

## FLOTSAM AND JETSAM.

## FLOTSAM AND JETSAM.

THE following is said to be a true copy of a will, which was submitted to a lawyer in Indiana lately :

INDIANAPOLIS, October 15th, 1867.

This certifies that Thomas Shannessey has made his last will to his wife, Catherine Shannessey, to dispose of said property as she thinks fit, if necessary to compel her to do so.

THOMAS SHANNESSEY,  
X.

Witness

DENNIS O'CONNELL,  
MICHAEL CALLAHAN.

GREAT SEALS.—The Nova Scotians are by no means the first people who have been in trouble about a Great Seal. When the Prince of Orange, in 1688-9, took the reins of government in England, there was no Great Seal. It was part of his Catholic Majesty's luggage when he left Whitehall; but James did not keep it for many minutes. With the impression on his mind that the government of the kingdom could not be carried on without it, he dropped it into the Thames with his royal hand. About a century later, when Lord Thurlow was High Chancellor, his house in Great Ormond-street was broken into on the 24th March, 1784, and the Great Seal of England was among the property stolen. It was never got back from the thieves, but was replaced the next day by a new one. Later, William IV. was very angry with Lord Brougham for taking the Great Seal to foreign parts in his valise. A young lady once made it her pleasure to obtain the Seal from the gallant old lawyer, and compelled him to go down on his knees to her on a rather public occasion, before she would restore it to his custody.—*Ex.*

ROBES.—More confusion has arisen from the supposed operation of the Judicature Act. On the Queen's birthday—or, rather, on the day specially appointed for the celebration of Her Majesty's birth—judges and counsel were at cross purposes concerning their robes. Some judges wore the splendid scarlet and full-bot-tomed wigs; others black gowns and ordinary wigs. Some Queen's counsel affected big wigs, and some little wigs. There are days in the Calendar which sorely puzzle the authorities at Oxford and Cambridge, leaving dons and scholars in doubt whether surplices or gowns should be worn in chapel. Society also occasionally presents problems in costume, not easily solved. But lawyers are supposed to rise above all difficulties; and judges are expected to know in

what robes they are to expound the law, as clearly and certainly as they are 'on assumption' able to declare the law itself. Judges often complain that they do not know from one day to another where they are to sit, and what business they are to do. This is very deplorable; but not so bad as doubt and discrepancy as to the dress in which justice is to clothe her preachers.—*Ex.*

A CORRESPONDENT of the Albany Law Journal, writing from London on "The Crime of Murder in England," reaches the following conclusions: (1.) That the sensational manner in which crimes of violence are reported in American newspapers has impressed foreigners, and especially the English, with the idea that lawlessness prevails throughout every grade of American society, and that no man's life is safe even in the streets of New York, unless he can defend it himself in any chance quarrel or contact with any bloodthirsty desperado, with a whole arsenal of pistols and knives. (2.) That for every man killed in the heat of affray in America, some man, woman or child is murdered in England barbarously, deliberately in cold blood. (3.) That in England the man who commits a murder is "past praying for," whenever the evidence is conclusive that he did kill. If A kills B to-day, a coroner's jury renders its verdict to-morrow. A is examined before a magistrate and committed the same or next day, tried next week, and hanged three weeks hence, within the walls of the county jail, unknown, unrecognized, unapplauded; and a brief paragraph in the newspapers announces when, how and why he paid penalty to the law, and that is the last of him. (4.) That in England there are no long delays, and frequent postponements, and new trials, and reprieves, and public demonstrations of sympathy, and speeches upon the scaffold, and departures with great *eclat*, surrounded by an admiring staff of newspaper reporters, and celebrated, to the slightest detail, in columns of tumid newspaper sensationalism. (5.) That England punishes her murderers with certainty and fitting circumstance, while we either let them go free or waft them from the gallows to the clouds amid the pæans of admiring friends. (6.) That the English method of treating murderers is greatly superior to the American, with its delay, uncertainty, and, at the end, senseless and demoralizing publicity. If people must be killed, let it be done quietly, sadly, solemnly, as becomes the terrible example sought to be conveyed, and the great responsibility assumed.—*Ex.*