walk in constant use by the public in a town has a right, when walking with due care, to presume —and act upon the presumption—that it is reasonably safe for ordinary travel, and free, throughout its entire width, from all dangerous and annoying obstructions of a permanent character.[1] And even if obstructions are placed in the road by wrongdoers, and thereby it is rendered unsafe, the corporation is liable if it knew, or ought to have known, of them.[2] And if a walk ought to be kept in repair by the adjoining landowners, the city will be liable if the bad state of the walk has become notorious."[3]

"You repeated that sentence very well and with great emphasis. It is quite correct in a general way that highways, streets and sidewalks, should at all times be safe and convenient, but then regard must be had to the locality and intended uses.[4] Towns are liable only for injuries caused by defects and obstructions for which they might be indicted.[5] It is necessary in some way to connect the corporation with the obstructions, either as having directly caused them,[6] or assented

[1] Indianapolis *v.* Gaston, 58 Ind. 224.

[2] Castor *v.* Uxbridge, 39 Q.B. (Ont.) 113; Hall *v.* Fond du Lac, 42 Wisc.

[3] Nevin *v.* Rochester, 19 A.L.J. 315.

[4] City of Providence *v.* Clapp, 17 How. 168.

[5] Merrill *v.* Hampden, 26 Me. 234; but see Burns *v.* Toronto, 42 Q.B. (Ont.) 560.

[6] Howe *v.* Leeds & Grenville, 13 C.P. (Ont.) 515.