RHODE ISLAND BAR
JOURNAL

MARCH 1976 VOLUME XXIV No. 6

K
110
R4
A3
V. 24, no. 6

JAMES MITCHELL VARNUM HOUSE

Owned And Maintained By The

VARNUM CONTINENTALS

JAMES MITCHELL VARNUM, ESQ.

GENERAL OF THE CONTINENTAL ARMY, COLONEL OF THE KENTISH GUARDS, DELEGATE TO CONTINENTAL CONGRESS AND THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS. FEDERAL JUDGE OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORY AND MEMBER OF THE R.I. BAR.

by

RICHARD B. CARPENTER, Esquire

James Mitchell Varnum was one of the foremost practitioners of his day and during his relatively short life accomplished as much as an ordinary man would in two lifetimes. During his forty years he was a General of the Continental Army, Colonel of the Kentish Guards, Delegate from Rhode Island to both the Continental Congress and the United States Congress, Federal Judge of the Northwest Territory, a member of the General Assembly, and last but not least, a member of the Rhode Island Bar.

General Varnum was born in Dracut, Massachusetts, on December 17,1748. Little is known of him until he entered Harvard College in 1767. By 1768 he was in the thick of the student disorders of April of that year. The disorders arose over the alleged confinement of another student named Whiting by a tutor named Willard. Varnum proposed tearing Willard's house down. He drew up a statement that the whole student body would resign over the Whiting affair. In the style of the 1960's he attempted to dictate the terms upon which the students would return. As a result, he was promptly expelled and despite his efforts, was unable to return to Harvard.

On May 22, 1768, Varnum entered Rhode Island College, now Brown University, and graduated at the first commencement in 1769. Three years later he took his M.A. A look at his graduation exercises shows that he presented an argument entitled, "British America Cannot Under the Present Circumstances, Consistent with Good Policy, Affect to Become an Independent State."[1]

After obtaining his first degree, he ran a classical school in Dracut, and in 1770 entered the offices of Oliver Arnold of Providence, who at that time was the Attorney General. He also married that year and in 1771 hung out his shingle in East Greenwich. In 1773, he purchased a tract of land where his house now stands and began its construction.[2]

James Mitchell Varnum, Esq.

In 1774 Varnum served on a committee to gather provisions for Boston which was then suffering under the Port Bill. In the same year, he is mentioned for the first time in the Colonial Records as being appointed to a committee which was to consider a petition presented to the General Assembly for establishing independent companies in Newport, East Greenwich, Coventry, and a grenadier company in Providence.[3]

At the same time he and others were involved in organizing the Kentish Guards. Nathaniel Greene, then serving in the legislature, was also involved in the organization and had volunteered to serve as a private. Greene, who was well known in the area, at the urgings of his friends, applied for a lieutenancy in the Guards. Greene had a physical infirmity being born with a stiff right leg. In the eyes of various local critics, his limp although described as slight not only made him unfit to be a lieutenant but equally unfit to be a private. In an organization such as the Guards, his limp reflected a blemish on the martial dignity of the Guards. Greene was both hurt and amazed. His friends, including Varnum, were outraged. Varnum threatened to withdraw his support from the Company. Greene, aware of the effect Varnum's withdrawal would have on the Company, wrote him urging him to retain his position in the Company. How the matter was resolved is unknown today but Varnum became Colonel and Greene remained a member of the Guards.[4]

When news of the fighting at Lexington and Concord arrived in East Greenwich, Varnum mustered his company within two hours and set out for Boston. During this march, Greene served as a private. The Guards got as far as Pawtucket when they received word that the British troops had returned to Boston. They also received orders from the Tory Governor Joseph Wanton to return. Greene and three others kept going, however, and arrived in Boston. [5]

On May 3, 1775, the General Assembly, sitting in grand committee, created an army of observation. Greene, who was a member of the Assembly from Coventry, was named Brigadier General. Varnum was named Colonel of the regiment to be formed out of Kent and Kings County. Another member of the Rhode Island Bar, Daniel Hitchcock, was appointed as Colonel from Providence. This appointment was to cause a problem in 1776.

In that year Varnum "concerning himself to be greatly injured in not having been noticed in the late arrangements and promotions of General Officers,"[6] threatened to resign his commission. General Washington convinced him to stay on. Varnum remained convinced that he would soon receive such a promotion. Hitchcock protested, stating that he felt he should be appointed General before Varnum because he was from Providence, the senior county. Varnum was ultimately appointed ahead of Hitchcock because of his earlier appointment as Colonel in the Kentish Guards.

(Next Page Please)

VARNUM

(Continued from Page 2)

The bulk of the Rhode Island troops arrived in Roxbury where they reported to General George Washington in June of 1775. The Rhode Island regiment because of its fine uniform and equipment was the sartorial envy of the Army. The Rhode Island troops remained around Boston until April of 1776 when they left for New York, and by May they found themselves fortifying Brooklyn Heights. Varnum was present at the Battle of Long Island with the Rhode Island Troop, fighting at Fott Defiance, but fell ill and missed the Battle of Harlem Heights. He fought at White Plains, but was determined to leave the service because of Congress' failure to appoint him General.

In December, 1776, he returned to Rhode Island. Wilkins Updike in his *Biographical Sketches of the Rhode Island Bar*, states that Varnum returned at Washington's request to enlist troops into the Army. It is intimated that he also returned to force Congress' hand toward a general's commission. In any event, Varnum was reappointed Colonel of the First Rhode Island regiment and on February 21, 1777, Brigadier General in the Continental service.

By returning to Rhode Island in December, Varnum missed the 1776 Christmas campaign around Trenton and Princeton, New Jersey. Daniel Hitchcock was in command of the Rhode Island forces at those actions. General Washington cited both Hitchcock and the Rhode Island regiments for their excellence in those actions.[7]

As mentioned when the Rhode Island troops arrived in Massachusetts in 1775, Varnum's regiment was the envy of the army. When Varnum returned to the army in the late winter of 1777, all that had changed for the worse and the Rhode Islanders, like the rest of the Army, were half naked and less than fifty percent of the troops had shoes. This did not stop them from fighting well at the battle of Germantown under Varnum's command.

For the Rhode Island troops the heaviest fighting was yet to come. Varnum commanded all American troops on the New Jersey side of the Delaware River. In an attempt to block the British from direct access to Philadelphia by way of the Delaware River, two forts were built. One named Fort Mercer was built at Red Bank and a second, Fort Mifflin, on Mud Island. Two Rhode Island regiments were detailed to hold Fort Mercer while a Maryland regiment was sent to hold Fort Mifflin. The first fighting took place in October and the British and Hessians were repulsed after suffering heavy casualties. Washington, who at this time was trying to buy time until troops from Massachusetts and New York arrived from their victory at Saratoga, ordered Varnum to prolong the defense as long as possible without sacrificing the garrisons. On Novemeber 12, the British began an artillery barrage of the two forts. After four days of heavy losses, Varnum withdrew the garrisons. During the bombardment of Fort Mifflin, Varnum reported to General Washington, "We have lost a great many men today; a great many officers are killed and wounded. My fine company of artillery is almost destroyed. We shall be obliged to evacuate the fort this night."[8] They retreated from New Jersey to winter quarters in Valley Forge.

- Rhode Island troops at Valley Forge

Richard B. Carpenter, Esq.

were stationed in the Star Redoubt which may be considered the key position in the Valley Forge defense' They suffered there along with the rest of the army.

Varnum, writing to General Washington on December 22, 1777, states, "Three days successively have we been destitute of bread. Two days we have been entirely without meat. The men must be supplied or they cannot be commanded. The complaints are too urgent to pass unnoticed. It is with pain that I mention this distress. I know that it will make your Excellency unhappy; but if you expect the exertion of virtuous principle while your troops are deprived of the necessaries of life, your final disappointment will be great in proportion to the patience which now astonishes every man of human feeling."[9]

Varnum at Valley Forge was not reticent about portraying not only to Washington but to the Congress and Rhode Island General Assembly the sufferings of the troops at Valley Forge and his aggressive insistence on immediate relief earned him the hostility of members of the government. On May 23, 1778, Governor Morris wrote to Washington complaining that Varnum's "temper and manners are by no means calculated to teach patience, discipline, and subordination."[10]

In the summer of 1778, Varnum returned to Rhode Island where he was joined by his brigade prior to the battle of Rhode Island. On August 14, pursuant to orders from General Sullivan, he was assigned command of the right wing of the army. On the day of the battle, his command bore the brunt of the fighting.

In January 1778 Washington selected a number of officers who were prominent in their home states to return to recruit soldiers. Varnum was selected to return to Rhode Island. In the early part of 1778, Varnum reported to Washington that Rhode Island could not raise its quota without enlisting black soldiers. Washington did not commit himself one way or the other but sent the proposal on to the General Assembly.

In February 1778, the General Assembly passed an act authorizing the enlistment of slaves either "negro, mulatto, or Indian man slave" into two battalions to serve for the duration of the war. Every slave so enlisting shall be "entitled to and receive all bounties, wages, and encouragements allowed by the Continental Congress to any soldier descharged from the service of his master" as though he had never been encumbered with any kind of servitude or slavery. Compensation was voted at a sum of 120 pounds sterling for most valuable slaves and proportionately less for less valuable.[11] The battalions so raised fought at the battles of Rhode Island, Red Bank, Yorktown, and Fort Oswego. During the battle of Rhode Island they distinguished themselves under Varnum's command by desperate fightings against Hessian troops who they repelled with heavy losses.

Varnum served through 1778 but resigned his commission in 1779 because at the time there were more general officers in the army than were needed in proportion to men enlisted. When he returned to Rhode Island he was elected General of the Rhode Island militia for life. He reopened his practice in East Greenwhich and was instantly successful. With the fruits of

(Continued on Page 14)

VARNUM

(Continued from Page 13)

disenchantment he felt with the Articles of Confederacy. In February of that year Congress requested the States to grant them a five percent tariff on all imported goods. The revenue gained from the tax was to be used to finance the war. Varnum, along with other prominent men, returned to his home state to try to persuade the General Assembly and the citizens to grant the duty. Non-maritime states quickly agreed to the duty; however, here in Rhode Island, it was a different matter. Opposition quickly formed around David Howell later to become a justice of the supreme judicial court. Styling himself "Farmer," Howell in the Providence Gazette sounded a theme which is still with us today. In effect, he argued "give them five percent today and tomorrow they will want ten percent," and so on. In the same edition Varnum wrote an article vindicating the tax signing himself "Citizen". The matter was then argued before the General Assembly. The Assembly, punch drunk from three hours of argument by Howell and three more hours by Varnum voted the measure down. Eleven states voted to grant the five percent duty; however Rhode Island's negative vote coupled with the fact that New York never got around to voting at all, defeated the measure.[15]

Under the Articles of confederation a state could be represented by no less than two delegates but in no event could it be represented by more than seven. Rhode Island only had two delegates because each state was required to pay their own representatives. After the defeat of the five percent bill, Howell was elected to replace Varnum and the latter returned to his private practice.

After the war the state treasury was as broke as the Federal treasury. The army had been paid with bills of credit issued against the Federal treasury. Congress asked the states to vote funds to pay the bills which request the states promptly rejected. Merchants at this time began to ship gold and silver to Europe creating a shortgage of hard money. The result was one that a loan shark would admire. Borrowers were required to borrow at twenty percent per year plus four percent per month.

It was generally a bad time. Captain Shay had begun his revolt in Western Massachusetts and civil disorder was the rule of the day. In Rhode Island the export of hard currency created a political alliance between the farmers, taxpayers and other debtor interests. In 1786 this party swept into office. In May, the Assembly issued $100,000 worth of notes. No funds were encumbered, nor was any time fixed for redemption. The notes were mortgaged at four percent for the first seven years and were to be repaid over the next seven years in seven equal installments bearing no interest. One provision of the law which was especially difficult for business people to swallow was a provision which allowed a debtor upon refusal by a creditor to accept a bill, to apply to the Superior Court of Judica-

(Continued on Page 15)

Legal Briefs printed, collated and bound. Competitive prices. Complete printing service. Convenient downtown location. Pick up and delivery.

INSTANT PRINTING SERVICE

Div. of Providence Blue Print Co., Inc.
92 Weybosset St., Providence, R.I.
272-1470

Fast Service

on **PROBATE** and other

FIDUCIARY BONDS

JUDICIAL BONDS

Starkweather & Shepley, Inc.
155 South Main St., Providence, R. I.
Phone 421-6900

693-5

Alexander Meiklejohn Lecture

Judge J. Skelly Wright

"Politics and the First Amendment: Is Money Speech?"

Tuesday, April 27, 1976
8 p.m.

Sayles Hall
Brown University

ABA ALLOWS MORE INFORMATION TO PUBLIC IN ETHICS CHANGE

(Continued from Page 2)

jurisdiction by state law over the subject." The effect of this requirement is to ensure that lawyers may be selected according to facts that permit comparison on an equal basis with respect to the substance of their services, rather than the attractiveness of the form of publication. The regulating authority, for example, might under this provision adopt regulations requiring lawyers with foreign language ability who desire to make that information publicly available to do so by the use of the phrase "fluent in ." The individual lawyer would fill in the blank, but could make no change in that format.

Under Association procedures, the ABA Standing Committee on Law Lists is available to review material submitted for approval by those who wish to publish law lists. The Committee reviews the material to determine whether it is consistent with the Association's Code of Professional Responsibility with respect to information that can be published. It is these Disciplinary Rules of the Code that have now been changed to expand the scope of information that can be disseminated. These persons are not required by the Association to submit law lists for approval, although many do to ensure the propriety of the release by lawyers of information they wish to publish.

The committee on law lists will meet in mid-March to consider implementation of the new rules enacted by the House of Delegates.

VARNUM

(Continued from Page 14)

tion for a citation which notified the debtor that the bill was lodged with the court as payment. If the debtor after receiving such notice failed to appear, the lodgment of the bill of credit with the Court was sufficient tender and "a sufficient Plea in Bar to all and every Citation and Action that shall be brought for the Recovery of money so lodged and tendered, and shall forever operate as a discharge and a bonafide payment of the Debt...and if the Creditor—shall not within the space of said three months call for or demand said sum so tendered or lodged, the same shall be forever forfeited to and for the use of this state."[16] As might be expected the bills fell into instant discredit and people with property refused to use them.

The paper party in June, attempting to put teeth into the bill added a preamble which essentially provided that any person who refused to take the new bills, or made any difference in price between hard currency and paper money in any sale, "or in any manner whatever tend or attempt to depreciate or discourage the possession of said bills—or do any act to invalidate or weaken the said act emitting said bills for the first offence shall forfeit and pay the sum of 100 pounds and be rendered incapable of being elected or to elect to any office of honor, trust or profit within this state."[17] A portion of the 100 pounds was to be paid to the person informing of and appearing to prosecute the action. In August when the paper money was still not accepted, the legislature in a jury took off the gloves and passed an act entitled, "An Act in Addition to and Amendment of an Act made as passed by the Assembly at their session holden in Newport in May last in emitting the sum of 100,000 pounds in bills of public credit."[18] It was further enacted that if any person refused to accept the bills a complainant could apply to either the Supreme or Common Pleas Courts and citation should be issued to the refusing party to appear before a special court within three days and there stand trial without a jury. The amended act did provide that no complaint or information shall be received by any of the Justices of the said Courts that shall not be made within ten days after the act of refusal was committeed. And last but not least "the judgment of said Court upon the conviction of the accused, was to be forthwith executed, and the offender immediately to pay said penalty, or stand committed to jail until sentence be performed, which said judgment was to be "final and conclusive and *without appeal.*[19] The act still was unsuccessful.

Trevett v. Weeden

John Weeden, a Newport butcher, remained unimpressed, and when one John Trevett offered him the bills of credit, he refused to accept them. Trevett filed a complaint and Weeden was arrested and hauled into Court. Paul Mumford, Chief Justice of the Superior Court of Judication, ordered a special Court convened. Because the Court was in session, the case was deferred to the regular session as opposed to a hearing before a special Court within three days. Weeden in his pleas answered that the act had expired on its face and had no force. "Also, for that by said act the matter of complaint are made triable before special courts, uncontrollable by the Supreme Judiciary Court of the State. Also for that the said court is not by said act authorized and empowered to empanel a jury to try the facts charged in the information, and so the same is unconstitutional and void."[20] Varnum was retained by Weeden. The state was represented by Attorney General Channing. Updike states that large partisan crowds attended the hearing. The case was heard on September 21, 1786.

(Continued on Page 16)

YOU CAN'T DEDUCT YOUR DUES ON INCOME TAXES IF YOU HAVEN'T PAID THEM!

Important Protection!

PROFESSIONAL LIABILITY

Complete coverage for you, your partner or for any other person for whom you are legally liable.

DISABILITY INCOME

As official underwriter for your Association, we will design your income protection to fit your individual needs.

Starkweather & Shepley, Inc.
155 South Main St., Providence, R. I.
Phone 421-6900

694-5

Citizens Bank

Our Trust Department has had years of experience handling a variety of different trusts with a number of different financial goals. When considering creation of a Trust for a client, it makes sense to talk to Citizens.

Call Barney Campbell at 351-5800 for details.

Citizens Bank
We try to do things your way.

Members F.D.I.C.

VARNUM

(Continued from Page 15)

Varnum as was his wont addressed the Court for three hours and dealt with the various issues which made the validity of this act questionable. Argument in the case touched on three points; first, the question of the lack of the right of appeal of a conviction under the act to the Supreme Judicial Court; second, the right to a jury trial; third, the rights of citizens after the Revolution. He first pointed out that appeal to a Supreme Court with power of final judicial interpretation under the act of 1729 was essential because only by such appeal would the body of the law be uniform and certain and once such an interpretation was made, all inferior jurisdictions must so conform.[21]

In his argument, he points out that the right to a jury trial was one of the ancient rights afforded the people and the attempted interference with that right by Parliament was one of the primary causes of the Revolution.

Varnum's final point is that the citizens of Rhode Island retained all of the rights they had under the English constitution and as such the acts of the legislature could not undermine these ancient rights.

The Court voted that under the amended act the information was "not cognizable before them."[22] The outcry was loud and long from the paper money party which felt itself betrayed. The paper party had appointed the Court for its annual term and had supposed it had picked its friends. The General Assembly acted swiftly and issued citations to be served upon the justices "to give their immediate attention on the Assembly, to assign the reasons and grounds of their aforesaid judgments, and to assign their reason in adjudging an act of the supreme legislation of the state unconstitutional and void.[23]

Thus, in September of 1786, the battle lines were drawn in Rhode Island on the question of judicial review of legislative action some seventeen years before the question was to be decided by Chief Justice Marshall in **Marbury v. Madison** in 1803.

Feeling ran very hot particularly in rural towns. The Town of Coventry had a special town meeting immediately after the decision and ordered their representatives to the General Assembly, William Burlingame and Jeremiah Tenney, "to vote and to use their influence in the General Assembly that the Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court—be dealt with according to their offences in giving their determination in the case—in which determination it was thought by the Town that the said Judge exceeded the bounds of their jurisdiction by giving their determination that the law made by the General Assembly of this state was unconstitutional, when it was the duty of said court to have given their judgment whether said Weeden was guilty of a breach of the law of this State of not."[24]

Two of the judges answered the citation; two suddenly became indisposed. The General Assembly gave the indisposed judges two weeks to recover and ordered the trial of the court for the last Monday in October "whether the members comprising it were sick or well, or however well qualified the exasperated majority might be for impartial judgment." At the adjourned session, the judges appeared, the Chief Justice did not attend.

Judge Howell addressed the Assembly for six hours pointing out: first, that the act was unconsitutional, and could not be executed and second, that for the reasons of their judgment they were accountable to God, their own conscience and not the legislature. Judge Tillinghast observed that judges accepted their offices with regard to the public good, that their prerequisites were trifling, their salaries not worth mentioning, and that his opinion had resulted from the purist reflection and clearest conviction. Judge Hazard, a paper money man, indicated he was sorry to have earned the displeasure of the administration, pointed out any feeling of favor he had would be on the side of the Act but stated he could not resist the face of conviction.[25]

The question was then taken by the Assembly, "Whether the Assembly was satisfied with the reasons given by the Judges in support of their judgment."[26] The answer was negative. A second motion was then made to dismiss the Judges from office.[27]

At this time the Judges presented a memorandum to the Assembly in which they stated that when they appeared before the Assembly they did so without fear that the proceedings would affect either their lives, good names, or their offices, and asked at that time that they be allowed a hearing before any vote be taken whereby the legislature could deprive them of their office without due process of law; "and more especially upon a mere suggestion of a mere error of judgement."[28] The Judges then informed the House that they had retained counsel to enforce its contents. The counsel was Varnum. Varnum argued that it was immaterial whether the judgment of the Court was right or wrong. The only question is, whether they can in any respect be brought to answer for it, but by due process of law? And, consequently, whether they can be passed upon and condemned, until they be proved guilty of a crime?

He pointed out that the tenure of office was one year and consequently during that term every officer has an interest, "a kind of estate, inseperably annexed to his appointment. To be divested of which, he must either neglect, misuse or abuse his trust."[29] The abuse includes questions of fact which must appear before the forfeiture can be declared.

He points out that in England, Judges were appointed by the King and their commission valid during good behavior and therefore not triable by the King. He argues that the same is true where the Judges are appointed by the Assembly. In present instance both Houses of the Assembly are the party complaining, in this respect also they resemble the King and cannot be their triers..."there may be an assembly whose interested views might induce them to establish systems totally sub-

(Continued on Next Page)

FINEST Beautygraved (THERMOGRAPHED) Stationery
LETTERHEADS $18.90 FOR 1000
Engraver's Parchment Stock
FREE PROOFS
AMERICA'S LOWEST PRICES
BUSINESS CARDS • 500 for $10.00 • 1000 for $12.00
BUSINESS ANNOUNCEMENTS • 100 for $17 • 500 for $37
10 DAY SERVICE • No sales tax outside Ala.
Dewberry ENGRAVING CO. SINCE 1901
HWY. 280, P.O. BOX 2311 • BIRMINGHAM, ALA. 35201

LANS
WAREHOUSE COMPANY
of WAYLAND SQUARE
AGENTS FOR
Wheaton Van Lines, Inc.
LONG DISTANCE MOVING
MOVING AND STORAGE SERVICES YOU CAN HAVE CONFIDENCE IN!
Local and long distance moving • World-wide service • Modern vans • Experienced drivers • Expert packing • Safe, prompt deliveries • Clean, modern storage when needed.
Call 861-1110

VARNUM

(Continued on Page 16)

versive of the constituion, and of political as well as civil liberty. To effect which, the Supreme Judiciary must be the creatures of their power; and such creatures they would finally be were the Judges to be appointed, accused and tried by them."[30]

A long debate followed; the House then moved to seek the Attorney General's opinion, "as to whether the General Assembly can suspend or remove from office the Judges of the Supreme Court without a previous charge and statement of criminality, due process, trial and convictions."[31] The Attorney General answered pointing out "that there would be a fatal interruption if not an annihilation of government, if they could be suspended or removed from office for mere matters without charge of criminality."[32]

Shortly thereafter, another vote was taken and the judges discharged from further attendance upon the General Assembly. Within sixty days after the case was concluded, the amended acts were repealed.

In June of 1787, Varnum was involved in the movement to send delegates to the Federal Constitutional Convention. This was defeated by paper money interests in the State that did not wish to lose custom revenues. This was to be his last public act in Rhode Island because on August 28, 1787, he was elected a director of the Ohio Company and in September, appointed Federal Judge for the Northwest territory. Many Rhode Islanders, including Varnum, owned shares in the company. It was felt that their interests in the company were being sacrificed by some of the Massachusetts directors who also had interests in the Scioto Company. Varnum set out for Ohio and arrived there in June 1788. Shortly after arriving, he challenged the platting policies of the Company and was very unpopular with the people from Massachusetts.[33]

Manessah Cutter, a director of the Ohio Company, declared that Varnum was elected against the inclinations of many who voted as a director but that he represented such a large interest in the Company they had no choice.[34]

Varnum, ever the classicist, also endeared himself to the settlers in Ohio when he ordered them to change the name of their settlement from Alelphie which he stated was bad Greek. They grudgingly obeyed and changed the name of the Town to Marietta before he arrived.[35]

Almost immediately from the date of his arrival in Ohio, his health went downhill. He roused himself long enough to push a law code into practice which was similar to New England's but by December of 1788, he wrote to his wife who remained in Rhode Island, that he hoped to leave Marietta and go to the warmer climate of New Orleans. He died in Marrietta before he could make the trip at the age of forty on January 9, 1789.

William Updike indicates that his grave was unmarked at his burial, and that he was the second adult person buried in Ohio.

Although his biographers are highly laudatory that he was not universally beloved is evident in Manessah Cutler's comment in learning of his death, "It is a maxim with me that the Lord be Praised for all things and in this case I have found no great difficulty in applying it."[36]

Perhaps the statement which most accurately describes Varnum's life and career comes from his funeral oration which was preached by Doctor Solomon Drowne, "As a man, he was open, generous, humane, and liberal. Philanthrophy was a conspicuous trait of his character—An unwearied advocate of the rights of his fellow man, and an utter enemy to every species of oppression."[37]

He was survived by his widow who died in Bristol at age 88 on October 10, 1837. The couple left no children.

[1]Sibley's Harvard Graduates, Vol. XVII 1768-1771, Mass., Historical Society, Boston, Mass.
[2]R.I. Historical Society Collection, 1927.
[3]Vol. VII R.I. Colonial Records, 1774, P. 257.
[4]Vol. I Greene's Life of Nathaniel Greene (1867)
[5]Vol. I Greene's Life of Nathaniel Greene (1867)
[6]Sibley's Harvard Graduates, P. 268
[7]Wilken's Updike for an excellent description of the battle of Trenton & Princeton and Hitchcock's participation therein. See Ketchum, The Winter Soldiers, P. 362, Doubleday (1973)
[8]Varnum's of Dracut, (1907) P 154
[9]Varnums id at P. 155
[10]Varnum's id at P. 157
[11]R.I. Colonial REcords, Vol. VII, P. 359
[12]History of East Greenwich, Inc. Portland (1960)
[13]Wilkin's Updike, P. 165
[14]Wilkins Updike, P. 165
[15]Wilkin's Updike, P. 165
[16]R.I. Acts and Resolves, May, 1786
[17]R.I. Acts and Resolves, June, 1786
[18]R.I. Acts and Resolves, August 1786
[19]R.I. id, August 1786
[20]Varnum, Trevet v. Weeden, P. 8
[21]Chandler. American Criminal Trials 1844, Vol. II, P. 279
[22]Chandler's American Criminal Trials, P. 326
[23]Chandler's American Criminal Trials, P. 326
[24]Wilkins Updike, P. 199-200
[25]Varnum, Trevet v. Weeden 40-43
[26]Varnum, Trevet v. Weeden 44
[27]Varnum, Trevet v. Weeden 44
[28]Varnum, Trevet v. Weeden 44-46
[29]Varnum, Trevet v. Weeden 48
[30]Varnum, Trevet v. Weeden 50
[31]Varnum, Trevet v. Weeden 51
[32]Varnum Trevet v. Weeden 51
[33]Magazine of American History, Vol, XIX 519-520
[34]Sibley's Harvard Graduates, P. 277
[35]Sibley's Harvard Graduates, P. 277
[36]Sibley's Harvard Graduates, P. 279
[37]Sibley's Harvard Graduates, P. 279

PROCEDURES AND LABOR LAW SEMINARS ON TAPE

Two seminars by Rhode Island lawyers on Rhode Island law have drawn over 260 registrants. The first course, "Rhode Island Practice and Procedures-1976" was sponsored by the Continuing Legal Education Committee, Melvin A. Chernick, Chairman. An eight week course, one night per week, the following subjects were covered, and the speakers are listed with the topic: Domestic Relations, Hon. Angelo Rossi, Associate Justice, Family Court and Alan T. Dworkin; Commercial Law, Alan Shine. Organizing Small Business Entities, James J. Skeffington; Civil Litigation, Kenneth P. Borden; Estate Planning, Helen C. MacGregor and Joachim A. Weissfeld; Conveyancing, Leases and Mechanics Liens, Melvin A. Chernick; Practice Before the Administrative Adjudication Division, Leo P. McGowan, Chief Commissioner; Practice Before the Department of Employment Security, Louis B. Rubinstein, Chief Legal Officer; Law Office Management, Daniel J. Donovan and John W. Kershaw.

A seven week, one night per week Labor Law lecture series, sponsored by the Labor Law Committee, Orlando Rodio, Chairman, lists the following talks and speakers: Processing Representation Cases, Orlando Rodio; Pension Reform Law, George L. Chimento (substituting for William J. Sheehan); Processing Unfair Labor Practice Cases, John J. Pendergast III; Public Sector Bargaining, Vincent J. Piccirilli and Gerard P. Cobleigh; Conduct of Arbitration Hearing, Thomas S. Hogan; Civil Rights, Patrick A. Ligouri; Occupational Safety and Health Act-Federal and R.I., Orlando Rodio and Patrick A. Ligouri.

Both series have been taped and can be rented from the Bar Association for $2 per title.

E. L. FREEMAN COMPANY
Complete Stock of Legal Forms-
Corporation Records - Seals - Bankruptcy Schedules
in
Providence-Pawtucket-Woonsocket Newport - East Providence
"Try Freeman's First"