

that he concluded, as the breeze was fair, not to wait. He then concluded :

"That is the second affidavit made by Medeo Rose."

Mr. MITCHELL. Does that statement contradict his statements? No, it does not. His affidavit is specific. He does not bring any complaint against the collector; he does not say that he was received harshly by the collector; he simply says that inasmuch as the collector refused to allow him the privilege of purchasing these things, the treatment of the Government was harsh. That was the meaning of his affidavit, not that the collector behaved ungentlemanly to him, but that the policy of the Government was harsh. That was Medeo Rose's statement of 13th October, 1886. Any later affidavit I have not been able to find in this book, and I have looked it over carefully. It may be here, but I can find no affidavit containing the statement the hon. gentleman has read. If the hon. gentleman has any additional papers connected with the fishery question, he should have laid them before the House in order that the House might be charged with the whole case as it appears to the country and as it appears to the American Government, and to our own Government at this moment. Medeo Rose's statement is quite clear :

"I stated to him my situation, short of provisions, and a voyage of 250 miles before me, and pleaded with him for this slight privilege, but it was of no avail. I then visited the American consul and asked his assistance and found him powerless to aid me in the matter. The collector of customs held my papers until the next morning, although I asked for them as soon as I found I could not buy any provisions, say 1½ hours after I entered, but he refused to give them to me until the next morning. \* \* \* I think the treatment I received harsh and cruel, driving myself and crew to sea with a scant supply of provisions, we having but a little flour and water and liable to be buffeted for days before we came home."

That is sworn to in 1886.

Mr. EDGAR. I am perfectly willing to accept the statement which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has read, though I have never seen it, as the subsequent affidavit on this point by Capt. Rose; because the statement, as he has read it, corresponds with the statement of the collector of customs which I read last night, and on which I founded this charge, and not on the original statement of Capt. Rose, which, however, was substantially correct. I made the charge, not of having been refused his papers, but of having been refused by the collector at the port, the right to buy seven pounds of sugar, three pounds of coffee, and so on, and that until they could hear from the headquarters at Ottawa by telegram, this man could not purchase even those little supplies; and I contend that was a harsh and unfriendly treatment of this captain. The collector's own statement, published in defence of himself, was as follows :—

"I gave him permission to fill water at once; but as the treaty made no provisions for the purchase of supplies, I would telegraph the department at Ottawa and no doubt it would be allowed. Capt. Rose expressed his willingness to remain until reply was received. He called at the office next morning (Thursday) at 6:30, and finding I had not received a reply, said, as the wind was fair and a good breeze, he would not wait longer."

That is what I stated last night. I did not charge that the parties acted contrary to the treaty, but I charge that the interpretation of the treaty was harsh and unfair. As the Minister of Finance stated :

"It is one thing to hold a technical construction, and it is another to undertake to enforce it."

I say that they did hold an extremely technical construction of the treaty, and they undertook not only to enforce it, but they did enforce it.

Mr. LAURIER. We have had so far two affidavits from Medeo Rose, but there is a third one which the Minister has not alluded to. The hon. gentleman will find it on page 111 of the book from which he quoted :

"I, Medeo Rose, of Gloucester, being under oath, do depose and say, that I was master of the schooner *Laura Sayward* during the year 1886, and that I am now master of the schooner *Gleaner*, of Gloucester.

"On April 18, 1887, I went into the lower harbor of Shelburne, Nova Scotia, in said schooner *Gleaner*, for shelter and water.

"On the morning of April 19, Mr. Atwood, the collector of customs, with two men wearing badges, which I supposed were Government badges, came on board. Their appearance filled me with fear, for I felt some trouble must be in store for me when Collector Atwood would leave his office and come so far (about 4 miles) to board my vessel. I invited him into the cabin, where he showed me a copy of my statement of October 13, 1886, in regard to the treatment I received from him when in schooner *Laura Sayward* (October 5, 1886), and asked me if I made that statement. I told him I did. Well, said he, everything in that statement is false. I told him my statement was true. He then produced a prepared written statement, which he read to me, which stated that my statement of October 13 was untrue, and told me that I must go on shore and sign it. Being nervous and frightened, and fearing trouble if I refused, I went on shore with him, to the store of Mr. Purney, and before Mr. Purney signed and swore to the statement.

"On the afternoon of the same day, realising the wrong I had done, I hired a team, and with one of my crew (Augustus Rogers), went to the custom-house and asked Collector Atwood to read to me the statement I had signed. He did so, and I again told him it was wrong and that my first statement was true.

"He said I did not ask for all the articles mentioned in my first statement; that he did not refuse me my papers, and also that that statement might be the cause of his removal from his office. I told him I did not want to injure him, and I did not want to make myself out a liar at Washington.

"About the 3rd day of June last I went into Shelburne again solely to get a copy of the last statement. I went to the custom house, taking the same man (Augustus Rogers) with me, and asked Collector Atwood for a copy of the statement.

"He refused to give it to me, and said my lawyers had been advising me what to do and that I need never expect a favor from him.

"The above is a true statement of the case. The statement obtained from me by Collector Atwood was obtained through my fear of seizure if I refused.

"MEDEO ROSE."

I find this affidavit is accompanied by another from Augustus Rogers :

"I, Augustus Rogers, one of the crew of schooner *Gleaner*, being duly sworn, do depose and say, that I went with Capt. Medeo Rose to the custom house at Shelburne, Nova Scotia, on the 19th day of April last, and also on the 3rd day of June. I heard his conversation with Collector Atwood on both occasions, and hereby certify that the statements of those interviews, as made above, are correct and true.

"AUGUSTUS ROGERS."

"MASS., ESSEX, s. s. :

"Personally appeared Medeo Rose and Augustus Rogers, and made oath to the truth of the above statements before me.

[Seal.]

"AARON PARSONS,

"Notary Public.

August 3, 1887.

So the case is far worse than was stated by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar).

Mr. MITCHELL. I desire to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if, when he read the statement of Medeo Rose, he was aware of the second communication being in the book? If he was aware of it, and read the other statement alone, without communicating the whole matter, he was concealing from this House an important fact and was misleading the House. I am not saying he was doing that; but I ask him, was he aware when he read the state-