

CONSPIRACY TO BOYCOTT.--The Virginia Court of Appeal, in *Crump v. Commonwealth*, concluded that a conspiracy to boycott is criminal. We gather the facts from the *Criminal Law Magazine*. The plaintiff in error was a member of the Richmond Typographical Union. This body sought by means of boycotting to break up the business of Baughman Bros., printers and stationers, and compel them to make their office a union office. For this purpose the plaintiff in error and the other members of the Typographical Union conspired together. They sent out circulars saying that the labour organizations had boycotted Baughman Bros., and formally notifying customers of that firm that the names of all who should persist in dealing with that firm after notice would be published weekly in the *Labour Herald*, in a black-list, and in their turn boycotted until they agreed to withdraw their patronage. The employees of the obnoxious office were mercilessly persecuted by the labour organ, which sought to prevent them obtaining board or shelter, and customers were black-listed. The community was flooded with notices to boycott Baughman Bros., and all their customers. On appeal it was contended that the indictment did not charge a conspiracy to do any unlawful act, or show that the means to be used in breaking up the business of the non-union firm was unlawful. The objection was overruled, and the conviction affirmed. Boycotting is held to be unlawful in Virginia. The judgment of Fauntleroy, J., reviews the English and American decisions affecting the question at issue with considerable fulness.

FALSE ECONOMY.--Occasionally the person who evades the clear duty of every man when in trouble about his property to consult a respectable solicitor finds that he has made an expensive mistake. An illustration of this has just been supplied by an exhibitor at the Anglo-Danish Exhibition, who had a dispute with the manager of the "space department" as to the amount of rent due at the close of the Exhibition. The exhibitor wanted his goods (show-cases, etc.) for exhibition elsewhere, but did not feel inclined to pay the full rent demanded, the Exhibition having been closed prematurely. The manager claiming a lien on the goods, the exhibitor went to a police court and invoked the aid of the sitting magistrate, who offered him a summons under section 40 of the Metropolitan Police Act, provided the value of the goods did not exceed £15. This offer the exhibitor, who was all impatience to have his property transferred from South Kensington to some remote venue in Wales, jumped at with celerity. Mark the result. The summons was heard, and on every question raised the magistrate was in favour of the complainant, who not only got an order for immediate delivery of his property, but a substantial sum for his costs. Charmed, no doubt, by Mr. D'Eyncourt's urbanity and celerity, the exhibitor went away triumphant, and forthwith appeared outside the ruins of the Exhibition with vans and horses to retake possession of his property, but to no purpose. To his horror he found that his adversary had outrun him in the race; for, when he returned next day to complain to his worship that the order of the court was set at nought, he discovered that the defendant had paid into court