they assumed the prosecution of the work and dismissed the contractor. The unchallenged finding is that no damage arose to plaintiff from the main dam, which was sanctioned by the statute (62 Vict. ch. 64, sec. 2); that the damage was caused by another and temporary dam, which was not a part of the power works, was not authorized by the statute, was put up for the mere convenience of the contractor, for purposes of navigation and transportation so as to provide more commodious carriage for the material used in the main dam, which was lower down the river. That which is challenged is his carriage for the material used in the is his finding that defendants have so maintained this temporary days that defendants have so maintained in 1902. porary dam as to be liable for the damage it caused in 1902. Their contention is, that they did not direct or approve of the erection of this temporary dam, they did not take it over part of the works, nor did they maintain it in any sense as against plaintiff. On 24th March, 1902, defendants gave notice dismissing Patriarche, the contractor, and thereupon the town took possession of the power works.

The first complaint made (in evidence) was in May or June, 1902, when Mr. Doolittle, a witness, asked Dilworth, bedy would take away the temporary dam. The precise date is not given, and I take it that as to details the memory of companion. The upshot of the interview was, that the memtained: viz., that the temporary dam was not part of the that the contractor put it up for his own convenience and responsible for its removal. They emphatically declared that or to pay damages to the applicant.

The point held of importance by the Judge in this interlope, the mayor), "'Well, if you do not take out the dam, I and Mr. Tudhope said, if I went down and pulled out the they would hold me responsible."

The plaintiff was not then present; it is not shewn that was then communicated to him; and it is not proved that this municipality. But, assuming all these things as made out,