

Mr. CAHAN: I am putting my question. The other evening I called attention to the fact that in one year the iron and steel industry in this country produced in finished commodities \$460,000,000. I ask if that \$460,000,000 worth of products so produced did not contribute dollar for dollar to the wealth of the country to the extent that \$460,000,000 worth of wheat would contribute.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. EVANS: But in the same statement my hon. friend said that the steel industry could not live on its own feet.

Mr. CAHAN: I did not say that.

Mr. EVANS: That it could not stand on its own feet? His one argument was the necessity of protection. Then the steel industry is not a paying concern in Canada, and the farmers, the men engaged in the basic industry of this country, would be better off buying their implements in the markets of the world where they have to sell their own products.

Mr. CAHAN: What proportion of the farm products of Canada find a market abroad?

Mr. EVANS: About 72 or 73 per cent at present.

Mr. CAHAN: Not a bit of it; nearer 20 per cent.

Mr. EVANS: We have this year to find a market for nearly 400,000,000 bushels of wheat when the crop is all marketed.

Mr. CAHAN: Yes, but not outside the country.

Mr. EVANS: Yes, that is what I mean. But I want to pass on. The argument is made by several protectionists that the tariff they need on automobiles is just sufficient to preserve the Canadian market for Canadian cars, it being necessary to offset cheaper construction in the United States owing to closer proximity to raw materials, mass production, and so on. Well, let me present this problem to my protectionist friends. In 1924 we exported over \$31,000,000 worth of cars. Surely the United States manufacturers must compete quite as keenly in the markets abroad as they do at home.

Mr. MURPHY: Not necessarily; Canadian cars have the advantage of a preference in that market.

Mr. EVANS: Not at all. In 1924 we exported cars to seventy countries, many of them outside the British Empire.

Mr. CAHAN: In which of them did they not have a preference over American cars?

Mr. EVANS: Not in any of them.

Mr. CAHAN: In nearly every one of them where the cars went.

Mr. EVANS: The fact that we exported \$31,000,000 worth of cars is another admission that the tariff is not needed, or else it is used to ensure a profit on the export trade as well as on the home trade. Perhaps some Conservative or protectionist advocate will yet explain how far our automobile manufacturers are using the tariff or import penalty to soak the home consumer so that a profit is assured over the whole of their factory output, whether sold at home or abroad. That is one question I want answered. I say again, if the export trade in Canadian autos is carried on at the Canadian taxpayer's expense, it is time the public was relieved of this burden. When their books are examined by the Tariff Advisory Board I hope some light will be thrown on this subject. Perhaps, though, the next tariff subvention advocate will explain it.

I want to repeat that one thing is certain; either the automobile manufacturer does not need protection in the Canadian market or he is using the tariff to exploit the home consumer, so that he may cut prices or meet competition abroad. A good deal of surprise has been expressed because this matter was not allowed to stand over until the Tariff Advisory Board was brought into action. Every bit of information needed on this question surely must have been open to every Conservative member, and particularly to the leaders of that party. A very able tariff commission went through this country at great expense in 1920. The hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) was at the head of the commission, and he is reckoned in this House to be an authority on economics and finance. The trouble with this commission was that they were all protectionists, and although five years have passed no report has been forthcoming, for the reason that its findings would be detrimental to those interests of which that party professes to be the docile servitor. That commission, in other words, was afraid to make known its own findings, for party reasons. If such is not the case I would advise gentlemen such as the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) to apply those findings to the present controversy. I hope the findings of the present Tariff Advisory Board will be open to the public.