

that enter our country and let her see the duty that is paid on them, and at the same time turn it on to the cotton goods so much required by the average person in Canada, so that she may see that the duty on that is almost double the duty on silk. You might go a little further and turn it on to the boot and shoe business, also the hides which are the raw material which go into the manufacture of these boots and shoes. Let the facts appear in contrast with the statement made by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Peter McGibbon) who quoted from Hansard of the first session of 1919, stating that the duty paid on boots and shoes was just about equal to the duty paid on the raw material. If hides are not the raw material that goes into the manufacture of boots and shoes, I am under a great misapprehension as to what our boots and shoes are made of.

Mr. PETER MCGIBBON (Muskoka): Might I correct the hon. member? What I referred to was the leather that was brought in, not the hide?

Mr. MAHARG: Raw material is what the hon. member referred to, and if the House wished, I could easily quote Hansard to show that the words used were "raw material". The raw material for boots and shoes, if I am any judge, is hides. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon) might also have pointed out that there was about \$45,000,000 or \$50,000,000 worth of Canadian boots and shoes sold in this country in each year. He took very good care to point out that there was less than \$1,000,000 worth of duty collected on boots and shoes entering Canada and that about \$3,000 of duty was collected on the boots and shoes that the farmer and the labourer wore, meaning the cheaper class of boots and shoes. He described them as those with pegged soles, but I notice that the words "pegged soles" are not mentioned in Hansard, although the hon. gentleman used that expression. I should like the farmers and labourers in the electoral district of Muskoka to ask the hon. member when he next appears before them, if he ever should, if he does not think they might be permitted to wear a little better class of boot than those with pegged soles. I have worn this kind and I know what they are like; the pegs come through the soles continuously, and I did not wear them any longer than I had to, and I hope I shall never wear them again. The hon. member for Muskoka also took a fling at the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) and criticised him for making what he considered inaccurate state-

ments to the House. He objected to what the hon. member for Marquette said with regard to the amount of duty collected on articles of consumption, and proceeded to enumerate certain articles other than articles of consumption and gave the duty collected on them. In his enumeration he included fruit, both green and dried, and nuts. I can only say that either his knowledge as to what articles of consumption consists of is very faulty, or else he is trying to place the hon. member for Marquette in a false position. He even went a little further in giving these figures and mentioned animal and vegetable products such as furs, feathers, etc. Now that word "et cetera" may cover a great deal, and if it does in proportion to the number of articles which I regard as articles of consumption, but which evidently the member for Muskoka does not, then I think his criticism of the hon. member for Marquette was very much uncalled for.

The ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) evidently had some particular object in coming here. This is the second visit he has paid us at intervals since his retirement from the Cabinet. Since he resigned from the Government he appears to have gone into seclusion, at all events from political life. However, he breaks that seclusion to a certain extent and the Great War Veterans were the first, if I may use the expression, to smoke him out of his lair. Things were getting pretty warm here last session. A committee had been appointed to inquire into the possibility of giving further aid towards the re-establishment of the returned men. That committee had several different organizations before them, one of which was the Great War Veterans Association, who submitted a plan to the committee which evidently members of the Government thought it would be just a little difficult to get over, and called for playing their very best cards.

2 a.m. Consequently the ex-Minister of

Finance was called before the committee and the remarkable thing about his visit was not his appearance, but what he told the committee, at that time and what he told the House yesterday. The inference to be drawn from his evidence before the committee was this: That the financial condition of the country was so critical that it would be impossible to raise further sums than those already provided for the re-establishment of the soldier. Now what did he say yesterday when addressing this House? Here are his exact words—unrevised Hansard, Page 201. He