

can adopt is one of complete exclusion. I asked my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, when I spoke in the debate on the address, whether he was in favour of a prohibitive tariff, and he said he was not.

Mr. MANION: I am not.

Mr. EULER: I do not think he is. I leave it to the common sense judgment of the house, when objection is made to imports of less than one or two per cent of consumption, whether you can do anything to shut out that small percentage except by putting on an absolutely prohibitive tariff. I have always been in favour of a reasonable tariff so that our own industries could exist. I have never been in favour of an absolutely prohibitive tariff, and I have no objection whatever to saying that here to-night.

The hon. member also spoke of industries in my own city of Kitchener, and in reply to him I repeat that I have had no complaint with regard to the small reduction that is being made in the tariff on shoes. There is still a tariff of thirty per cent, which I think, ordinarily speaking, ought in almost all lines to be a sufficient protection in Canada. I was speaking to one shoe manufacturer, not a supporter of the party on this side of the house, and he said that he had no complaint to make with regard to the reduction.

I would further point out that the shoe manufacturers are getting some benefit by way of certain reductions which are being made under this trade agreement. Take, for instance, kid leather. We have reduced the tariff from 27½ per cent to twenty per cent. I think that is a step in the right direction, one that is going to help the shoe industry. There are two small tanneries manufacturing kid leather in Canada. They have not been able to supply the Canadian market. The only result has been that the Canadian shoe manufacturer has paid more for his kid leather coming in from the United States than he should have paid, and it has made the price of the shoes higher to the Canadian consumer, without benefit to the manufacturer of shoes. Now we have made some reduction there. Further than that, some of the component parts of the shoe, such as thread, will also get the benefit of the reduction and the removal of the excise tax.

But the point I make is this. If it is contended by our hon. friends opposite that the small importation amounting, in some instances, to less than two per cent, less than one per cent, is objectionable, then their own policy can only be, and I think they should say so, one of complete exclusion. Although I am a supporter of a policy of reasonable

[Mr. Euler.]

protection, I say that I am entirely in disagreement with a policy of complete exclusion.

Mr. MacNICOL: With regard to the minister's remarks about two per cent, what I want him to answer me if he can is this: What per cent of fine shoes of Canadian production is the million dollars' worth that came in under the \$100 exemption?

Mr. DUNNING: Nobody can answer that.

Mr. MacNICOL: The Minister of Finance referred a few moments ago to the \$100 exemption under which fine shoes, or any kind of shoes, but particularly fine shoes, came in. What percentage of Canadian production does that million dollars' worth represent? It is fine shoes that are coming in under the \$100 exemption.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend would no doubt describe as "fine" shoes, women's leather boots, shoes and slippers, sizes 2½ and up. That is about the sort of thing he has in mind. I am looking at my own information which I have here in order to try to answer the hon. gentleman's question. There is no classification of what may be described as fine shoes. There are men's leather boots, shoes, and slippers, sizes 5½ and up; women's leather boots, shoes and slippers, sizes 2½ and up; and children's leather boots, shoes and slippers, all other sizes. Women's shoes would more closely approximate what my hon. friend has in mind. Total importations from the United States of that classification of women's leather boots and shoes were \$399,000 last year, which of course would be considerably less than one per cent of the total Canadian production. I have also that classification in the production figures. There is nearly \$16,000,000 production of that class in Canada. If all of the million dollars to which my hon. friend refers, which came in free of duty under the \$100 exemption, fell into that class, it would still be, as nearly as I can figure mentally, about eight per cent of the production of that particular class. It must be remembered that our total production of boots and shoes was \$35,500,000 last year, and total imports from the United States were \$583,000. Add your million to the \$583,000, and then you get some idea of the size of imports in relation to production.

Mr. EULER: There is one point that must be remembered there. While possibly boots and shoes lend themselves a little more readily to importation under the \$100 exemption than some other commodities, it must be borne in mind that there is no legislation