

port figures of the Dominion of Canada for the year 1933 as given on page 978 of Hansard will be found this: the number of pounds of exports of canned salmon to the United Kingdom is 11,151,800. Then the United Kingdom figures of imports for the same twelve months are 11,397,680 pounds, or a difference roughly of about 240,000 pounds.

The other day I explained that there are bound to be and always are discrepancies between figures of exports to a country and those of imports into it, for two or three reasons. First, these goods move from the Pacific coast to Great Britain and it is more than likely that at the end of the year some might be in transit which were not entered in the returns for that year, and at the commencement of the year the same thing would apply, so there is bound to be a discrepancy. The second reason is that many cargoes going from Canada to Liverpool, Falmouth or other ports in England—and this applies particularly to wheat—are often diverted at some point in midocean to continental ports. My hon. friends who are in the wheat business know that. There is no possibility of our knowing where such shipments from Canada may be diverted but every effort is made among the statisticians of Canada, Great Britain, the United States, European and other countries to keep their whole system as accurate and as uniform as they can. This is a difficult, intricate and complex task, but it is a most remarkable instance of reasonably accurate comparison. Let me again say that the total figure of Canada's exports of canned salmon to the United Kingdom for the twelve months of 1933 was 11,151,800 pounds while the British figure of our imports into the United Kingdom for the same period amounted to 11,397,680. Does such a slight discrepancy as that justify a serious indictment of the bureau and its accuracy?

Mr. NEILL: The minister is talking about something utterly remote from what I was speaking about when he interrupted me. He says that I am unfair and unjust and that the honour of so-and-so is at stake, but he has not replied as to the particular item about which I was talking when he interrupted me. I still fail to see any unfairness in what I was saying. Let me quote the minister himself as reported on page 977 of Hansard; never mind about page 978; I shall come to that later. He said:

In the second place the imports in Great Britain are set forth in hundredweights of 112 pounds while exports from Canada are set forth in the Canadian standard of 100 pounds.

Hansard will show that those were exact words I was using when the minister interrupted me. Is there anything unfair in that?

Mr. STEVENS: That is not what I objected to, and the hon. gentleman knows it.

Mr. NEILL: Well, that was what I was talking about when he interrupted me and said that I was unfair.

Mr. STEVENS: No.

Mr. NEILL: I shall leave it in the judgment of the house and Hansard whether that was what I was talking about when I was interrupted.

Mr. STEVENS: The hon. member had better read Hansard to-morrow.

Mr. NEILL: We can read it now if he likes. When I came to the second explanation of the minister I said that part of the discrepancy could be accounted for by the fact that 100 pounds to the hundredweight was used in the one case and 112 pounds in the other, and that is true; that was his own language. To draw a picture of what took place as reported on the next page of Hansard is beside the point. I said that that would make a difference of only 12 per cent. It was at that point the minister interrupted; there is nothing wrong there. For instance, in the June quota instead of a discrepancy of 9,000 hundredweight it would still show a discrepancy of 7,144, and in the nine months ending September, after allowance for the difference, it would still leave a discrepancy of over a million pounds, which certainly requires explanation. But even supposing that was correct, who is to blame for putting into his journals two contradictory things, hundredweights of 100 pounds and of 112 pounds, without telling people? Certainly it was the duty of the department to let us know. I am not blaming the minister personally, but an explanation should have been given so that the ordinary business man would not be putting hundredweights of 112 pounds against hundredweights of 100 pounds for purposes of comparison. That is an inaccuracy and a lack of attention that should not have occurred. If that is the cause of the inaccuracy, and the minister suggested it as being one, then the department is to blame. Now I did not get this from the British papers, I got it either from his own departmental bulletin or the Commercial Intelligence Journal.

Then again I complained of three items, the June and the September quarters and the nine months ending September. The ex-