Equal before marriage, she becomes legally an inferior. The man surrenders no legal rights—the woman loses nearly all. The idea of marriage being a mere civil contract may perhaps lie at the root of certain anomalies in the law regarding husband and wife. But the violent remedies proposed in the present day would be worse than the alleged disease: we are quite prepared to admit that some improvements might be drawn from the civil law, which would tend to remove such evils as may be found in the principles of the Common Law. We certainly should not object open our columns to a reasonable extent to "well-informed parties," who would be disposed to reason fairly, without resorting to the "clap-trap" of the "Bloomer School."

J. LEACH TALBOT, ESQUIRE.

We regret to have to record the untimely death of this gentleman, whose name appeared in our last number as Reporter for the *Law Journal*.

He was accidentally drowned by the upsetting of a skiff on the Humber Bay, near Toronto, on the 11th of October last.

Mr. Talbot was a member of the Irish Bar. He came to Canada in June last, with the intention of practising his profession. The notices of his death in the City Journals of the day testify to the esteem in which he was held here by all who knew him; and he had already laid the ground for believing that the bar of his adopted country had in him gained one whose talent and industry would in time have made him one of the brightest ornaments of his profession.

A QUAKER IN COURT.

A transaction occurred in Liverpool at the last Assizes for South Lancashire, which is thus recorded in the *Law Times*:—

"Immediately before the business commenced in the Crown Court, Mr. Justice Willes observed a member of the Society of Friends seated in the grand jury box, with his hat on. Addressing him, his Lordship said,—"Sir, I see you with your hat on in court. I must request you to take it off. I do not assume it to be done with any intentional disrespect on your part, as I know members of your persuasion have an objection to take off your hats in any assembly. But wearing the hat has nothing to do with religion; the hat is a mere covering for the head, which every one in court has taken off but yourself. I don't wear my hat; and I hope that your own good sense will point out to you the propriety of taking your's off; and you will oblige me by doing so." The Quaker gentleman, who had stood up on being addressed by the judge, here rubbed his hands nervously over the handle of his umbrella, and without the slightest indication of any intention to remove his hat, said to his Lordship—"I don't think good sense has anything to do with it. I am a member of a persuasion that for 200 years has objected to remove the hat in any presence, and I object therefore to remove mine. I was very roughly handled in court this morning for refusing to take it off." His Lordship: "I am sorry to hear that. I have near relatives of my own who are of your persuasion, but I never knew any one of them object to remove his hat when reasonably requested to do so. Your persisting to wear your hat is a mark of disrespect, and if you choose to persist in wearing it, I must request you to retire from the court." The Quaker gentleman here, amid a somewhat general titter, turned round and walked out of the grand jury box and the court with his hat well on his head, and with the stiff-necked bolt upright gait of a man who has successfully performed a disagreeable but great moral duty."

We manage matters rather better in Upper Canada. When a Quaker appears in Court with his hat on, the Sheriff, or some other officer of the Court instructed by him, quietly and respectfully removes it, and the "*friend*," as becomes his profession, offers no resistance. It will be evident that he is not a Quaker *indeed* if he violently and actively opposes himself to authority; unless, perhaps, he should be like friend "Mead," (a co-defendant of Penn's in his celebrated Trial.) Mead was an old Cromwellian soldier. He was once set upon by robbers in a lonesome place, but thoroughly discomfited them. He was questioned for this at a monthly meeting, and though a strict partizan of the doctrine of non-resistance, his reply was, "The Spirit of the Lord was upon me, and I could have beaten seven of them."

CHAMBER CASES.

Our Chamber Reports are again so numerous that we can only, as before, give notes of many of them, which want of space will not allow us to publish in full in this number. Prompt arrangements were made to supply the place of Mr. Talbot, whose death we have mentioned elsewhere;—and the cases of which we give notes below, are furnished by our new Reporter, whose fitness for the task we have every reason to be assured of.

McLeod v. Buchanan.

A prisoner applying to be discharged from custody under the 300th section of the C. L. P. Act 1856, should show in addition to the other requirements of that section that he has been in close custody for three successive calendar months.—Per Burns J., Oct. 8th.