

acts, who had been on duty for fifty-nine hours without rest, and had performed duties which at this moment it took four officers to perform. He thought that, under the circumstances, the Government did not act with a spirit of justice when they visited upon an officer, who for eight years had shown by unremitting attention to his duty that he was a thoroughly painstaking officer, such a heavy penalty. He thought they did not act justly towards that officer when they deprived him of the means of earning his bread, after these facts had transpired at the investigation. His object in bringing this matter before the House was to draw the attention of Government strongly to the peculiar hardship of the case, with a view, he trusted, to the reconsideration of what he considered to be a very severe penalty.

MR. MACKENZIE said he regretted that he was unable to lay his hands on the papers; he presumed they were at the railway office. His recollection of the case, and he thought it was tolerably correct, was that the statement which the hon. gentleman gave as a statement of facts, was not received as a statement of facts by the Department; in other words, that statement was controverted, and it was shown, he thought, conclusively, that there was very gross negligence in the matter. There was nothing in the whole system so dangerous as one of these train despatchers neglecting his duty; for while the system, itself, was tolerable, if properly worked, it was a very dangerous one if great care was not bestowed upon its working. The position of a train despatcher was one of great importance; everything depended on the accurate transmission of orders, and it required most unremitting attention. In this case, there was gross negligence shown, which made it utterly impossible for the Government to continue this despatcher in his position. He would not speak, of course, with absolute positiveness of the facts, but he believed that when the papers came down, the hon. gentleman would find that the statement furnished to him was not so correct as he (Mr. Tupper) considered he was. There was no intention of doing an

injustice to the man, the sole object of the Government being to secure safety to the travelling public.

MR. MCKAY (Colchester) said he could vouch for the fact that three men were appointed to do the same duty as was performed by Mr. Boggs alone. He had no doubt that a mistake had been made, but Mr. Boggs was one of the most industrious, hard-working, and attentive men they could possible employ, and he was always at his duty; and, although it might not be in the public interest to maintain him in the same position, which he (Mr. McKay) would admit was a most responsible position, he thought it was very unjust to dismiss the man from the service. He was a good officer, had been a station master for many years, and he thought the least the Government could do was to give him another position, as good as the one he had left, in some other capacity.

MR. PLUMB said it was well known that, in England, the question of the overworking of the pointsmen and men who were employed to give the railway signals at great stations had been thoroughly investigated. It had been found that overwork in that respect was not only apt to create confusion in the minds of such a person at the time, but there had been a permanent effect produced upon his mind; and the investigations to which the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) had referred, showed that there was no reason to believe he was responsible for the error made in the discharge of his duty, after the stress put upon him by overwork. If he was kept fifty-nine hours at work on a stretch, as was stated, and there was nothing brought forward to contradict it, it seemed cruel that he should be made responsible for an accident which, after all, did not result in loss of life and was not of a serious character. If it was proved that through overwork, he had committed an error, he might have been retained to do some other work. It became the duty of the Government to enquire seriously into every affair of this kind,—one which affected the management of the railways of the country and the differ-