

ment,' in which, however angry the House of Commons might be with the persons who had advised the measure and whom, as appears from their resolutions, they voted to be 'enemies to Their Majesties and the kingdom,' nobody presumed to question 'the right' of doing it, and the representation drawn up on that occasion puts this matter upon the proper and constitutional ground in praying His Majesty 'that for the future he will be graciously pleased to listen to the voice of Parliament and not to the secret advice of particular persons who may have private interests of their own separate from the true interest of the King and the people.' "

DUTY OF TRAVELLER ON HIGHWAY WHEN APPROACHING RAILROAD CROSSING.

The law on this subject as found in the courts of the United States appears in the following article copied from *Case and Comment* for July. The authorities are given there in footnotes —

"The deadly grade crossing will doubtless be with us for many years to come, even on the more important lines of railroad, so that, unfortunately, it will be a long time before the numerous decisions relative to the respective rights and duties of railroad companies and highway travellers toward each other will be out of date.

The inequality of the conflict between a train and an ordinary road vehicle or pedestrian when both attempt to occupy the same place at the same time would seem to be sufficient to impress upon those about to cross railroads with the necessity for extreme caution, but, judging from the numerous cases involving such a state of facts, crossing a railroad is one situation where self-preservation ceases to be the first law of nature.

The admonition so commonly seen, and seldom regarded in its entirety, to "stop, look and listen," has some support in law, though but few cases insist upon the doing of all three things