

promise that they would not raise prices; and so far as I know, with the exception of one industry, they lived up to their agreement.

Mr. DEACHMAN: That was on April Fool's day.

Mr. MANION: Perhaps my hon. friend knows more about April Fool's day than most people, but that was the agreement and it was carried out.

One point brought out by the hon. member for Huron North (Mr. Deachman) seems to me utterly foolish. He and some few others talk free trade, but there are only a few supporters of free trade left in the world; they are a sort of extinct species. No country in the world has free trade; the only country that approached it was Great Britain which had free imports, but not free trade, because there was no nation with which they could trade freely. However, from the early part of the last century up to the war Great Britain had free imports, but we all know that now Great Britain has become one of the most highly protected countries in the world. I am sorry to take up time, but I have not taken much time on this agreement except on the original discussion. I put some figures on *Hansard* in my remarks on the address in reply to the speech from the throne showing that Great Britain is at the present time collecting by means of protective duties three times as much per head of the population as we are. If I remember the figures correctly, Great Britain is collecting about \$25 per head and we are collecting \$3.50. That is the country which was once free trade. And now the hon. member for Huron North comes out with this antiquated obsolete argument that everyone but himself and a few others threw aside long ago, and attacks his own government with it. The hon. member is about the most antiquated gentleman in this house; he should get up to date.

Mr. DUNNING: Before this Donnybrook goes any further, I did not raise a point of order while the leader of the opposition was speaking—

Mr. MANION: Or the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Euler).

Mr. DUNNING: As my hon. friend said, he did not take up much time himself on the treaty. But I suggest, as a matter of good sportsmanship that you, Mr. Chairman, might allow the hon. member for Huron North five minutes to reply, which is about the time the leader of the opposition took on the general question of free trade.

[Mr. Manion.]

Mr. MANION: I am only giving him back a little of his own. He has been abusing me ever since the house met.

Mr. DUNNING: The hon. member when he "abused" the leader of the opposition was in order so far as the item was concerned. The hon. member for Huron North complained of my appealing on a point of order the other day, so I am trying to put myself right with him now by pleading that he be allowed to be out of order for not more than five minutes.

Mr. DEACHMAN: I shall not need that amount of time. All the arguments which I have heard from my hon. friend the leader of the opposition were old when Adam quarrelled with the food controller; there is no need to discuss them. I rise merely to ask the Minister of Finance a simple question: Will he be good enough to let the committee know the percentage that wages bear to the total costs of production in the shoe industry in Canada, and also the percentage of material cost?

Mr. DUNNING: I am sorry I have not that information here, but I can get it at a later stage.

Mr. DEACHMAN: I take it as a fairly accurate guess that wages amount to roughly thirty per cent. The tariff rate we now have is thirty per cent, and in addition there is a certain protective element in the sales tax of eight per cent which is levied not only on the value of the goods but on the duty. Last year, or before this change was made, the tariff on shoes was thirty-five per cent plus three per cent on the duty paid value, bringing it up to about thirty-nine per cent, plus the sales tax of eight per cent levied on that value, which would mean approximately an additional three or four per cent levied by the sales tax, bringing the duty altogether pretty close to fifty per cent. Is it enough? It is 100 per cent on the wage cost, at least. Surely even the most embittered protectionist who ever fought the battle for protection must say that a tariff which represents 100 per cent of the wage cost is enough. Surely it is enough.

Mr. HEAPS: One or two statements have been made in connection with which I should like to say a word. In the first place a thirty per cent duty on boots and shoes is fairly high protection. I do not think the shoe industry has much to complain about in that respect. It has been shown by the Minister of Finance that comparatively few shoes are imported. Even if the tariff were doubled or