

fort is to overrule *O'Neil v. Clason*, 46 L.J.Q.B. 191, and *Pollexfen v. Sibson*, 16 Q.B.D. 792; but Lord Esher, M.R., did not agree to that view. According to the majority of the Court, therefore, in the case of suing a foreign firm whose members are resident abroad, the proper course is not to sue them by the firm name, but to sue and serve the several individuals who compose the firm, and not attempt to apply to such a firm the Rules which enable one partner or a manager to be served on behalf of the firm.

The cases in this number of the Probate Division do not call for any notice. We may, however, observe that if any of our readers take any interest in the ritual disputes which have of late been rife in the Church of England, they will find 110 pages of this number devoted to the recent case of *Read v. The Bishop of Lincoln*, in which the careful and exhaustive judgment of the Archbishop of Canterbury at least shows the difficulties and perplexities in which the subject is involved.

---

### Notes on Exchanges and Legal Scrap Book.

---

SAMUEL JOHNSON ON LAWYERS.—“Sir,” said Dr. Johnson to Sir William Forbes, “a lawyer has no business with the justice or injustice of the cause which he undertakes, unless his client asks his opinion, and then he is bound to give it honestly; the justice or injustice of the cause is to be decided by the Judge. Consider, sir, what is the purpose of the courts of justice,—it is that every man may have his cause fairly tried by men appointed to try causes. A lawyer is not to tell what he knows to be a lie, he is not to produce what he knows to be a false deed; but he is not to usurp the province of the jury and of the Judge, and determine what shall be the effect of evidence, what shall be the result of legal argument. If, by a superiority of attention, of knowledge, of skill, and a better method of communication, a lawyer hath the advantage of his adversary, it is an advantage to which he is entitled. There must always be some advantage on one side or the other, and it is better that that advantage should be by talents than by chance.”—*Boswell's Johnson*.

CHURCH BELLS.—The *Troy Times* is evidently sensitive about one of the pet industries of that lively village when it says: “An English court has just decided that the chime of bells in the village of Deptford must not be sounded, because the noise is offensive to the majority of the property-owners of the vicinity. The souls of property-holders who could object to the delightful melody of church chimes must indeed be devoid of poetical instinct. Could this circumstance be related of any but stolid Britons?” Now, if Britons were really stolid, they would not be annoyed by the ringing of chimes. But the ringing of bells has been frequently forbidden by the courts, not only in England, but in this country, as in *Pennsylvania (Harrison v. St. Mark's Church, Philadelphia Common*