

ployee of contractor and not entitled to compensation for injury received while removing eaves. *Marvil v. Elliott*, 164 Md. 660.

Where worker in quarry, on extremely hot day, while exposed to gases from explosion of dynamite, had cerebral hemorrhage, question was for jury to determine whether it was accidental injury arising out of and in course of employment. *Schemmel v. Gatch & Sons, etc., Co.*, 164 Md. 676.

Employee of store, who was subject to call at any time to go to store for any unusual conditions, entitled to compensation for injury when struck by automobile while returning from store after being called there at night, since the injury arose out of and in course of employment. *Reisinger-Siehler Co. v. Perry*, 165 Md. 191.

Employee looking after horses and having his eye injured by pebble blowing in it while shutting stable door, it was question for jury whether injury arose out of employment. *Noyes v. Liddle*, 167 Md. 335.

Nursing is not extra-hazardous work under the provisions of this article. *Baltimore v. Smith*, Daily Record, April 11, 1935.

This section referred to in construing sec. 36. *Victory Sparkler Co. v. Gilbert*, 160 Md. 189; *Baking Co. v. Reissig*, 164 Md. 23.

Cited but not construed in *McLane v. State Tax Commission*, 156 Md. 145.

See notes to secs. 14, 32 and 56, and to art. 16, sec. 37.

66. Repealed by ch. 483 of the Acts of 1929.