

The net results are just operating results less interest owing to the public. It is those which have run \$50,000,000 short in the past, and if we had had this balance sheet for the last ten years the results would have shown exactly the same.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: It would have been generally better as an operating picture, I think. Others may hold their own opinion.

I want to make a brief reference to the proposal made twice by the honourable senator from Alma. He gave two examples of how this railway situation could be improved, as I understood him. He indicated there was only one or other of two plans to make the picture better and better for the Canadian taxpayer. I am wondering—and I am selfish in this—whether the honourable senator took into consideration what the application of his beneficent proposal would mean to the operating of our railroads, or would mean—I do not think I exaggerate—to tens of thousands of Canadian railway men and their families. I wonder if he took into consideration what his proposals would mean to thousands of settlers in outlying parts of Canada who located on various branch lines, and who would probably be, under a unified one-system control, without any train service. I do not believe that those who have been arguing so strenuously to put the Canadian National Railways out of business under any circumstances have taken into consideration some of those factors. I thought my honourable friend from Alma should have stated what under his proposal would be done by presumably two-thirds of the present operating staff of the Canadian National Railways, who are citizens of Canada and are surely entitled to some consideration.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Question!

The Hon. the SPEAKER: It has been moved by Hon. Mr. Dandurand, seconded by Right Hon. Mr. Graham:

That the Senate do concur in the amendment made by the Commons to the second amendment made by the Senate to Bill 12, intituled an Act to provide for revision of the accounting set-up of the Canadian National Railway System, and that a message be sent to the Commons accordingly.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Should not the wording be, "do not insist"?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I would suggest that the Clerk see that the message is properly drawn.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not like the expression "do concur." I do not concur at all. I simply agree not to insist.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: An amendment is brought to us; so we must accept it.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I think it should be expressed that the Senate do not insist upon its own form, but do accept the substituted form presented by the Commons.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I have no objection. Of course, the expression is "concur in."

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: Not the expression.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The effect is concurring.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: Yes, the effect must be concurring.

The Hon. the SPEAKER: It is moved by Hon. Mr. Dandurand, seconded by Right Hon. Mr. Graham:

That the Senate do not insist upon the form of its second amendment and do accept the amendment made by the House of Commons thereto, without any amendment, and that a message be sent to that House accordingly.

The motion was agreed to.

FEEDING STUFFS BILL REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Hon. Mr. DONNELLY presented the report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on Bill 64, an Act to control and regulate the sale of Feeding Stuffs, and moved concurrence therein.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not opposing the Bill, but I cannot see for the life of me what authority we have to pass it. It deals not with agriculture, but with trade. It is no less objectionable constitutionally—it is even more objectionable—than the Natural Products Marketing Act, which was declared unconstitutional just a few months ago, and the constitutionality of which I did not support.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Is it incidental to agriculture?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: If it can be said that because these seeds are used mainly on farms the subject of the Bill is agricultural, then a Bill to control the purchase and sale of farm implements would also be agricultural, for they are used altogether on farms. The Bill is not agricultural at all. But let it go.

The motion was agreed to.

THIRD READING

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND moved the third reading of the Bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time, and passed.