

duty specified below. The authorities are arranged under headings designed to facilitate comparison with that part of the writer's note (already mentioned) in 51 L.R.A. (Sub-d. VI., p. 584), in which the official acts of common law vice-principals are classified. It will be observed that the acts there reviewed cover practically the same range of incidents as those which import liability under this sub-section of the statutes.

(1) The adoption of an improper method of doing the work in hand (a).

(a) The master's liability is for the jury under the following circumstances: Where a staging fell under the injured servant in consequence of the superintendent having ordered a whole cart load of wood to be put on the staging, the usual custom being to put only half a load of wood on it at one time. *Prendible v. Connecticut River Mfg. Co.* (1893) 160 Mass. 131, 35 N.E. 675. Where the superintendent of a pile-driving gang directed one of the gang to stop a car on which the pile driver was placed, by laying a crowbar on the track in front of the car while it was being drawn down a slight incline, a distance of about five feet, by attaching a rope to a heavy pile and setting the pile driver in operation, instead of moving the car to the proper place by means of crowbars, which was the customary mode. *Southern R. Co. v. Shields* (1898) 25 So. 811, 121 Ala. 460. Where a foreman failed to have a bank which was being undermined properly shored up. *Lynch v. Allyn* (1893) 160 Mass. 248, 35 N.E. 550. Where a foreman of a quarry undertook to have an unusually large stone hoisted without drilling holes in it so that it might be more securely held by the points of the dogs. *Crowley v. Cutting* (1895) 165 Mass. 436. Where a superintendent failed to give proper instructions as to the method of putting into the shears a heavy gate which was to be cut up preparatory to being melted. *Madden v. Hamilton I. Forging Co.* (1889) 18 Ont. R. 55. Where a superintendent who was experienced in transporting timbers upon a gear of a given make, and knew that the road over which it was to be carried was rough and uneven, loaded a timber with its narrow sides at the top and bottom and directed the employes to get on and hold it down. *Gagnon v. Seconnet Mills* (1896) 165 Mass. 221, 43 N.E. 82. Where an engineer allowed or directed coal to be loaded in the tender of his engine in such a manner as to be dangerous to his fireman. *Cutler v. Alabama M. R. Co.* (1895) 18 So. 827, Ala. Where the superintendent of a quarry instructs a labourer to unload an unexploded hole, and stands by him for several minutes while he is undertaking to do the work with an iron scraper. *Grimaldi v. Lane* (1900) 177 Mass. 565. If a superintendent knew, or had reason to know, that there was danger of the caving of a trench, and had no materials for bracing it, and no power to procure them, it was negligence to allow the digging to go on before the necessary materials were procured. For such negligence of a superintendent, the principal is answerable, and cannot escape liability by shewing that it was by his own act, and not by the fault of the superintendent, that suitable materials were wanting. *Connolly v. Waltham* (1892) 156 Mass. 368. The risk that the plaintiff's employer, a quarryman, or his superintendent will negligently attempt to remove a charge of gunpowder by drilling into a hole that had been charged, before ascertaining that the charge had exploded, is not one of the risks of his employment which the plaintiff assumed. *Malcolm v. Fuller* (1890) 152 Mass. 160, distinguishing common law rule, as exemplified by *Kenney v. Shaw*, 133 Mass. 501. In an action for injuries occasioned by the falling upon him of a large iron pump, which, loaded upon a truck, he with others was moving from one part of the defendant's works to another, evidence as to other appliances which were at hand and other methods which might have been used to move the pump is admissible upon the question whether the defendant's superintendent was at fault in causing it to be moved as he did. *Geloneck v. Dean Steam Pump Co.* (1896) 165 Mass. 202. In *Knight v. Overman Wheel Co.* (1899)