

Austrian Upper Chamber passed an Act to a similar effect, and like in terms to one previously assented to by the Lower House. This measure provides that the Minister of Justice shall examine any claim for compensation and fix the amount, and it is only when the Minister refuses to recognize a claim and admit the petition that the petitioner need apply to the High Court of Justice for indemnity. Very recently, and following not long after the action of the Austrian Chamber of Peers, the French Chamber had under consideration a bill making the reparation as wide as possible, and this measure was carried against the Government by a majority of twenty-seven in a total vote of five hundred and nine. In England the indemnity appears to depend upon the uncertain mood of the Home Secretary, assisted by popular clamour within and without the House of Commons. It is true that among the continental nations justice is administered and witnesses examined by almost inquisitorial means, and that there is not the presumption of innocence recognized by our laws, but this would seem to be no less a reason for providing that where justice has erred reparation should be made to the unhappy sufferer.

A. H. O'B.

Notes and Selections.

"DELIVERY AS REQUIRED."—It has been held in the Nottingham (Eng.) County Court that when orders are given "delivery as required," delivery within a reasonable time is meant and not "delivery as wanted," since with the latter construction the goods might never be wanted.

ELECTRIC RAILWAYS: TROLLEY SYSTEM.—Where a municipal corporation had given permission to a street railway company to put up poles and wires in certain streets and use electric motors by means of the trolley system, as provided by statute, and the company had spent money on the faith of the permission and begun the construction of the apparatus, it was held that an injunction would lie to restrain servants of the corporation from interfering with the work, unless it is made to appear that the method in which it is proposed to use the system is dangerous, and no objections to the system itself will be considered. *Jersey, etc., R.R. Co. v. Mayor, etc., of Jersey*, 25 N.J.L.J. 109.

MORTGAGORS—TENDER.—In the case of *Greenwood v. Sutcliffe*, 61 L.J. Rep. Chanc. 59; L.R. (1892) 1 Chanc. 1, we have some instruction in the law of tenders. In that case a mortgagor tendered a sum of money to the mortgagees for principal, interest, and costs, but reserved his right to tax the costs and review the figures. In *Harmer v. Priestley*, 22 Law J. Rep. Chanc. 1041; 16 Beav. 569,