to them,[1] or permitted them to remain knowing of their existence, or being negligently ignorant when they had the means of knowing of them.[2] If an obstruction is the work of a wrongdoer, notice of it must be brought home to the door of the corporation, or the defect must be so notorious as to make it reasonable to fix the corporation with notice of it.[3] Towns do not insure the safety of all using sidewalks in the depths of our northern winters;[4] and it has been expressly decided that the mere existence of a little ice on the walk is no evidence of actionable negligence;[5] the slipperiness of the ice, if the walk is properly constructed and free from accumulations of snow, will not give those who fall a right to sue a city with success.[6] One must go gingerly and with due care on such occasions;[7] and walking unnecessarily over icy walks—which one knows are dangerous and might easily avoid—is negligence.[8] Although it has been held in New York that as ice on a sidewalk does not necessarily prove it to be dangerous, so walking over it at night does not prove negligence if the walker exercises such care and caution

[1] New York *v.* Furze, 3 Hill, 612.

[2] White *v.* Hurdley Local Board, L.R., 10 Q.B. 219.

[3] Hart *v.* Brooklyn, 36 Barb. 226.

[4] Ringland *v.* Toronto, 23 C.P. (Ont.) 93. [5] Id.

[6] Stanton *v.* Springfield, 12 Allen, 566; Hutchins *v.* Boston, Ib. 271, n.; but see Morse *v.* Boston, 109 Mass. 446.

[7] Wilson *v.* Charlestown, 8 Allen, 137.

[8] Schaeffer *v.* Sandusky, 18 A.L.J. 377; Burns *v.* Toronto, *supra*; Saunders on Negligence, 61.