

cessary and advisable precaution that damage shall not be done to the proprietors on the banks of the streams. Now, defendants themselves say that the damage was caused by the absence of a glancing boom to prevent the logs from going into the little bay leading to the plaintiffs' flume. If that be the case and if it be true that the defendants were obliged to take every precaution against doing damage, the placing of such boom was an obvious precaution and was easily applied. Of course, it would be just as easy for the plaintiffs to place the boom for the protection of their own mill but that boom was not necessary for their purposes, and if it was the duty of the defendants, as an incident of their right to float logs, to take precautions against doing damage, it was for them to place the boom. They neglected to do that. They allege that the damage resulted from the fact that that was not done; therefore, they must be held responsible for that damage and the judgment which does so must be confirmed.

---

**GOUPIL v. VAN.**

---

**Responsabilité—Accident du travail—Droit commun**  
**—Inscription en droit—S. ref., art. 3747a, 7335**  
**—4 Geo. V, 1914, ch. 5.**

1. Le seul recours que donne la loi à un ouvrier victime d'un accident alors qu'il est à l'emploi de son patron, est celui en vertu de la loi des accidents du

---

M. le juge Flynn.—Cour de circuit.—No 2518.—Mégantic, 14 décembre 1917.—J. A. Gaudet, avocat du demandeur.—Foster, Martin, Mann, Mackinnon, Hackett et Mulvena, avocats du défendeur.