

Mr. EVANS: On the retail price. These are figures from the Statistical Department. The total number of employees on wages and salaries in 1924 was 9,277 and the wages paid to 7,872 wage earners amounted to \$10,938,202. That makes an average for each wage earner of \$1,389. Salaried employees to the number of 1,405 were paid \$3,280,935 or an average of \$2,335. In this industry the number of salaried employees in comparison with wage earners is altogether out of proportion to that in any other industry, and this feature is an evidence of the prosperity which it is enjoying and the tremendous profits it is making. I would call the attention of the House to the meagre wage paid the workers. This is something that is absolutely out of keeping with the argument advanced for protection, that we must maintain a high tariff if we want to preserve a high standard of living for our people. The fact is that these benefactors of the nation have pinched their wage earners on the one hand and the consumers on the other, in the matter of prices. Indeed, 35 per cent is not all the protection they have enjoyed. I find that during the year 1924 the Ford runabout sold at the Ford factory for \$410 and the duty added was 41 per cent, not 35. On the touring car they charged 42 per cent, while the others were 33 and 34 per cent. I am looking forward to some wonderful revelations in connection with the automotive industry when the Tariff Advisory Board has access to their books. And surely they cannot refuse to lay their books on the table, seeing that they have become wards of the nation. Is there any man in this House bold enough to say that legislation which takes out of the pockets of those who buy cars nearly \$6,000,000 more than was paid in wages in the whole industry is legislation for the general good of Canada?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That is for the wage earners.

Mr. EVANS: Yes. Our tariff has enhanced the total price of cars made and used in Canada to the extent of \$5,900,000 more than wages paid in the whole industry for the year. Our fiscal policy, I say, is a senseless, unreasonable one; it is altogether absurd. Let us follow this matter through to its logical conclusion. Since the automobile manufacturers do not pay the wages of their own workmen, who does? Our automobile manufacturers were paid by way of tariff exactions nearly \$6,000,000 more than they paid out in wages in the whole industry.

Mr. FOSTER: How much of that represents excise duty and how much taxes paid to the government?

Mr. EVANS: The sum I have given represents the retail price of the cars, enhanced as a result of the tariff.

An hon. MEMBER: That is the American retail price.

Mr. EVANS: An hon. gentleman says, the American retail price. I will not dispute that but—

Mr. CAHAN: In the figures the hon. member has quoted, is he not including the number of employees engaged in the assembling of parts and not the 20,000 men who are employed in the making of component parts which enter into the manufacture of cars?

Mr. EVANS: In answer to the hon. gentleman's question I may tell him that in order to be correct I got my figures from the Statistical Bureau.

Mr. CAHAN: They are true as far as they go, but they do not go far enough.

Mr. EVANS: That does not alter the case anyway; the price has been enhanced by that amount. And who foots the bill? It may be said that everyone who buys a car and pays the duty does so, but under a tariff system such as ours, and with agriculture as the basic industry of the country, this contention is obviously wrong. If the farmer buys a Ford car he pays the duty in the price charged by the dealer. If the dealer sells a car to the doctor, the doctor pays the duty in the price charged, but when the doctor makes a professional visit to the farmer or the farmer's wife his fee will include a part of that duty which he has paid on the car.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): What about the lawyer?

Mr. EVANS: I am coming to that. Now, agriculture is the one basic industry in this country, and it does not matter who performs the duty for the agriculturist, the fee for that service always includes a part of the tariff duty on the car he drives, the clothes he wears or anything else he uses.

Mr. CAHAN: And all that is paid by the farmer?

Mr. EVANS: Wait a minute. If the farmer even buys a sack of sugar from the grocer he not only pays the duty on that sack of sugar, but he pays a part of the duty on the sugar which the grocer himself uses. If the farmer uses his Ford car to drive to his nearest city to consult a lawyer, the cost of that trip is enhanced not only by the duty he has paid on his own Ford car, but the lawyer's fee will include a part of the