

The Legal News.

VOL. XII. NOVEMBER 9, 1889. No. 45.

The use of the bicycle has given rise to some litigation on both sides of the Atlantic. In the English case of *Taylor v. Goodwin*, L. R., 4 Q. B. Div. 228, a bicycle was held to be a carriage. So, too, in the Indiana case of *Mercer v. Corbin*, 117 Ind. 450, it was held that a bicycle is a vehicle, and entitled to the rights of the road, and has no lawful right to the use of the sidewalks. In a more recent case in the same State, *Holland v. Bartsch*, Supreme Court of Indiana, Sept. 18, 1889, it was held that a person in a carriage drawn by horses, and the rider of a bicycle, have equal rights upon the highway; and allegations that defendant rode a bicycle in the centre of the road at the rate of fifteen miles an hour, up to within 25 feet of the faces of plaintiff's horses, whereby they became frightened and ran away, and injured plaintiff, do not state a cause of action. The Court said: "Although the use of the bicycle for the purpose of locomotion and travel is quite modern, yet it is a vehicle of great convenience, and its use is becoming quite common. While travelling upon the highways by means of horses has been in vogue much longer, and is more universal at present than by means of bicycles, yet persons travelling by means of horses have no superior rights to those travelling upon the highway by improved methods of travel, which are consistent with the proper use of the highway. . . . In this case, the acts complained of in each paragraph of the complaint are the riding of the bicycle in the centre of the highway at the rate of fifteen miles per hour, to and within twenty-five feet of the faces of the plaintiff's horses. It is these acts which are charged as negligence and as a wrong, but as we have held, they are not unlawful acts and are not a wrong; hence they constitute no cause of action. To make a person liable for the doing of such acts, they must be charged to have been done at a time or in a manner or under circumstances which render him chargeable

with a want of proper regard for the rights of others, which is not done in either paragraph of the complaint."

Prof. T. W. Dwight, being asked for a list of fifty leading law books (exclusive of reports), names the following:—"Holland's Elements of Jurisprudence (3d edition); Revised Statutes of the United States; Revised Statutes of the Practitioner's State; Kent's Commentaries; Schouler on Personal Property; Pollock on Contracts; Addison on Contracts; Story on Agency; Daniel on Negotiable Paper; Reeves' Domestic Relations; Smith on Master and Servant; Bishop on Marriage and Divorce; Bishop on Married Women; Tyler on Infancy; Morawetz on Corporations; Dillon on Municipal Corporations; Angell & Ames on Corporations; Sugden or Dart on Vendors and Purchasers; Benjamin on Sales (Corbin's or Bennett's ed.); Taylor on Landlord and Tenant; Burge on Suretyship; Story on Bailment or Schouler on Bailment; Redfield on Railways; Story or Wharton on Conflict of Laws; Abbott on Shipping; Arnold on Marine Insurance; Phillips on Insurance; May on Fire and Life Insurance; Dwarris on Statutes; Browne on Statute of Frauds; Angell on Statute of Limitations; Mayne on Damages; Sedgwick on Measure of Damages; Kerr on Fraud and Mistake; Bigelow on Estoppel; May (H. W.) on Fraudulent Conveyances; Lindley on Partnership; Parsons on Partnership; Pomeroy's Equity Jurisprudence; High on Receivers; High on Injunctions; Perry on Trusts; Lewin on Trusts; Williams on Real Property; Jones on Mortgages; Washburn on Easements; Rawle on Covenants; Jarman on Wills; Humphrey's Precedents; Taylor on Evidence; Stephens on Evidence (Chase's ed.); Gould on Pleading; Daniel's Chancery Pleading and Practice." He remarks: "Being limited to the number of fifty, I have failed to include many highly valuable works. These are not to be regarded as disparaged because they are not named."

The Hon. Alex. Morris, Q.C., who died in Toronto, October 28, was a member of the bar of Quebec, as well as of the bar of Onta-