

LAW FOR LADIES.

have a similar display? A green-house might be erected at a comparatively small cost, and heated at a very small additional outlay, and by this means the necessary supply of plants could be kept up at no very great expense.

We also noticed in a recent number of the *Law Times*, that the lawn of the Middle Temple is utilized for the playing of tennis. Why could not the west lawn of Osgoode Hall be similarly used? Under proper regulations as to the time within which play should be allowed it could not possibly do any harm, and might prove a source of very great pleasure and amusement to many members of the profession during the summer months. We trust the Benchers will cogitate over the subject and give the matter favourable consideration next year.

LAW FOR LADIES.

A few decisions interesting to the ladies "have been found and made a note of" (according to Captain Cuttle's advice) during the canicular days. Dress is always a fascinating theme to the fair sex, and occasionally the judges consider the subject, not only when the bills of their wives and daughters have to be settled, but when some deep point of law lies hidden in an article of apparel and has to be disposed of. Down in Louisiana it has recently been held that wearing a sun-bonnet in the street is not necessarily an act of negligence. Mrs. Shea owned the bonnet that settled this question. Of the fabric, size and shape of this courted bonnet we know naught. The owner had it on her head and was crossing a street, when the projecting sides prevented her seeing a horse that was bearing down upon her, and she succumbed to the equine. The Court gave her damages for the damage done to her. (*Shea v. Reems*, 36 Louisiana 969.)

Some time since (but as revolving years

and fashions are bringing in again the article to be alluded to—at least so we are told by sisters in law—it may be well to remind our gentle readers of the fact) it was decided in New York State that the use of crinoline was not an act of negligence, even though it was the cause of the accident complained of. Mrs. Mary Poulin was alighting from a car on Broadway with Mr. P.'s youngest hopeful in her arms: her steel hoop skirt caught upon a nail in the car platform, and she was thrown down and dragged some distance. Her injuries were serious and her fright was great. She sued the car company for compensation; they ungallantly pleaded that the article in question was not a necessary article of female apparel, and that if Mrs. Poulin were determined to wear such expansive balloon-like skirts she ought to have exercised more care than is expected of a man. The Court, however, pooh-poohed the notion; said there was no negligence on the lady's part and that if the railroad company took the money of passengers adorned with crinolines they must see to their safety. (*Poulin v. Broadway, etc.*, R. W. 34 N. Y., Sup. Ct. 296.)

We wonder whether the ladies fully understand how much wider their rights in the matter of shopping are when they are forced to leave their husbands, than when they live comfortably at home. Judge Blackburn says: "A husband whilst his wife resides with him chooses his own style of living, at least in theory." (The last four words impress one with the conviction that the judge is a married man, and felt that *in foro domestico*, if not *in banco reginæ*, his decisions were oftentimes overruled and reversed.) He quotes old Judge Hide who remarked that "if a woman will have a velvet gown and a satin petticoat, and the husband thinks mohair or farendon for a gown, and watered tabby for a petticoat, is as fashionable and fitter for his quality," who is to