

gressive group, or the almost solid bloc from the province of Quebec, which in any shape or form was not in the best interests of Canada as a whole. My answer to the hon. member for North Oxford is that I am not controlled by anybody from the province of Saskatchewan, but I have come to the conclusion, as a humble member from Ontario, that this is one of the best budgets that has ever been brought down in the Dominion of Canada, in that it is calculated to contribute to the prosperity of the whole country.

Hon. members on the other side of the House have spoken of the desirability of unity; they have emphasized the fact that we must have a united Canada. This statement was made particularly by the Conservative members from Ontario, including that solid bloc of Conservative members who come from the city of Toronto. I say that there is not a single member in this House who does not want a united Canada. We all want it. But, Mr. Speaker, we will get a united Canada sooner if there is a little more compromise and reason on the part of the members of the Conservative party from Ontario. The sooner they realize that Toronto is not the whole of Ontario; that Ontario is not the whole of the Dominion of Canada and that they cannot choke down the throats of the members from all the other provinces their policy of higher and higher protection, the sooner we will have a united Canada.

Coming to the budget, I will not deal at any length on the reductions in the income tax. It is obvious to anybody who has read over the schedule that there is a substantial reduction, which will benefit especially those who receive moderate incomes. I am not very much concerned about what the cut is, if any, on the income of anyone who is in receipt of \$50,000, \$75,000, \$100,000, or \$150,000 per year or upwards. But I am concerned about the man with the moderate income, and the Minister of Finance has provided for that class of people and granted for their benefit a substantial reduction. The two-cent postage appeals to everybody and I will not say anything in regard to it. The taking off of the stamp tax appeals to all and is a welcome change.

I come now to what is the most contentious matter in the budget, namely, the reduction in the duty on automobiles. Hon. members who have spoken from the opposite side of the House during this debate have taken this attitude: they do not directly criticize the reduction in the tariff on automobiles, but they hide themselves behind the argument that this is a matter that should have been referred to the Tariff Advisory Board. I am

in favour of a tariff board, and I am only speaking for myself when I say I would like to see a little wider power granted to that board. In regard to referring this question of the reduction of duties to the tariff board, I think this government did the right thing when, off its own bat, it reduced the duty on automobiles. Hon. members on the other side have taunted this House with having no initiative, with hiding themselves behind commissions, with doing nothing but drift, with not having sufficient strength of character or will power to take any matter into their own hands and come to a decision upon it. When this government on its own initiative virtually decided to make this cut in the duty on automobiles they showed strength of character; they showed that they were prepared to stand or fall on that question. They showed that they had the courage of their convictions in reducing the tariff on automobiles without referring it to the tariff advisory board.

The reduction in the tariff on automobiles is not a new matter. It has been debated in this House, I understand, session after session; it has been discussed by the people, who have demanded that some reduction be made in the duty on automobiles and motor trucks imported into this country. Hon. members opposite have argued that the government had not sufficient knowledge of the automobile industry to be in a position to decide whether or not this cut should be made. While I am on the tariff I may remind the House that we have had in this country before commissions which have investigated the whole subject. In 1920, for instance, the government of that day appointed a commission to study tariff matters and that body, composed of three members of the cabinet, the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton), the hon. member for Victoria, B.C., (Mr. Tolmie), and the hon. Senator Robertson, then Minister of Labour, travelled up and down the country from the Atlantic to the Pacific. This morning I was curious enough to look up the history of that commission, but I could find no trace of any order in council appointing it. I did discover, however, that the jaunt of these three hon. gentlemen who toured Canada on that occasion for the purpose of securing information on the tariff, and presumably of giving to parliament and the people the benefit of that information, cost the country the sum of \$17,153.39. I am not going to go into the details of that expenditure; I would refer any hon. gentleman interested in the matter to the Auditor General's Report of 1920-21, page F 126. Perhaps it may be observed in pass-