

that he was unaware of the existence of these three affidavits. It seems to me utterly incredible that a letter of Mr. Bayard to Sir Sackville West should have escaped the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. If it did escape his attention, all I can say is that his mode of conducting the business of his department is most extraordinary and unprecedented. If he did read that letter, he knew the existence of those three affidavits, and I think, in view of the existence of that letter, the hon. gentleman's explanation is very extraordinary indeed. Now, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Justice, who must also have seen this letter, whether our collector did or did not prepare a written statement, as this Capt. Rose alleges, and did submit it to this man to be sworn to. I think, after what Mr. Bayard stated, enquiry ought to be made into that matter.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not see why the hon. gentleman should ask me. He is not an officer of my department, and I have nothing to do with the matter. But what I know is that the second affidavit of Capt. Rose, in which he states that he was well treated, was fully corroborated, not only by the officer himself, but by others as well.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think enquiry should be made as to whether our officer submitted the affidavit to this American captain to swear to it. I think that ought to be done in a matter which was of sufficient importance to be noticed in a letter from the Secretary of State to the British ambassador. The whole circumstances are simply remarkable.

An hon. MEMBER. Fishy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, fishy in the extreme.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is one extraordinary statement made by the Minister of Justice. He attempts to discredit the statement of Capt. Rose by the allegation, but the second affidavit is against the statement in the first one; but when the third affidavit was made, contradicting the one made before, that ought to prove the man unworthy of belief. But the hon. gentleman fails to notice this fact: that the man swears that he made the second affidavit under fear that his vessel would be seized, and that he would be placed in the power of the officers of a British port. The hon. gentleman also fails to notice that the third affidavit is sustained by the statement of another party to the transaction. My hon. friend shakes his head, I presume to signify that I am stating something that is incorrect.

Mr. THOMPSON. If you will allow me, I will state what I mean. I explained, when on my feet before, that what had been spoken of as the corroboration of the affidavit was merely a corroboration of the fact that this man had stated to the collector that his former statement was untrue, but there was no corroboration of his allegations of fact. It is a mere corroboration by a witness who was present when Capt. Rose said to the collector, "My former statement is untrue;" and I call the attention of the committee to the fact that he did not swear that the affidavit was untrue, but simply said so to the collector.

Mr. MITCHELL. He did swear that it was not true, as I understand. In addition to that, Mr. Augustus Rogers swore:

"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 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.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

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

"AARON PARSONS,

"Notary Public.

"August 3, 1887."

How can the Minister say that it was not sworn to? Both of them distinctly contradict the statements made in the second affidavit, and Mr. Augustus Rogers confirms the statement of Medeo Rose that he did it from fear of arrest. The thing is as plain as can be, and I am surprised that a statement should be put before the House by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and confirmed by the Minister of Justice to the contrary. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries says he did not know of the existence of these papers.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then that makes the matter worse. If he did, he ought to have told it to the House. The Minister of Justice listened to the statement made by him, and he sat still, and allowed the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to mislead this House by the statement that Medeo Rose had contradicted the previous affidavit he had made. The thing is outrageous.

Mr. THOMPSON. All I can say in conclusion is that there is not one word in the statement of Augustus Rogers which is inconsistent with the second affidavit of Medeo Rose. He simply states that he was present when Capt. Rose made certain statements. The hon. gentleman perhaps knows how carefully devised some of these affidavits are drawn with the view of representing a certain state of facts, when they do not entail the penalties of perjury upon the person who makes them. Here is the second affidavit distinctly recalling the charges made in the first, and the third affidavit, in which he beats all around the compass, and does not say as a matter of fact that the statements he made in the second affidavit are untrue at all. But the person who drew the affidavit, and I venture to say it was not Medeo Rose, is very careful indeed to insert all kinds of statements that he had contradicted it, and eliminate altogether the statements contradicting it in the affidavit which was sworn to.

Mr. MITCHELL. I look on the explanation of the Minister of Justice as hair-splitting. It is a nice piece of special pleading, and, from his well-known ability in that line, I can understand how he could mislead this House by such special pleading. He says there is no sworn statement that Captain Rose's second affidavit was false. I will read again what Capt. Rose said:

"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."

Mr. THOMPSON. He said so, but does not swear to it.

Mr. MITCHELL.—

"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 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