

Railway Act—Rate structure

Casgrain,	Moore (Chateauguay-
Chevrier,	Huntingdon),
Coote,	Mullins,
Cowan (Long Lake),	Murphy,
Davies,	Myers,
Dickie,	Nicholson,
Duguay,	Peck,
Duranleau,	Pickel,
Embury,	Plunkett,
Ernst,	Robinson,
Esling,	Rogers,
Fontaine,	Ross,
Fournier,	Ryckman,
Fraser (Cariboo),	Ryerson,
Gagnon,	St-Père,
Gardiner,	Sauvé,
Garland (Carleton),	Séguin,
Gobeil,	Senn,
Gordon,	Shaver,
Gott,	Simpson
Hackett,	(North Simcoe),
Hanson	Simpson
(York-Sunbury),	(West Algoma),
Hay,	Smith
Jones,	(Victoria-Carleton),
Kennedy	Spankie,
(Peace River),	Speakman,
Kennedy (Winnipeg	Spence,
South Centre),	Spencer,
Lafêche,	Spotton,
Laurin,	Sproule,
Lawson,	Stanley,
Loucks,	Stewart (Lethbridge),
Lucas,	Stirling,
Luchkovich,	Stitt (Nelson),
MacDonald (South	Stitt (Selkirk),
Cape Breton),	Tétreault,
Macdonald (Kings),	Thompson (Lanark),
Macdougall,	Weese,
MacNicol,	Weir (Melfort),
McGillis,	White (London),
McGregor,	Wright.—86.
McLure,	

Mr. GEARY: I was paired with the hon. member for Laurier-Outremont (Mr. Mercier). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): I was paired with the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Bell). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. SHORT: I was paired with the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Heenan). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. HANBURY: I was paired with the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Manion). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. SMOKE: I was paired with the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Cayley). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. JOHNSTONE: I was paired with the hon. member for Willow Bunch (Mr. Donnelly). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

[Mr. Reid.]

Mr. CANTLEY: I was paired with the hon. member for Richilieu (Mr. Cardin). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. DUPRE (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Ferland). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

THE BUDGET

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Hon. E. N. Rhodes (Minister of Finance) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the house to go into committee of ways and means, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Ralston.

Mr. J. L. ILSLEY (Hants-Kings): Mr. Speaker, there are a few observations which I should like to make upon the budget. First of all let me say that of the seven budgets which I have had the privilege of listening to since I became a member of this house, the present one is the most disappointing, the most disheartening and the most depressing. I suppose many hon. members who came into this house for the first time after the elections of 1930 think it a usual thing for budgets to be brought down from year to year which disclose huge deficits, huge additions to the public debt, and huge increases in taxation. To those of us who sat in the last parliament and listened to the budgets presented by the late Mr. Robb and by Mr. Dunning, budgets which year after year disclosed large surpluses, large decreases in the public debt, and large reductions in taxation, the three budgets which have been presented by this administration since the elections of 1930 are nothing more or less than fiscal nightmares.

It is impossible within the forty minutes at one's disposal to deal with all the features of the budget, but I would not attempt to do so even if I had the time. This ground has been covered far better than I could do it by my esteemed colleague, the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth (Mr. Ralston). The speech which that hon. member delivered on Friday last was a magnificent effort; I think it the ablest speech of his distinguished career. Able though he is, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Stevens) could not succeed this afternoon in touching the salient points put forward by the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth.