

on the industry in this country, because one has only to read the speech delivered by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in the Waterloo South by-election to appreciate that in his view the trouble with the shoe industry in Canada, so the minister said, was that we had too many shoe factories, and he also said that the same thing applied to the furniture industry. If that is the attitude of members of the cabinet who negotiate trade agreements, I can readily understand that industry in this country cannot expect any consideration whatever from this government. The government might just as well say we have too many wheat farmers, too many butter producers, and if that is their attitude we might just as well get out of the country and give it back to the Indians.

The fact of the matter is that the shoe industry is one that means a great deal to other industries in this dominion. It is important to the tanneries, for instance, and let us consider for a moment some of the other industries that are affected when we import large quantities of shoes. The upper leather for the shoes comes from Oshawa or Kingston, the black or brown leather from Newmarket or London. Then there is Clark's of Toronto; another firm at Omeme and one at Barrie; also two large industries in the city of Kitchener. All these industries are going to be affected by the greater importation of shoes. Then we have the industries supplying the thread, the wooden heels, the eyelets, the packing cases and various other necessary items in the manufacture of shoes. While I realize the futility of protesting against this reduction in the tariff, which with the removal of the excise duty will represent a reduction of some eight or nine per cent, I do say that to-day the shoe industry in Canada is feeling the very serious effects of the greater importations.

Mr. HANSON: An industry that cannot live with thirty per cent protection has no right to live in this country.

Mr. LANDERYOU: I agree with the hon. member for Skeena. Under the high tariff policy of the Conservative government I could have purchased hides in western Canada for fourteen or fifteen cents. The price is substantially higher now than it was when the Conservative tariff went into operation. I think a thirty per cent protection for the shoe industry is sufficient, particularly in view of the fact that hides and other leathers come in free, and we have now this situation, that because of the high freight rates hides are coming in from the United States instead of being purchased in western Canada. So I agree with the reduction that is made here.

Mr. EULER: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Homuth) has made some reference to something I said in the Waterloo South by-election of more or less unhappy memory.

Mr. MANION: Not for us.

Mr. EULER: No, but I am really rising in my place, not on account of what my hon. friend from Waterloo South said, but rather to ascertain the attitude of my hon. friends opposite with regard to tariffs. I do not think anyone in this house who has known me as a member for a good many years will say that I have at any time been in favour of such a reduction in tariffs as will ruin any Canadian industry. I believe my record will prove that. At the same time I have always contended, and I mentioned in the debate on the address that the former leader of the Conservative party, Mr. Bennett, laid this down as a principle, that the Canadian producer or manufacturer should have sufficient tariff protection to give him a chance of fair competition in his own market. I have said that I have no fault to find with that. I believe that Canadian industry ought to have a fair chance in its own market; but if it ought to have a fair chance for competition, surely that means that there should be some competition.

I mentioned the shoe industry in the Waterloo South by-election, where my hon. friend was a candidate at that time, because he had said that the shoe industry was being seriously injured by imports from the United States, and I quoted figures from my own department, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, showing that our importations of shoes from the United States amounted to less than two per cent of the consumption in Canada. I was not referring to what came in under the \$100 exemption. I contended that that was not a large enough import to injure the Canadian manufacturer seriously. If it is, then the only possible remedy is to put on a prohibitive tariff. I do not think that can be denied.

I was surprised yesterday or the day before, in the debate on textiles, when my hon. friend, I think from Waterloo South, protested against the injury being done to certain textile industries in this country. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Dunning) showed that less than one per cent of the consumption in Canada was imported. If there is going to be the protest made that Canadian industry is going to be ruined because of importations amounting, in some instances, to less than one per cent and, in others, to less than two per cent of the consumption in Canada, then I say the only policy our hon. friends opposite