on its journey, until it was stopped by collision with the stationary car in front of it. He said that he could have brought the car to a stop by the application of brakes, had he seen the other car, and the evidence admits of no doubt that at the rate he was going and within the distance at which that car was from the circuit-breaker, he could easily have done so.

Under these circumstances, it appears to me that there is no escape from the conclusion that plaintiff was the author of his own injury, and that there was nothing to justify the finding of the jury, in answer to the 4th question, that his negligence and breach of duty did not cause or so contribute to the accident, that but for such neglect or breach of duty, it would not have happened. The rule was made to provide for the exact situation, and for the obvious purpose of preventing accidents, either to the property of the defendants or the persons of their servants, from a car continuing in motion when the power left the line. It was a plain and sure guide for the plaintiff. His duty was to bring the car to a stop, not to reason about possibility of the power soon returning to the line or the lights soon beginning to burn. Had he acted in compliance with the strict requirements of the rule, there would have been no collision, and, that being so, the appeal must be allowed and the action dismissed with costs, if the defendants ask for them.

MEREDITH, J.A., gave reasons in writing for the same conclusion.

MOSS, C.J.O., GARROW and MACLAREN, JJ.A., concurred.