

which provides merely for the importation of boots and shoes in that way under the \$100 exemption. It runs all along the line and applies as well to many other commodities. And the same condition exists in the United States. When United States tourists come to Canada, they take back goods to the United States, and therefore it is not fair to apply the principle only to boots and shoes. It applies to radios and to a good many other articles as well.

Mr. MacNICOL: Do I understand the minister to say that the percentage of ladies' shoes imported under the \$100 exemption was eight per cent?

Mr. DUNNING: No.

Mr. MacNICOL: What did the minister say?

Mr. DUNNING: I was trying to calculate mentally the percentage of the figures I gave. I am of the opinion that the \$100 exemption both ways is of distinct advantage to Canada on balance. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. MacNICOL: By which the minister means that United States ladies take back Canadian shoes.

Mr. DUNNING: I am talking about the whole exemption, not boots and shoes alone. Americans take back more goods to the United States than Canadians bring back.

Mr. MacNICOL: We have not yet seen any of their statements indicating how much was taken back. In any event, I suppose they would take back more on account of their population. But comparing their population and their production with ours, I am inclined to think we get the wrong end of the stick so far as providing employment for our people is concerned.

Mr. EULER: Even if the reduction of five per cent in the tariff had not been made, there would still be imported as many under the \$100 exemption as before, so that it should not enter into the calculations from the point of view of the reduction made.

Mr. MANION: The minister of Trade and Commerce rather threw a challenge at me in regard to the question of tariffs.

Mr. DUNNING: Not a challenge.

Mr. MANION: In a sense it was a challenge, although I did not take it in any offensive spirit. It was a challenge in regard to our attitude towards tariffs. Let me say frankly that I am not a high tariff man, in the sense that I do not favour prohibitive tariffs. I am exactly the same sort of tariff

man as the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He is one of the best protectionists in the house and—I say this without intending to be unfair to him—he has never failed to protect the interests and the industries in his own riding. He has watched them carefully. I do not say that offensively, and indeed I do not find anything wrong with it. But take furniture, for example. In this present treaty it is cut down about one-half of one per cent on a thirty-three per cent tariff. My figures are not exact, but I do not think I am far wrong. However, I do not want to argue any questions of detail. Let me say that I believe in a moderate, not a prohibitive tariff; and that is the attitude of the Conservative party generally. I do not agree with my friends from the west, who seem to have the idea that if you put on a thirty per cent tariff the price goes up thirty per cent. In many instances nothing of the sort occurs. The purpose of a tariff is not to raise prices at all; it is simply to hold the market for the people of the country concerned. That is the real purpose of the tariff.

Mr. MacNICOL: And to give employment.

Mr. MANION: Yes. It not only protects the market, it not only protects the industry affected, but also protects the workingmen in the industry; it protects agriculture in many instances.

Mr. DEACHMAN: What about the consumer?

Mr. MANION: I will answer that question in a moment. My hon. friend is a free trader so long as he is not voting, but the minute he votes he is the best Grit in the house. I used to meet him in the street and discuss various questions with him. I used to think he was one of those chaps who always was fighting for principle, but I found when I got here that no one votes more regularly with his party—

Mr. DEACHMAN: I could not vote for yours.

Mr. MANION: You could vote for ours just as well as for yours on protection, generally speaking. As far as the consumer is concerned, I have said many times on the public platform, and I think it is the belief of every hon. member on this side, that no manufacturer or producer has a right to exploit the people behind tariff walls. If a manufacturer, or any producer, is taking unfair advantage of a tariff, he should lose his protection. When the Bennett government in 1930 to 1935 increased the tariff, we took back from the producers and manufacturers a