

the bounden duty of our Government to give a direct and official denial of the charges preferred by Professor Hind. I have paid some little attention to this question because my constituents and the people of my Province are deeply interested in it. As I take it, there were four points to be settled before the Halifax Commission, namely: the value of the American market to the Canadian fishermen; the value of the Canadian market to American fishermen; the value of the American fisheries conceded to Canadian fishermen, and the value of the Canadian fisheries to American fishermen. The first two points, the value to each of the market of the other, was settled by the fishery statistics contained in the navigation returns of each country. I am informed that statistics prepared by both Governments very nearly agreed; but to satisfy myself on that point, I have compared the Trade and Navigation Returns of the United States with those of Canada for some years past, and I find that so far as the quantity of fish imported into the United States is concerned, both reports very nearly agree. It is true the values differ, but that may be easily accounted for, the values in the United States being made up from the market prices at the time the fish were received there, while in the Canadian returns they are made up from the invoices of shipments. There may be some other slight differences easily accounted for, such as losses in transshipment of fish, or through the manner in which fish were cured, rendering them unsaleable on reaching the American market, but on the whole the reports agree very closely. The point as to the value of the Canadian fisheries to the American fishermen was settled wholly on the testimony of important witnesses, summoned by both Governments; the Trade and Navigation Returns had nothing to do with it. The conclusion I have arrived at is that Professor Hind has no ground for the wholesale charges he has preferred against the department and the Government officials. There is one point, however, to which I desire to attract the attention of the Government, not in a spirit of fault-finding, but simply in the interests of the fisheries of the country, and that is the manner in which our fishery statistics are annually collected. I believe the returns submitted in our Fisheries Report this year, do not give the exact annual value of the products of our fisheries. The fault cannot be laid at the door of the department in Ottawa, for they have to make their return from the statistics furnished by the fisheries officers all over the country. But one reason for the mistakes committed is, that in many instances the officials are not appointed for their special fitness or qualification for the work, but rather because of their political leanings.

Mr. POPE (Queen's). There is no objection to furnishing the correspondence asked for. It has created a great deal of excitement both in England and the United States, and I was going to say in Canada also. The charges made by Professor Hind are so outrageous in themselves that I think the correspondence will convict him of some improper motive rather than a desire for the correction of errors in these returns. Doubtless, in making up returns, errors may have occurred; but no one would believe that the member for Westmoreland (Sir Albert J. Smith) could be guilty of the conduct charged by Professor Hind. The effect of the alterations spoken of might be altogether against the interests of Canada. Therefore, Canadian officers could not be expected to have worked against those interests, and in favor of the United States. In the pamphlet published by Professor Hind, he states:

"In a printed letter addressed to Sir Alexander Galt, bearing date, Windsor, Nova Scotia, November 10th, 1879, in reply to a letter addressed by Sir Alexander Galt to myself, I have shown that this table, alleged to represent the produce of Canadian fisheries from 1869 to 1877, is a gross forgery; that it only alters the quantities, the prices and the denominations of the items in the Fishery Reports, from which it is falsely alleged

to be taken, but it presents in the aggregate a shamefully concocted contrivance framed to deceive. I have shown that, among many other falsifications, it cuts off more than 1,000,000 pounds of haddock from the catch of 1869, annihilates 100,000 barrels of mackerel in 1871, adds 100,000 barrels of herrings in 1874; introduces eels at \$1.78 per pound, alters quantities, denominations and prices, and is 'cooked' from 1869 to 1873."

Now, the charge made by Professor Hind is that those accounts have been cooked and falsified for the purpose of benefitting Canada—that the whole thing is based upon fraud. He says the returns of one year show an error to the extent of 100,000 barrels of mackerel. I believe when the Commission was sitting at Halifax, a table was made up in the Department of Marine and Fisheries—no record I can find gives much information on the subject—but I believe, before the case was argued, the incorrectness of this table was discovered, and the whole conclusion was based on the return of statistics prepared by the proper officers. I do not believe the incorrect return affected the case in the slightest degree, but if it did, it was to the injury of Canada. Canada, however, is not complaining. I am happy to say the United States Government is not taking the matter up, and the British Government does not think it worth while to notice it. In the first place, if fraud had been designed, it would have been necessary to increase the exports from this country to the United States, because the comparison made relates to the value of our fisheries to the Americans. If you lessen the quantity of fish exported from this country to the United States, you injure our case. If, on the other hand, you increase the exports from the United States to Canada, you lessen our claim, and benefit the case of the United States. The reduction of our mackerel exports would, therefore, injure the Canadian case. One of the charges is that furs and skins have been added to the quantity of fishery exports from the United States to Canada, as of "furs and skins of marine animals." Well, anything added to increase the exports from that country to Canada operates against us. The effect of the whole of Hind's argument is that errors have been committed by us, which, on examination, would really injure us. He says:

"In the Customs Returns for 1874, in the items 'furs, skins and tails, undressed,'—a terrestrial item—amounting to \$110,258, is changed to 'furs and skins of marine animals,' and introduced as such into the alleged average imports of fish and fish products from the United States."

Well, the effect of that action on our part would have been injurious to our argument. Among the first of his charges we have statements that go to increase the exports from the United States to this country, and which would benefit the case of the Republic. He says:

"In framing the averages of exports of Canada to the United States during the duty period, 1867 to 1873, the compiler lessened the official record of exports from Prince Edward Island to the United States, and increased the official record of exports to other countries. In some cases this alteration of records of Government was made to a very large extent."

He goes on:

"The effects of these various artifices in framing the averages of imports from the United States during different fiscal periods, is to lessen enormously the apparent value of Canadian importations of fish and fish products from the United States during the duty period, and to increase enormously the apparent imports of fish and fish products from the United States during the free period, or since the working of the Washington Treaty."

He says further:

"First.—During the duty period, from 1867 to 1873, the items, oysters, (excepting the year 1873) whale oil, lobsters, preserved fish, furs and skins of marine animals, etc., are omitted—but in framing the averages from 1874 to 1877, all these items are introduced.

"Second.—In the Customs' Returns for 1874, the item 'furs, skins and tails, undressed'—a terrestrial item—amounting to \$110,258, is changed to 'furs and skins of marine animals,' and introduced as such into the alleged average imports of fish and fish products from the United States.

"Third.—The prices and quantities of imports of fish and products of fish from the United States, as stated in the Customs' Returns from 1874 to 1877, are in many instances absurdly high and enormously large, suggesting false entries.