Committee held that it was not. This point applied to one parish only, and does not appear to have been specially urged in the court below.

In the case of *Atlantic & N. W. Ry. Co.* v. *Wood*, which will also be found in the present issue, the argument before the Judicial Committee seems to have been reduced to a very simple question. The Railway Company admitted the respondents' right to recover compensation under the Railway Act, and that the damages to be estimated were those caused and to be caused to the remainder of their property by the intended use of the part expropriated; but the pretension was put forward that the Court of Queen's Bench had not made a re-valuation of the damages and had accepted that made by the arbitrators. It is not easy to understand how such a point could be seriously urged before the Committee unless there were something to show that the Canadian Court had declined to hear any argument as to the amount of damages. Now, although the case before our courts was argued principally upon the legal questions raised, no restriction was imposed upon counsel, so far as we are aware, in reviewing the evidence of damages. The only point discussed before the Board, therefore, was one which seems to have been founded chiefly upon a misapprehension of some remarks made by Mr. Justice Hall, which clearly do not support the interpretation sought to be placed on them, and the Judicial Committee, under these circumstances, did not consider it necessary to call upon the respondents to reply.

In the judgment following—*Casgrain es qual.* v. *Atlantic & North West Ry. Co.*—Lord Watson has treated in a very elaborate manner a case of considerable complication. The salient points of the judgment are that the attorney general, in an action under article 997 of the Code of