

DEFICITS OF CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Hon. J. P. B. CASGRAIN: Before the motion to adjourn is put, I should like to point out that according to an item in this morning's Gazette the revenue deficit of the Canadian National Railways for January was \$1,510,753. The item says, in part:

The statement of operating revenues and operating expenses of the Canadian National Railways all-inclusive system for the month of January issued here to-day shows operating revenues were \$13,321,632, as compared with \$14,043,352 in January, 1937. Operating expenses were \$14,832,385, against \$13,960,130 during the corresponding period of last year.

I am bringing this up now as a matter of urgency. I am sorry that I shall not be here to-morrow, for I have to attend a meeting of the Canada Steamships in the morning.

Honourable members will notice that in January of 1937 the operating revenue was in excess of the expenses, the respective figures being almost the reverse of those for January last.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: Honourable senators, following the cue given by the honourable the senior senator from Winnipeg (Hon. Mr. McMeans), I submit that this discussion is out of order, and particularly so since there is on the Order Paper a motion to be made to-morrow with respect to the whole railway situation.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: Before the point of order is discussed, I suppose I may say a word. I hold in my hand a copy of *La Revue des Deux Mondes*, a very serious publication, which I see is in its 108th year. It contains an article that deals with the railway situation in France and discusses an Act recently passed there. The writer is one Louis Marlio, de l'Institut. So far only one Canadian has ever been a member of l'Institut, the late Rodolphe Lemieux, who was elected to succeed Cardinal Mercier. I find that railway conditions in France are similar to those in Canada: there is about an equal division between private and public ownership. The article is in French, and, as I know some honourable members are not as proficient in both languages as I am, I would suggest that it be translated into English, if the House will consent. It is long and would require some time to translate, but the work would be worth while because of the similarity between many of the conditions dealt with and those we have in Canada.

I bring this up as a matter of urgency; so I cannot be stopped by a point of order. The situation is certainly urgent, for we are losing a million and a half dollars a month, accord-

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

ing to the statement in the Gazette. And this loss is on operations alone.

I do not know how to go about having the article translated, and I leave it to honourable members to say whether it can be done.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I understand that my honourable friend will not be here to-morrow, when the honourable senator from Montarville (Hon. Mr. Beaubien) will move a motion with respect to our railway situation. I can state with assurance that the debate on this motion is not likely to close this week; at all events, it will not close to-morrow. My honourable friend will have plenty of time, after he comes back, to give us a résumé of the article—the meat of it—in support of any argument that he desires to make.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Having in mind the lamentable figures just recited by the honourable senator from De Lanaudière (Hon. Mr. Casgrain), I make this suggestion to him. He should spend the time between now and his return to the House in asking forgiveness for not having voted as I urged him to do two years ago.

The Senate adjourned until to-morrow at 3 p.m.

THE SENATE

Wednesday, March 2, 1938.

The Senate met at 3 p.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

KENOGAMI RIVER DIVERSION PROJECT

CORRESPONDENCE

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I desire to lay on the Table copies of a communication dated March 1, from the Prime Minister of Canada to the Premier of Ontario, regarding the Kenogami river diversion project.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Is that supplementary to what was laid on the Table yesterday?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Yes. It is dated the 1st of March.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: A subsequent letter?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Yes.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Does that end the letters?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I am under the impression that it does.