

"automobiles" for the words "agricultural implements" in one place, and then in another place add the word "consumers" this is how the resolution in question would read:

That in the opinion of this House a substantial reduction in the import duties on automobiles is now due the agriculturists and consumers of Canada, and is in just accord with the true ends of a protective tariff.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that these words are absolutely true, and I cannot see why any protectionist cannot consistently support this resolution to-day. I know that many of my Conservative friends, and some of my Liberal friends who, I think, are protectionists, believe that this should be done. They think it is about time the Canadian people—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman explain why he did not word his resolution in that form?

Mr. COOTE: All I can say is that when I placed my resolution on the order paper I had not looked up the resolution moved by the right hon. gentleman. I must admit that I had read his speech before, but I did not remember the exact form of the resolution which he moved at that time. I may say that I would have no objection to having the resolution changed in the manner indicated. I am not a protectionist, but I realize that it is not possible to get rid of protection in Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why not?

Mr. COOTE: If we must have protection it should be as low as we can get it. In the case of automobiles I think it is altogether too high.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman answer the question why we cannot get rid of it if we want to?

Mr. COOTE: Because both the leading parties in this House contain a number of protectionists.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Would the hon. gentleman remove it if he could?

Mr. COOTE: It is impossible to do it, so I do not think it necessary to discuss that question. I should like to make it clear that I am not advocating that or asking for it; I do not think the people of Canada want all of the duty removed. I may say I am tired of the continual strife going on in Canada in regard to this question—some people wanting to put the tariff up as high as Haman's gallows and others wanting it removed altogether. We cannot get either of those policies, I believe, but I think we should

do our best to get together, and I think the question of automobiles affords an opportunity for doing it.

I have appealed to my protectionist friends to support this resolution. I am now going to appeal to the government to support it, and this is the question I should like to put to the government particularly to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb): How can a government which reduced the tariff on butter, eggs, lard, cheese, mutton, beef, dried fruit and so forth, coming from Australia, partly at least to secure from Australia preferential treatment for our automobile manufacturers, now refuse to lower the tariff on automobiles, a tariff which amounts in the aggregate to twice the wages and salaries paid by this industry—

Mr. SUTHERLAND (North Oxford): Are you in favour of putting back the duty on agricultural implements—

Mr. COOTE: —and under which the manufacturers are soaking us 35 per cent for the benefit of foreign capitalists. It is the farmer's turn now. I think the time has come when some consideration should be shown him. I hope nobody will think this will be of mere advantage to farmers than to any other class, because we all pay the same rate of duty. There were no lobbyists here in the interests of the farmer when the Australian treaty was put through. It is an open secret the lobbyists for the automobile manufacturers have been busy around the House for the past few weeks. Possibly a vote on the resolution to-day will show what effect they have had on hon. members. But I ask the House, what its duty is in regard to this question. To protect the automobile manufacturers eighty per cent of whose stock is owned in the United States? Is it our duty to protect the industry which makes these inordinate profits, or is it our duty to protect Canadian consumers from further unreasonable exploitation at the hands of these men by insisting that the tariff be reduced, so as to make it possible for our own people to take advantage at a reasonable price of this great invention—the automobile?

Mr. AIME BOUCHARD (Kamouraska) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, it affords me much pleasure to rise in support of the motion of my hon. friend from Macleod (Mr. Coote). Last year on March 16, 1925, the same hon. gentleman delivered on the same question, a very noteworthy speech, which I regret to say did not at the time draw our attention to the