

Held, that as the services to the disabled tug were rendered under the easiest conditions, without increase of labour or delay to the F. it was clearly a towage and not a salvage service.

2. It not being a case of salvage the officers and crew of the F. were not entitled to participate in the amount awarded for the towage but that it belonged to the owners of the ship.

3. The defendants having paid into Court an amount sufficient to liberally compensate the plaintiff for the services rendered, they were given their proper costs against the plaintiff.

A. H. Cook, Q.C., for plaintiff. *Pentland*, Q.C., for defendants.

Flotsam and Jetsam.

Lawyers have no objection to jokes against themselves provided there is something jocular about it; but when they are simply stupid and evidently manufactured by some one who has no sense of the humorous, they are a bore. Our brother of *Green Bag* devotes considerable space to *Facetiae*. Some of these are good, some indifferent, some only stupid, and some in bad taste. Recent numbers contain some of all the above classes, the last being much in evidence in the September number. This matter is of very little consequence, but perhaps worth noting as a suggestion to the editor of that very readable magazine. The following from the October number are of the kind that are good:—One of the neatest instances of the tables being turned upon a bullying counsel was afforded by a clergyman, who gave evidence at the Worcester Assizes in a horse-dealing case. He gave a somewhat confused account of the transaction in dispute and the cross-examining counsel, after making several blustering but ineffective attempts to obtain a more satisfactory statement, said, "Pray, sir, do you know the difference between a horse and a cow?" "I acknowledge my ignorance," replied the reverend gentleman. "I hardly know the difference between a horse and a cow, or between a bull and a bully—only a bull, I am told, has horns, and a bully"—here he made a respectful bow to the advocate—"luckily for me, has none." Quite as palpable was the hit of the farmer who, though severely cross-examined on the matter, remained very positive as to the identity of some ducks which he alleged had been stolen from him. "How can you be so certain?" asked the counsel for the prisoner; "I have some ducks of the same kind in my own possession." "Very likely," was the cool answer of the farmer, "those are not the only ducks I've had stolen."

In the Court of Appeal, before the Lord Chief Justice and Lords Justices Smith and Williams, counsel contended, in the case of *Styles (Surveyor of Taxes) v. Treasurer of the Middle Temple*, that the hall and