

other member who gave a reason was from British Columbia, who said the reduction was made for political exigencies, which is a rather broad reason. To me it sounds like a very weak political excuse.

While addressing the biggest deputation of working men that ever came to Ottawa, the Prime Minister said that numbers did not count with him, only argument. I think he told the truth. If there had been one hundred thousand men in that throng his answer under the circumstances would have been the same, as his mind had already been made up for him by his few supporters from the west. When the Prime Minister was appealing for votes in the last election he stated from practically every platform that if elected he would take the tariff out of politics by appointing a tariff board. This was confirmed in the Speech from the Throne. Days after the appointment of this board the budget was brought down, which takes the tariff out of the hands of his own tariff board. Then he tells the deputation that parliament rules! If parliament passes this budget it will in effect tell the Prime Minister that he cannot live up to his pre-election promises. This is a clear intimation that the Prime Minister does not possess the confidence of his own government, and that if he had kept true to his pledges he would not be in office to-day.

But the Prime Minister is not the only member of the cabinet who has offended in this regard. The Minister of Railways the other day had to admit that he had said something in the West Middlesex election that was not so. Then the Minister of "Self" Defence from Pictou, or where he jumped to, also tried to make the House believe that 350,000 bushels of wheat had gone over the Canadian National Railways to the port of Halifax, knowing all the time it was not so. Now, these triplets of truth are very economical with the truth, and if they made such statements in any private business they would not last long.

Coming to the reduction in the automobile tariff, I notice by the new Ford price list—and I use this as an example because it is the car that has been most spoken of in this debate—that the price of the cheapest car has been reduced \$15. I have heard a great deal from the government side of the House about the poor man on the street, and how the tariff kept him from buying a car. However, if he could not afford to buy at \$410, and is now thinking of buying at \$395, my advice to him would be to leave it alone as he is practically in the same position still. If this government had been sincere in its desire to help this poor man there was a way open to do so. They could have removed

the luxury tax, which would have made a greater reduction in the price of the car than the decrease in the tariff duty. If a car is a necessity, there is all the more reason why the luxury tax should come off and the tariff duty be left alone to protect that poor man in his job.

Let me direct the attention of the House to the effect which this new tariff has upon the manufacturer engaged in the making of auto bodies. The makers of auto parts in Canada have never taken advantage of the full tariff. Most of them have contracted to deliver goods to the Canadian auto maker at a price of at least 5 per cent under the tariff. The tariff on auto bodies has been reduced from 35 to 20 per cent. This compels the body maker to work upon a basis of 15 per cent, taking into consideration the 5 per cent he surrenders through his contract. Then the clause in the new tariff which gives to the automobile manufacturer a drawback of 25 per cent, provided that 50 per cent of the total cost is of Canadian manufacture, reduces the working basis of the body maker another 5 per cent, leaving him a tariff of only 10 per cent. And that is not all. The body maker is compelled to import certain expensive parts from the United States under the new tariff, the duty on these parts running as high as 35 per cent. The amount of duty they pay on the imported parts is responsible for a still further reduction and probably in some cases entirely wipes out the 10 per cent which was left, which means that the body makers have no protection at all.

Now if it is true, as the government contend, that they have thoroughly investigated this automobile tariff from all angles, then they have knowingly and deliberately put these automobile part factories out of business. If they did not get this information before hand, it is all the more reason why they should have referred the whole matter of the automobile tariff to their new tariff board. I believe that after the business has been disorganized it will eventually be forced into the hands of the board for expert investigation. I feel certain, therefore, that the government would save themselves a lot of trouble and the country a great deal of turmoil by placing this tariff problem before the tariff board who were appointed for the express purpose of dealing with questions of this nature.

The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) said the other day that the automobile industry would not be hurt any more than some of the farmers out west had been hurt by hail. Admitting that they had lost every-