under the Fordney-McCumber tariff. Added in this value under the former arrangement was a one cent maximum addition. Entering Canada under the treaty it will be fourfifths of one cent per pound.

Mr. HEAPS: What quantity of apples do we import free under the British preference?

Mr. DUNNING: Our total imports last year from all countries were 22,137 barrels, of which 15,589 barrels came from New Zealand. That I think is the closest I can come without a considerable calculation, so far as quantities from British countries are concerned.

Mr. HEAPS: Those coming in from New Zealand would be exempt from duty?

Mr. DUNNING: Free of duty.

Mr. ROWE (Dufferin): What were our total exports?

Mr. DUNNING: Exports to all countries were 2,060,000 barrels, valued at \$8,220,000. The United Kingdom was our principal customer, taking 1,807,000 barrels. To Belgium we shipped 77,000 barrels; to Egypt, 33,500 barrels; to The Netherlands, 33,000; to Germany, 26,000 barrels; to Newfoundland, 18,000 barrels; to France, 17,000 barrels; to New Zealand, 7,000 barrels. We imported 15,000 barrels from New Zealand and exported 7,000 barrels.

Mr. BENNETT: That is a seasonal demand?

Mr. DUNNING: We exported to South Africa 7,000 barrels; to the Argentine, 5,500 barrels; to Sweden, 4,700 barrels, and to the United States, 4,500 barrels.

Mr. TAYLOR (Nanaimo): The minister made no mention of India.

Mr. DUNNING: I have no record of any exports to India.

Mr. TAYLOR (Nanaimo): There is a considerable consumption of apples in India and the Americans are taking all the business.

Mr. BENNETT: Proximity has something to do with that.

Mr. STEWART: Could the minister give the imports from the United States?

Mr. DUNNING: That again is a seasonal matter. We imported 6,548 barrels, mostly from the United States, and exported 4,500 barrels. In connection with India, I would say to my hon. friend that we have no preference in that country.

[Mr. Dunning.]

Mr. TAYLOR (Nanaimo): I think a little work on the part of the minister in charge of that particular department would ensure the consumption of Canadian apples. I have a little information which I should be glad to disclose to the minister.

## Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—94. Grapes, fresh, in their natural state, the weight of the packages to be included in the weight for duty,  $l_2^1$  cents per pound.

Per pound. Provided that in no case shall any value for duty established under the authority of section 43 of the Customs Act exceed the invoice value by more than 80 per centum of the lowest advance imposed on such goods under the authority of said section during the calendar years 1933 to 1935, inclusive.

Mr. DUNNING: The United States duty at the present time is twenty-five cents per cubic foot, and it was twenty-five cents per cubic foot prior to 1930. Canadian imports were 18,400,000 pounds from the United States, valued at \$738,000; 114,000 pounds from Spain and 55,000 pounds from the United Kingdom. There are no separate statistics available for exports. The estimated Canadian production for 1935 was 39,350,000 pounds.

Mr. LOCKHART: May I have the imports of grapes from the United States for the same five years as in the case of peaches?

Mr. DUNNING: In 1929 we imported 32,366,000 pounds; in 1932, 17,636,000 pounds; in 1933, 16,959,000 pounds; in 1934, 15,636,000 pounds, and in 1935, 18,400,000 pounds.

Mr. LOCKHART: Has the minister the exports to the United States for the same five years?

Mr. DUNNING: There are no separate statistics available for the export of grapes.

Mr. STEWART: Did the minister give the estimated Canadian production?

Mr. DUNNING: Last year it was 39,350,000 pounds.

Mr. BENNETT: Has the minister the figures for the preceding years?

Mr. DUNNING: The preceding year the production was 46,800,000 pounds.

Mr. BENNETT: And for 1931?

Mr. DUNNING: I have not those figures.

Mr. BENNETT: What is the present added value for duty purposes?

Mr. DUNNING: Prior to the agreement the advance on invoice value was one cent and the maximum can now be four-fifths of one cent. It was never applied in 1935.