Chan. Div.]

NOTES OF CANADIAN CASES.

[Prac. Cases.

CHANCERY DIVISION.

Proudfoot, J.]

May 22.

JENKINS V. THE CENTRAL ONTARIO RY.

General Railway Act—Compulsory purchase—Mines—R. S. O. c. 165, s. 20, subs. 23.

Motion for injunction. Where the Special Act of a certain railway incorporated the claims of the General Railway Act relating to powers, tion, and surveys, and lands and their valuation, and also authorized the company from and out of the ores obtained along their line of railuse, and also gave them power to acquire mining had chosen a site for a station upon the lands of netic iron ore, and called upon the plaintiffs to part with the land.

Held, the plaintiffs could not obtain an injunction restraining the company from expropriating ceded that the company knew of the mine, and that it was the property of the plaintiffs; for the legislature had not seen fit to impose any limitations on the right of the company in locating only a right of way over the surface or otherwise, but had left the expropriation clauses to their full effect, which, in this country, at least, land.

Aliter, if it were proved that the company were acquiring the land not for the purposes for were given, but for some collateral object, as, for to a third party.

Semble, should it afterwards appear that such hereafter carried out, means might probably be completed to prevent it.

Semble also, the powers conferred on the Rounty Judge under the Railway Act of Ontario, in mediate possession, before arbitration had, do join the taking of possession, if the railway company is making use of their powers to attain any object collateral to that for which it was incor-

porated; but if it is not proved that the company is exercising its powers for an unauthorized object, it is not within the jurisdiction of a judge of this Court to interfere with an order for immediate possession granted by a County Judge, though granted ex parte.

C. Moss, Q.C., for the plaintiffs.

for the defendants.

PRACTICE CASES.

Cameron, J.]

October, 1882.

Ontario & Quebec Railway Co. v. Grand Trunk Railway Co.

Railway Company—Construction of line—Powers under act of incorporation.

Upon an application for the appointment of arbitrators to determine the compensation to be paid by the O. & Q. Ry. Co. for crossing the railway of the G. T. Ry. Co. at a point near the Carlton station of the latter company, it was objected by the G. T. Ry. Co. that the O. & Q. Ry. Co are only authorized by their Act of incorporation to build or construct their railway eastward from the City of Toronto, that the Carlton station of the G. T. Ry is about three miles north-west of the City of Toronto, that the O. & Q. Ry. Co. have not determined the point in Toronto where the western terminus of the railway shall be, and untill that is done the company cannot exercise a right of crossing the G. T. Ry. with a view to uniting its line with the C. V. Ry., which is what it contemplates doing.

Held, that there can be no valid objection to the O. & Q. Ry. connecting their line at any point on the C. V. Ry. within the County of York, with the C. V. Ry. without reaching or touching directly the City of Toronto except through such connection.

H. Cameron, Q.C., and G. T. Blackstock, for the O. & Q. Ry. Co.

W. Cassels and C. A. Brough, for the G. T. Ry. Co.

Cameron, J.]

[]an. 31.

BLAINEY V. MCGRATH.

Partnership—Costs—R. S. O. ch. 15.

The plaintiff and defendant entered into a partplany is making use of their powers to attain any object collateral to that for which it was incor-