

have the right of way on their tracks, and that most of these accidents are due to the negligence of automobile drivers. There cannot be too many notices put at crossings in order to warn motorists to be very careful, when they come to a place of this kind, to stop their cars and so avoid accidents which may be fatal, not only to themselves, but to those who ride with them. On this matter everybody is in agreement. Indeed it is impossible to disagree, and it is easy to admit that the federal Government, as well as all the provincial Governments, are taking every opportunity of telling motorists to be especially careful when they come to a railway crossing. This point is not contentious; we all agree with it, and we deplore the numerous fatalities which occur every year, and which should be reduced to the strict minimum.

As regards the strike to which the honourable senator has referred, there are several other points which should be considered. There was a royal commission which included three judges, one of them, Mr. Justice Kellock, then a member of the Supreme Court of Canada. I have the highest regard for the bench. As my honourable friend from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck) pointed out last year, our judges deserve the respect of all, even when we disagree with them. And on that occasion my honourable friend, after having enunciated that principle in a broad manner, blamed me for differing with the judges. I understand very well that the judges are far from being infallible, and whether it is a justice of the peace or a judge of the Supreme Court it makes no difference. It is human to err, and perhaps today my honourable friend was right. Perhaps his contention is well-founded, better founded than that of Mr. Justice Kellock. It is in the domain of possibility.

But if my honourable colleagues are interested in the conditions of railway employees, they cannot be any more interested than I was for 31 years when I represented 800 railway employees who were working in the shops at Rivière du Loup, and on trains running from there to Campbellton and to Charny. I had a great affection for them and when they were in trouble they used to come to see me, just as many people go to see their member of Parliament. They would say, "Jean-François, we have come to you because the union will do nothing for us." They would tell me their troubles and I would sympathize with them and go to Moncton, Montreal and Toronto to discuss matters with officials of the Canadian National Railway. Often did I encounter difficulty with regard to their seniority. There were only

chairmen at Rivière du Loup, and I had many arguments with the general chairmen who were at Moncton. They were very greedy for themselves, their relatives and friends, and everything had to go to them. When the Rivière du Loup erecting shop was closed, it was at first impossible to come to an understanding with the general chairmen at Moncton. I took the matter up with Mr. Smith of Montreal, a very nice gentleman, who seemed to realize that I was right, but he could not tell me so because he was a high officer of the union. Then I came to Ottawa to see Mr. Bengough, who was the head of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada. He listened to me with attention and seemed to be sympathetic, but I had to wait until I got in touch with Mr. Meany in Washington. Then, with the assistance of Mr. Gregg, who was Minister of Labour, I succeeded in having a better treatment for my constituents.

My honourable friend from Toronto-Trinity knows that he could not represent any member of a railway union in any investigation where that member's fate was at stake. We are not allowed by the unions to represent them as solicitors and attorneys, and my friend knows that. They don't want us. They prefer to do their business alone, and it happens that railway employees are often represented by fellow employees who do not know anything about their case. Statements may be signed blindly by the employees concerned; these people are left in the hands of the railway superintendent or the investigator, who has a right of life or death over them.

It is the duty of a member of Parliament to take care of railway employees who are not protected and looked after by the unions to which they have contributed large sums of money from their salaries every month, as a union fee.

When the strike of 1950 came I was called by the strikers themselves to speak. I told them, "Gentlemen, how many times have I had to fight the leaders of your unions in order to protect your rights and to protect you yourselves?" And then some of them said, "That is true, Jean-François." It was one of the greatest tributes ever paid me. But I have seldom been impressed by the railway unions with whom I had to deal quite often. How many times have employees been criticized for going to their members of Parliament to get some help and protection?

With regard to the last railway strike, my honourable friend is inspired by worthy motives in saying that he wants to protect human lives by having two men, an engineer and a fireman, in the cabs of locomotives in the yards and on the freight trains. He may