

angine pectorale dont il souffrait depuis un mois. Depuis quelques jours, il s'affaiblissait beaucoup et avait beaucoup maigri. M. Loranger était toujours sur le point de partir pour la France afin de rétablir sa santé, mais il retardait constamment ce voyage, malgré l'avis de ses médecins, et travaillait à la codification des statuts."

GENERAL NOTES.

EXCOMMUNICATION CASE.—The Rev. Coker Adams, Rector of Soham Toney, has excommunicated Mr. Payne, a farmer, eighty-two years of age. Mr. Payne does not attend Church, and, it is said, has refused the clergyman admission to his house. A letter was written threatening to excommunicate him, but Mr. Payne, not understanding the process, wrote to inquire whether any part of the last half year's tithe had accidentally remained unpaid. He received the following reply: "Sir,—My letter of last Sunday was not written in consequence of any personal matter. You have, as you truly say, always paid me my dues. I wrote to remind you that you had persistently neglected to attend the Church's services and refused to receive her ministers, and that I should therefore feel it my painful duty to pronounce you cut off from the Church's communion and membership. The wish I express at the end of my letter was quite sincere and remains unaltered still.—Yours faithfully, **COKER ADAMS.**" The wish referred to in the first letter was that the rector prayed God to change Payne's heart and save his soul. When the sentence was pronounced the whole congregation was taken by surprise. Just before the sermon the rev. gentleman said, "In the name of God, &c.," making use of the entire form of excommunication, which is generally believed to be obsolete. Mr. Payne seemed unmoved by the proceeding.—*Law Journal* (London).

THE FIRST LAWYER IN BOSTON.—Almost two and a half centuries ago, Thomas Lechford, who had been bred at the English bar, came to Boston to practice his profession. He was the first professional lawyer in the colony. He remained here three or four years, when he was glad to return to London and the more congenial haunts of Clement's Inn. Not very much is known of his doings here, except that in 1639 he was disbarred on a charge of going to the jury and pleading with them out of Court. He was at the same time admonished not to meddle with Court business unless he should be called upon by the Courts. The next year he was again taken to task for his officiousness towards the Courts, and he promised not to meddle in future. In 1642, after his return to England, he published his 'Plain Dealing, or News from New England.' It is apparent from this book that the ground of his trouble with the Courts was that he was trying to set up the common law, while the Puritan Courts cared nothing at all for the common law, but were trying to set up, especially in criminal matters, the Mosaic law. Lechford tells us that the Governor gave the charge to the grand juries 'under the heads of the Ten Commandments.' Long after Lechford was driven from Boston came the witchcraft trials, and there was not even then

any lawyer to preside upon the bench, or to defend the accused at the bar. There was no use for lawyers learned in the common law, 'the perfection of common sense,' while ministers in the pulpit and on the bench proclaimed a law that was made up more of superstition than of sense. Now the Puritan ministers have gone; no place in the wide land is more free from the taint of the religion that in early days was the law as well. The lawyers have come; there are now about fourteen hundred of these ministers of a new civilization in Boston. Thomas Lechford, while there, kept a note-book in which he entered a memorandum of the cases that he conducted, the papers that he drew up, and the pay that he received. The American Antiquarian Society is about to publish it. It will be entertaining now.—*American Law Review.*

THE FRIEND OF MAN.—Courts have leaned so far in favor of the assured in the interpretation of insurance contracts, that we are not surprised at the ingenuity of counsel in the case of *The Trojan Mining Company v. The Fireman Insurance Company*, decided by the Supreme Court of California, May, 1885, in claiming that because a watchdog was kept in the building insured, while the watchman slept in another building across the road, and distant about one hundred feet, there was no breach of the condition of the policy which required the assured to employ a watchman to be in and upon the premises night and day while the same were idle. It also appears from the evidence that it was shown that the dog 'had the whole range of the building on the inside, and was accustomed to bark loudly when any stranger approached the building.' But this also failed to prevail with the Court, and for once at least an insurance company secured a victory: but it shows what a narrow escape it had from losing the case from the 'bark of a dog.'—*American Law Record.*

THE PRIVILEGES OF A FOREIGN ATTACHÉ.—At the Westminster County Court, on July 20, before Judge Bayley, an action brought by Mr. George T. Parkinson, of Bath, to recover from Henry A. Potter, of Hampstead, the sum of 37*l.* 19*s.* in respect of rates paid in the parish of Marylebone, was heard. It appeared that the plaintiff was the freeholder of 1 Blandford Square, and the defendant formerly held the lease. In 1883 the lease of the house was assigned to Senor Pinto Basto, at that time Portuguese consul-general, with offices at 1 Throgmorton Street, City, and attached to the Portuguese Legation at 12 Gloucester Place, Portman Square. In the meantime an application was made for payment of parochial rates, and these not being forthcoming from the occupier were eventually paid by the plaintiff, who now sought to recover them from the defendant, who in taking the house agreed to pay the rates. The defendant's counsel urged that Senor Basto, who was the proper person to pay the rates, was not privileged from arrest under the Act. It was contended that he could not claim exemption as consul-general, and that his connection with the embassy was an honorary one and not of a nature entitling him to the privileges allowed to ambassadors and their servants by this country. After a lengthened argument, his Honor held that Senor Basto, as an attaché of the embassy, was privileged, and gave judgment for the plaintiff accordingly.