

FLOTSAM AND JETSAM.

shall gave on to my wife mary purtell all the Lands that I own Containg fifty acres—50 acres in this township to mannage and have charge and controle thereof ontill death shall await on her then my oldest son Edward Purtell shall own the same fifty acres in the saim township providiing my son Edward purtell does not goe of or lave the Charg of his mother before he is at age of 21 years being this time in his 15th year, alsoe he is to contennue after he is at age in the same other ways my wife mary purtell may gave said lands onto my son James Purtell. I alsoe charge my son Edward purtell to gave on to my son James purtell the sum of Two Hundred dollars in cash this sum being £50, currency alsoe my son Edward purtell shall pay on to my young son Robert Purtill the sum of two Hundred Dollars being £50 pound currency the are 21 years if by sickness or acce-dence my son edward should Die said lands shall be giving onto my 2 twoe sons James and robert purtell or of my sons 3 may die that the one boys may own the same which he is hear of: Alsoe my daters fore 4 alles, ellan, Briget and Mary Jane purtell shall have a home on said lands and farm house in health or sickness does plevale on them."

A "DIVORCE" lawyer in Chicago has met the fate which all his peculiar species deserve. He was in the habit of advertising in the newspapers in different parts of the country, in terms such as the following: "Divorces legally obtained, without publicity, and at small expense;" "Divorces legally obtained for incompatibility, etc., residence unnecessary, fee after decree." One of the worst phases of the case of the lawyer in question is, that he well knew that incompatibility was not one of the lawful grounds of divorce in Illinois, and that a residence of one year in that state was required prior to filing a complaint for divorce, unless the offence complained of was committed in that state. The advertisement also conveyed the idea that he had the power of manipulating the courts of justice to suit himself. These things being properly presented to the Supreme Court, the "divorce" lawyer was duly disbarred. Breese, J., who delivered the opinion in the case, thus pronounces upon the practices of these parasites of the profession: "It is not denied an attorney may make any one of the branches of the law a specialty, but he must not, in so doing and acting, use undignified means, or low, disgusting artifices, and, least of all, should not withhold his name from

his advertisements, nor should they be false or contain libels on the courts. No honourable, high-minded lawyer, alive to the dignity of his profession and emulous of its honours, could stoop so low as this defendant has. That he should embellish his papers, contrived in a spirit of barratry, with the emblem of justice, is singularly inappropriate. We have no patience with one who, bearing our license to practice law in our courts, has shocked all sense of propriety, of professional decorum, and of respect to the courts in which he practises. He is an unworthy member, and must be disbarred.—*Albany Law Journal.*

We trust that strict attention to each of the different kinds of business that appear in the following card will enable the advertiser to make both ends meet. We regret, however, that a Clerk of a Division Court should also be a druggist; there is no saying to what excesses suitors may go in the agony of hatred or disappointment, caused by an adverse judgment. With that eye to business which Mr. M. would seem to possess, he has probably some relation in the undertaking line:—

EDWARD MATTHEWS,
Druggist, Conveyancer and Commis-
sioner in B.R. Deeds, Mortgages
Bonds, &c., *Executed on*
Reasonable Terms.
CLERK OF THE DIVISION COURT.
&c., &c.

The nicety and technical precision required in criminal pleading, have often been the subject of remark. The policy and tautology of Equity pleadings likewise have been animadverted upon. "I remember," said the late Lord Chancellor Campbell, "when Bills in Equity told the same story over and over again, and each time more obscurely than on the previous occasion. When the answer came, the great object in drawing it up was, that however long it might be, it should form only one sentence, in order that if a part of it had to be read, it should be necessary to read the whole! But I am happy to be able to say, that both the bills and answer, which I have lately read, were simple, reasonable, grammatical, and perspicuous." *Hansard N. S. vol. 154, col. 1032.*