of the accident. Gosselin had nothing to do with the falling of the box of stones. He was inexcusably at fault in remaining in such a dangerous place, but his liability ends there. Gosselin was therefore not even the sole cause of the accident.

"On the second point, it is true that the evidence is to the effect that Gosselin had no business to be where he was when killed; that he had been warned to stand aside. No doubt the act receives its application only when the injury to the workman was received in the course of his work. The first section of the French Act of 1898 is almost identical with the corresponding section of our act. (His Lordship cites *Serre* on the subject, p. 87; *Meunal and Berthiot, p.* 68; 1 *Sachet, No* 356).

"From all of which it will be seen that the liability of the employer exists when there is a relationship between the work of the employee and the accident which has injured him. In the present case, a quarry was being operated, and this business requires different classes of workmen. Whatever difference in their callings, it is all for the purposes of the quarry. If, during the operations, a workman is injured or killed, can it not be said that it was in the course of his work? To come under the act, it appears to me unnecessary that the workman should be at a precise spot assigned to him. From the moment one of the cog-wheels of the machinery of which, so to speak, he is a part, causes an accident, the accident happens in the course of the work, of the professional risk, and the employer is liable.

"This is the trend of the decisions in France: *Pandectes Françaises, Travail, No* 1942, 1978, 1981, 1995 1998, 2015. An interesting and instructive case will be found in *Pandectes Françaises,* 1902, 1, 299. It is almost abso-