

to the public revenue in the duty they paid on accessories and other parts imported from the United States. But in the list he quoted from there was not a single one of these products that paid as high as 35 per cent. On the other hand the figures which the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote) quoted proved that the Ford Motor Company, after receiving the drawback for the goods exported, paid only about a million and a half annually in duties to the treasury on the goods imported. That is not a very substantial amount at all. The hon. member for Macleod corrects me and states that these figures apply to the whole automobile industry—that is to say the entire industry pays only a million and a half into the treasury annually for the purpose indicated. So, I think there is very little indeed in the argument.

• Mr. KAISER: What does my hon. friend mean by the figures quoted?

Mr. CAMPBELL: The figures I was quoting deal with the amount of duty paid on imported parts or raw material. When the drawback is deducted from that amount it leaves only about a million and a half that the treasury actually gets annually from the raw material or parts imported.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think my hon. friend has made a mistake there; I think the amount should be about four times that.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The figures I quoted from are those which the hon. member for Macleod gave this afternoon.

An hon. MEMBER: He was wrong.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Again when we come to deal with the exports I find that we export about \$30,000,000 or \$40,000,000 worth of automobiles and automobile parts annually. Last year we sent automobiles and parts to the Argentine, to Australia, to Brazil, to British India, to British South Africa, to New Zealand, to the United Kingdom, to the United States; and to other countries not specified we shipped goods to the value of \$6,028,000. It seems to me that when our automobile manufacturers can export their products and compete successfully with the manufacturers of other countries in the markets of the world there is no necessity for such a high duty as 35 per cent being given them by way of protection.

Mr. JOHN VALLANCE (South Battleford): The question under discussion is one of great moment to-day throughout the whole of Canada. The automobile industry, I think, is the most protected of all our Canadian

industries. The extent to which the industry has developed has already been pointed out, and that growth is not to be wondered at when we consider the amount of protection it has received.

Being a westerner and a farmer, my mind naturally thinks of the Ford when discussing automobiles, because that is the farmer's car. I should like for a few moments to consider the Ford car and compare the one we get in Canada with the same make of car in the United States. We have had a great deal of discussion along this line already, and it is quite obvious to the House that it has been mostly on the part of western members. So if I reiterate something that has been already mentioned, I hope the House will bear with me. We find that such a car sells in the United States, f.o.b. for \$310, whereas at Ford, Ontario, the same car sells for \$440, an increase of 42 per cent. Again, we might take the Dodge touring car. We find the United States price to be \$795 and the Canadian price \$1,095, or an increase of 38 per cent. The Ford runabout costs \$290 in Detroit. A United States tax of 5 per cent must be paid, and this brings the price up to \$304.50. This is the value for duty on importation into Canada. Add 35 per cent to that and it amounts to another \$106.57, bringing the cost of your imported car up to \$411.07, and if you buy such a car at Ford, Ontario, they will charge you \$410, showing how closely they hew to the tariff line. All you save by buying a Canadian car is \$1.07. But the revenue lost to the government of Canada amounts to \$106.57. The Ford people naturally get that as additional price.

To the average Canadian citizen a car is no longer a luxury, at least not to the farmer. It is just as necessary to the farmer as is every other implement of production, and I believe that if we reduce the tariff down to 10 or 15 per cent it will not only make cars cheaper, but will greatly increase the demand. This will mean the employment of more hands and will help to reduce unemployment. Why is it that in the United States to-day there is one car to every six citizens, whereas in Canada there is only one car to every fourteen? It is not that conditions in general in the United States are any better than they are in Canada; it is because cars are more reasonable in price there, and are within the reach of a greater number of the population.

According to figures I have before me I find that the Ford Motor Company have now invested in the business something over \$31,000,000, all of which has been made from