"Fourth.-The imports of Manitoba and British Columbia are included

"Fourth.—The imports of Manitona and British Columbia are included in the imports of the year 1877, but in no other year; 'these Provinces not being included in the Treaty of Washington.'

"Fifth.—While hale oil is rejected during the duty period, it is introduced in the free period, and 'crude oil,'—a terrestrial product—is introduced as a marine item during the duty period, but rejected during the free period."

He says further on:

"By the introduction of manifestly absurd entries into the Customs The compiler has largely increased the fish exports of Prince Edward Island to other countries, and lessened the official record, showing exports

The effect of the artifices and frauds is to increase the apparent exports of fish and fish products to other countries, in comparison with the exports to the United States."

Now it is not my intention to discuss this matter at all fully at the present moment, as the whole of this correspondence was conducted, and the whole of the business transacted, during the time when the hon member for Westmoreland (Sir Albert J. Smith) was at the head of the department. The matter may or may not come up between the two Governments; I do not think it will, but, in the meantime, I do not think it necessary to enter into a lengthy discussion on the subject. Looking at Professor Hind's outrageous charges against the officials of that time, it seems to me that his own words are sufficient to condemn him and to make it apparent that he is not actuated by kindly motives, nor in view of the best interests of this country. The member for Westmoreland could give the House much more information on this subject than I can. His services at the time the Commission was sitting were recognized by Her Majesty, and he received a great deal of credit for the able manner in which he conducted the investigation of the Commission, and I am sure that everything in connection with the matter will be fresh upon his memory. There is nothing in the department which would enable me to throw any light upon the matter. I believe when the charges are sifted they will be found to be entirely without foundation; but, nevertheless, it is necessary that we should be careful in any statements we may make on the subject.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Having been charged with the general management and conduct of the Fishery Commission which sat at Halifax, it seems fit that I should make some observations with reference to the charges made, not only against me, but against almost every person connected with the Commission. My predecessor, and several other departments of the Government, fall under the whip of the Professor. The charges when divested of a great deal of verbiage amount to this: that the Imperial Government and the Government of the Dominion, through their agents and officers at Halifax, falsified statistical returns and reports, fabricated testimony and used false evidence at the Commission in order to secure an award. Now these are grave and serious charges, and if true should cover the perpetrator with infamy and disgrace. But, Sir, the charges are not true; there is no foundation for them whatever. What the motive of Professor Hind may be I cannot say. He seems very desirous of obt ining notoriety, and in that he has certainly succeeded. It would seem, also, that he is desirous of entangling the two countries in difficulties, but I think in that he will utterly fail. So far, at all events, he appears to have made very little progress. Professor Hind was a witness at Halifax, and I am quite prepared to say that he gave valuable and useful testimony on behalf of the British Government. After the Commission was closed, it was suggested that we should have an analytical digest of the whole matter, and Professor Hind was jointly employed by the two Governments to prepare an index—that was his business and nothing more. It seems, however, that in the preparation of this index he discovered that there were Mr. Pope (Queen's).

some inaccuracies and discrepancies in the returns and statistics, not only of this country, but of the United States. Now, it would have been fitting for him, being employed by both Governments, if he discovered errors or discrepancies which, in his judgment, had influenced the deliberations of the tribunal, to have submitted the facts to both Governments; and it would then have been proper for those Governments to have acted upon them or not. And having done that, I think he would have done all that he ought to do. But, instead of doing that, we find that he has been pursuing this thing with a pertinacity which is really a wonder. He went to England at his own expense, and spent several weeks there in negotiations with the Foreign Office, but I believe he received very little encouragement, and came home a disgusted man. Since he returned he has been writing letters against, and persecuting I might say, everybody connected with the Commission. Now, if Professor Hind had any valid object in this, I think he would have adopted the course I have suggested; but so far as I have seen he has never suggested a solution of the difficulties which he says exist; he does not suggest whether the award should be refunded to the United States—in fact, he has apparently no other object than to persecute those who have had to do with the Commission and to endeavor to get the two countries into difficulties. Now, the persons who, on behalf of the United States, had a knowledge of this subject, are Mr. Foster,—who was the accredited agent and representative of the United States-and he had associated with him Mr. Trescott and Mr. Dana, two very distinguished lawyers of that country. Now, I have been waiting with some interest, and not without some anxiety, to see whether Judge Foster would speak on this subject; but up to the prosent hour, so far as I have been able to see, he and his two associates have remained silent. therefore, seem to me to be a fair and reasonable inference from their silence that they considered there was no foundation for these charges in fact. That seems to me to be the fair and reasonable conclusion from the silence of those gentlemen who knew all about the matter, and who, I have no doubt, were communicated with by Professor Hind. I am satisfied the matters he refers to had no influence whatever on the deliberations of the Commission. That is quite clear, because I am quite sure that if there was any reasonable ground to find fault with the way the business was conducted the Commissioners would have taken cognizance of it. The case on the part of the British Government was prepared by four lawyers, assisted by Mr. Forbes, Mr. Whiteher, and myself. This case required a great deal of care and deliberation. That portion of the case which refers to the statistics had reference to the reports made from time to time to our own Government, and we made frequent allusions to the returns, statistics, and reports of the United States. As provided for the treaty of Washington, these exhibits were produced before the Commission, and were laid upon the table where they were open to examination and criticism, and the American gentlemen found no fault. There was no keeping back of papers, no concealment of the truth, no su pression of evidence. Everything was free, open and straightforward, to the entire satisfaction of the American gentlemen who conducted the case on behalf of the United States. Now, it seems to me that if there was anything concealed, as alleged, the American Government would have taken action, because I have no doubt that Protessor Hind has communicated his information to that Government. I am glad to hear the Minister of Marine and Fisheries state that the American Government had taken no action in this matter. One or two members of Congress have made inflammatory speeches on the subject, but as I understood before, and as I am glad to know now, the American Government have not considered this matter of sufficient gravity to take action upon it. I