

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that someone will say, "Well, we believe that the tariff might be reduced, but we are going to have a tariff board and we had better leave it to them to settle this question."

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. COOTE: I am glad to hear that "no" I understand that is the attitude of the automobile manufacturers themselves. The automobile manufacturers realize perfectly well that the Canadian people are demanding this reduction, and they think that if they can only get the matter before a tariff board there is no question in the world but that they can stave the matter off for at least one year more. And one year is worth a considerable amount to them. As I pointed out a little while ago the Ford Company profits in 1925 were \$6,132,000 compared with \$3,719,000 the year before. No doubt they want to enjoy one more year of these very handsome profits. They have already a reserve in cash and government bonds to the amount of \$6,520,000. Is there not evidence enough before this House to convince us as representatives of the people that the tariff protection which this industry enjoys could and should be reduced now, and that the question should not be shelved by referring it to some tariff board? I say let the tariff on automobiles be reduced now. If the automobile manufacturers are not satisfied let them go to the board and convince it they have not been justly dealt with; but I do not apprehend there is any danger of the government putting the tariff so low that they will need any further protection. I do not think we need a tariff board to determine the fact that a Ford car on this side of the river is just the same as a Ford car in Detroit. I do not think we need a tariff board to convince us that a bolt or a nut in a Dodge car on this side of the river is the same as a bolt or a nut in a Dodge car in the country to the south. Furthermore, we do not need any tariff board to convince us that the Dodge car costs \$300 more on this side of the river than it does on the other side. So I ask, what do we need an advisory tariff board for in connection with the automobile industry? In the Ottawa Citizen of Saturday there was an editorial headed "Uncertain tariff protection," which contained this paragraph emanating from a Conservative newspaper:

In the border cities alone men have been out of employment for months, and production has been curtailed for months, simply because the government seeking to curry favour in certain sections of the country, let it be given out that it would reduce the tariff on cars.

[Mr. Coote.]

I wish the government had given that statement out; I would not need to make this speech this afternoon.

Now, to show you how unreliable some of the statements which are published in the press may be, I have here some figures showing the production in the automobile industry in the last four months compared with a similar period a year ago. They are as follows:

November, 1924.. . . . .	5,962 cars
December, 1924.. . . . .	7,200 cars
January, 1925.. . . . .	8,301 cars
February, 1925.. . . . .	10,779 cars
November, 1925.. . . . .	8,741 cars
December, 1925.. . . . .	7,498 cars
January, 1926.. . . . .	11,252 cars
February, 1926.. . . . .	15,895 cars

Surely those figures will dispose of the idea advanced in the paragraph quoted. I do not want to leave a wrong impression on the House. The paragraph I quoted was mentioned by the Citizen as coming from some other paper; I do not wish it to be understood that the Citizen itself was expressing that opinion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am very nearly through. But before I close I want to appeal to the members of all parties, in all sections of this House to support this resolution. I do not think I need appeal to any free trader that may be here. I should not have to appeal to any low tariff men, and I feel that I can safely appeal to protectionists in this House to support this resolution. I have heard it contended here by protectionists that protection does not necessarily increase prices. Well, there can be no doubt it does in this case because a Dodge car which sells in Detroit for \$795 costs \$1,095 at Windsor, so that protection increases the price of this car by exactly \$300. The National Policy was established fifty years ago to build up industries in Canada. It has built up this industry; but surely the protectionists here would not want the Canadian people to think that it is the spirit of the National Policy that industries of this character should be permitted to take advantage of the tariff to the fullest extent as they are doing in this case. I claim there is no doubt in the world but that an unfair advantage has been taken of the tariff in the case of automobiles. We have often heard hon. gentlemen to my right say that when unfair advantage is taken of the tariff that tariff should be removed. Has not unfair advantage been taken of the tariff in this case? Then why should not the duty be lowered? If I were to take the resolution moved by the right hon. leader of the opposition in 1911 and substitute the word