

very favourably with those of many other leading railways of the United States when all the facts are taken into account, because we must remember that the Canadian National railway system is only a union of several lines. It is not one large railway built as a unit; it is several railways brought into union. I have not the figures available for all the different leading railways on this continent, but I know the ratio is more than 80 per cent. The ratio of the Canadian National Railways is very slightly over that of the Great Northern, Northern Pacific and the Pennsylvania railway system, and two years ago their ratio was just about the same as the Canadian National is now. The average ratio of ten of the leading railways of the United States is in excess of 84 per cent. I claim that part of this success is due to this government, and the government and the management of the Canadian National Railways under Sir Henry Thornton deserves the highest tribute for so greatly improving the financial condition of the road.

There are several other things for which this country owes this government a debt of gratitude. The government has reduced the tariff somewhat on the implements of production and several other things. Although the reduction is not as much as I would like, when other countries are going tariff mad, putting up their tariffs, it is encouraging to see our country following a sane and safe method by reducing the tariff on the implements of production. This government proposes to go a step further; it proposes to reduce the tariff on automobiles and light trucks. Hon. gentlemen opposite have moved an amendment in connection with this cut in the tariff on automobiles. I hardly like to call it an amendment; it does not suggest any real amendment to the budget at all. It does not come out clearly protesting against the reduction in the tariff on automobiles; all it says is that what the government is doing now it might do at a later date.

There is a good reason why hon. gentlemen opposite have taken this position. Last year some hon. gentlemen voted for a reduction in the tariff on automobiles. Where are they now? Why do they not rise in their place and speak in favour of the reduction this year? I think I know the reason. They feel that they can shelter behind this amendment; they feel that they can go back to their constituents and tell them: Oh, I was not voting against the reduction; I was voting only for a postponement of the reduction. Personally, all I would like to say about that is that I do not think the tariff on auto-

[Mr. Donnelly.]

mobiles has been sufficiently reduced; I would like to see a still greater reduction.

Why should we have a tariff of 4 p.m. 35 per cent on automobiles and light trucks which are just as essential to farmers and other workers as any other implement of production; when the heavier implements of production receive a protection of only 8 to 10 per cent and the lighter ones only as high as 20 per cent, or an average protection of only 12 per cent? Why should the automobile industry be protected to the extent of 35 per cent? It is altogether out of reason. Twenty per cent is even too much; it should be cut down to fifteen—and there is where we would like to see it.

Mr. McGIBBON: Cut it out altogether.

Mr. DONNELLY: Yes, cut it out altogether. The western people look on the tariff as a sort of tax, and they believe that if the whole Dominion was the same as western Canada, a farming community, Canadians would be better off without any tariff at all. But the people in the east say they need a tariff. To that the western people reply: Well, this tariff is simply a tax on us, but if you need a tariff in order to keep the Dominion together, we are willing to put up with a little of it, but we do not want to have it any higher than we can possibly help; for heaven's sake make it as low as possible because it is a tax on us.

Mr. MULLINS: What part of the west is the hon. member referring to?

Mr. DONNELLY: The whole of the west I have been over just as much of it as the hon. member has.

Mr. MULLINS: Saskatchewan or Manitoba?

Mr. DONNELLY: Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Alberta, British Columbia.

Mr. MULLINS: Not Manitoba.

Mr. DONNELLY: I have been through it all. The western people do not believe that any tariff on agricultural products can help them at all. One hon. member of the opposition has tried to show us during this debate that we could enhance the price of wheat by putting a duty on it, while another hon. member from the same quarter of the House expressed the contrary view. Evidently our friends of the opposition are not agreed among themselves as to what a tariff will do. I find at page 2756 of Hansard that the