

7. How many miles did the Canadian National Railways operate in the province of New Brunswick in 1935 and 1936?

8. How many miles did the Canadian National Railways operate in the province of Nova Scotia in 1935 and 1936?

9. How many miles did the Canadian National Railways operate in the province of Prince Edward Island in 1935 and 1936?

10. What was the deficit, or surplus, in each of these provinces in the years 1935 and 1936?

11. What was the total mileage operated by both the Canadian Pacific Railway and the

Canadian National Railways in each of these provinces in the years 1935 and 1936?

12. What was the number of souls in each of the provinces of Canada per mile of railway operated?

That he will call the attention of the Senate to the railway problem in Canada.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I have a statement for my honourable friend (Hon. Mr. Casgrain). I am sorry he is not here. I will have it placed on Hansard so that he may read it.

Data for 1936 not yet available. Changes from 1935 would be small.

1935

Province—	C.N.Rys. Miles	(11) C.N.Rys. and C.P. Rys. Miles	(12) Persons per mile of Railway*
1. British Columbia.. . . .	1,374	3,330	186
2. Alberta.. . . .	2,162	4,864	133
3. Saskatchewan.. . . .	4,305	8,556	109
4. Manitoba.. . . .	2,472	4,277	143
5. Ontario.. . . .	5,885	9,181	339
6. Quebec.. . . .	2,898	4,560	630
7. New Brunswick.. . . .	1,260	1,881	222
8. Nova Scotia.. . . .	996	1,283	377
9. P. E. Island.. . . .	286	286	322

*Based on estimated populations and mileage of all railways.

10. No figures are available as to deficit, by provinces, the accounts of the railways being kept on the basis of the various operating regions, and that would be the operating deficit only, there being no assessment of fixed charges on a regional basis.

SATURDAY SITTING

MOTION

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND moved that when the Senate adjourns to-day it do stand adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, at 11 o'clock in the forenoon.

The motion was agreed to.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANCE BILL

SECOND READING

The Senate resumed from yesterday the adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. Mr. Dandurand for the second reading of Bill 80, an Act to assist in the alleviation of Unemployment and Agricultural Distress.

Hon. JOHN T. HAIG: Honourable senators, when this Bill came before the House yesterday I asked that it be delayed until this afternoon. Since then the honourable leader of the Government has asked me to be as brief as possible, as it was his hope that Parliament would prorogue to-morrow night. I am in entire accord with that hope, and if I thought that by sitting down now I could bring about its realization, I would sit down at once. But I am not at all certain.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: It would be a sit-down strike.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I bring up this question because I come from a province that is the second worst sufferer in the Dominion of Canada in regard to unemployment relief. I think Saskatchewan has more difficulties than we have in Manitoba, but after Saskatchewan our province comes next.

This problem started in 1929 or the winter of 1930, and in the fall of 1930 this Parliament made its first grant of money towards relief. The Bennett Government first decided that relief was the problem of the municipalities; then, when the problem became more widespread, that the provinces should take part; and finally, that the Dominion Government should make certain grants. I will not deal with the politics of the matter, because that does not interest me very much at the moment.

I would point out that there are three classes in the unemployment list: first, there are married people with families; second, there are single male persons, and third, single female persons. I am not going to deal with the cause of unemployment. It is sufficient to say that it exists and has become a matter of paramount importance by reason of the way in which relief has been administered. Let me illustrate. In Winnipeg we had in earlier days a number of people who were engaged for eight or nine months in the year