

practice seventy-four years ago, having been admitted a solicitor in 1822. He retired from practice several years ago, but a few of his former clients continued to employ him in matters which did not impose too severe a strain upon his strength. His family was a singularly long-lived one. His brother, who for many years practised as a doctor in the Isle of Man, died not long ago at Bawtry at the age of ninety-three. Mr. Raynes was, even when far advanced in years, an enthusiastic follower of Lord Galway's hounds. When he was no longer able to join in the chase he habitually attended the meet in a phaeton. He was present at the opening meet at the beginning of last month.

PRIVILEGES OF THE POLICE.—The cases of the Michaelmas sittings afford consolation to the much abused police. We select two rulings for their comfort: (1) The joint committee of a county council is not justified, even by the advice of the Home Office, in insisting on the exercise of its power to have a pensioned constable medically examined in the county, with the ulterior object of bringing him within reach of an official receiver in bankruptcy—*Regina v. Lord Leigh*. (2) A constable is acting in the execution of his duty who pursues a coroner to his lawn-tennis club to inform him of the discovery of a dead body within his district, and stops him in his amusement to give him the information. But *semble* that before interfering with a coroner in the execution of his pleasures, the constable should first seek him at his official residence, and failing to find him there, should seek his clerk or officer.—*Cook v. Gaches* (Queen's Bench Division on November 2)—*Law Journal*.

PRIVILEGE OF WITNESSES IN ENGLAND.—We forbear at present to comment on the case of *Kitson v. Playfair* further than to express our agreement with the observations of Sir Henry Hawkins in regard to the lack of any authority in Courts of law for the code of professional rules as to confidentiality which medical men have constructed for themselves. The issue could hardly have been raised in the case of a barrister, who—unlike a medical man (*Duchess of Kingston's Case*, 20 St. T. 572, 573) and *semble* a priest of the Church (*Butler v. Moore*, M'Nalty Evid. 253, 254)—is usually not only not compellable, but not permitted to disclose confidential communications. The position of priests is still doubtful, as we have indicated, but only in regard to the question of compulsion. Chief Justice Best, in *Broad v. Pitt*, 3