

you have only 133 persons per mile of railway: When you come to Alberta you have 4,273 miles of railway as against a population of 496,525, or 116 persons per mile.

Saskatchewan has 6,162 miles of railway as against a population of 647,835, or 105 persons per mile of railway. In British Columbia they are well supplied with railways; they have 4,247 miles for a population of 450,000 people, or a mile of railway to every 106 persons. In New Brunswick they are not quite so well off, but still they are not badly situated: they have 1,959 miles of railway as against a population of 352,000 people, or 1 mile to every 180 persons. In Nova Scotia there are very few railroads, there being only 1,428 miles to a population of 525,000, or 367 persons per mile. There is not much mileage in Prince Edward Island, where they have only 279 miles of railroad to 93,728 people, or 336 persons to the mile. Now we come to the dear old province of Quebec. How many people do you think there are per mile of railroad in that province? According to my figures the province of Quebec has 4,791 miles of railroad and a population of 2,357,566, or 492 persons per mile of railway. The local government of Quebec has just completed a municipal census, and they find the population to be 2,500,000; therefore there are 520 persons to contribute to the upkeep of 1 mile of railway in that province.

When the collector comes round to make up the deficit everyone is taxed the same amount. In the province of Quebec he collects from 520 people \$7 each, and in Saskatchewan or British Columbia he collects \$7 from only 105 or 106 people, and still they have the advantage of having the money spent to keep the railways in those provinces. You see, there is an average deficit of \$4,000 per mile, and those provinces with a small population and a big mileage get the benefit of all the expenditure on those railways, while the other provinces with a smaller mileage and a greater population contribute a greater proportion to help the others. That was never the intention when the Confederation pact was made. In one word, Quebec has 1,371 miles of railway less than Saskatchewan—25 per cent less—although Quebec has four times the population.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: What about your docks and wharves?

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: And it is Ontario and Quebec that are principally affected by that.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN.

Now, this railway situation—and this deserves serious consideration—is an impossible one. Does anyone believe that any 105 or 106 persons, which means perhaps 25 or 30 families, can keep up 1 mile of railway? It is a physical impossibility to take that deficit of \$4,000 per mile and divide it among 25 or 30 families. What must be the receipts per mile? If there is a deficit of so much, what must be the receipts for the operation, and so on?

There is one good thing about the Speech from the Throne, a thing of which I approve. Our dear old friend the Hudson Bay railroad is not mentioned. It is not stated that the road will be finished this year. The question of the Hudson Bay railroad lies in abeyance for the time being; so nothing need be said about it. However, I should like to place some photographs on the table of the Senate for inspection by some of my honourable colleagues. These photographs were taken in Hudson bay and strait during last summer. On the 14th of August, 1920, the steamer Nascopie, which I think belongs to the Hudson Bay Company, lost its screw in the ice, and the steamer had to be beached at high water. On the 14th of August! I would like to lay on the Table these various photographs, showing especially the Nascopie surrounded by ice. The dates are on the back of the photographs, and photographs cannot lie.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: What has the honourable gentleman to show that they are taken in Hudson bay?

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: They are marked.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: That is nothing.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: I did not take the photographs and if it comes to a question of swearing to them, I must declare at once that I cannot vouch for them. But I would like to lay them on the table.

One word about the League of Nations and I am finished. There was in Geneva not very many weeks ago a great Assembly of the League of Nations. The word "nation" is there used instead of the word "states", for it was states and not nations that were represented there. For instance, there is an Irish nation, and it was not there. Canada was represented at that Assembly—oh, we were there in great shape! We had the honourable the Minister