

The property, to my mind, is unquestionably injuriously affected by what has been done.

The 30-foot street constructed by the railway company on the west side of the right of way is of advantage to the plaintiffs; that is to say, with St. David street closed they are better with the 30 feet north and south street, than without it, but it does not compensate them for their damage in having St. David street closed.

The plaintiff Arsene has not any right of way over any land to or from his island property.

It is difficult to see how that property is injuriously affected by the act complained of.

This property is assessed at only \$100.

That is not the test of value but it is something. He paid \$281 for it.

The suggested speculative value of dividing the property into town lots, and guessing at the difference between what these lots would sell for with St. David street closed and if not closed, does not appeal to me.

Before he can sell at all a street must be obtained, the branch of the river must be bridged, and many other circumstances must be considered.

The plaintiff is entitled, in my opinion, to \$250 in all for St. David street property and that will include any damage for personal inconvenience.

I assess the damages of Joseph Sequin at \$100.

Raoul does not reside upon his property, and has not, up to this time, suffered any personal inconvenience. I assess his damages at \$75.

Albert Treand put down foundations of a house three years ago, but did not build.

He made an agreement with his father-in-law to purchase the land at a comparatively small sum. I assess his damages at \$75.

Judgment accordingly, with County Court costs and without any set-off of costs.

As the actions were all tried together the costs of trial will be as of one action.

Thirty days' stay.