

be right. I do not say he is wrong, but the matter has been considered by a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, the highest tribunal in the country. My friend has reached a conclusion different from that of the judge. Now, I am sure that my honourable colleague drives his car well. He has no footman sitting next to him when he drives—

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: I can see out both sides of my car.

Hon. Mr. Pouliot: Yes, I know, and my honourable friend can see all around him with a good mirror in front of him. The engineers can see very well too. When they go backwards it takes special care, but what is important for an engineer, especially on a single track, is to see ahead of him. He has to see behind him only when he goes backwards. When he goes ahead his vision is clear and he can see any other locomotive coming towards him. The only thing he may not see is an automobile coming across the track. Sometimes automobiles are hidden from his view by shrubbery, trees, a fence, a house and so on. If automobile drivers were as careful at the wheel as the locomotive engineers are at the throttle, there would be very few accidents at railway crossings.

At first I was opposed to diesel locomotives, for many reasons which I have given to the Railways and Shipping Committee of the other house, but I did not have the support of the union leaders who wear a big gold chain, smoke a big cigar and receive a salary often higher than that of the Prime Minister of Canada.

Honourable senators, I do not want to be called unfair or unjust to the cause of labour, but I do not believe union leaders are infallible. Moreover, I was rather indignant when I heard that a Mr. Gilbert of Cleveland ordered Canadian railway men to go on strike. How is it that the union is in the hands of an American citizen across the boundary, giving orders to Canadians, orders that cannot be controlled by anyone, neither by a minister of labour nor anybody else, until labour legislation is amended to provide for all-Canadian unions? I find it absurd that the railway men of Canada received their directions from a gentleman they never met—the big head of the union who is maintained there on account of the trips enjoyed by a few employees who attend the conventions. I hope the day will come before my political career is over when the Canadian union will not be run by American citizens, worthy or not of that honour.

Now that the strike is over, it is to be hoped that the matter will be considered

closed. The Canadian Pacific Railway and Canadian National Railways are making sacrifices in order to give the best possible service. One has only to look at the time-tables for trains running between this capital city of Ottawa and any other point in Canada to see that I am not exaggerating. It is easy for anyone to say that he is for the men and that they are unjustly treated by the management of either railway system. Sometimes they may be, but when I feel in my heart that they are unjustly treated I will rise from my place in the Senate to defend them. But in this case the president and management of the C.P.R. have acted as a good family father. And why did the president have to come to that conclusion to remove one man from the cab? It was precisely on account of the exaggerated demands of the labour unions in order to justify their existence. Are they not responsible to a large extent for what is called inflation? They never miss an opportunity to tell how indispensable they are. Whether one agrees or not with my views, I have known railway employees for a long time, and I can say that those I met during the strike were nearly all opposed to it, and if there was a free vote of confidence among the employees the union leaders would have very little power and authority.

Once I told the late Honourable Humphrey Mitchell, at the time of the Detroit strike, "You should speak to the men above the heads of the union leaders". A year afterwards he said to me, "What we should do in railway strikes, and all other strikes, and to prevent them, is to speak to the men above the heads of the union leaders".

Hon. John J. Connolly: Honourable senators, I rise not to protract this branch of the debate, but principally because I think we may all be concerned with one phase of the remarks that have been made by my good and honourable friend from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck). I refer particularly to his remarks about the position of the public in the light of the settlement of the strike against the Canadian Pacific Railway. As members of this chamber, indeed as members of Parliament, we are all vitally interested in the protection of the public as far as we can be. I think perhaps we should stop and consider whether or not the honourable gentleman was warranted in going as far as he did in the remarks he made. I realize that he did sit upon the board of conciliation. I realize also that very few people in Parliament have an understanding of the details of this issue to compare with his own. That board of conciliation was followed by the stoppage of the trains in January of 1957,