

FLOTSAM AND JETSAM.

dignities. Indeed, I did not even suspect that he knew any law. Upon my expressing my surprise, he replied, calmly, "Yes, sir, for four years I administered justice in Oregon—with the help of one law-book and two six-shooters."

—]

SUPREME COURT EXAMINATION IN INDIANA.—Years ago a young law student emigrated from New England to the State of Indiana, and applied for admission to the Bar, the examinations then being required before the Supreme Court in public session, as at the present time in Illinois. Judge Stevens was then presiding, and acted as examiner. "Let the applicant for admission come forward," proclaimed the Judge, in a commanding and lofty tone. The crowded court room was silent and sympathetic, as the modest and embarrassed young stranger presented himself before the Judge with eyes as downcast and nerves as tremulous as if he had been arraigned for crime. "Young man," demanded the Judge, with sternness and oppressive pomp, "*What is the first great duty of a lawyer?*" "*To secure his fees, Sir,*" squeaked out the bashful student, in a voice of girlish clearness. This answer to a question strangely general and indefinite, so apt and unexpected, produced an irrepressible burst of laughter at the Judge's expense, who, blushing and indignant, cried out to the clerk, "prepare a license for the applicant—I find him well qualified to practise law in the State of Indiana." The student became a wealthy and distinguished lawyer and citizen—the late Hon. James Farrington, of the city of Terre Haute, a gentleman universally respected and beloved.

A correspondent of the *Albany Law Journal* has unearthed two points in criminal practice from the old reports. In the trial of the Seven Bishops, after the charge to the jury, the following colloquy took place. The Lord Chief Justice: "Gentlemen of the jury, have you a mind to drink before you go?" Jury: "Yes, my Lord, if you please." [*Wine was sent for, for the jury.*] Afterwards the following conversation ensued. Jurymen: "My lord, we humbly pray that your lordship would be pleased to let us have the papers that have been given in evidence." Lord Chief Justice: "What is that you would have, sir?" Mr. Solicitor-General: "He desires this, my lord, that you would be pleased to direct that the jury may have the use of such writings and statute books as may be

necessary for them to make use of." Lord Chief Justice: "The statute books they shall have." The "treating the jury," it is pointed out would probably vitiate a verdict at this day, but the authorities are not uniform. See *Van Buskirk v. Dougherty* 44 Iowa, 162; *Kee v. State*, 28 Ark. 155; *Perry v. Bailey*, 12 Kas. 539; *Redmond v. Royal Ins. Co.*, 7 Phila. 167. As regards the second point, in *Merritt v. Nary* 10 Allen, 416, a new trial was granted because the judge who presided allowed the jury to have a copy of the general statutes in the jury room while deliberating on their verdict. The ancient authority above mentioned does not appear to have been cited in the argument of the latter case.

—]

SINGULAR CASE OF DISPUTED IDENTITY.—A court-martial sitting in Paris has just sentenced to five years' penal servitude a man named Charles Drouhin, who was convicted nine years ago of having given information to the Germans during the siege, and who, having escaped from prison during the Communist insurrection, was recaptured under very peculiar circumstances. When the insurrection was over, Drouhin had disappeared, and nothing more was heard of him until last year, when an old man with a long white beard came to the office of the registrar of the court, and asked to be allowed to consult some of the documents filed in connection with the case, alleging that he was the eldest brother of Drouhin, who had died in an hospital a short time before. The registrar let him have the documents, but it suddenly occurred to him that the visitor must be Drouhin himself. Inquiries were made, and Drouhin, who was found begging at the porch of a church in the Rue St. Honoré, was arrested. He stoutly denied the accusation. When confronted with the warders of the prison in which he had been confined nine years ago none of them recognised him, and everything pointed to an acquittal at the trial, when the officer presiding ordered the prisoner to be taken out and shaved. He protested energetically, declaring that his occupation as a model would be gone if he were deprived of his flowing white beard; but the court was inexorable, and when he emerged from the barber's hand the warders recognised him at once. He still protested that he was the brother of the man whom they took him for, but the barber's razor had removed all doubt, and Drouhin went back to prison to serve the remainder of his term.