**CIHM
Microfiche
Series
(Monographs)**

**ICMH
Collection de
microfiches
(monographies)**

Canadian Institute for Historical Microreproductions / Institut canadien de microreproductions historiques

© 1998

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming are checked below.

- ☐ Coloured covers / Couverture de couleur
- ☐ Covers damaged / Couverture endommagée
- ☐ Covers restored and/or laminated / Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- ☐ Cover title missing / Le titre de couverture manque
- ☐ Coloured maps / Cartes géographiques en couleur
- ☐ Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black) / Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- ☐ Coloured plates and/or illustrations / Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- ☐ Bound with other material / Relié avec d'autres documents
- ☐ Only edition available / Seule édition disponible
- ☐ Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin / La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure.
- ☐ Blank leaves added during restorations may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming / Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.
- ☐ Additional comments / Commentaires supplémentaires:

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- ☐ Coloured pages / Pages de couleur
- ☐ Pages damaged / Pages endommagées
- ☐ Pages restored and/or laminated / Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- ☒ Pages discoloured, stained or foxed / Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- ☐ Pages detached / Pages détachées
- ☒ Showthrough / Transparence
- ☒ Quality of print varies / Qualité inégale de l'impression
- ☐ Includes supplementary material / Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
- ☐ Pages wholly or partially obscured by errata slips, tissues, etc., have been refilmed to ensure the best possible image / Les pages totalement ou partiellement obscurcies par un feuillet d'errata, une pelure, etc., ont été filmées à nouveau de façon à obtenir la meilleure image possible.
- ☐ Opposing pages with varying colouration or discolourations are filmed twice to ensure the best possible image / Les pages s'opposant ayant des colorations variables ou des décolorations sont filmées deux fois afin d'obtenir la meilleure image possible.

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below /
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10x		14x		18x		22x		26x		30x	
								☒			
	12x		16x		20x		24x		28x		32x

The copy filmed here has been reproduced thanks to the generosity of:

Library of the National
Archives of Canada

The images appearing here are the best quality possible considering the condition and legibility of the original copy and in keeping with the filming contract specifications.

Original copies in printed paper covers are filmed beginning with the front cover and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression, or the back cover when appropriate. All other original copies are filmed beginning on the first page with a printed or illustrated impression, and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression.

The last recorded frame on each microfiche sheet contains the symbol $\rightarrow$ (meaning "CONTINUED"), or the symbol ∇ (meaning "END"), whichever applies.

Maps, plates, charts, etc., may be filmed at different reduction ratios. Those too large to be entirely included in one exposure are filmed beginning in the upper left hand corner, left to right and top to bottom, as many frames as required. The following diagrams illustrate the method:

L'exemplaire filmé fut reproduit grâce à la générosité de:

La bibliothèque des Archives
nationales du Canada

Les images suivantes ont été reproduites avec le plus grand soin, compte tenu de la condition et de la netteté de l'exemplaire filmé, et en conformité avec les conditions du contrat de filmage.

Les exemplaires originaux dont la couverture en papier est imprimée sont filmés en commençant par le premier plat et en terminant soit par la dernière page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration, soit par le second plat, selon le cas. Tous les autres exemplaires originaux sont filmés en commençant par la première page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration et en terminant par la dernière page qui comporte une telle empreinte.

Un des symboles suivants apparaîtra sur la dernière image de chaque microfiche, selon le cas: le symbole $\rightarrow$ signifie "A SUIVRE", le symbole ∇ signifie "FIN".

Les cartes, planches, tableaux, etc., peuvent être filmés à des taux de réduction différents. Lorsque le document est trop grand pour être reproduit en un seul cliché, il est filmé à partir de l'angle supérieur gauche, de gauche à droite, et de haut en bas, en prenant le nombre d'images nécessaire. Les diagrammes suivants illustrent la méthode.

LT. COL. C. E. KAULBACH, M.P.
Lunenburg, N.S.

**Speeches of the Member
for Lunenburg County—
Delivered in the House
of Commons During the
Session of 1904.**

SPEECHES
OF
C. E. KAULBACH, M.P.
HOUSE OF COMMONS,
1904

TARIFF ON SHIPS' CABLES.
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC CONTRACT.
NEWFOUNDLAND FISHERIES.
THE DOG-FISH PEST AND REMEDY.
BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN.
ON THE PROHIBITION OF CIGARETTES.
THE CANADIAN FLAG.

**MR. KAULBACH ASKS THAT CABLES FOR FISHING VESSELS
BE ADMITTED DUTY FREE.**

House of Commons, April 22nd, 1904.

THE TARIFF AND SHIPS' CABLES.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the hon. the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) for a few moments to a matter respecting the customs tariffs which materially interests the fishermen of the maritime provinces. I observe that by tariff item 542, ships' cables are admitted free of duty, whilst fishermen's ships' cables are charged 25 per cent. The fishermen are a class who contribute very largely to the revenue of the country. They are a class who should be looked after very carefully. The farmer is cared for to the greatest possible extent, and his binder twine is admitted free. I do not see why ships' cables for fishing purposes should not be admitted free as well. I wish to ask the minister if he will kindly give this matter his attention and view it as favorably as he can in the interests of the fishermen. I would also ask that the hon. minister consider this matter carefully and give the benefit they desire at as early a date as possible, as many new vessels are being built this year and it would be a great advantage to the fishermen if their ships' hawsers for fishing purposes were admitted free of duty as ships' cables are. I cannot see why the difference should exist.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC CONTRACT.

Mr. Kaulbach opposes the construction of this Railway as a gift by the Government to the Grand Trunk Railway, claiming that it should be built, owned and operated by the People.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH (Lunenburg). Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention at the commencement of this debate this session, to have offered a word of comment as respects the agreement between the government of Canada and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, as to its merits, if it has any, or its demerits, for the reason that I had

spoken at some length, on the subject last session, and had given no less than fifteen reasons for opposing the contract. But considering the changed condition of the agreement between the government and the company, and the concessions that have been accorded the company to the detriment of Canada, I feel I would not be doing justice to the honest electorate of the county whom I have the honor to represent, were I not to express my views here and now, on a project such as this, to my mind so suicidal to the best interests of Canada as a whole, and to Nova Scotia, the province whence I come, more particularly, which is entitled to some benefit at least, by the construction of this proposed road. But will she get it if the government intend only carrying the road as far as Moncton, 186 miles short of Halifax? Certainly not. It will not be an ocean to ocean road, and Halifax will be handicapped by being deprived of the traffic and as a result left in the cold. Halifax with its magnificent harbour, well lighted, easy of approach, well fortified, geographically offering the nearest approach to the old world, with its terminal facilities, its advantages as a coaling station, is the most important point and station on the western Atlantic. I may ask, why should Halifax be then overlooked and Nova Scotia's rights be ignored?

I may be told that Nova Scotia still has the Intercolonial Railway for all her purposes, which may be true so far as it goes; but what earthly benefit would it be to Nova Scotia if it is to be handicapped, paralleled and paralyzed by the Grand Trunk Pacific? The chief traffic it had hitherto been receiving, will be diverted by means of the arteries or branches of the Grand Trunk Company to its well equipped terminal points, Portland, in particular, in the United States, upon which it is said that company has spent upwards of \$20,000,000 in improving facilities; or if not sent to Portland, it can reach Boston; or by the Erie Canal, upon which \$100,000,000 are about being expended to meet anticipated trade, it would be taken to New York.

When I consider the unfortunate position Canada will be placed in by such an agreement or contract, and the baneful effect upon Canada if carried into execution, of the building, for a foreign corporation, a railway, fully equipped, at a cost of upwards of \$150,000,000, and when completed to be handed over to a company of aliens for a term of fifty years, during ten of which they will not have to pay interest, and by which time all the rolling stock, and probable the rails, will be worn out and worthless, I feel the whole transaction is sad to contemplate. But considering that the Intercolonial is to be paralleled and paralyzed by this proposed Grand Trunk Pacific, and left in the cold, and Nova Scotia as well, without one solitary benefit, I feel constrained to use words strongly emphasized to express my feeling of indignation. But kind words, we are taught, are more effective and productive of better and more satisfactory results, they being the music of the world. Consequently I will use them instead. It is said that kind words have a power which seems to be beyond natural causes, as if they were some angel's song, which had lost its way and come to earth. I feel that words like these may touch a tender chord—a key-note—in the heart of my right hon. friend the leader of the government, and his supporters opposite as respects the effect of their conduct, and if such words will strike him like an angel's voice bringing good tidings, it is to be feared he may still change his mind, and so modify the character of the agreement with such safeguards as to make it acceptable to all, or, better still, accept the alternative proposition of extending the Intercolonial from Montreal to the grain fields of the west, which would cause the Intercolonial to be at once a good paying property, and prevent the exports of our Canadian Northwest being diverted over American railways to American seaports.

I feel that this Grand Trunk Pacific road, if built, will be a millstone about our necks, depriving us of other public works of a more important nature, as the immense interest on the capital we will have to borrow will exhaust our revenue and deprive us of other public works more greatly needed. I applied for a railway in my county—Lunenburg—to extend from the junction of the Caledonia Railway at New Germany station, making it a prolongation of that road to Foster Settlement and New Ross; and from New Ross to extend down the valley of the Gold river till it intersects the Halifax and South-western at or near Chester Basin. I have also applied for another railway from Lunenburg, the terminus of the Central Railway, to Park Creek, on the east side of the La Have river and places adjacent thereto, such as

Ritey's Cove or Riverport, with a steam ferry to cross the river to connect with Dublin shore, important points, where an immense trade is being carried on, but which, up to the present, have been completely overlooked so far as railway accommodation is concerned. I hope for appropriations for other public works, such as the dredging of Lunenburg harbour, La Have river and Mahone bay, the completion of the breakwater at Petite Riviere, repairs of the breakwater at the narrows of Martin's river, a bell buoy to be placed at or near Eastern Point Reef, a public building for customs, post office, &c., at Bridge-water, now becoming a railway centre and an important place, last, but not least, a breakwater at Mill Cove, St. Margaret's Bay, protection of boats and other property of the fishermen of that place, all of which can be brought about in one year without any difficulty, for the county is entitled to these works.

But I may be told the Grand Trunk Pacific is our first consideration. Why not adopt the alternative proposition of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), that is to extend, as I have stated, the Intercolonial west from Montreal by acquiring the Canada Atlantic Railway 312 miles to Detroit Harbour, on the east shore of Georgian Bay, and utilize the water stretches of said bay, Sault Ste. Marie canal and Lake Superior to Port William or Port Arthur and by the Canadian Pacific Railway to Winnipeg; acquire or construct boats such as are now in use doing excellent work, and profitable, with capacity to carry 27,000 bushels of wheat, equal to 275 earloads at a time, which would make transportation to the east complete in the summer season or when navigation is open; appropriate the railway from Scotia Junction to Sudbury, and nationalize it; also appropriate the railway from Sudbury to Port Arthur, improving the gradients and curvatures, and also nationalize it; also appropriate and nationalize the railway from Port Arthur to Winnipeg, and double track it. By this method we can have a splendid system of transportation from west to east, over an all-Canadian route, to Canadian seaports, and with no diversion to American ports.

This would assure us success, and government ownership, and government regulation of tariff rates, the Intercolonial can be made a good paying property, and exceedingly beneficial to the general trade and interests of Canada. The Intercolonial will then be, in all verity, the people's road, owned and operated by them. By this means Halifax and St. John will become the entrepot of trade and traffic from the west, and the chief depots for all imports from the east across the Atlantic, making each city to grow and prosper, and giving employment to thousands of hands, now struggling for a living. By this means will find an improved market for their products, having the additional mouths to supply and by which they can have improved prices, as the improved amount of shipping visiting these ports and wanting supplies will increase the demand. Farmers, mechanics, artisans and fishermen, all will be benefited, particularly the fishermen, as we by this means will have our own Intercolonial Railway direct from Halifax to the west, by which we can ship our fish in cold storage to the west and obtain our supply of flour for the east. There will thus be no empty cars running to the west from the east, for by the increased imports, together with our fish transportation to the west, we can have a continuous trade either way, and counteract the trade to and from Portland, Boston and New York channels hitherto supplying our Canadian west to our great discomfort and injury.

I am the more greatly impressed with the desirability of extending the Intercolonial from Montreal to Winnipeg, for by it, as compared with the government scheme, we save 461 miles, the distance from Moncton, N.B., to Winnipeg being 1,875 miles, whilst from Montreal to Winnipeg it is only 1,414, making a saving in cost to the country in construction of about \$20,000,000 in the eastern section alone. As to the western section, that is west of Winnipeg, I say extend it, but certainly not to Port Simpson, as it is only a gunshot from the Alaskan boundary, which means considerable and more than I at present desire to express.

The original agreement between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific, introduced last session, was to my mind very objectionable, and one on which I expressed my views in a speech to the House; but the concession accorded to the company since, giving time for the completion of the road till December 1, 1911, without a clause requiring work of construction to commence simultaneously at

both ends till all is completed and without a restrictive clause requiring Canadian traffic to be routed to Canadian seaports over this line, and Canadian labour to be employed instead of alien, on construction when obtainable, is certainly not in the interest of Canada. What is to prevent this company—the Grand Trunk with all its facilities for shipment at Portland, costing it for such improvements upwards of \$20,000,000, and with all its railway connections with Portland—what is there to prevent it diverting every portion of its traffic, on reaching Winnipeg, via Pembina branch to Emerson, or St. Vincent, and thence to Duluth, St. Paul, Minneapolis, Chicago, or other cities in the United States? Or, when reaching North Bay, diverting the traffic over its system of railways to Buffalo and thence to the seaports of Portland and Boston, or by the Erie canal upon which has been expended some \$100,000,000, to the port of New York? Is there anything in the way to prevent this diversion of traffic? Not any. Then I ask is it fair for us as Canadians to spend a mint of money in this project to build up American cities, seaports and towns to the sacrifice of Canada? I for one protest against it.

It was said by some of the members of the government that the cost to Canada for this project would only be \$1,000,000 and some of the supporters on the other side went so far as to state to this House that it would not cost to the people of Canada one dollar whilst the president of the Grand Trunk, Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson, to his shareholders made the statement, that the liability of the company was only \$15,000,000. Now I will not ask you, the members of this House, and the honest electorate of the country which is correct, but I will place the facts and figures before you and allow you to judge for yourselves. The length of this railway is supposed to be in the neighborhood of 3,200 miles. Under this agreement the government is to build 1,200 miles (the eastern section). I am putting it in round figures, and guarantees three fourths of the cost of the remainder, 1,500 miles, the Grand Trunk being liable for only one fourth. This problem is a simple one which any one can solve. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) very modestly placed the cost of this road to the people of Canada at from \$150,000,000 to \$175,000,000 and a reasonable mind will view it as correct.

I approve of government ownership of railways, to control rates, and avoid combines, and in this case I feel I am voicing not only our honoured and respected leader (Mr. Borden) but the voice and sentiment of the people of Canada, who are free from party bias and willing to decide in the best interests of Canada. I say this is a view which all should accept as being feasible and patriotic, and have the Intercolonial—Canada's highway—built for and by the people of Canada—extended from Montreal into the grain fields of the west, and owned and operated as Canada's national highway, used by and in the interest of the people of Canada for the transmission of passengers and freight between the rich grain fields of the west, and the Canadian seaports in the east, over Canadian railways.

The Intercolonial Railway has cost the people of Canada \$70,000,000, and when extended into Montreal, the Grand Trunk Railway Company, from whom the government purchased a portion of the road between Levis and Montreal, agreed that the Intercolonial was to have a portion of the traffic routed to the Grand Trunk Railway in Montreal.

If they failed to keep faith with the government and people of Canada in the instance referred to, have we any better reason to believe they will keep faith with Canada, as regards the contract, in routing freight over Canadian territory to Canadian seaports? I say they will simply do as they please, and so will suit their best interest, which will be to carry all to their own seaport—Portland. It certainly is a humiliating position for Canadians to be placed in, and I certainly must request that the government drop all negotiations with the Grand Trunk and Grand Trunk Pacific, and extend the Intercolonial to the grain fields of the west, and thereby retain the interest and future welfare of Canada in our own hands. I say we should stand pledged to the prolongation of our own national highway—the Intercolonial, and not allow ourselves to be taxed for building railway, and then hand it over to a foreign company. We should emulate and in every possible way encourage transportation within our own domains, which we cannot accomplish in any better manner than by extending our own national highway—the Intercolonial—not only by sending it to the gateway of

the Dominion, Winnipeg, but beyond it, and right into the golden grain fields or garden, where we may gather the fruit, and transfer it direct to our own eastern seaports for transportation across the Atlantic to our parent home, England. Better still that we may gather the wheat into our granaries at Halifax and other Canadian seaports for manufacture into flour, to keep the labour in our own country, and transmit the finished articles across the Atlantic to the markets of the east. We could then see Canada bloom and blossom as a rose. Proud and delighted should we be, occupying a country such as this Canada of ours, stretching from ocean to ocean, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, abounding in natural resources, the prospective home for millions of people.

Our climate is such as to produce and stimulate the strongest type of ripe young manhood and womanhood, physically, mentally, intellectually and morally. Our resources invite the highest inventive skill, and the very best and most earnest effort to develop them. Canada has attained a prominent place among the nations of the earth, morally and socially, in science, in arts, in literature, in commerce, in fisheries, in farming, in manufacturing, in navigation and many other matters pertaining to the interest of Canada. Our sons are the bravest of the brave, a proof of which, their conduct and their skill in the arts and tactics of war, was clearly manifest in the late war in South Africa but a short time ago, where they as volunteers offered their services, and as valiant soldiers, stood shoulder to shoulder, side by side, with the veteran soldiers of old England, and fought and bled and won on the gory fields of battles, not only fought, but died on the blood-stained soil of that country. But this is not all. We find Canadians in every portion of the world to the fore in all the struggles of life, filling prominent positions of trust, and generally prominent in every good work. Our young men, as Canadians, have attained a prominence in the solution of scientific and mechanical problems, and are distinguished for their quick recognition of that which tends to further the progress of our country, Canada, and the empire as well, and the world's advancement.

With materials such as this, we on this side of the House earnestly request that the right hon. the leader will withdraw this agreement, and encourage thereby the growth of Canada by a system of transportation having clearly Canada for Canadians.

House divided on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

APPEAL FOR RIGHTS OF NOVA SCOTIA FISHERMEN ON NEWFOUNDLAND SHORE.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH (Lunenburg). Mr. Speaker, I desire to draw attention to a matter which is of vital interest to the fishermen of the Maritime provinces, more especially to the fishermen engaged in deep-sea fishing, along the Newfoundland shore. I observe in this morning's "Citizen" an item headed:

TREATY IS SUPERSEDED

Newfoundland Fish to enter United States Free of Duty.

Valuable Monopoly Granted to an American Syndicate which will be able to get its Products Duty Free into the United States.

This, I may say, Mr. Speaker, is simply an attempt of a renewal of the former Bond-Blaine treaty that had been brought about unfortunately in the year 1890 by Mr. Bond, now Sir Robert Bond, with the Secretary of the United States, Mr. Blaine. The fishermen of the maritime provinces, realizing at that time the unfortunate position in which they would be placed by this treaty, appealed to the government then in power and met with a very favorable response. The government appealed to the imperial government through the Secretary of State, and action under the Bond-Blaine treaty as proposed, was withheld. Since then an effort has been made during the regime of the present government to resurrect this treaty and at that time I again brought the matter up in the House and asked the government to intercede with the imperial authorities in order to have the matter treated in the same manner as it had been previously treated. I do

not know, however, what action was taken at that time, but nothing was done. We now find by this reference in this morning's 'Citizen' that they are again endeavoring to bring this about under the Bond-Hay treaty. This has been very strongly advocated by Sir Robert Bond, the premier of Newfoundland, and it is now before the Foreign Relations Committee of Congress with the hope of its being ratified. This treaty I consider is not altogether in the interests of the fishermen of Newfoundland, as was shown when the effort to secure this treaty was previously made, for the reason that if the bait of Newfoundland is to be disposed of as proposed by this treaty, the bait fish will be used up by the Americans when they should be preserved for the fishermen of Newfoundland, in order that they may secure the fish on their own waters. When that effort was made in 1890, we appealed very strongly to have this passage annulled, because when our fishermen visited those shores they would be compelled to purchase bait from the Newfoundland fishermen and that only in limited quantities, quite insufficient in many cases to enable them to successfully prosecute their industry. We felt that under these circumstances we would be handicapped to such an extent that the fishing fleet which is the pride of the county I represent, would be practically annihilated. I would ask the government, therefore, under the circumstances to take the matter into their very serious consideration, and take such steps as will preserve to our fishermen the opportunities which they have a right to enjoy and to see to it that the interests of the fishermen of the maritime provinces are guarded, fostered and promoted. The fishermen last year were seriously handicapped owing to the want of bait fish, which were very scarce on the shore at that time, and as a result their success in fishing during the past season has not been by any means what they would have desired. Under this treaty a company is to be formed known as the Newfoundland Cold Storage Company, with a capital of one half million dollars, but it states here that that capital may be increased to something like three millions, which would constitute a complete monopoly. Such a company would gather up all the fish from the various fisheries which would be placed in its cold storage plant, and as a result we might be deprived entirely of any bait for the deep-sea fishermen visiting the Newfoundland coast. I therefore feel that the government will see for themselves the deprivation which the fishermen of the maritime provinces will suffer if such an arrangement as proposed is carried out. It is a matter which I feel is of vital importance to the fishermen of the maritime provinces and I would not speak so earnestly in the matter now, if I did not feel that their interests would be completely sacrificed if this treaty is ratified.

Under the treaty of 1818, there has been an expression of doubt as to whether American fishermen could go on that shore and fish. That question was brought up before when the treaty was referred to in 1860, but subsequently the matter was dropped, and I think that the remark of the hon. gentlemen is simply a reference by some American writers which has had no material effect as respects the maritime provinces.

This despatch, which is dated from Toronto, reads as follows:—

Toronto, April 26.—The 'Globe' to-day gives prominence to a letter by Norman Smith writing from St. John's, Nfld., under date of April 19, detailing the facts of the establishing of an extensive industry in that island by an American syndicate, as follows:

A Bill passed last week by the legislative assembly of Newfoundland has rendered very remote the ratification of the Bond-Hay treaty. The island has long been desirous of concluding a reciprocal arrangement with the United States under which Newfoundland fish should be allowed to enter free of duty in return for fishing privileges conceded to Americans on the shores of the colony. In 1890 Mr. (now Sir) Robert Bond negotiated in Washington what is known as the Bond-Blaine treaty. Canada protested against the ratification of the treaty, and had sufficient influence with the imperial government to successfully prevent its being signed. Newfoundland resented Canada's action, and in and out of season worked hard to have the embargo removed.

Last year its representations were effective, and Premier Bond immediately opened correspondence with Secretary Hay. Soon afterwards the Bond-Hay treaty, based on the Bond-Blaine agreement,

was drawn up. The treaty is now before the Foreign Relations Committee of Congress, and strong hope has been expressed in the island that, despite the strenuous opposition of American fishery interests, it would be ratified.

AMERICANS GET CONCESSIONS.

The Bill which the assembly of the colony has just passed provides for the granting of assistance to a United States company which proposes to go into the cold storage business on a large scale. The company is guaranteed for twenty years a dividend of 5 per cent per annum on a capital of half a million dollars on condition that \$250,000 is spent on a cold storage plant and \$200,000 expended yearly in the purchase of fish in the island for export. The company also undertakes to preserve bait in cold storage, and distribute the same at a reasonable price wherever it is needed by Newfoundland fishermen, an undertaking that will undoubtedly be a great boon to the fishermen, enabling them, as it will, to overcome the difficulty they have hitherto laboured under, of frequently being unable to obtain bait in localities where fishing is good.

SHIP FISH INTO UNITED STATES FREE.

The company, as has been said, intends to go into the business on a very large scale, and instead of being capitalized at half a million, it will probably issue stock to the extent of two or three millions, and instead of spending \$250,000 on a plant, a million will be nearer the mark. It proposes to establish a central cold storage station, and a number of sub-stations in various parts of the island. At these sub-stations fish will be purchased, shipped to the central depot and thence to the United States.

The American duty on fish, both fresh and dried, averages about three-quarters of a cent per pound. The Bond-Hay treaty looks to the removal of the duty on dried fish, the Washington authorities refusing absolutely to consider any change in respect to fresh fish.

The Newfoundland Cold Storage Company, the concern which has been given assistance by the island government, will be able to ship fish, both fresh and dried, into the United States free of duty, and this is how it can be done:

The law department at Washington has given an incontrovertible opinion that, under an Anglo-American treaty signed in 1818, any American citizen may fish in certain waters of Newfoundland, and that the fish so caught in such waters are not liable to duty in the United States. On representations from the Newfoundland Cold Storage Company that certain disabilities exist preventing Americans from deriving full benefit from the treaty concessions, and that it proposes to remove those disabilities by employing Newfoundland fishermen to assist in supplying the company with fish, the Washington authorities have declared that there is nothing to prevent all the fish shipped in American bottoms by the company to the United States from entering free of duty, even though not entirely caught by American fishermen.

In other words, the company referred to can apparently take into its employ if it chooses, all the Newfoundland fishermen, and ship the product of their labours into the United States free of duty.

NEWFOUNDLAND HELPLESS

The leverage the Newfoundland government has hitherto used in its endeavour to obtain concessions from the United States has been that at any time it could enforce a Bait Act against American fishermen, such as that now in operation against the French, or raise considerably the license fee now imposed. But the Newfoundland government by its guarantee has connected itself financially with the cold storage company and cannot place any disabilities in its way without materially affecting its own interests. It has guaranteed this company 5 per cent interest on its half million capital for twenty years, and cannot restrict its operations. The Bill providing for the guarantee was a special Bill, and, therefore, practically grants a monopoly to the company, and hands over to it, to all intents and purposes, the control of the bait supply.

ENORMOUS SAVING IN DUTY

An idea of the concession which has been granted to the company may be gathered from the fact that, should it confine its operations to storing and shipping 50 tons of fish per day, the saving in the American duty at three-quarters of a cent per pound will alone amount to \$225,000 yearly. The company proposes, however, to operate a line of steamers, and the probability is that its output will be from 100 to 150 tons per day.

The company originally proposed to export the fish to the United States in bond via Sydney, Cape Breton, establishing at that point a cold storage warehouse, but the severity of the past winter having proven that Sydney is not a winter port, it is most probable that this idea will be abandoned and Boston made the receiving port.

All the advantages of the agreement will not by any means be on the side of the company. The island fishermen will undoubtedly benefit very considerably. They will obtain not only all the advantages of the Bond-Hay treaty, but their fish will be admitted into the United States free; they will have the benefit of a great modern cold storage system, and in addition it will be enabled to obtain frozen bait in localities where bait is scarce.

So valuable is the concession to the company, however, that there is very little likelihood of the government being called upon to make up any deficiency in the profits.

The Newfoundland government still expects to put through the Bond-Hay treaty, but to everybody who has studied the details of the concession granted to the American company, no reason is apparent why the Washington government should do anything. When the Gloucester interests are informed of the proposed sale of the company there probably will be wailing on the ground; but the Newfoundland Act has been duly signed, and the Washington law authorities have given no opinion in writing that would be extremely difficult to meet. *Foronto Globe.*

This, Mr. Speaker, you see will pile up for us to a very great extent. With the tremendous amount they expect to have of bait fish it will handicap the maritime provinces fishermen employed in the deep-sea fishing in going to these quarters for bait. It will not only hamper them in the obtaining of bait, but it will hamper them as well in the price, and it will mean that the industry will be wiped out completely. The ship building industry which is a very material industry, and one from which we gather, particularly in my county, a large amount of profit, will suffer a depression which will affect a large class of men, ship builders, blacksmiths, carpenters and every one else employed in connection with that industry. Under these circumstances I appeal very strongly to the right hon. premier in this connection, and I ask him to take active and early measures to meet the situation that I have pointed out.

I am fully aware that we cannot interfere with any action that the United States may take in Congress in regard to their domestic relations; but the strong point is there set out, that the Gloucester fishermen are interfering with the action of the United States, and on the same principle I to-day ask this government if they will interfere to protect the interests of the fisheries of the maritime provinces? I think that could be accomplished through the Secretary of State of the Colonies, and by a reference to our sister colony of Newfoundland. If we are to be deprived of the free capture of bait-fish on that shore, the United States will be in the harvest field, gathering the harvest, whilst we are deprived of getting the material wherewith to gather. I wish the Prime Minister to see the matter in that light, and to use his utmost efforts, as I am sure he will, to place the matter in its proper position in the interests of our fishermen.

THE DOG-FISH PEST.

Mr. Kaulbach who last year called the attention of the Govern-

ment to the serious loss sustained by the fishermen of the maritime provinces by the Dog-Fish, again during the present session invited attention to it by the following questions :

1. Did the government recently cause the commissioner of fisheries to make an investigation into the dog-fish pest in the waters of the Atlantic coast of the Dominion ?

2. If so, what was the nature of the report of the commissioner?

3. Does the government intend offering a bounty for the capture of these fish, as suggested by me last year ?

4. What steps does the government intend taking towards minimizing this nuisance, which is doing so much injury to the fisheries of Canada ?

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN. In the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I beg to answer:

1. The Commissioner of Fisheries was authorized to hold an investigation into the dog-fish pest and other fishery matters on the shores of northern New Brunswick. The investigation concluded on April 21st.

2. The report is in preparation, to be laid before me in a few days.

3. The report referred to is awaited before deciding the question of a dog-fish bounty.

4. A large number of suggestions are before the government, and steps will be taken when the report referred to is presented.

MR. KAULBACH RECOMMENDS INCREASED BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN; ALSO BOUNTY TO LOBSTER FISHERMEN.

The Proposed Division of the Fishery Award to the Various Provinces Strongly Opposed by Mr. Kaulbach in the Interests of the Fishermen.

During the discussion of this question in Parliament, Mr. Kaulbach said:

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Spronle) was in the House representing the county he now represents at the time that legislation was passed, and I remember right well the then Minister of Finance, Sir Leonard Tilley, being strongly urged by myself and others to give this bounty to fishermen because they had become so numerous that their business was not sufficiently remunerative and in consequence were migrating to the United States. We urged that, in order to prevent this, they should be encouraged to prosecute the deep sea fishing and the government of that day acceded to our representations. It was also considered that the giving of a bounty would not only so encourage the prosecution of deep sea fishing, but also the industry of shipbuilding and in this way keep a large number of our mechanics at home. But while I endorse the views of my hon. friend from Victoria, I am of the opinion that the government should increase the bounty and give the lobster fishermen a share in it also. These fishermen (the deep seamen) are not getting the reward from their industry which they used to enjoy in the past, and the result has been that many of them have gone to the United States to seek for labour in other avocations. To counteract that tendency, I think the government should increase the bounty and include the lobster fishermen among those entitled to share in it. I understand that the amount of \$4,500,000 was in the exchequer of this Dominion for some time before any action was taken to give our fishermen a portion of that money in the shape of interest. It would, I believe, be most unwise for this government to hand over that money to the provinces for the reason that in that case it would go into other channels and the fishermen would not have that security with regard to the payment of their bounty which they enjoy at present, whilst the capital sum is funded in the Dominion treasury. I would therefore ask the government to let the matter rest as it is. I was under the impression that it was settled in 1882 with the consent of the respective maritime provinces. I understood that the provinces agreed that this money should remain in the hands of the federal government and not paid over to the provinces, and only the interest on it paid out to the fishermen in

the shape of a bounty. I think, now that as the fishermen are increasing in numbers, that the amount of the bounty should be increased so that the apportionment meted out to each fisherman would be the same as in years gone by.

The apportionment last year was less to the fishermen as a whole than in the previous year. I would strongly urge the Minister of Marine to allow the matter to rest and not put it in the hands of parties who knew very little about the situation and the needs as respects the fishermen. Let this amount remain where it is and give the increased number of fishermen an increased amount from the exchequer, so that the payment to each man would be the same as in the past and in order that the lobster fishermen might also receive a share in the increased amount of bounty so granted.

I agree with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that this was originally given to the deep-sea fishermen. At the time a request was made that lobster fishermen should receive a share of the bounty also, but that was objected to by those who considered that they had not shared in the sacrifices, to make up for which the award was given by the American government. I would like the Minister of Finance to understand that I do not complain of expenditure when money is applied in the right channel. He can always count upon my support in expenditures when wisely calculated to develop the resources of the Dominion and keep our own people at home in our own country. And the way to retain our own people is to provide that every man shall be able to receive a fair day's wage for a fair day's work. The only way that that can be done in giving a bounty to fishermen is by providing an increased amount in the estimates this year. I cannot see why the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and his colleagues, having the surplus of which they boast, should not be generous enough to meet the reasonable wishes of these hardy sons of toil who earn a livelihood at the risk of their lives on the deep sea, and that by very great exposure and arduous toil.

I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will see that if he grants an increase in the bounty over the block sum of \$100,000 per annum the government will receive it back indirectly in another way. There is no class of men in the Dominion who contribute more to the revenue in the way of duties than do the fishermen. When they are successful they live very well, and when they are unfortunate and have a shortage in their catch it is pretty difficult for them to get along at all. If the bounty to them is increased, they will contribute as much to the revenue in return, and so the government will not be a loser by the transaction. I urge again very strongly that the hon. gentleman should accede to the request and increase this amount beyond \$160,000.

Mr. Kaulbach's remarks on the Bill to Prohibit the Importation, Manufacture and Sale of Cigarettes.

Mr. KAULBACH. I believe in the principle of this Bill, but at the same time I am inclined to think that it is too broad in its scope, inasmuch as it would prohibit adults who are accustomed to the use of tobacco from smoking it in this form. I believe that every effort should be made to prevent our youths, those under the age of eighteen let us say, from using cigarettes. Should they not smoke until they attain that age, it is no more than likely that they may refrain from cigarette smoking ever afterwards. Even if this Bill should become law, there are various methods by which its provisions could be evaded. If the Bill went so far as to prohibit the use of tobacco in any form by young men under the age of eighteen, or even under twenty-one years, I think it would be more beneficial. I read the other day the statement by a magistrate whose duty it was to try juvenile offenders for various forms of crime, and he claimed that out of 500 whom he tried 90 per cent of those convicted had been addicted to the use of cigarettes. In view of such strong evidence it behooves us to use every effort to prevent boys under the age of eighteen from using tobacco in any form. It is my opinion that a great deal can be done by energetic men and by those public spirited women, who have taken a great interest in this matter, and who are deserving of a great deal of credit for their efforts towards the protection of our young men. If they

were to form an anti-smoking society amongst young men, and if the employers of labour joined with them in making a rule that they should not engage young men who used cigarettes or tobacco in any form, a great deal of practical good would be accomplished. I merely make this suggestion in the hope that the women, if they have not thought of it in the past, may consider it seriously, and adopt a method of that kind.

MR. KAULBACH'S PATRIOTIC SPEECH IN DEFENCE OF THE CANADIAN FLAG.

MERCHANT MARINE AND CANADIAN ENSIGN.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH. Before proceeding with the Orders of the D. I desire, as I announced yesterday, to engage the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine, indeed the right hon. the leader of the government and his associates in the cabinet, to a report appearing in the Montreal 'Daily Star' of the 17th instant, by Ship-master John Taylor, of Nova Scotia, headed:

HAULED DOWN CANADIAN ARMS.

British Consul declares Canada has no flag.

I might here state, Mr. Speaker, that I intend concluding with a motion. The report reads as follows:

MADE SHIP FLY RED ENSIGN.

Threatened to fine Capt. Taylor £100 if he continued to use Canadian emblem.

Captain John Taylor, of the three-masted schooner 'M. J. Taylor,' is in this port at present. Captain Taylor has a grievance.

Captain Taylor hails from Nova Scotia. His ship is registered in Parrsboro, N.S., and has always flown what he considered the Canadian flag, the red ensign of the British merchant service, with the Canadian coat-of-arms in the lower right hand corner. Captain Taylor related the reason for his grievance to the 'Star' this morning, as follows:—

'I had been sailing around the different ports of South America all winter, and last January I sailed in the port of Rio Grande do Sul, in the Argentine republic, with cargo. We lay there for some time, and as there were a number of vessels in the harbour whose masters were friends of mine, our flag, the Canadian ensign, was flying at our peak most of the time.

'Some three or four days after its first appearance, I received a verbal warning from the British consul, Mr. Ray Stamford, that I was not flying the right flag. He ordered me to haul down that flag and run up the 'Red Ensign.' Well, I have knocked around pretty well, and in the last few years have been in a good many corners of the globe, and the Canadian flag was always good enough for other British consuls, so I thought it would do for Mr. Ray Stamford. I therefore took no notice of his warning.

'Then I did get it. I received a notice stating that I was liable to a fine of £100 if I continued to fly that flag. The notice bore the stamp of the consulate, and ordered me to appear at the consulate with my flag the following day.

'Well, you know the British consul is a man's only friend down there if he gets into trouble; and I thought it better not to disobey. So I took the flag to him. He ordered me to cut out the Canadian coat-of-arms and fill the space with red bunting. I refused, and he had it done himself.

'This I consider quite unjustifiable. We Canadians were given the right to fly our flag in 1867. I have carried that flag at the mast head when lying in the midst of the British Mediterranean squadrons at the Malta dock yards, at Cadiz, at Havre, and most of the Mediterranean British North and South American ports, and there has never been any exception taken to it until now.'

Captain Taylor is addressing a letter to the Board of Trade about this matter, and desires to know if the action of the consul was justifi-

fiable. He says that he is a loyal Britisher, but is also a loyal Canadian; and he wants the right to fly what he maintains is the Canadian ensign.

I might here state that although this report I have just read, is, to my mind, an outrageous act on the part of the British consul, and wholly unauthorized and unprovoked, it is not the first time I had occasion to bring a subject of complaint of this nature to the notice of the government by way of seeking redress. It will be remembered by reference to 'Hansard' that on the third day of May, 1901, I brought to the notice of the government the case of the ship 'Canada,' belonging to the port of Lunenburg, N.S., Captain Arch. Conrad, master, which was floating the Canadian ensign of which, I am pleased to say, we, as Canadians have cause to be proud, in the port of Bahia, Brazil, on the 1st of March, 1901, when the British consul boarded the ship, and peremptorily required of the master to haul his flag down, informing him that it was a gross violation, or infringement of rights, and failing to do so, he would impose a fine of £500 and hold the ship for the penalty until paid. The captain rather than find himself and owners in trouble complied with the request. Feeling naturally much exercised over an apparent insult of this sort, I made special request of the government at the time, that inquiry be made of the British government, as to whether the master of the 'Canada' was within his rights in floating the Canadian ensign in a foreign port, and if found that the captain was in error, then to arrange with the British Admiralty for authority, and thereby have the Canadian flag treated with the respect Canada is entitled to receive. However, subsequently having ascertained Canada was within her rights in floating her Canadian ensign, having obtained the authority from the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty under power invested in them by the Imperial Merchants' Shipping (colours) Act of 1889, I inquired as to whether the authority had been officially communicated to the authorities in Canada, and found that it had. The royal warrant having issued under seal dated London, February 2, 1892, by the commissioners for executing the office of Lord High Admiralty of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, reads as follows:—

Whereas we deem it expedient that Canadian registered vessels shall be permitted to wear the red ensign of His Majesty's fleet, with a Canadian coat-of-arms on the fly thereof.

We do therefore by virtue of the power, and authority vested in us, hereby warrant, and authorize the red ensign of His Majesty's fleet, with the Canadian coat-of-arms in the fly to be used on board vessels registered in the Dominion.

Given under our hands, and the seal of the Office of the Admiralty this 2nd day of February, 1892.

(Signed) H. FAIRFAX.
FRED. G. D. BEDFORD.

By command of their lordships.

(Signed) Evan MacGregor.

To this a circular letter was issued by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, Ottawa, which reads as follows:—

In accordance with the permission granted by the above warrant, the following regulations have been adopted by the Canadian government:—

1. The area of the shield shall in no case exceed one-fourth the area of the Union Jack of the particular ensign.
2. The shield shall be placed centrally in that part of the fly which is beyond the Jack.

(Signed) WILLIAM SMITH.
Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Department of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa, June 10, 1895.

I desire to state here, that my object in bringing this subject of the Canadian flag prominently before parliament at present, is to have the world understand that Canada has a flag, composed of the British ensign with the Canadian coat of arms in the red fly thereof, and has authority to fly it. My object also is to urge the government of Can-

ada to communicate with the office of the Lord High Admiralty in London, through the Secretary of State for the colonies, asking that all British consuls throughout the world be advised of Canada's position as respects her flag, particularly the consuls of Bahia and Rio-Grande-do-sul, Brazil, in order that the unnatural and outrageous treatment extended to Canadian shipmasters, sailing Canadian ships, when visiting the various ports, particularly those referred to, cannot ignore the Canadian flag in future, and that all Canadian shipmasters, and the merchant marine of Canada may be advised as well, by a public notice issued by the Department of Marine of Canada and published in the Canadian 'Gazette,' informing the public of Canada's right to float her Canadian ensign in every sea.

It is wonderful the great instinct of the human race, the great delight we possess in the flying of flags. There is a something innate in man causing him to be enthused by a significant emblem raised in the air, whether it has the insignia of office or descent, or as the symbol of race or nationality—our national flag—it matters not. The flag of old England and the empire of which we may be justly proud—the Union Jack—when floated or wherever exposed, has an inspiring effect, there being in it so much of sentiment and meaning for sober thought. In the words of the poet, so beautifully outlined:

THE UNION JACK.

It's only a small bit of bunting,
It's only an old color — g,
Yet thousands have died for its honour
And shed their best blood for the flag.

It flutters triumphant o'er ocean
As free as the wind and the waves,
And bondsmen from shackles unloosened
'Neath its shadows no longer are slaves.

We hoist it to show our devotion
To our King, to our country, and laws,
It's the outward and visible emblem
Of advancement, and liberty's cause.

You may say its an old bit of bunting,
You may call it an old colored rag,
But freedom has made it majestic
And time has ennobled the flag.

Even the colours in the Union Jack, and you will remember the Union Jack forms part of the Canadian ensign, has its sentiment and significance, the red indicating courage, white the emblem of purity, and blue the emblem of truth, more strikingly given in the old loyal and familiar song: 'Three cheers for the Red, White and Blue,' or more sentimental and expressively rendered 'Three cheers for the brave, pure, and true.'

Let me say that lessons such as this, should be deeply impressed upon the minds of our Canadian children, particularly at school, so as to have them live lives worthy of the ideals of their national flag, and frame the character of our nation by its teaching.

With such natural emotions animating the hearts of our people, one can appreciate the fervid interest taken by each nation in its own national flag, and can realize and account for the associations which cluster about its folds, and are so ardently treasured in the inmost recesses of the human heart. With such feeling of affection for one's country's flag, picture to yourself the feelings of loyal Captain Taylor as he witnessed the brutal action of that British consul in Rio-Grande-do-sul, as he ruthlessly cut out the Canadian coat-of-arms from the flag held by him and us so dear. I feel that no punishment, however, severe, would be too great for the heartless act he (the Consul) has committed in the matter of the Canadian flag hoisted on the ship, 'M. J. Faylor.' I sincerely hope this government will advise the imperial government to this end.

Kings in their turn display the banner of their kingdoms, over which they reign, and have sway, value them and float them proudly.

Picture to yourself, Mr. Speaker, cutting the cross of St. George out of the flag of old England, or the cross of St. Andrew representing Scotland, or the cross of St. Patrick representing Ireland, or the fleur-de-lis from the flag of old France, or even interfering with one star, or one stripe of the star-spangled banner of the United States, would there not be a bugle call to arms from each and every one of them? Surely they would be heard from in the most emphatic tones. Then are we as Canadians to suffer the ignominy, nay, I must say the outrage of having the esenteheon or emblem of Canada constituting Canada's flag—cut out of the red fly of the ensign of old England floated on a British ship, commanded by a British master, in a foreign port, by a British consul not knowing his duty, and be silent? I say certainly not—I must therefore in conclusion, impress upon hon. gentlemen opposite the necessity of making public this matter, and obtaining redress in the manner I have advised.

e out
outing
fleur-
star,
would
them ?
n are
age of
lug -
ritish
ritish
ot—I
posite
ss in