

Hon. Mr. FERRIER—The company.

Hon. Mr. OLIVIER—The company and the station-master.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON said that if the railways neglected this duty, he should support some plan, next session, compelling them to put up information for the public.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER advocated the retention of the amendment just made. It would explain the law and the companies' obligations for the future. He assured the House they were disposed to give all the information hereafter, that any traveller or any individual whatever could desire. The bill as now amended required the hoisting of a black-board on the outside of the station-house, over the platform, in some conspicuous place at each station at which there was a telegraph office, and when any passenger train was overdue for half an hour it should be the duty of the master or person in charge to write or cause to be written with white chalk, a notice in English and French, stating to the best of his knowledge and belief the time when such train may be expected, and if when the time had come, she had not arrived, a fresh notice should be written stating when she was expected to arrive, the Company to be liable to an action by any passenger awaiting the train at such station for any neglect or omission of duty, in which action full costs of the suit might be recovered. A printed copy of this section of the Act was to be put up in a conspicuous place at each station at which there was a telegraph office. He argued this provision would secure all the information desirable, and protested against the imposition of a penalty on railways any more than steamboats or other carriers of passengers. Such a law would place railways at the mercy of any lounge about a railway station.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the Courts could make the penalties very low in certain cases.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER urged a trial of the law at any rate. If bad, it could be amended next session. Why render a railway punishable for a few seconds' or minutes' neglect on the part of an official, to put up a notice?

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST, disclaiming any intention of making capricious complaints, stated he could not remember an instance, within his own experience, of a notice having been put up for the information of the public. He had experienced frequent delays—having to wait for days at a station—and knew the people suffered greatly from these failures. Railways having received great assistance

from the country, should discharge their duties towards it, and pay the penalty of neglect or incompetency. He replied to the observations of Mr. Ferrier, contending that there was no danger of injustice or serious injury to the railways from the penalty now proposed. The discretion of the courts and public opinion affecting informers, constituted a sufficient protection. The clause, however, might be amended, to make the maximum penalty \$10, and allow the magistrate to decide where the money should go, instead of giving it to the informer. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the motion of the honorable gentleman (Mr. Olivier) could hardly be adopted according to the rules. He might move to refer the Bill back to the committee for reconsideration, without specifying in what direction it should be amended. He did not think the matter of great moment either way at present. If neglect resulted from the Bill as it stood, Parliament could apply a remedy next year; but he apprehended the Act would be obeyed, and no action for penalty instituted. On the other hand, he did not think railway companies should object to a reasonable penalty, particularly if it did not go to the informer. If they were going to obey the Bill there could be no suits or informers either; if, however, they did not obey, there ought to be a penalty on somebody. It should not go to anybody who might seek to make money out of such prosecutions. There was a difference between railways and steamboats, which had not the same facilities for reaching telegraph stations, and whose delays did not inconvenience the public to the same extent as those of trains.

Hon. Mr. REESOR argued that where there was a duty prescribed there should be a penalty provided for its non-fulfilment. In his own part of the country the people had suffered greatly from illegal charges on railway freight, exceeding the statute limit 20 and 25 per cent. There should be punishment for such offences.

After some remarks by Messrs. Read, Ferrier and McMaster, the latter in opposition to the proposed penalties,

Hon. Mr. FLINT referred to the hardships of the present system, with its frequent delays, and failure to supply information. He thought an improvement was needed, and that penalties ought to be levied, though not for the benefit of the informer.

Hon. Mr. OLIVIER replied, remarking that the public had suffered much from the negligence of railway employees. The bill was designed to punish employees