the cock's crowing on the Wednesday after Michaelmas Day, a court was held by the Lord of the Manor of Staleigh, called the Lawless Court. At it the steward and suitors speak not above a whisper, no candles are used, pen and ink are forbidden, but a record of proceedings is kept with a coal; and the unfortunate who owes suit or service thereto and appears not, forfeits to the Lord double the rent for every hour he is absent. If the young men of Coleshill, in the County of Warwick, can catch a hare and bring it to the parson of the parish before ten o'clock on Easter Monday, his reverence is bound to give them a calf's head, and one hundred eggs for their breakfast, and a groat in money. Robert Fitzwalter, a well-beloved subject of King Henry, the third of that name, as death drew nigh, betook himself to prayer and deeds of charity, gave great and bountiful alms to the poor, kept great hospitality, and rebuilt the priory of Dunmow. Here arose the custom, that any man or woman who repented not of his or her marriage, either sleeping or waking, in a year and a day, might lawfully claim a gammon of bacon, which was presented with all the solemnity and triumphs that they of the priory and town of Dunmow could desire. The party claiming the bacon had to take his oath before prior and convent, and the whole town, humbly kneeling in the church-yard upon two hard, pointed stones; his oath was administered with such long process and such solemn singing over him as doubtless made his pilgrimage rather painful; afterwards he was hoisted aloft on the shoulders of the men, and carried first about the priory churchyard and then through the town, with all the friars and brethren and all the townsfolk following with shouts and acclamations, and with the hard-won bacon borne aloft in triumph. The Lord of the Manor held his lands by the tenure of giving the bacon to all applicants, but only six claimants are recorded between 1444 and 1751, which fact does not argue well for domestic felicity in those early days.

THE CASE OF THE CAROLINE REVIEWED.

We have often had occasion to quote from the pages of the *Central Law Journal*, which, under the editorship of Judge Dillon, is one the very best of our United States exchanges. In a number of that paper published last month, there is a very learned *critique* upon a pamphlet, written by George Ticknor Curtis, touching the case of the *Virginius*. The learned reviewer adverts, in common with his author, to the destruction of the *Caroline*, and proceeds to make some important comments upon the law, propounded in the case which grew out of that affair—*The People* v. *McLeod*, 1 Hill, N. Y. 337. The *Central Law Journal* proceeds as follows, first giving a history of the transaction, and then going on to demolish the law as laid down by Mr. Justice Cowen, who delivered the opinion of the Court:

This case was determined in the Supreme Court of New York in 1841, before Chief Justice Nelson and Justices Bronson and Cowen, all able and distinguished Judges. It is note-worthy in this connection from the fact that Mr. Justice Cowen, who delivered the opinion of the court, attempted to answer the assertion of the British Government that the destruction of the Caroline was a necessary act of self-defence.

The facts of the Caroline case were substantially as follows: In the winter of 1837-8, during Mackenzie's rebellion in Canada, and while the United States and Great Britain were at peace with each other, a body of armed men, mostly Americans, took possession of Navy Island, in the Niagara river, an island belonging to Great Britain, and, having fortified their position, kept up for several weeks a frequent bombardment against the position occupied by British forces on the Canadian shore. An American steamer, the Caroline, plied regularly between Navy Island and Schlosser, on the American side of the river, furnishing the armed forces on the Island with supplies and stores, and keeping up a communication between them