houses thereabouts and notified the occupants to spread ashes upon their pavements or to level them. Before six hours had passed the plaintiff met with the accident. The snow and ice had not remained there long enough to warrant me, as a jury, to attribute negligence to defendants. The Corporation's having cut down the carriage level of St. James street and made a sloping bank from the pavement to the carriage level did not contribute to the accident of the plaintiff. She did not fall upon this slope, nor towards it. I am sorry for the plaintiff, but I cannot condemn the defendants. In our climate, slippery walking in winter is the normal condition of things. Where glare ice is generally and slight snow falls covering it, it behaves foot passengers to be cautious. I would have difficulty to hold the Corporation responsible for all falls that happen to citizens upon our ordinary pavements in winter. If something extra be proved as, for instance, that the Corporation had been notified of dangerous pavements laid by proprietors opposite their houses, pavements of slippery, glassy surface, upon which snow makes no bond, and citizens are falling every day; as in places in Great St. James street and in Notre Dame street, not far from this Court House, the case for the citizen falling and getting hurt would be more favorable against the Corporation; as regards the proprietors themselves putting down dangerous pavements I will say nothing. Again, the Corporation may be liable where notified of citizens habitually disregarding bye-laws made to compel them to keep their pavements in order in winter: the Corporation disregarding the notice, and doing nothing, and accidents happening afterwards. In the present case the Corporation was not in default. Time enough had not passed to make it liable. The occupants of No. 6, look blameable. Judgment for defendants.

BÉLANGER, DESNOYERS & OUIMET, *for Plaintiff.*

R. ROY & B. DEVLIN, *for Defendants.*