

the house something that I said in that report, because so very little publicity was given to anything said for the public or for the firemen. I congratulate the C.P.R. on the effectiveness of its propaganda. Different persons have said to me that the firemen seemed to have no case at all, and from reading the newspapers or listening to the radio one would come to that conclusion. However, I fancy there is no one in this house so simple or naive as to believe that one side of a great argument of this nature had no case at all.

As I say, I am not arguing the case for one side or the other of the contest. What I am disturbed about at the moment is the interest of the public. Perhaps one or two paragraphs in my report to the Minister of Labour may be of interest to my colleagues. This of course is now a public document. I said:

Through the courtesy of counsel for the Canadian Pacific Railway, the members of the board were permitted to visit the railway yards at Ottawa and to there observe an actual switching operation with diesel locomotives. I actually sat in the engineer's seat and peered through the window through which he keeps his look-out. On the engineer's left is a great square box housing the diesel engine which towers two feet or more above his head and extends forward some thirty feet. With the exception of what little he can see at right angles through the fireman's side window, the whole left-hand forward view is blank, and when the cab is followed by a passenger or box car the same may be said of the left-hand rear view: it is blank. The engineer can, of course, look forward as well as to the right but, obviously with the 30-foot wall obstructing his left-hand vision, the track is lost to his view whenever the track curves to the left. The same conditions reversed confront the fireman on the left side of the cab, and he can see nothing of the track ahead when the road swings to the right.

It is plainly obvious that such locomotives are designed for two-man operation. That a one-man drive was never contemplated by the producers of these machines is made clear by the fact that to look through the fireman's front-view window, the engineer must abandon all his controls. He cannot reach the throttle or the brake while he is on the fireman's side. This is a condition which no sane engineer would contemplate while the locomotive is in motion. There was some talk of installing dual controls, but this is purely prospective as none are as yet available on the diesels of the Canadian Pacific Railway or of any other railway so far as I know.

Nevertheless, the company proposes removing the fireman, if they are permitted to do so, and to attempt to avoid the perils of one-man operation and running blind by an alteration in the rules requiring the switching crew in yard service to do the watching from their positions on the ground. There are three men in a switching crew, one of whom is to be the engine follower. They are to work on the right side of the engine at all times so that they can give signalled orders directly to the engineer and they are to be responsible for what occurs on the left side of the train, which they cannot see, as well as for conditions on the right side, which they can see, except when the train is rounding a left-hand curve. Under

these conditions the engine follower is to ride on what used to be called the cowcatcher of steam locomotives.

In all switching yards there are one or more lead tracks off which other tracks radiate. Groups of cars are sorted by running the train back and forth on the lead track and shunting cars down the radial tracks to be later picked up and assembled in desired order. These radial tracks may branch off to either the right or left. When they join the lead track on the left side of the train they are within the range of vision of the fireman and not of the engineer. Were the fireman removed, a movement on a left-hand radial track could occur unobserved by those on the right side of the train including both engineer and ground crew, and a collision result.

That is what I wrote about yard switching where there is no head-end brakeman, and only two men ride on the locomotive. It is now proposed to run the locomotive blind in that way with one man on the right-hand side. These diesel engines were designed for a two-man operation. This is only one condition which I pointed out, and which in my opinion is dangerous to the public.

I now call attention to the fact that a mere settlement between the contending parties such as has now taken place is not a settlement so far as the public is concerned. The public was not represented and was not heard. I hold the Government responsible for what may occur, should the railway carry out its intention to run locomotives blind in yard service.

**Hon. Mr. Aseltine:** Why hold the Government responsible?

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** Because the Government took part in the negotiations and made no arrangement to protect the public. The Government is responsible for such major changes. The Board of Transport Commissioners are responsible, and they in turn are responsible to the Government. If there is a dangerous condition—and I contend there is—the authorities in charge of affairs should take notice of it, and see that the public is properly protected.

**Hon. Mr. Lambert:** May I ask the honourable senator if the Board of Transport Commissioners, on the basis of a stated case, taking into consideration the dangers which have been enumerated here, would be competent to rule that added staff be provided for?

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** Yes. If someone would take a stated case to the Board of Transport Commissioners it would bring this matter before them, and something of that nature should be done. The matter could be referred to the Board of Transport Commissioners by the cabinet. I know of no other way of bringing it before the board, other than by