

duty of the Respondents to take care that they were so; the public law did require it by the public health, and the Respondents altogether failed in this duty, thereby bringing the Appellant, and others who were, many thousands, into a state of danger; they should now, for each giving effect, be held responsible to him, who by reason thereof, has become a sufferer, and it is submitted the law justly presumes the Respondents must be the cause of the injury when it has been shown that their illegal acts were such as were likely to have directly contributed to, if not actually produced, the accident whereby the injury to his person and property was inflicted. It is respectfully urged that, in obedience to the legislature, for the preservation of the goods and lives of the community at large, due should be taken that regulations such as those which were lately decreed by the Respondents should be rigorously enforced. The acts of the Respondents in evading them, were obviously, and indisputably wrong, they directly and necessarily contributed to the intervention and probable injury of the public, they were well known to be attended with danger to passengers. They were followed by a violent injury to the Appellant, for which he contends the Court below should have held the Respondents liable, because even if there had been room to doubt of their being the actual cause of the disaster, it is better to set the law upon the party who has neglected his duty in the open violation of the law, and thus deprived the other party of a protection against accident which the law directed he should have rather than upon the injured party, who merely doing his duty to the public, and to whom no blame is shown to attach, for neither he nor the person with whose carriage he came into collision are to be presumed to have been in fault, as to them, until the contrary is proved the collision must be considered a pure accident; but as to the Respondents they may easily and justly be presumed to have been the cause of the same, and without which the accident would never have taken place and they may be held responsible for the immediate cause of the damage. Moreover, there is a want of public policy in refusing every protection that can be afforded to the limbs and lives of persons using the roads, by, not only holding both public and private bodies to the performance of their duty towards the public at large; numerous events show that what is conducive to safety on roads should be strictly observed, and no doubt, the judgment rendered in the Court below has a directly opposite tendency, is a manifest inducement to relax these rules and its effect will be to produce a continued non-observance of them.

The Appellant believes that it is not holding those who have infringed these laws to be answerable for the consequences that naturally flow from their breach, and that are shown in all probability to have been caused thereby; there is no one who he conceives himself entitled to have the said judgment reversed, and it is against the said Respondents, such condemnation for the damage which he has sustained as was sought for by him in the Court below, which condemnation he now respectfully prays this Honorable Court to award him.

ANDREWS & ANDREWS,

Attorneys for Plaintiffs.

1880.

APPENDIX.

PLAINTIFFS EVIDENCE IN SUPERIOR COURT.

BERNARD COLE, of the City of Quebec, in the District of Quebec, Auctioneer, aged above twenty-one years being duly sworn upon the Holy Evangelists, doth depose and say: I do know the parties in this case; I am not related, allied, or of kin to, nor in the service or domestic of either of them, or interested in the event of this suit. I have lived for several years past in St. John's Street, St. John's Suburbs, and some distance above Marois's new building; during last summer, during the construction of the said building, I was in the habit of going up and down the said street, and passing by place some six times a day; for the first week in November last, and a month or two previous thereto, the street opposite Marois's building was obstructed with building materials, for about one hundred feet in the line of the said street, and to about two-thirds of the way across; from the obstruction to the south side of the street the space was so limited that two-wheeled vehicles could with difficulty pass one another, and there was an inclination from the centre of the street to the parapet, which would render it more difficult for vehicles to pass; I should think that St. John Street, without, is one of the first thoroughfares of the city, and is one of the principal outlets; I always considered the obstruction in question unreasonable and exceedingly dangerous, and myself brought it under the notice of the police, and of members of the City Council, although at the present moment I do not remember which of them; I think it was Mr. Munn and Mr. McGreevy, at that time, City Councillors; the obstruction in question consisted of brick, sand, timber, and large stone for columns; I do not remember the day of the month of the Plaintiff's accident; it was, however, a Saturday in November last; I noticed during the week of the accident several large stones,

Cross Examined.—St. John Street, without, is a very broad street.

ROBERT FANSELL, of the City of Quebec, in the District of Quebec, Storeman, aged above twenty-one years being duly sworn upon the Holy Evangelists doth depose and say: I do know the parties in this case; I am not related, allied, or of kin to, nor in the service or domestic of either of them, or interested in the event of this suit. I have lived for several years past in St. John's Street, St. John's Suburbs, and some distance above Marois's new building; during last summer, during the construction of the said building, I was in the habit of going up and down the said street, and passing by place some six times a day; for the first week in November last, and a month or two previous thereto, the street opposite Marois's building was obstructed with building materials, for about one hundred feet in the line of the said street, and to about two-thirds of the way across; from the obstruction to the south side of the street the space was so limited that two-wheeled vehicles could with difficulty pass one another, and there was an inclination from the centre of the street to the parapet, which would render it more difficult for vehicles to pass; I should think that St. John Street, without, is one of the first thoroughfares of the city, and is one of the principal outlets; I always considered the obstruction in question unreasonable and exceedingly dangerous, and myself brought it under the notice of the police, and of members of the City Council, although at the present moment I do not remember which of them; I think it was Mr. Munn and Mr. McGreevy, at that time, City Councillors; the obstruction in question consisted of brick, sand, timber, and large stone for columns; I do not remember the day of the month of the Plaintiff's accident; it was, however, a Saturday in November last; I noticed during the week of the accident several large stones,