CANADIAN CONTRACT RECORD.



LEGAL DECISIONS AFFECTING MUNICIPALITIES.

BAILIE VS. ELMA TOWNSHIP .- At Osgoode Hall in Trial Court proceedings, before Robertson, J., judgment was given recently in action tried at Stratford, Bailie vs. Corporation Township of Elma. The plaintiff claimed that the defendants raised the readbed of the highway in front of his land (lot 4, in the 15th concession of the township of Elma), and by filling in the water-course through which the water passed in flowing off his lands in a southerly directions caused the water to remain on his land and damage his crops. He also set up an agreement to refer and the award made thereunder, requiring defendants to open a ditch across the adjoining lot 3, deep enough to let off the water. The action was tried with a jury, who found for plaintiff in respect of the taising of the road bed, and assessed the damages at \$300. The question of the award was by consent agreed to be di onsed of by the court without a jury. Action dismissed without costs as regards the claim under the award. Judgment for the plaintiff for amount found by verdict with full costs, and directing the issue of a mandatory order requiring defendants to take whatever steps may be necessary to abate the nuisance. Record and proceedings to be amended by adding plaintiff's wife as co-plaintiff.

RETOWNSHIP OF COLCHESTER NORTH AND TOWNSHIP OF GOSFIELD NORTH .-Judgment on appeal by township of Colchester Forth from the judgment of the Drainage Referee confirming a report by William Newman, engineer, reporting a scheme for drainage in these townships. It was contended inter alia that the proceedings to obtain the report were not in accordance with the provisions of the municipal drainage act, that the petition was insufficient under sec. 3, and that the engineer did not make and file the affidava required by sec. 5, that work in gues tion was a new drainage scheme for Gosfield North, and not for the improvement of existing drain No. 15; that the proposed drainage work is in breach of an abreement between the townships pursu ant to which Colchester North has paid Gosfield North \$2,000, that the proposed work was not authorized by sec. 75 of the act; that the assessments in connection with the work were unjust and improper; that the drain would work injury to land in Colchester North beyond its termination, which result had not been taken into consideration, and that evidence had been improperly excluded, and an amendment of the engineer's report improperly allow-

ed by the referee. Held, that while an appeal is pending against a report a council cannot refer it back for amendment unless upon consent of all parties, and that treating the amended report as an original report it is bad, because the engineer before making it had not taken again the oath of the office, which is an essential requisite of jurisdiction.

MCCRIMMON V. TOWNSHIP OF YAR MOUTH .- Judgment in action tried at St. Thomas. The plaintiff sues on behalf of herself, her children, and the estate of her deceased husband, for damages for injury to property and health owing to the flooding of the land with water which flowed through a drain called the Bailey award drain upon the construction road and on to the land of deceased. Bailey's land hes east and north of injured land. The Canada Southern Railway Co. are third parties. Held, that award made on the proceedings by Bailey under the Ditches and Watercourses Act does not bind the railway company. It is not subject to the

jurisdiction of the engineer under the act Miller v. G. T. R., 46 U. C. R., 222, not to to the Act which is confirmed to ditches "situate on the property of any railway and running along or under the railway and the scheme of the engineer did not provide for a proper ou let without dam ige to adjacent lands giving a fall, etc. Held, also, that the evidence of Smith (who an ter the award was to construct thethird section of the drain) so connected the defendants with the conducting of the water which flowed through the award drain from Bailey's land as to make them responsible for injury to plaintiff. Claim against third for plaintiff for \$150 if defendants agree, having regard to sees, 6 and 7, R. S. O. ch. 166, the husband having died more than 12 months before action. If defend. ants do not agree, reference to junior judge of County of Elgin to ascertain amount of plaintiff's damage and as to liability of defendants for injury which is found to have arisen from flow of water through the Warehouse street culvert, and assessing damages if he finds liability to exist. Farther directions and costs reserved.



ÆMILIUS JARVIS & CO. (Toronto Stock Exchange) 19-21 King St. West, TORONTO