

Motor Cars (Use and Construction) Order, 1904, under which the proceedings were taken, has been amended in consequence of the judgments in that case.

It will be seen that since the Act of 1903 was placed on the statute-book a fair number of important decisions have been given both with regard to its provisions and those of the earlier Act of 1896. We do not suppose that under these statutes many more difficult questions will arise in the future, inasmuch as most debateable points have already been considered. No doubt the time is approaching when fresh legislation with regard to mechanically propelled vehicles will be introduced; and for ourselves we should prefer to see the abolition of the artificial speed limit, and dangerous and reckless driving dealt with by provisions akin to—or even stronger, if need be, than the existing s. 1 of the Motor Car Act, 1903.”

---

In commenting last week upon recent decisions with regard to motor-cars, we omitted to call attention to the case of *Wing v. London General Omnibus Co., Limited* (100 L.T. Rep. 301). That case, which had reference to the skidding of a motor omnibus, is of undoubted importance so far as passengers in such a vehicle are concerned. It was laid down in *Redhead v. Midland Railway Company* (16 L.T. Rep. 485) that it was the duty of a carrier of passengers to take every precaution to procure a vehicle reasonably sufficient for the journey it is to assist in performing, and *Brenner v. Williams* (1 C. & P. 414), seems to shew that the duty is to supply a vehicle not only reasonably fit, but absolutely fit. In the present case the plaintiff, a passenger in a motor omnibus, sustained injuries by reason of an omnibus skidding and running into an electric light standard. The jury found that the defendants were negligent in allowing their motor omnibus to run when the road was in a slippery state, such vehicle being liable to become uncontrollable through skidding, and the court held that under such circumstances the plaintiff was entitled to succeed in the absence of proof by the defendants that when the passenger entered the omnibus she was aware that