give the jury to understand that its language was to be construed as meaning other than what it expresses. . . . When the jury, after listening to a lengthy review of the case, retired with certain written questions before them to answer, it is not reasonable to suppose that they construed question 3 as intended to elicit from them other than a complete finding whether, upon the whole facts of the case, the plaintiff had been guilty of contributory negligence disentitling her to recover. . . . The almost casual remarks of the trial Judge in connection with question 3 . . . fall far short, in our view, of what would be required in order to cut down the generality of the plain question to something less, and the answer here should be interpreted as meaning precisely what it says. . . .

It was argued that the answer to question 5 cannot be reconciled with that to question 3; but an examination of the answer to question 5 shews that it is not an unqualified finding of contributory negligence. The word "yes" loses its force when its meaning is stated by the jury as being "possibly by taking hold of the hand-rail" she might have avoided the accident. They do not say that taking hold of the hand-rail would have prevented the accident, but only "possibly," which here implies nothing more than "perhaps." All other suggestions of negligence on her part, according to Andreas v. Canadian Pacific R. W. Co., 37 S. C. R. 1, are negatived, so that, reading the two answers together, the jury's finding in substance is "that the plaintiff was guilty of no want of care, though perhaps taking hold of the hand-rail might have prevented the accident, but we do not say that it would." This leaves to the plaintiff the full benefit of the unqualified answer to question 3.

It also appears to us that the answer to question 5 has no bearing upon the issue here. It is admitted that the car was at rest when the plaintiff arose to leave, and the jury found that when she had reached the edge of the platform the car was at a standstill. She then continued her progress towards alighting, and it is suggested that, at some stage between her reaching the edge of the platform and stepping upon the ground, she could have taken hold of the hand-rail. When she was at the edge of the platform . . . the car was at rest. So long as it remained at rest, no useful purpose would have been served by her taking hold of the hand-rail.

Further, there was no duty cast upon her to take hold of the hand-rail when the car was at rest, in anticipation of any negligent starting of the car. There is no standard of duty requiring a passenger to do something to guard against possible injury