

wires by statutory authority upon the public streets at a time when no other wires were there, is under no duty to inspect the wires periodically for the purpose of seeing that no other wires had subsequently been placed in too close proximity to their own wires and so avoiding injuries which might result to persons handling the dead wires of another company should the latter become charged by close contact with the power wires. *Roberts v. Bell Telephone, etc. Cos.*, 10 D.L.R. 459, 24 O.W.R. 428.

INJURY BY WIRES IN STREETS.

The effect of conferring statutory authority upon an electric power company to erect poles and power wires on a highway is that, apart from negligence, the company is absolved from the rule that any one who, for his own purposes, collects or keeps anything likely to do mischief if it escapes, is *prima facie* answerable for all the damages which are the natural consequence of its escape. *Fletcher v. Rylands*, L.R. 1 Ex. 265, and *Rylands v. Fletcher*, L.R. 3 H.L. 330, considered; *National Telephone Co. v. Baker*, [1893] 2 Ch. 186, and *Eastern and South African Telegraph Co. v. Capetown Tramways Co.*, [1902] A.C. 381, referred to. *Roberts v. Bell Telephone Co. and Western Counties Electric Co.*, 10 D.L.R. 459, 24 O.W.R. 428.

DESTRUCTION OF BUILDING BY FIRE; LACK OF SAFETY DEVICES.

Negligence sufficient to render an electric

company liable for the destruction of a building from fire originating from an electric current of abnormally high voltage being carried upon wires leading into the building, may properly be inferred from the fact that several hours before the fire the company's high voltage wires became crossed with low potential service wires on the same poles, which trouble had been corrected prior to the fire; where it also appeared that the use of a simple safety device by the electric company on the pole nearest the building would have prevented the abnormally high current entering it, and that the electrical installation for the service of the burned building was not defective. *McElmon v. B.C. Electric Ry. Co.* (B.C.), 12 D.L.R. 675.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

See Employees.

WORKS FOR GENERAL BENEFIT OF CANADA.

See Constitutional Law; Expropriation.

WORKSHOPS.

See Warehouses, Yards and Workshops.

YARDS.

See Warehouses, Yards and Workshops.