

clear perception that he seldom failed to make the most involved case plain to his hearers. For several years he conducted the Crown prosecutions in Montreal with much credit to himself. While firm and unyielding in the defence of his clients' interests, he was at the same time a gentleman of remarkable courtesy and affability. His death occurred at the comparatively early age of 54, when, to all appearance, he had still a long career before him. Yet many years before his sudden demise he had attained the foremost rank of the profession.

COMMUNICATIONS.

GRANT v. BEAUDRY.

To the Editor of the Legal News:

SIR, Permit me to state, that I was not counsel for the appellant in Grant v. Beaudry, as incorrectly reported in vol. 2 of Mr. Dorion's Q. B. Reports at p. 215, and that I was not counsel in the case on either side. So far from giving counsel to the appellant, I was one of the four counsel who advised Mayor Beaudry that the Orange Body was an illegal association.

STRACHAN BETHUNE, Q. C.

Montreal, 31 Aug. 1882.

GENERAL NOTES.

At the annual conference of the Association for the Reform and Codification of the Law of Nations, held last month in Liverpool, several Americans participated in the debate on the form of a bill of lading. Judge Warren, of New York, moved that the words "Act of God" be struck out on the ground that the phrase was irreverent and entirely superfluous. Judge Peabody seconded the motion, because he did not like to have the misfortunes and accidents of the sea attributed to the Supreme Being. Mr. Westgarth considered that it would be tantamount to a revolution to leave out of the bill of lading the old phrase "the act of God." Mr. Atkinson denied that the words were any more irreverent than the shibboleth "So help me God," which was used when they went into Court to give evidence. Mr. Gray Hill said the words had received a judicial interpretation for a long series of years, but "super-human cause" would cover "act of God." Judge Warren withdrew his motion, moving that the words "lightning and other causes" be inserted. Mr. E. R. Condert, of New York, was in favor of the retention of the phrase, because it was a reverent expression, and because there was a tendency among Continental nations to strike it out. Eventually, the motion for the omission of the words from the bill of lading was lost by 27 to 12.—*Albany Law Journal*.

The appointment of Mr. Thos. Hughes to a County Court judgeship may perhaps do something to weaken the prejudice that literature is incompatible with law. It was proof against the practical test of a man of letters becoming Lord Chancellor, which produced the sarcasm that Lord Brougham would know a little of everything if he knew a little law. When Samuel Warren brought out his "Ten Thousand a Year" his friends professed to be anxious to know who wrote the law in it. Yet Brougham was a good, though not a great lawyer; and Warren, at least, made an efficient master in lunacy. Probably Sir Walter Scott, who never rose in the law beyond a subordinate post in the Court of Session, suffered through his fame as a writer. The County Court bench has hitherto been free from the suspicion of letters, but the author of "Tom Brown" may find a precedent in the case of the author of "Tom Jones." Fielding was an admirable police magistrate, and his novels gained from his experience in Court, while his law was probably not the worse for his having an imagination.—*Law Journal*.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OF LAWYERS.—The Hon. D. B. Eaton, in an address before the Yale Law School, upon the public relations and duties of the legal profession, remarked:—"Lawyers are the great office-holding class, who, for that reason, also know more than every other class combined, concerning the grave administrative abuses which now threaten and alarm the nation, of their causes, and the fit means for their removal. We may indeed almost say that we have a government of lawyers,—a privileged class of professional office-holders. Twenty four out of the fifty-six signers of the Declaration of Independence, and thirty out of the fifty-five members of the convention that framed the Federal Constitution, were of the legal profession. Of the nineteen presidents, all but three, who were generals, have been lawyers; and so have a great majority—perhaps five-sixths—of all the members of the cabinet. At this moment every cabinet officer is a lawyer. The greater number of the Governors and of their advisers, if not of the mayors of cities, have at all times been of that profession. In the cases in which its members have not been in majority in legislatures, it is pretty certain that they have been the most influential members, with a controlling voice in framing the laws. There has hardly been a congress in which the numbers and influence of the lawyers have not been overwhelming. In the last Congress the lawyers of New England furnished seven of her twelve senators, and eighteen of her twenty-eight representatives, or nearly three times as many as all other classes combined. From Pennsylvania, one of her senators and seventeen of her twenty-seven representatives were of the legal profession. From Ohio, both senators and all but three of her twenty representatives were lawyers. Of the nine senators and representatives from Georgia, all but two were lawyers; and so were all but two of those from Virginia. Only a solitary person not a lawyer represented Tennessee or North Carolina, and not one, so far as the record shows, who was not a lawyer, reached Washington from Texas. Of the whole of that Congress more than three-fourths were lawyers. Of the seventy-six members of the present Senate, fifty-nine are lawyers, and only seventeen belong to all other classes of the people."