which he was placed by the company on the 28th September, 1912, the plaintiff's husband, John Soden, could, notwithstanding the negligence of the company, if any there was, by the exercise of reasonable care on his part, have avoided the accident which resulted in his death.

It is true that if employers of labour knowingly place an ignorant or unskilled employee in a situation which, although not necessarily unsafe, is yet likely or liable to cause injury to an ignorant or inexperienced operator, it is the duty of the employers to instruct their employee as to the proper method of operation, approach, or control, and to warn him of incidental dangers before exposing him to the risk. Neglect of this and injury resulting as the proximate cause will subject the employers to damages: Drolet v. Denis, 48 S.C.R. 510. It is alleged that the gangway, and appliances in connection with it, were constructed in an improper way and were defective in detail, and I think that they were at one time. Subsequently, however, and before the happening of the accident complained of, a new system of fastening the levers was adopted, and there is evidence, which has not been directly met, that by this means a condition of efficiency and safety was secured. I cannot, therefore, find as a fact, because there is no evidence to establish it, that, at the time of the casualty, the condition or arrangement of the ways and their appliances were defective, or were out of repair, or were unsafe for an employee, acquainted with the conditions and situation, and exercising ordinary intelligence and care; but, all the same, the arrangements were of a character that might readily prove fatal to a green hand—to a new or inexperienced operator; and the defendant company, if legally, are not morally, blameless, for, by a few moments' thought, a trifling expenditure, and the exercise of the most elementary mechanical skill, every element of danger could have been eliminated.

The questions then are: Had the deceased, in the circumstances of this case, having regard to the condition of the ways at the time, a fair chance to protect himself? Did the defendant company negligently expose him to a danger of which he was ignorant? And what was the immediate cause of the injury?

If, as I have said, the conditions involved a liability to injury, obvious to the company, though remote—and I have already found this to be the fact, and the event proved it—and if this man was wholly ignorant of the danger and met his death