its age, its strength, its insulation, its proximity to the Bell Telephone Company's heavy cable, its nearness to the Citizens Company's wire—which is said not to have been properly insulated—and the prompt discovery and removal of it after it fell.

If the accident happened on Saturday night, then negligence in inspecting the wire, in the sense of not having an efficient watch for dangerous and possible accidents therefrom, would be enough, apart from any antecedent neglect on the other five points; whereas, if it happened on Sunday night, the answer might refer to this kind of negligence, the less flagrant, or to any one of the other kinds of inefficient supervision.

The jury may have known what they meant; but this is not sufficient. Their answer must be such that, having regard to the evidence adduced, the Court can say that there is evidence to support their finding, and that that evidence discloses a ground of legal liability. In this respect the appellants have a right to complain, especially in view of the sharp conflict among the witnesses as to the night of the occurrence and to the fact that throughout the trial the appellants, so far as the respondents were concerned, had their attention fixed on the one issue raised by the pleadings, and dealt only with the other points so far as they afforded an answer to the defence of the third parties.

Upon one of the charges of negligence—and the one perhaps most forcibly presented—a learned Judge has, in Roberts v. Bell Telephone Co., ante 1099, expressed the opinion that there is no duty to inspect wires periodically for the purpose of seeing that other wires have not been improperly placed in undue proximity. This, if correct, is an additional reason for ascertaining the exact meaning of the answer to question 2.

I do not think it is unreasonable, under these circumstances, to insist that the answers of the jury should be clear and intelligible in order to support their verdict: Clarke v. Rama Timber Transport Co. (1885), 9 O.R. 68; Stevens v. Grout (1893), 16 P.R. 210; Cobban v. Canadian Pacific R.W. Co. (1895), 23 A.R. 115.

I think there should be a new trial; the costs of the former trial and of this appeal to abide the result.

Judgment accordingly.