

if I recall rightly, after which the Government of the day was faced with the problem of what was happening to the economy while the strike went on. As a result of considerable effort, and after a good many days of work, a royal commission was set up. Now, the Government need not have set up that royal commission. Perhaps the matter could have been referred to a single judge or to a different kind of board. The matter might even have been referred to the Board of Transport Commissioners, which deals with matters of this kind.

However, a royal commission was set up—and I believe it was after agreement between both of the parties that the Government took that step. The members of that royal commission were a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, then Mr. Justice Kellock; a judge of the Court of Appeal of the province of Quebec, Mr. Justice Jean Martineau; and the Chief Justice of the Trial Division in the Supreme Court of Alberta, Mr. Justice Colin Campbell McLaurin. I think it can be said that this was a fair and impartial body, a body that was ready to look into this serious problem without any sense of partiality at all. They were men who were accustomed to considering problems of this kind in a judicial way.

Both parties appeared before that royal commission, called any witnesses they cared to call and argued fully. I understand that the commission not only examined conditions in this country on the ground, but travelled to other countries, including some in Europe. Just how many countries it visited I do not know.

As I say, that investigation might have been undertaken by the Board of Transport Commissioners, but in view of the volume of work that board has to do every year, it seems to me that it was much more sensible to appoint an independent royal commission which would devote its entire time to this very important problem. It is important not only to railways, I should say, but to other branches of industry. It may recur many times because of this whole problem of automation.

The commission sat for many months. Its report, which was published some weeks ago, was unanimous. After an investigation of that kind it seems to me that members of Parliament and indeed members of the general public should feel that the public interest has been served, and that the conclusions which the commission reached unanimously are entitled to public acceptance.

Without being critical, I think perhaps my honourable friend from Toronto-Trinity rather weakened his case when he referred to the

propaganda activity of the railway. I repeat, I do not say this critically, for I am aware of the high sense of public responsibility that he has. But in my opinion the company was justified, as it seems to me the general public and many honourable members of this chamber were justified, in feeling that the conclusions of that royal commission should be accepted. Moreover, I think this should be said on behalf of the company, that while it continued through the last negotiations to reaffirm the principles embodied in the commission's report, it nevertheless retreated to the extent of helping a good many employees, over 400 I believe, to retain seniority rights that they had built up within their own union and in their own trade. I suggest it speaks very well for management and for that particular management that this was done. I rise today only to say that while I realize that the honourable gentleman's remarks, as he quoted them from his own report of the conciliation board, reflected the kind of finding that he honestly and sincerely felt should have been made, I believe we all are justified in relying upon the later conclusions of the royal commission in the light of the circumstances which developed since the time the conciliation board reported.

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** Honourable senators, may I, as a matter of privilege, say I did not blame the honourable senator from De la Durantaye (Hon. Mr. Pouliot) for differing with the judges. What I said was that his differing was a matter of importance. I said, moreover, that he had a perfect right to differ.

Motion agreed to and bill read second time.

### THIRD READING

**Hon. Mr. Aseltine:** With leave of the Senate, I move the third reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to, bill read third time, and passed.

### PETITION FOR PRIVATE BILL

MERCANTILE AND GENERAL REINSURANCE COMPANY OF CANADA LIMITED

**Hon. William R. Brunt:** Honourable senators, I have the honour to present a petition from The Mercantile and General Reinsurance Company of Canada Limited praying for the passing of an act increasing the capital stock of this company.

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** Explain.

**Hon. Mr. Brunt:** Briefly, what the company wants to do is to increase its capitalization from \$1 million to \$5 million. This has been made necessary for two reasons. First, companies that have been writing fire and