injured servant. To give some idea of the exhaustive nature of this note it may be said that it would make three hundred pages in an ordinary text book, and nearly a thousand cases from all States of the Union are consulted and referred to.

The present sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is not presumably a convenient one for the Canadian profession. However that may be, the list of business just to hand shows that of the twenty-six Colonial and Indian appeals down for argument during November and December of this year, only one is from a Canadian court, viz., *C. P. R.* v. *Parke* from the Supreme Court of British Columbia. This case is an interesting one, involving the question whether the respondents can be restrained by injunction from continuing to irrigate on their ranch above the railway, thereby causing landslides, to the damage of the railway track. Both the trial judge and the full court on appeal were of opinion that the British Columbia statute authorizing the bringing of water on the land for irrigation purposes impliedly exempted the irrigator, in the absence of negligence, from all liability in respect of the escape of such water, however destructive such escape might be to neighbouring lands. (See *C.P.R.* v. *McBryan*, ante p. 282). Among the appeals set down for judgment are three from Canada, viz.: *G. T. R.* v. *Washington*, *Young* v. *Consumers Cordage Company*, and *Seminaire de Quebec* v. *Limoilu*.

Attention was recently called in these columns (ante, p. 449), to what appeared to the writer to be the objectionable and demoralizing practice of recklessly filing election petitions, and then going through the procedure of "sawing-off" one against another. Mr. Justice Osler took occasion, in the Haldimand case, on 17th ult., to criticize such proceedings with considerable severity. His remarks sound almost like an echo of the article referred to. In discussing the petition he alluded to the m[illegible]er in words which are reported in the daily papers