

stitutes an obstruction to footmen, placed by an independent contractor over a required sidewalk, without signals or guard to protect the public from injury after dark.

The liability of a master for injury to his employee, due to the master's negligence in failing to furnish a suitable number of servants to do the work required of them, is sustained in *Di Bari v. J. W. Bishop Co.*, 199 Mass. 254, 85 N.E. 89, 17 L.R.A. (N.S.) 773.

The liability of a railroad company for the negligence of an independent contractor in setting out a fire guard along the railroad right of way is sustained in *St. Louis & S. P. R. Co. v. Madden* (Kan.) 93 Pac. 586, 17 L.R.A. (N.S.) 788.

The right of a telegraph company to refuse to transmit a message which is not libellous or obscene, on the theory that it is improper, is denied in *Western U. Teleg. Co. v. Lillard* (Ark.) 110 S.W. 1035, 17 L.R.A. (N.S.) 836.

Flotsam and Jetsam.

A former member of the House of Commons, now a Senator, has evolved a cure for the level crossing evil. He proposes to fine the people who risk getting killed. Farmers and others who attempt to cross a railway track on the level without first stopping their conveyances at a safe distance from the rails and looking carefully both ways, will be subject to a penalty. Also they must listen; so that if their eyes are poor, their "ear-sight" will make up the deficiency. Just who is going to accuse the farmer when there is no one present but himself and the fence posts, how they are going to collect the fine after he has been smashed to pieces, or to what extent a fine will frighten a man who will risk his life, is not explained. He ought to add a clause to his bill making it a penal offence for any man to cross a level track without putting his ear to the rail first, as vibrations carry a long distance through metal.—*Ex.*