

satisfied when he left that he would do what he could to apply a remedy. However, toward the end of last year it began to be whispered about that all was not well with the dumping provision. When I reached Ottawa I placed six questions on the order paper. The first three referred to the amount of money which had been collected in duty, and the second three asked what claims, if any, had been made for rebate, the reasons for those claims, and the amounts. The only answer vouchsafed to me was a partial answer to questions one, two and three; I received no information with respect to the latter part of the question regarding rebate. I do not think that is to be wondered at, now that the Duncan report has come out because there are several paragraphs in that report which show that a rebate of the duty was granted if it was claimed. I want to read a few extracts from it, if I may. To begin with, I give the commissioner's opinion of the situation with regard to the dumping duty. He says:

It is a common trade practice for those whose home market is well organized to "dump" supplies abroad at prices below those obtaining on the home market. The Canadian fruit and vegetable growers, whose crop is later in maturing than that of southern growers, have long suffered from American fruit and vegetables being thrown on the Canadian market in this way. To the American exporter who has already taken a profit before the Canadian supply comes in, every additional dollar received means an addition to profits. The Canadian grower on the other hand, without government protection in the nature of a dumping duty, would be unable to exist in the face of organized American competition.

That is the view of the fruit commissioner after investigating the market conditions. Then he quotes the famous anti-dumping clause from the Customs Tariff 1902 and regulations relating thereto. I notice, however, that he makes no reference whatever to this government's valuation clause in the Customs act, clause 47A. He then proceeds to give instances of evasion of the dumping provisions, and we find that in some cases dumping was actually followed by rebate. Here is a telegram from the Mutual manager at Vancouver to the Nash supervisor:

Customs dumped us on car Walla Walla barb—

That means rhubarb grown in the state of Washington.

—which cost seventy-five cents. Are you paying dump duty? We protested wildly but had to pay.

The reply to that telegram, sent by the Nash supervisor, was as follows:

Bought barb seventy-five here but not hooked to date. Suggest send particulars your claim to A. E. Burns, secretary, Western Canada Fruit Jobbers, Winnipeg, for him to fight.

Then follows a letter from the same gentleman to the Canadian manager of the Nash interests:

Dear Sirs:

...Regarding the dumping duty on barb, I am suggesting to Snow that he forward all particulars of his claim to A. E. Burns, our secretary, Winnipeg, and I am satisfied if there is any chance Burns will be able to get Snow a refund. I wish you would just call Burns up on the phone and mention the fact that Vancouver got hooked on a car and that Snow is forwarding the papers,—

And so on.

Then the commissioner points out that on that date rhubarb was being dumped into Canada at 75 cents, while the Walla Walla market price was \$1. The cost of production of the British Columbia rhubarb was 90 cents. He goes on:

It appears from the above that the price of the imported rhubarb was both below the Canadian cost of production and the fair market value as sold for American consumption. In such a case it is considered that it was the duty of the local customs officer at the port of entry to apply the dumping provisions of the Customs Act both at Vancouver and Calgary. It is not known whether the duty was imposed on Carruthers' car at Calgary or remitted on Snow's at Vancouver.

Then follows some correspondence between the Nash supervisor and the Mutual manager in Vancouver, as follows:

Dear Sir,—Mr. Simington advised that Mr. A. E. Burns, our secretary at Winnipeg, will be very pleased to handle your claim for dumping duties imposed on that car of barb, and when you forward him particulars, George, I suggest that you outline that you are exclusive selling agents for the Rhubarb Association, and at the time American barb was purchased there was none available in B.C.

Mr. Burns is a very competent secretary, and I hope that you will write him giving full particulars and asking him to handle your case.

So much for rhubarb. Now let us take a look at apples.

The Nash supervisor for Alberta and British Columbia sent a circular to all the Alberta houses, as follows:

I am advised that in nearly every instance where wholesalers have been compelled to pay dumping duty on apples that Mr. A. E. Burns has applied for refund and obtained it. I do not know of a case in Alberta where it has been applied, but seems to me some houses during last season had it applied on peaches or some other commodities, and I am satisfied if you have not obtained a refund, if you will be good enough to use our secretary, Mr. Burns, sending all particulars to him, requesting him to fight the claim for you, I am sure that he will be successful.

We contribute yearly to our Association, and I believe we have a very competent secretary, and I hope that any house having a claim will give it immediate attention by following instructions suggested above.

Then we have an instance of the dumping having been withdrawn. This is from the