

Hon. Mr. CHEVRIER: While I cannot give this committee any undertaking that an amendment will be introduced, I can give the committee my assurance that I will ask the Board of Transport Commissioners to remedy the situation for which Mr. Adamson seeks relief. That is all I have to say. The matter is in your hands.

Mr. ADAMSON: Might I, with your permission, just recapitulate what has gone on before. We have had, as you will see in the evidence, a number of witnesses before this committee and each one of the witnesses, I think, without exception, approved of the principle of the bill. They did raise two objections which I think will be met by a suggestion I have here. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to read the evidence given by the witnesses. Mr. Hugh Wardrope—in case the committee has not read that evidence—said:—

The Chairman, the board I may say has in its long experience every sympathy with and understanding of the affliction that so many people now suffer through the statutory blowing of whistles at crossings outside of cities or towns where no bylaws have been passed prohibiting the blowing of these whistles. The board, if it is at all possible, will be glad to see some measure of relief for a lot of these people.

Hon. Mr. CHEVRIER: Your statement was that the witnesses approved the bill. All they said was that they had no objection to the bill and would like to meet the difficult position in which you find yourself. That is a different thing from approving the bill. That is not what Mr. Wardrope says there.

Mr. ADAMSON: He said that he would be glad to see some measure of relief.

Hon. Mr. CHEVRIER: And so would I.

Mr. ADAMSON: And that is just what the bill is really trying to do. He then says—I had questioned him as follows:—

Q. Would it overcome your first objection if we altered the amendment and used the word "contiguous" only? That would make it specific.

Then Mr. Wardrope said:—

A. Yes, that would facilitate interpretation. I would not like it to be understood that the board is objecting to the principle in this at all. The board is in full sympathy if something can be done that is reasonably safe to afford or extend the relief now available in the Act to the more densely populated sections. "Contiguous", of course, is easier to interpret. I do not think there would be any difficulty there.

Mr. IRVINE: What is your idea in asking to take away the whistle with nothing in its place to warn the public?

Mr. ADAMSON: As I have explained to the committee, relief is sought only for a few specific crossings. The evidence shows that those crossings are protected by wigwags or by gates, and that it is the wigwag or the gate, and not the whistle, that protects the public. That is according to the evidence of witnesses who spent long hours observing the behaviour pattern of traffic at those crossings for which I am asking relief.

Then, Mr. Best, the secretary of the Joint Legislative Committee of the Railway Transportation Brotherhood, Ottawa, said:—

We are not opposing the bill. It is just the suggestion as contained in that paragraph that if you take away the audible signals, then there is a responsibility, and however the cost of it may be apportioned by the