

did so, and I again told him that it was wrong and that my first statement was true."

This statement was sworn to by Mr. Aaron Parsons. This is Capt. Rose's statement:

"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 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."

Yet the hon. the Minister of Customs tells us that Capt. Medeo Rose did not, in this affidavit, declare his statement was untrue. I will read the words again: "I told him it was wrong, and that my first statement was true." The captain signed to the truth of this last statement, and is sustained by Mr. Augustus Rogers in the most complete manner possible, as I have already shown. Mr. Rogers made the following affidavit:—

"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 13th day of April last, and also on the 3rd June. I heard his conversation with Collector Atwood on both occasions, and I hereby certify that the statements of those interviews, as made above, are correct and true.

"AUGUSTUS ROGERS."

What better evidence can be adduced. True, the hon. gentleman has chosen to assail the testimony of Capt. Rose because he made the second affidavit, although that affidavit was made under fear of arrest and seizure of his vessel, but the moment the captain had made his second affidavit he found out his mistake and at once tried to recall it, and his final statement is confirmed by the evidence and affidavit of Mr. Rogers, who was present the whole time, and swore to the truth of the captain's declaration and to the truth of the facts as stated in his first affidavit.

Mr. McNEILL. Where was that affidavit drawn up?

Mr. MITCHELL. At Essex, county of Massachusetts.

Mr. McNEILL. I should think we all have heard of hair-splitting Yankee lawyers.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. the Minister of Justice has a strong imagination. He has imagined a host of lawyers advising this Capt. Rose, who has been giving them so much trouble and drawing his affidavit so carefully that he might get out of it, no matter whether he was swearing to a lie or not. But it appears from the papers that it was not Capt. Rose who was advised by the lawyers, but the collector of Shelburne, for he told Capt. Rose that his lawyers had advised him about the matter. It was the affidavit which Collector Atwood coerced Capt. Rose into signing, that was drawn by the lawyers for that particular purpose. That was the affidavit which the Government, through their officer, coerced this man into signing, and which he afterwards, when free from that coercion, declared under oath to be untrue. That was the affidavit drawn by the lawyers, and it appears that Capt. Rose, when he signed it, did not know exactly what he was swearing to. There is no need to read over the documents again, for it has been clearly proved that Capt. Rose made a declaration in the second place under coercion, and I submit it was forced from him with the approval of the Government, because these facts have been known to them for some time, and they have not yet dismissed Collector Atwood. This captain was coerced into swearing to

a lie in order to get the Government out of a scrape. The affidavit was a lying one, drawn out by the lawyers, and not the spontaneous affidavit of Capt. Rose before other parties. But there is one point outside of that which has not yet been explained, and to which I merely wish to call attention again without dwelling on it at all. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has not yet explained—I do not know whether he can or not—the reasons of his ignorance of the affidavit which is on the page opposite to the one he read. How it was that he knew of the existence of the lying affidavit, the bull-dozed affidavit which sustained his case, and in regard to which this Government are responsible, because they have maintained in office the man who forced that affidavit on Capt. Rose—how it was he knew about that and did not know about the subsequent free, spontaneous, and amply corroborated affidavit, he has not explained. I say the subsequent affidavit was amply corroborated, because Augustus Rogers, who was present on both occasions—who was present when the collector terrorised Capt. Rose into making the false affidavit, and who was present on the subsequent occasion—certifies to its truth. The hon. gentleman may take whichever horn of the dilemma he chooses. He may admit he was ignorant of the subsequent affidavit, and, therefore, unfit to be where he is and to have taken part in the conference at Washington, or he may admit that he knew of its existence and concealed it from the House by speaking as if no such thing were in existence. I do not know which horn of the dilemma would be more discreditable to him as a Minister of the Crown.

On section 7,

Mr. JONES (Halifax). When this Bill was under discussion on a previous occasion, I took the opportunity to draw the attention of the House to the concessions made to the American fishermen under this and the previous clause, showing, according to my judgment, that we had, under these clauses, yielded up the whole value of our fishing privileges and had obtained nothing whatever in return. I maintain that the use of our ports for the purpose of securing bait and supplies and the transshipment of cargoes is a privilege of unestimable value, so far as the American fishermen are concerned, and that the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Finance, and the other hon. gentlemen who spoke on that side, have not been able to show a single advantage gained by the Canadian fishermen on our side. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, pointed to several articles in various newspapers, showing the advantages of the treaty from our point of view. Now, I hold in my hand the *New York Herald* of Sunday last, in which an interview is reported with Mr. Phelan, the Consul General of the United States in Halifax.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps my hon. friend was not in the House when the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) read every word of that interview, so that it is already in *Hansard*.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The interview he read was in the *Montreal Herald*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think not. Was my hon. friend in the House when my hon. friend for Northumberland read that interview?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I was.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then perhaps this is a different one altogether.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Yes.

"The advantages of the treaty," Mr. Phelan replied, are manifold. Among other things it opens up valuable fishing bays to us by removing all doubts as to our right to fish in them. This in itself is no small matter, inasmuch as Canadians had pre-