

THE LAW OF TELEGRAPHS.

CAMDEN, Lord Chan.—“Lord Camden examined the whole question with that accuracy which peculiarly belonged to him,” per Lord Redesdale in *Hovenden v. Annesley*, 2 Sch. & Lef. 632. (Only one of his decisions, and that but in part, was reversed in appeal. His judgments are of very high authority. See 9 Law Mag. O. S. 53.)

CHAMBRE, J.—“That very able pleader,” per Bayley, B., in *Gladstone v. Hewitt*, 1 Cr. & J. 578. (He was in pleading the “cracksman of his court.” He was singled out by Williams as a great lawyer. See Woolrych “Serjeants” 692. He was great also in conveying. See 10 Law Mag. N. S. 260.)

COMYNS, Chief Baron.—“A very able common lawyer,” per Lord Hardwicke, in *Lawton v. Lawton*, 3 Atk. 16. “His opinion alone is of great authority, since he was considered by his contemporaries the most able lawyer in Westminster Hall,” per Lord Kenyon, in *Pasby v. Freeman*, 3 T. R. 64, and per Blackburn, J., in *Brinsmead v. Harrison*, 20 W. R. 785. “He is a high authority himself,” per same judge, in *Wells v. Abrahams*, 20 W. R. 660.

COTTENHAM, Lord Chan.—“He was one of the ablest Chancery judges, but he abused referencés to the master. The general tenor of his judgments turns on a careful consideration of the pleadings; his constant remark was, ‘Let us look to the record.’” See 26 Law Mag. O. S. 254, and 27 ib. 270. He was notoriously antagonistic to Vice Chan. Knight Bruce. See 46 Law Mag. 280.

COWPER, Lord Chan.—“That great Master of Equity,” per Lord Chan. Parker, in *Litton v. Litton*, 1 P. W. 543.

DE GREY, C. J.—“A very eminent judge,” per Lord Eldon, in *Fox v. Chester*, 6 Bing. 22, 3 Bli. N. R. 156.

DENISON, J.—“Than whom no person was ever better versed in the rules of special pleading,” per Lord Kenyon, in *The King v. Stone*, 1 East. 650.

ELDON, Lord Chan.—“The greatest judge in this country,” per Sir T. Plumer, M. R., in *Copin v. Middleton*, 2 Madd. 433.

ERSKINE, Lord Chan.—“He was assisted in his cases by Hargrave; his judgments are considered with respect, though wanting in the research of a mature equity lawyer. See 22 Law Mag. O. S. 337.

EYRE, Chief Baron.—“Unquestionably a great authority in questions of revenue,” per Lord

Eldon in *Phillips v. Shaw*, 8 Ves. 250. “He was always considered to be a strong-headed man,” per Richards, C. B., in *Duncan v. Worral*, 10 Price 42.

FOSTER, J.—“Sir Richard Foster was a judge eminently versed in criminal law,” per Ferrin, J., in the *Queen v. Charleton*, 2 Jr. L. R. 65.

GARROW, B.—“Did not distinguish himself as a profound jurist, but his memory was marvellous.” Woolrych “Serjeants,” 843.

GASELEE, J.—His peculiarity was “to have great difficulty in deciding the case,” and being “rather inclined to come to a different conclusion” from the rest of the court. See *Hargrave v. Smeé*, 6 Bing. 244; 3 Law Mag. & O. S. 212. He was the original of Dickens’ judge in Pickwick, “Mr. Justice Stareleigh.”

GIFFORD, Lord.—“He succeeded Sir Thomas Plumer at the Rolls; he was a common lawyer, was not familiar with the practice of the court, and not in favour with the leaders of the equity bar.” See 16 Law Mag. O. S. 14.

GIBBS, C. J.—“One of the most learned and acute judges that ever sat in Westminster Hall,” per Lord Tenterden, in *Whitworth v. Hall*, 2 B. & Ad. 697. “A lawyer of great eminence in every department of his profession, and peculiarly skilled in the science and practice of pleading,” per Abbott, C. J., in *Lytleton v. Cross*, 3 B. & C. 323. “A man most eminent for his knowledge of commercial law,” per Park, J., in *Dougall v. Kemble*, 3 Bing. 391.

SELECTIONS.

THE LAW OF TELEGRAPHS.

The constant growth of telegraphy as a popular institution and as an agency for commercial operations, has naturally given rise to many adjudications on the subject. Considering the diversity of judicial opinion, it may be considered as virtually *res integra*, and therefore ripe for original discussion. Of the many questions that have arisen, I will select only the one which I deem of the most importance for consideration in this article, viz.: the relation of telegraph companies to the public.

As an evidence of the distracting state of this question, it is only necessary to say that there are at least three classes of decisions, each tending in a contrary direc-