## DRIVING.

e drunk ! ning, and into Dr

troubled y knowd sleigh ran into y is pere injury, igh.<sup>1</sup> I general tortious ther by for that a Parke uis own, ess, the

that I s; but

. The

B. & Ald. v. Green-& P. 631 ; 2 C.P.D. more, 19 Doctor will rush off to friend Erskine, and I will have to pony up for the damage; because, as that rascal John was driving on his master's business, it matters not that he disobeyed his express orders in going out of his way, or made a detour to please himself.<sup>1</sup> A master is liable, also, if his servant while doing his work acts in a reckless or passionate manner, and inflicts unnecessary and unjustifiable injury."<sup>2</sup>

"Yes, but Eldon dear," continued my wife, "it was not on his master's business, it was on mine."

"Stupid, what difference does that make?" replied I, impatiently; and then seeing that my wife did not like the adjective, I added more feelingly, but rather vaguely, "Don't you see, I'm his master, you are mine, and so must be his also."

"Heigh-ho!" sighed the wife of my bosom. "But I have not told you all. After the collision the horse ran against an old man who was walking along the street, knocked him down, and hurt him : but, of course, he had no right to be on the road when there was a good sidewalk for him."

"Of course he *had* a right to be on the road just as much right there as the horse and sleigh had, even though he were sick and infirm; and it

<sup>2</sup> Cohen v. Dry Dock, &c., R.R., 69 N.Y. 170; Rounde v. Delaware, &c., R.R., 64 N.Y. 129; Hawes v. Knowles, 114 Mass. 518.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Limpus v. London Omn. Co., I H. & C. 526; Joel v. Morrison, supra; Mitchell v. Cresweller, 13 C.B. 237; Seymour v. Greenwood, 7 H. & N. 356; Venables v. Smith, L.R. 2 Q.B.D. 279,