

When bicycles are going in the same direction the hindermost may pass the others on either side. But one riding on the left-hand side of the road probably assumes all risks and is *prima facie* guilty of negligence.

Though in general a bicycle has no right upon the sidewalk, a pedestrian has a right to walk in the highway, and may cross the street where he pleases, but he is guilty of negligence which will prevent recovery of damages if he attempts to cross immediately in front of a moving vehicle, and for the purposes of such a case, the fact that the vehicle is on the left-hand side of the road is not alone evidence of negligence to charge the rider or driver.

If the bicyclist rides at an immoderate rate of speed on a highway or street, and while so doing injures a pedestrian, he may be liable either civilly or criminally, for his recklessness in riding at such a rate of speed will, in general, be held to supply the want of criminal intent. Thus, it has been held that where a bicyclist kills a human being while going at a dangerous speed he may be convicted of manslaughter. But what is "an immoderate rate of speed" is a question to be determined in view of all the circumstances of the case, as time and place, for what might be a perfectly safe rate of speed upon a country road might be murderous on a city street.

STRIKES.

Strikes, which were formerly considered illegal, have some time since been legalized; trade unions at one time pronounced to be illegal are now legal societies. Persons may now combine for the purpose of refusing to work for their masters; they may strike, unless in so doing they commit acts otherwise illegal, and a trade union that assists in or conducts a strike, may in so doing act legally, even when picketing with proper restrictions is resorted to. The limits within which a strike must be conducted so that those participating in it do not thereby break the law have recently been considered by the English Court of Appeal in the case of *Lyons v. Wilkins*, 12 T. L. R. p. 278.

Inasmuch as in most cases of strike many act in consort, the

law pertaining to the subject is generally to be found classed under "conspiracy." Another reason for this is that the acts complained of are nearly always in contravention of some criminal statute, the indictments, because of the number of persons implicated, being for a conspiracy to commit the statutory offence. There may, of course, be a conspiracy, not criminal, to do an illegal act, which Courts will restrain. Some recent actions have been brought for injunctions to restrain strikes, but the orders, where granted, have been to prohibit the doing of such acts as the particular statute applicable constitutes an offence. In the case just mentioned, the Court, on appeal, reformed the injunction order so that it read in the terms of the statute. There is no doubt,