

CRITICISMS ON REPORTERS—REPEATING OF TELEGRAMS.

**BROWN'S PARLIAMENTARY CASES.** Mr. BROWN only made abstracts from the appeal cases lying on the table of the House, and therefore the grounds of the decision can not be known from the abstract of the case in Brown: Per Lyndhurst, Lord Chan. when referring to *Bouchier v. Taylor*, 4 Bro. P. C. 708 in *Barrs v. Jackson*, 5 Law Times, R. 365.

**BULLER'S NISI PRIUS.** The author procured his materials from Mr. Justice Bathurst: 17 Law Mag. 27.

**CRUMPTON'S PRACTICE.** "Many of the cases were partly collected by myself before I was at the bar; they were never intended by me for publication, and were too loose to be relied upon: Per Buller, J, in 5 T. R. 372.

**DARBY AND BOSANQUET ON THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.** "A very useful book:" Per Willes, J., in *Wilkinson v. Verity*.

**ESPINASSE'S REPORTS.** "It used to be said that Mr. Espinasse heard one half of the cases and reported the other half": Pollock, C.B., in *Whyman v. Gath*, 22 L. J. N. S. Exch. 317. The observations of Denman, C. J., in *Small v. Nairne*, 13 Q. B. 840, as to the want of accuracy in this reporter, so that his reports were wont to be quoted with doubt and hesitation and even apology, were adopted by Coleridge, J., in *Wenman v. Mackenzie*, 1 Jur. N. S. 1016.

**FONBLANQUE'S NOTES** to the "Treatise on Equity" attributed to Mr. Barlow are executed with consummate ability: 22 Law Mag. 61.

**FOSTER'S CROWN LAW.** "Sir Michael Foster was a judge eminently versed in criminal law: *Queen v. Charleton*, 2 Irish L.R. 65.

**GALE ON EASEMENTS.** "A very excellent book:" Per Campbell, C. J., in *Renshaw v. Bean*: 18 Q. B. 124; "An excellent treatise": Per L. Wensleydale in *Rowbottom v. Wilson*, 8 H. L. C. 359.

**GILBERT ON REPLEVIN.** "Is a book of the very highest authority:" Per Burton, J., in *Kenny v. Simpson*. 4 I. R. L. R. 44.

**GILBERT ON USES.** "It is known that the book was a posthumous work, and not presented in the form in which the Chief Baron intended it to be made public, and it is possible he might have made considerable alterations, if published in his lifetime; and it bears marks, particularly in the latter part of it, of being incomplete:"

Romilly, M. R., in *Barron v. Wadkin*, 27 L. J. Ch. 124.

**HALE'S HISTORY OF THE COMMON LAW.** This book was published from a posthumous manuscript of the learned Judge, and is exceedingly cursory and defective:" *Barton, Convey.* cited in Greenleaf's Over-ruled cases, p. 204.

**HARGRAVE.** Mansfield's case cited by Mr. Hargrave, although by an unknown hand, yet the adoption of it by Mr. Hargrave makes it an authority: Per Hart, L. C., in *Power v. Sheil*: 1 Moll. Ch. R. 312.

**JARMAN ON WILLS.** Mr Jarman's work is one of great value. It has followed what was begun by Mr. Roper, begun by Mr. Powell, improved by Mr. White, and by Mr. Jarman himself brought to a surprising degree of perfection. Mr. Jarman has, upon a deliberate consideration of cases in his chambers, endeavoured to extract certain rules of construction to guide in considering the language of testators; but it is quite possible to attempt to do a great deal more than it is in the power of any human being to accomplish in that respect: per Stuart, V. C., in *Conduitt v. Soane*, 4 Jur. N. S. 502.

SELECTIONS.

CONCERNING REGULATIONS  
REQUIRING TELEGRAMS  
TO BE REPEATED.

It is an established principle of law that telegraph companies, like railroad companies, have the right to make reasonable regulations for the conduct of their affairs, but there is some diversity of opinions as to what regulations are "reasonable," and as to whether, and, if so, how far, they relieve the company from liability for negligence. Most companies have adopted regulations to the effect that they will not be responsible for mistakes in transmitting, or delay in delivering a message unless such message is repeated, and these regulations are usually printed on the blanks on which messages are written. How far such regulations, so notified, are binding upon the sender, has been considered in the following cases:—

*McAndrew v. The Electric Telegraph Company*, 17 C. B. 3 (1855), presents the earliest discussion of this subject. In that case the plaintiff sent a message to