

was about 85,000,000 bushels, while the crop for the 1931 season was 103,000,000 bushels. In 1930 it amounted to 101,000,000 bushels. Not since 1929 do we get a comparable crop figure. In that year the crop of the United States was 86,500,000 bushels, of which were exported to the United Kingdom 953,000 barrels. The export this year was practically the same, or 983,140 barrels up to March 4, 1933. The box shipments were somewhat less. The figures show for the present season that box shipments from the United States total 1,929,326 boxes, whereas in 1929 they were 2,654,000. So that the shipment to the United Kingdom market has been about normal during the last year.

With regard to price I happen to have under my hand a report from J. Forsyth Smith, Canadian Fruit Trade Commissioner, in which the statement is made:

Actually there was no shortage of supplies and no rise in wholesale prices, which continued to be lower than normal. As far as retail prices were concerned, the effect observed was the reverse of what the fruiterers' organizations had anticipated and the great mass of medium class fruiterers found it necessary to stimulate trade under generally depressing conditions by shading their profit. Whereas, therefore, one had been in the habit of expecting six pence per pound, to be about the minimum for boxed apples. This was no longer the case and prices of four pence and five pence per pound were by no means uncommon.

It has been the experience of apple growers in the Annapolis valley, from which I come, that the amount received during the past season for their apples has not been sufficient to meet the cost of production.

Mr. SHORT: They got four shillings six-pence per barrel more than the Americans did.

Mr. ILSLEY: Mr. Speaker, it would take too long to refute that statement with mathematical certainty, but all I can say is that it simply is not in accordance with the facts. Everybody in the Annapolis valley, and I think the hon. member himself knows it. In the selection of the thirteen commodities, why has the government not included apples, one of the commodities we would expect to find near the top of the list? We are told that we are getting four and a half shillings per hundred pounds in increased price on the British market. As a matter of fact we are getting nothing of the kind, because the operation of supply and demand, in the absence of an effective prevention of American competition, has brought the price down on the British market. Now, sir, I have turned over in my mind as carefully as possible the principles which may have guided the gov-

ernment in the selection of the commodities to be included in this list, and I am at a complete loss to find evidence of any definite or consistent principle. In my humble opinion the list constitutes discrimination of the rankest kind. Looking at it on the basis of volume, it might be said: "Oh well, we have selected this list to encourage shipments that actually go; we have left off commodities that are not exported to the British market in any volume." Indeed that is what the Prime Minister said yesterday in regard to butter. But I find maple products on the list, the exports of which last year amounted to only \$5,333; eggs, the exports of which amounted to only \$3,972; honey, exports of which amounted to only \$184,341, and other commodities not much greater in quantity of export. So the basis of the list cannot have been volume. It has been suggested that certain articles, apples for instance, were not included because they already enjoy a substantial preference. But I find on this list other commodities which enjoy a substantial preference, notably tobacco. Why should tobacco be on the list and apples be left off? It may be said that the list was selected with a view to helping the primary producers. But persons who should know inform me that there are on the list a number of processed products as to which the manufacturer or processor will get the benefit of the bonus while the persons who supply the products will not. The most notable instance of that, I am told, is bacon, and second to that I should say canned apples. Why are canned apples bonused, and evaporated apples and cider and concentrated cider and green apples left off? What is the basis of selection? I have made inquiry and I am told that the bulk of the fruits that are canned in this country come in from the United States; the canner sends the canned fruit to Great Britain and gets the bonus. About seventy carloads of pears were exported from Canada to Great Britain last season, while pears come from the United States to be canned. The pears that are shipped by the primary producers will not get the bonus, but the cannery of American pears will get it, because canned fruits are on this list and fruits in their natural state are left off.

Then it may be argued that this is a relief measure; in fact the other night the Prime Minister said so. If it is a relief measure I can tell the Minister of Finance of a great many industries producing natural products other than those covered by this list which