

Another serious criticism I have to make of the budget is this: Canada is possessed of wonderful natural resources, sufficient, if they were properly developed and manufactured and the products sold in a finished form, to go a long way towards reducing the national debt if not actually wiping it out. Nothing whatever is done to carry out a policy of that kind, in fact the opposite course is pursued. Encouragement is given to the export of our raw material, and supporters of the government then claim credit for the extent of that exportation, consisting as it does largely of raw materials that should be manufactured and sold in a finished form in Canada.

Now I come to the reduction of the duty on automobiles. We are all familiar with what the government has done; we are all familiar with certain incidents that have happened in recent weeks. Surely the first thing that should have been considered was whether we as Canadians desired to have an automobile industry in this country. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat referred to what he thought was a desirable form of protection; that protection, he considered, should be high in the case of a new industry, and be gradually lessened as that industry established itself. Let me remind the hon. gentleman that the automobile industry is one of the newest industries we have. Such being the case why should it be singled out for persecution when other industries that have enjoyed the same measure of protection for years have not been touched? I notice the Minister of Finance was careful to see that nothing was done to injure the milling industry in the budget. The Minister of Justice, too, was careful to see that boots and shoes were not touched, although that industry enjoys an equally high protective tariff. Furthermore, one of the prospective ministers has been careful to see, or at least someone took the necessary steps in his behalf, that nothing was done to prejudice the furniture industry. And only the other night the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Howard), who criticized the protection formerly enjoyed by automobiles, said the tariff was all right as far as the industries in his own town were concerned. The industries I have enumerated have been left alone, but one of our newest industries has been singled out for persecution, if not annihilation, without being granted a hearing in its own behalf. Are we as a Canadian people to return to the dark ages when things of this sort could be done, when an individual, a city or an industry could be condemned and sentenced, without any oppor-

[Mr. Stansell.]

tunity to make a defence? Now, it seems, we have a Tariff Advisory Board. The creation of this board is one of the few promises fulfilled by the government during the last four or five years out of the number which it made. That board has been in existence for some time, but it has not been given anything to do. Why was not the case of the automobile industry referred to this board for investigation, instead of bringing down suddenly a reduction of duty in the budget? Why did the government not make use of the machinery which it had created itself?

The question is whether we want an automobile industry in Canada or not. Will any hon. gentleman admit that we cannot have such an industry in view of the wealth of our natural resources, many of which could be utilized in connection with this industry, and the extent and population of this country? There can be only one answer to that question. Having admitted that we should produce automobiles for our own people, is it not reasonable that we should grant protection to the men engaged in that industry and the money invested in it? After all, what is it the Canadian buyer really wants? Is it a reduction of duty or the opportunity of being able to purchase the articles which he needs at a reasonable price? Surely if we can produce automobiles in Canada at a reasonable price there is no justification for a reduction of duty. These are questions that should have been duly weighed and considered. The manufacturers of automobiles have been deprived of the opportunity of presenting their case. Personally I am not concerned with the question of whether the protection is thirty-five, forty-five or fifty per cent. I am willing to afford the manufacturer of any legitimate industry in this country a protection sufficient to ensure him the Canadian market provided that in return he does not charge the people of Canada an unfair price on the goods which he produces.

Someone on the other side of the House will immediately say: That cannot be done. A short time ago we were told that this government in the exercise of its power could go out upon the high seas and control international shipping rates. A government able to undertake a task such as that should surely be able to control the price of an automobile in this country. I have reason to believe that if the automobile manufacturers had been approached in a reasonable spirit, if they had been given the Canadian market for a standard make of car, they-