

ment a few minutes ago, of the subsequent affidavit of Medeo Rose ?

Mr. EDGAR. In the same book, on the opposite page.

Mr. FOSTER. The only book was this, Senate documents, No. 113; and I read Medeo Rose's affidavit as given in that book, which flatly contradicted his first affidavit. I did not know what was in the book. I do not know the book yet.

Mr. EDGAR. It is on page 111 from which the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) read, only the affidavit the hon. gentleman read was dated 29th April and the other was dated 3rd August.

Mr. FOSTER. I see it exactly. I did not know it was in the book.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. FOSTER. I knew there were other statements in regard to Medeo Rose. I have sent to the department for them, and I will have them all here in a few minutes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. We have them.

Mr. LAURIER. Are there others?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, there is still a sequel.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Then you knew it.

Mr. FOSTER. With the permission of the House I will read the sequel when I receive it.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is in the tightest place he ever found himself in his life.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CASEY. I take that back. I have no doubt, from our experience of the hon. gentleman in this House, that he has been in a great many tight places in his life, and he may have been in a tighter place than this. One thing, however, is certain: that he concealed facts which he knew, and that he was aware of an affidavit made by this Captain Rose subsequently, the one he read to the House. To-day he brought this affidavit forward as a surprise, as he thought we had not the documents from which he was quoting, and which he took care that we did not possess, by his aid at least, and which contained the subsequent affidavit to the one he quoted, stating that the second affidavit, the affidavit which the Minister read, had been extracted from him, Capt. Rose, by pressure exercised upon him by the officers of the customs of Canada, that he had been terrorised into giving that former affidavit to clear the Dominion Government, and to clear the hon. Minister, from accusations that might be brought against them. Then the Minister tells us that although this affidavit was on the opposite page to the affidavit he read, he did not know anything about it. One of two things is true: either he misled the House as to his knowledge of the subsequent affidavit, or he had not the common gumption or sense to look upon the opposite page to see whether there was something bearing on the case. He must confess to either ignorance or to misleading the House, and I do not know which is most damaging to an hon. gentleman occupying his position, and I think a confession of ignorance is about as damaging as anything. I do not accuse him of these charges. I only state with what he must accuse himself, if he is to escape the accusation of telling the House an untruth—he must accuse himself of gross ignorance in matters connected with his own department. Now he tells us there is something else. When he sat down he hinted in a mysterious manner that there was something else to be produced, some sequel. What is the card he has got under the table—has he got anything up his sleeve?

Mr. MITCHELL.

He has said that there is something else; and if there is something else, now is the time to tell it to the House. But apart from the utter humiliation of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, which has resulted from this short debate, and I cannot call by any other name a confession of ignorance or falsehood on the part of an hon. gentleman in the position of the Minister, there is something else that requires to be noticed. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has pointed out the inconsistency between the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice said some time ago, before the negotiations, that the privileges granted under this clause we are discussing, would utterly destroy our control of the inshore fisheries, and if they were granted we would not be able to prevent the United States fishermen from using them as they pleased. I believe the Minister of Justice is right, and I must confess he very generally is in a technical matter. But the Minister of Finance has taken the other line. He agreed to the clause as it now stands. And the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) asked for an explanation of the different views held by the hon. gentleman, and the Minister of Finance gave him an answer. And what was the answer? He said "carried." We all know the Minister of Finance is the controlling power in the Cabinet, that he has been working for and has attained to that position, but still under the circumstances we think the Minister of Justice ought to have received more consideration from his superior, from the virtual leader of the Cabinet, than was given to him and the rest of the Cabinet by simply uttering that word "carried." It was as much as to say: I have been to Washington and have agreed to this provision; it is none of your business whether it surrenders the inshore fisheries or not—I say "carried." This is the only argument the hon. gentleman advanced in regard to the question. It is cavalier treatment of the Minister of Justice and the rest of the Cabinet and of his venerable chief, to put the matter in that shape. It is due to the House and to his chief and the junior members of the Cabinet, that he should give some explanation as to how he reconciled the memorandum of the Minister of Justice with this clause of the treaty to which he has agreed. He must take one of two positions: either the Minister of Justice was wrong in his statement that the granting of those privileges to American craft would destroy our control of the inshore fisheries, or, if they would be destroyed, the hon. gentleman should state the reasons why it was necessary that we should grant those privileges. It is for him to speak now. "Carried" is not a sufficient argument in a matter of this national importance. It is for him to speak and explain why he said "carried," and why he sits on the Minister of Justice in the way he has done.

Mr. THOMPSON. I wish to say a few words, but not at all in the way of removing the imputation which the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Casey) has made, for I do not feel in the least sat upon. I do not admit for a single moment that the privileges I objected to as being likely to be injurious to our fishing interests, are conceded by this treaty or by the Bill now before the House without qualifications and without safeguards which will remove the objections I foresaw. I do not see how hon. gentlemen have made so much out of those affidavits of Medeo Rose. Let me call attention to what those affidavits are. I am sure that if they read them again they will hardly find a case on which to make an attack on the Government or the department for maladministration, or too severe an administration of the custom or fishery laws. In the first place the gentlemen opposite who are opposing this treaty with great vigor this afternoon, rely on the *ex parte* statements of a man who has made at least three conflicting affidavits which have been already before the House, and who has also made a fourth affidavit, which, we understand, is contradictory to the other