blocks was due to the negligence of the respondent or the person who was entrusted with the duty of seeing that these safeguards were properly provided.

I am not of opinion that if it did not appear from which of the three causes I have mentioned the accident happened, but it did appear that it must have happened from one or more of them, even assuming the law to be as stated by Mr. Beven, the appellant fails to make out his case. In other words, I am of opinion that, if the conclusion is warranted that the accident happened from one or more of these three causes or from the combined effect of all three of them, the appellant made a case entitling him to recover.

Upon the whole, I am of opinion that the appeal should be allowed with costs, and that there should be substituted for the judgment which has been directed to be entered a judgment for the appellant for $450 with costs.

The damages were not assessed by the learned Judge, but the evidence amply warrants their being assessed at at least the sum I have named.

Appeal allowed.

DECEMBER 7TH, 1914.

DAWSON v. HAMILTON BRIDGE CO.

Master and Servant—Injury to Servant—Falling of Beam—Defective Hook—Negligence—Evidence—Findings of Jury—Cause of Injury—Negativing Cause not Found.

Appeal by the plaintiff from the judgment of KELLY, J., at the trial of the action at Hamilton with a jury, dismissing it with costs.

The appeal was heard by MEREDITH, C.J.O., MACLAREN, MAGEE, and HODGINS, JJ.A.

T. N. Phelan, for the appellant.

S. F. Washington, K.C., for the defendant company, the respondent.

The judgment of the Court was delivered by MEREDITH, C.J.O.:—The action is brought to recover damages for personal