company would in all probability be called on to repeat every message, with the inevitable effect of putting the public to an increased expense, without any corresponding gain.

We are, therefore, inclined to think that the regulation in question, or at least so much of it as has been considered in this opinion, is well calculated to reconcile the economy and despatch which the mass of the community principally desire, with the security against accident which each individual is entitled to demand. But we limit ourselves to saying that it is not so far contrary to private interest or the public good, as to justify a court of justice in pronouncing it invalid.

We have not arrived at this conclusion without a just diffidence arising from the novelty of the subject and the want of any controlling authority in this State. But it is satisfactory to know that the principles set forth above are sustained by the judgment of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, in *Ellis* v. *The Telegraph Co.*, 13 Allen, 226; and also by that rendered in *Camp* v. *The Telegraph Co.*, 2 Metcalf, Ky., 164.

We do not think it requisite to notice the second point, beyond saying that it presents a nice question, about which the books do not agree: See *Harris's* Case, Law Reports, 7 Chan. Appeals, 587; and the *British and American Telegraph Co.* v. *Colson*, Law Reports, 6 Ex. 108. The fair deduction from the authorities seems to be, that although an offer made through the post-office becomes binding as soon as the assent of the person to whom it is addressed is signified by mailing a reply, the contract is still subject to this condition, that the letter of acceptance shall reach its destination; and will fail if the opposite party does not receive notice within a reasonable time in that or some other way. The principle is the same, when a telegram is altered in passing over the line, and misleads a purchaser. We do not, however, express any opinion on this head, and leave it for the consideration of the court above. In deciding that the company is not answerable for unrepeated messages, we have in effect disposed of the whole controversy, and judgment is consequently entered for the defendant on the points reserved.

Judgment for the defendants.

We are pleased to notice by some of our exchanges that Mr. H. J. Morgan, of the Secretary of State's office in Ottawa, better known as the author of several useful Canadian works, has been called to the Bar of Quebec. At one time he held a very humble position in the Civil service, but by dint of industry and ability has already raised himself to a position of which he may feel justly proud. His example is one that we would like to see more generally followed by young men who enter the Civil service. Many of those who enter the service, being void of ambition, lead a sort of hum-drum existence, without any effort to utilise their leisure, of which they have a good share, by engaging in literary pursuits or in fitting themselves for the higher positions to which they should naturally and properly aspire.

A money bond void on payment of the money by instalments is not within either the Statute 4 & 5 Anne, c. 16, s. 13, or the Common Law Procedure Act 1860, s. 25, and a plea of payment into court of money sufficient to satisfy the claim of the plaintiff in respect of the unpaid instalment for default in payment of which the action is brought is bad.—*Preston* v. *Dania et al* 27 L. T. Rep. N. S. 612.

Mowat's Administration of Justice Bill, noticed in another place, we have learned, barely in time to mention, has passed the third reading with very few alterations. The body of the Act will not come into force till 1st January next. This is desirable; though, in suggesting a postponement, we did not contemplate so long a day: it will afford practitioners ample time for a deliberate and careful examination, and we hope to be able to give some exposition of its provisions assisting to its successful working.

No doubt a measure making such important alterations in procedure may be seriously clogged, if not blocked, by a hostile feeling on the part of those who have to work it out, and the hearty co-operation of the judges and the bar is always a great aid to success. We have no doubt that will be given to the new law, and we think the Attorney-General has acted wisely in postponing its operation. Secs. 53, 54, and 55 will come in force at once.