIDED.**  
—Four men in India, partners in business, bought several bales of Indian rugs, and also some cotton bales. That the rats might not destroy the cotton, they purchased a cat. They agreed that each of the four should own a particular part of the cat; and each adorned with beads and other ornaments the leg thus apportioned to him. The cat, by an accident, injured one of her legs. The owner of that member wound around it a bag soaked in oil. The cat, going too near the hearth, set this rag on fire, and being in great pain, rushed in among the cotton bales, where she was accustomed to hunt rats. The cotton and rugs thereby took fire, and they were burned up—a total loss.

The three other parties brought a suit to recover the value of the goods destroyed against the fourth partner, who owned this particular leg of the cat. The Judge examined the case, and decided thus:

"The leg that had the oiled rag on it was hurt: the cat could not use that leg; in fact, it held up that leg, and ran with the other three legs. The three unhurt legs, therefore, carried the fire to the cotton, and are alone culpable. The injured leg is not to be blamed. The three partners who owned the three legs with which the cat ran to the cotton will pay the whole value of the bales to the partner who was the proprietor of the injured leg."

**AN INGENIOUS DEFENCE.**—The *Nonconformist*, in a paragraph on pulpit plagiarism, says that recently a student, after delivering a trial discourse in a Scottish divinity hall, being charged by one of his fellow-students with plagiarism, coolly replied, "I wrote my sermon with inverted commas." "But how," exclaimed his fellow-student, "could your inverted commas be discovered by the Professor?" "Did you not observe," replied the unabashed thief, "that I turned up my tongue twice, in imitation of inverted commas, when I commenced my discourse, and turned down my tongue twice, at the other side of my mouth, when I had finished my sermon?"

**TRIAL BY JURY.**—The acquittal of Bartley, on the charge of having murdered Serjeant Doré in the County of Beauce, has excited considerable remark. *L'Événement* publishes the names of the jurymen, all French-Canadians, with their places of residence. It says:—"A verdict like this is a shame and a disgrace, and at the same time a serious warning that the notions of an oath and of duties toward society have become very weak in a considerable portion of the class from which juries are drawn." The *Courrier du Canada* says:—"According to the Court the verdict given in this case is evidently false, and the jury is guilty of perjury, either voluntary or involuntary. The sacredness of an oath is set at naught to-day, and we have proof that in this case one of the jurymen declared that he did not know whether the Holy Scriptures was a good book or not. Ignorance is very great among that population, and the sooner it is deprived of trial by jury the better it will be for the honor of justice."