

ages to a sum considerably less than the \$500 allowed by the judgment, in view of the "inexcusable fault" of the deceased as well as of the fact that he does not appear to have been much of a help to his mother, I do not dissent from the conclusion to dismiss the appeal."

Sir Louis A. Jetté, C. J., dissenting from the judgment about to be given by the majority:

"Gosselin's duty, at which he had been employed but two days and for which he had been expressly hired, consisted in aiding a fellow-workman, drilling holes by steam, and in cleaning out the shot holes as they were bored. The foreman in charge ordered him to do the same work in another part of the quarry, and while on his way he stopped where a group of other workmen were loading and hoisting stone. While standing there, under a heavy box full of stone, which was being hoisted out of the quarry by a crane, he, at a given moment, was immediately underneath the load. The foreman told him to get away, that it was not the place for him to be, and Gosselin had barely time to reply that there was no danger when the box full of stone fell upon and killed him.

"The present proceedings have been taken under the Workmen's Compensation Act, which has introduced entirely new principles into our law and has had for effect to put employers in the position of insuring their workmen against accidents while employed at their work. This liability on the part of the employer subsists even when there is concurring or inexcusable fault on the part of the workman. Being such an exceptional law, it must be applied very carefully and strictly within the limit of the conditions upon which it is based. To give rise to the benefit conferred by the act, the workman must have been injured by reason of or in the course of his work. In the present case, no reason is given why Gosselin stopped

w.
co
re
ne

in
or
a
ed

Ex

JUG