

above writer hints at, "the desire to please a personal or political friend". In this case the Governor had previously granted two respites to the prisoners. The article concludes by a statement which ought to be unnecessary in any civilized community: "After conviction, and the affirmance of that conviction by the Court of last resort the Governor ought never to interfere except in the event of bona fide, newly discovered evidence, or some other equally cogent public reason rendering such action necessary in the interests of justice." The above shews a condition of things which cannot be described by a much milder word than, appalling.

THE rights of pedestrians crossing city streets were, as we see in *Law Notes*, vigorously affirmed in *Lahne v. Seaich*, 82 N.Y. Supp. 69, where the judge said: "The time is opportune to draw attention to the rule of law that upon crosswalks, at least, the rights of pedestrians are equal to rights of vehicles, and neither has a right of way over the other. The drivers of vehicles have assumed the right of way over pedestrians so long that it is an uncommon thing to see the rights of the latter respected by the former. Except at crossings where, at great public expense, the municipal authorities have found it necessary to station patrolmen, vehicles are generally driven over crosswalks and intersecting streets and around corners as the same speed as in the middle of the block; and pedestrians, whether men, women, or children, are often obliged to wait a long time, or to run by or dodge passing vehicles, in order to get across the street and proceed on their way. If the street-railway company should block the way of pedestrians with one car after another in such close proximity that they could not get across, every one would agree that this was an infringement of the rights of pedestrians which should not be tolerated. Pedestrians wait at a corner for one vehicle which is approaching to pass, and another after another follows in close succession, in utter disregard of the desire and right of pedestrians to cross the street. Any pedestrian has a right to cross at will, exercising ordinary care for his own safety, and having due regard to the rights of those travelling by vehicles; but a pedestrian whose business is urgent cannot wait indefinitely, and has a right to cross as best he can; and if, in asserting that right, he is run down by a vehicle proceeding in disregard of his rights, he should not be held guilty of contributory negligence, and the driver or owner of the vehicle should be held responsible for the damages."