

the Supreme Court of Canada on appeal, Nesbitt, J., in delivering the opinion of the majority of the Court, said at page 631: "We also fully agree that answers by a jury to questions should be given the fullest possible effect, and if it is possible to support the same by any reasonable construction they should be supported." A reference to the evidence places beyond all doubt the true meaning of the jury when they speak of there being insufficient help on the tramway causing careless handling of the lumber. It was charged against the defendant that in the distribution of the lumber from the tramways not enough men were employed for the work. He employed in that part of his work, so to speak, two men to do three men's work; and the result was that they were obliged to work with so much haste that the care requisite to avoid accidents was impossible. It is not contended, or at all events it cannot be successfully contended, that there is not ample evidence to sustain this finding. The other juries had found the same negligence though they failed in saying that the accident was due to it. Besides this there is undisputed evidence that during the two or three weeks previous to the time when this accident happened, on two or three occasions, planks had fallen from the tramway precisely as this one did, though fortunately no one had been injured. Attention was therefore directed to the danger of the work as it was carried on, and the accident which caused the deceased's death was one which the defendant might well have foreseen and which it was therefore his duty to provide against. We have it therefore in the present case found as a fact that the falling of the plank which was the proximate cause of the injury was due to the negligence of the defendant. The latter part of the finding as to the dogs is immaterial, relating as it does to the staging. In the report of the case already referred to (35 S. C. R. 625), Nesbitt, J., at page 633, says: "The negligence, if any, must have consisted, under the circumstances, in the throwing off of planks in the immediate neighbourhood of the men engaged in the act of stage-raising; and the throwing off or falling off of the planks at that particular period of time, if found to be negligence, and the direct and immediate cause of the damage, would determine the defendant's liability." The verdict must therefore stand, unless there are other objections to it which can be sustained.

The only objection which seems of any importance is the question of misdirection or improper reception of evi-