HOT SHOT FOR GOVERNMENT

Mr. Maclean Attacks the Policy Regarding the Yukon.

The General Tendency to Encourage Monopolies Denounced Vigorously by the Member for East York—Transportation Problem Paramount Now—Clarke Wallace Also Made a Hot Speech.

Ottawa, Feb. 21.—(Special.)—The majority of questions on the order paper to-day related to Yukon affairs in one form or other. Mr. Sifton told Mr. Davis that there was no Indian title on the Yukon.

Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper asked had the Government considered, or is it now considering the question of Canada's right to exclude or regulate the passage of vessels registered in the United States through the territorial waters on the coast of British Columbia to and from Alaska?

Sir Wilfrid Laurier said the Government had this subject under consideration, but they did not deem it expedient, in the public interest, to make any statement now.

Mr. Wallace was informed that customs dues were collected in the Yukon as follows: 1895, $3,247; 1896, $21,691; 1897, $9872; 1898 to date, $83,834.

Mr. Blair Was Evasive.

Mr. Martin asked: Does the Government intend to provide for the employment of Canadian labor only in the building of the Yukon Railway? Does the Government intend to take any steps to provide that Canadian labor only shall be employed in the construction of railways receiving subsidies from the Dominion Government?

Mr. Blair replied that the necessity for constructing this line immediately rendered it inadvisable to insist on the exclusion of foreign labor on this work. In the case of the Crow's Nest Railway foreign labor or foreign contractors had been prohibited.

Sir C. H. Tupper reminded the Minister that he had not answered the second question.

Mr. Blair replied that the action of the Government regarding the Crow's Nest line, forbidding the employment of foreign labor, was a fair indication of the Government's intentions regarding other lines.

Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper: In the recent negotiations with the United States authorities respecting customs regulations and the shipment of goods via Dyea and Skaguay to the Canadian Yukon territory, was any precaution or provision made so that the negotiations proceeded without prejudice to the claim that Dyea and Skaguay are in British territory?

Mr. Sifton replied that the negotiations were unofficial, but it was understood that whatever was done was without prejudice to any claims Canada might have to possession of this territory.

As to the East Line.

Sir Richard Cartwright, answering Dr. Borden (Halifax), said the Government had general assurances from Petersen, Tate & Co. that they proposed to carry out the line contract. He was not aware whether steamers were actually under construction; indeed, he thought they were not.

YUKON BILL DEBATE.

After Mr. McClure Had Defended the Government the Member for East York Made a Strong Protest.

The debate on the Yukon Railway bill was resumed by Mr. McClure (Liberal, Colchester), who strongly supported the bill on the ground that it was imperatively needed in the interests of the country.

Maclean's Speech.

Mr. Maclean (East York) said the Yukon Railway proposition now before the House ought to be condemned here, ought to be condemned everywhere, as indeed it is to-day condemned in the minds of nearly, we believe it is condemned by all thoughtful men throughout the country, who perceive the time has come when great monopolies must be regulated, when the supremacy of the State over the great corporations must be vindicated, and when an end must be put to those monopolies and the power they possess. I am here to give a very simple reason why I am opposed to this contract, and my reason, I hope, will be on high grounds. I will try to express the opinion entertained by those people in this country and other countries who think that the time has come for the regulation of monopolies; or a new departure in respect to the transportation problem. I hope yet to see something done by this House in that direction.

A Little Retrospect.

When Confederation was inaugurated in this country the main question before the people was the interpretation of our constitution and the building up of the country by the erection of new provinces. That has been accomplished. The next point which came up in connection with the constitutional question was the building of the C.P.R. After that there was the trade issue. That was certain of the adoption of the National Policy introduced by the Conservative party, and now assumed by hon. gentlemen opposite. The constitutional question has in the main been settled.

The Great Question of To-day.

The great question to-day is the transportation problem. The great purchasing centre of the world is the British market. The countries who desire to get there are Russia, North America, including Canada and the United States, Argentine and South America and Australia. These five great countries are trying to get their produce there by paying the lowest possible freight rates, and only such countries will get there as are able to obtain the lowest freight rates for their produce. The time has come when we should determine the policy to be adopted in order to get produce there at the cheapest possible rates. That is the whole question, and it is before us to-day, and hon. members and the Government are bound to take some position in respect to the solution of this problem; they are bound to do something to regulate the transportation monopoly that exists to-day.

Government Building Up Monopoly.

We find, however, that instead of regulating this monopoly, the Government are strengthening it and even building it up. It is really the case—and I shall endeavor to show that such is the fact—the Government are to be condemned for the position they have taken and to be condemned for the legislation they have introduced in this House. No doubt there is a monopoly created by this legislation proposed. That is apparent from the contract, and it has not been denied. It has been stated that there will be a competing road, and, indeed, that road may be chartered by British Columbia. That may be so, but the fact is this, that a provincial charter has been acquired by McKenzie and Mann, including a large provincial land subsidy, and that firm is now obtaining a Dominion charter, with a large Dominion land grant with it. Thus, a vigorous monopoly has been created which will rule this country and which will enable the company to make their own tariff rates, and, in fact, do as they please. Out and out Reformers, coming from the Northwest raised the cry in this House from year to year that there was a monopoly created in regard to the C.P.R. Where are those members from the Northwest Territories who thus condemned this railway monopoly, and who are here to-day to propose that a monopoly in regard to freight rates shall be placed on the miners of the country?

Where is the Difference?

If it were wrong to create a monopoly in the case of the farmers of the Northwest, is it not equally wrong to create a monopoly against the miners? That is what is done by the contract; it creates a monopoly in the trade in which the miners of the Yukon are interested. Hon. gentlemen opposite profess to be in favor of progressive legislation; but, so far as I can gather, they are reactionists. Max Nadeau has told us about the decadence of the present day, but he would find a good example on the other side of the House. They are not progressive, they are degenerates, as all events, so far as the present question is concerned. They are not attacking monopoly, but strengthening it.

Speaking for myself and for a large section of the community, I make bold to say that we must restrain those monopolies and declare in favor of the supremacy of the state over them; we must do something to minimize their strength and importance, and not increase and strengthen them, as hon. gentlemen opposite are now doing. I can only discuss this question from the standpoint of the ordinary thinking man. In such light, I say the contract is bad, because its terms are bad. Because there may be urgency, is that any reason why a monopoly should be created? If there is urgency, it is not necessary to relieve it by adopting a measure that is wrong in principle. Hon. gentlemen opposite contend that it is necessary in order to build this railway to give McKenzie and Mann over 4,000,000 acres of most valuable mining lands. It is not necessary to do so.

A Better Proposal.

The Government have to-day a proposal which is a much better one for the people of this country than that accepted from McKenzie and Mann, and I will read it to the House. The people of the country are watching hon. gentlemen opposite to see if they are carrying out their promises to protect the public interest, and how can they say they are protecting the public interest in view of the large land grants proposed to be given to these contractors, and this in face of the proposition submitted by Mr. Hamilton Smith?

I ask my hon. friends from British Columbia and the Northwest to see whether with their votes they could justify this proposition of the Government in the light of this offer from Mr. Hamilton Smith.

An Hon. Member: Who is he?

Mr. Maclean: He is a representative of large capitalists in Great Britain, and his credentials are undoubted. He has presented his credentials to the Government, and if they care to wire to London, as he says in his letter, they will find that his credentials are as good as those of the Rothschilds themselves.

(Mr. Maclean here read Mr. Smith's offer, which is given in another column.)

Mr. Morrison Wanted the Vote.

Mr. Morrison: May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) what is the date of the letter?

The Prime Minister: It is the 18th Feb.

Mr. Maclean: Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) doubt it? Mr. Hamilton Smith put his proposition in on the 14th, and this letter is subsequent to that. He is prepared to construct the road in the same time as Mann and McKenzie, and he is prepared to execute it for one-fourth of their land grant and without any monopoly.

That is the proposition before the people, and it is on that and on similar propositions that the Government will be judged. That is on the right of all countries to bid for this work; it is on the record of the Liberal party that no contract should be granted unless all contractors had a chance to tender for it; it is on the resolutions that hon. gentlemen opposite will be tried before the country, and will be condemned before the country if they do not retrace their steps. If the Government opposite are condemned they will be condemned effectually, and it will be found, as it was found after four years' trial of the Liberal government in 1873 (as Mr. Davin said here the other day, and for which he was ridiculed), that the Liberal party have not the gifts of magistracy and have not the instincts of government.

This proposition of Mr. Hamilton Smith is to build a railway, beginning at Pyramid Harbor, and I stand here to-day to contend that Pyramid Harbor is in Canada, that the road from Pyramid Harbor right into Dawson City is entirely in Canada, and that it is a better Canadian route than the one the Government proposed.

Who is in Possession?

Sir Louis Davies: Whose possession is it in?

Mr. Maclean: It should be in ours, and if the hon. gentleman raises the question, then, I say the Government is responsible if it is not in our possession. I would contend that Pyramid Harbor is in Canadian territory, and that the line should be built from there.

Sir Louis Davies: I would ask the hon. gentleman if he knows whether or not this harbor has been in possession of the Americans for a number of years back, before this Government came into power at all.

Mr. Maclean: I know that.

Sir Louis Davies: Then, how does the hon. gentleman contend that this Government, which only came into power in July, 1896, could at all be responsible for the fact that the Americans held possession of it for over 20 years before this Government came into power?

Mr. Maclean: The hon. gentlemen will be held responsible for refusing this offer. He and his Government will be held responsible if they do not occupy that territory, and if they do not maintain the rights of Canada, whatever they be, in connection with it.

Mr. Wood (Hamilton): Next week we may have a better offer.

Mr. Maclean: Yes, it is altogether likely you will, and there is where you stand convicted, that you did not notify the contractors for the moment that this Government contract becomes widespread, men come in and offer to take it up at much better terms for the country. [Loud cheers].

The Growth of Monopolies.

Now, the rise of monopolies is the most dangerous thing to the world to-day. The influence they exercise on legislatures and the shackles they forge on the people in every direction is exciting widespread interest all over. It, as they say, a revolution is threatened in the United States, it is because of the growth of these monopolies, which are getting stronger and stronger every day, and which have now become so powerful that the people of the United States have lost faith in their representative institutions. Representative institutions are to-day almost a failure in that country, and they soon will be a failure in this country if these enormous monopolies are created and allowed to rule and dominate Canada. Sir, they and not the Canadian Parliament will soon be the masters of Canada. I make bold to say that it is not McKenzie and Mann that are here, but it is that great monster monopoly, the C. P. R. That is the corporation that this Government is building up. True, they deny it, but I believe there was an option at the time of this proposal, and if this railway proposition goes through it will not be many moons before the timetables and everything else in connection with the Yukon Road will be signed by Sir William Van Horne and not by William McKenzie.

Representative Institutions Threatened.

Not only do these railway monopolies threaten our representative institutions—not only have they brought the people of the United States to think that representative Government has been a failure, but they have caused the people over there to clamor for direct legislation by the people themselves. In the United States the people to-day are demanding that such matters as this should be submitted to the popular vote, and, sir, if this Yukon Railway contract were submitted to the people of Canada, it would be condemned from one end of the country to the other. I only hope that this Government will take this question to the country; I only hope that this bill will meet with defeat in some other quarter, and that the Government will go to the country on it. I would like to see them ask the electorate of Canada to endorse a proposal such as this, not only on its merits, or rather demerits, but in the light of this further proposal that has been made by Mr. Hamilton Smith.

Who are Bringing Them Forward?

Let me ask: Who are bringing forward all these propositions in the country? Both the Yukon Railway proposition and the Crow's Nest Railway proposition of last year were brought before the people in a very mysterious way. They were first announced and the way paved for them in columns of The Toronto Globe. Now I have no objection to The Globe as a newspaper. It has been the Liberal organ, and it has been a very good paper for the Liberal party in this country; but something has happened within the past few years, and hon. gentlemen on the opposite side ought to know it, and probably do know it. The Globe has passed into the control of monopolists. Instead of being the conscience of its party, as it ought to be, it is the organ of railway exploiters who are taking advantage of the position The Globe stands in with regard to its party, and are using it for their own ends and for the ruin of the Liberal party. Let the C. P. R. Company—let these monopolists—go into the newspaper business if they wish, but let them go into it openly. If hon. gentlemen opposite have any interest in their party—if they have any interest in their chief organ—they will say that the day has come when the paper that professes to be their organ and to speak for them and to keep the conscience of their party—the day has come when that newspaper must pass out of the hands of those railway exploiters.

Not a Government Proposition.

Now, all these propositions have come forward in this way. The Globe newspaper hints at them, and other papers friendly to the Administration and especially to the railway monopolists.

This proposition is not a Government proposition; as a matter of fact. It is a proposition which was brought forward by railway exploiters, submitted to them by special members of the Cabinet, adopted by these special members of the Cabinet, and by them introduced into this House. It is not a Government measure at all, but a measure submitted by these railway exploiters, and the Government was induced to take it up, especially through the agency of The Toronto Globe.

There is Another Feature.

There is another feature of this monopoly and it will come out in a very few days. These gentlemen who have made this railway proposition are very enterprising men, who are looking for good things all the world over. They have acquired the street railways in most of the cities in this country; they acquired the street railway franchise in the City of Toronto, for which they paid very little; and what they did was to issue bonds to pay for the entire cost of that road, and on these bonds they issue $6,000,000 of stock, which they have divided among themselves and sold to the public; and to-day that stock is at par. They have done the same thing with many other street railway franchises in this country and with certain electric plants; and now they propose to do it with this project. I believe there is a statement in the papers to-day that within twelve months, if this measure goes through Parliament, these gentlemen will be able to bond the project to the extent of $15,000,000 or $20,000,000.

Key to the Situation.

There is another thing in the wind. If there is one thing that will help to settle the transportation question in this country—and again I appeal to my hon. friends from the Northwest and British Columbia—it is the absolute control of a railway from Fort Arthur to Winnipeg. That is the key to the situation—that is the key that must be saved at any cost to the people of this country. But what are the facts, so far as hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends in the Ontario Legislature are concerned? The charter for the Rainy River Railway and the large subsidy that goes with it have passed into the hands of Mr. McKenzie, Mr. McKenzie, as the papers tell us, and I presume they tell the truth, has been in Winnipeg, negotiating with the C. P. R. Company and the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Greenway is staking his political reputation upon maintaining a road securing a railway rate and guaranteeing a low rate for the transport of wheat from the Province of Manitoba to Lake Superior. He threatened at one time to take the railway into his own hands; but I understand that his friends here asked him to abandon Duluth and go to Port Arthur or some other Ontario port. I believe he has that end in view, but with Mr. McKenzie in possession of the charter of that railway, without being required to make any terms as to rates or running rights over that road, and by these means get into his hands a monopoly which will have cost him but little, but which he can sell for millions to the C. P. R. Company. We know that hon. gentlemen opposite are to be asked to subsidize a rival railway from Port Arthur to Winnipeg, but if they cannot take a stand in regard to the Yukon railway, how can they be expected to take a stand in regard to the Rainy River Railway? I know what they are going to do. I can forecast it, as I have recently forecast some other things. They will do as they have done on other occasions, make a pretence of regulating that railway, but in the end it will pass into the hands of the C. P. R. Company and the farmers of Manitoba and the Northwest will continue to be under their thumb.

A Government Railway Wanted.

The day has come to declare for a Government railway. The day has come to declare that this Yukon railway should be a Government railway, and that the Government should regulate the rates, not once in four years, but every day in the week. The day has come for the complete control of those rates by the Government, and the granting of running rights over the railways of the country to anybody who may apply for them. These are the principles that ought to govern railway legislation to-day, but they are being abandoned by hon. gentlemen opposite. The people of the United States are alive to this question. They are alive to railway monopolies there, but what is the proposal of one of their ablest thinkers in regard to the transportation problems as set out in The North American Review of this month? This well-informed writer shows the necessity of regulating railways and controlling their rates, and his proposal is to nationalize every road west of the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean. He says that that will be the one cure of the evil, and we in this country must do the same thing.

Parliament Must be Supreme.

We must nationalize the railways. I do not care how large or how small they may be. We must keep Parliament supreme over them; we must control their rates, and we must give running rights over them to any railway that may require them. But hon. gentlemen opposite are not taking one single step in this direction. They are simply doing their best to create a new monopoly and to allow it to be absorbed by the greater monopoly, the C. P. R. Company.

Mr. Flint: Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Is it his opinion that the Government should have built the Yukon Railway as a Government work out of borrowed or other money?

Mr. Maclean: That is my view, decidedly. The Government should have built this road with the people's money and kept the road in its own hands. For that the people would vote the necessary money tomorrow. If you bring down a proposition to build that railway, for which I admit the urgency, with Government money, though I cannot speak for the Opposition, I believe every man on this side of the House would vote for it. The Opposition (cheers). It is not the members on this side of the House, but the Government's friends who may not have enough confidence in them to support such a proposition, that they need to convert.

Why Was That Clause Put In?

Now, hon. gentlemen were very careful last year in the Railway Committee to put a certain clause in all railway bills which went through that committee. There was a railway company chartered last year under the name of the British Yukon Company, and in that charter there is this clause:

"Any Act hereinafter passed for the purpose of controlling railway companies incorporated by or subject to Parliament as to the issuing of stock or bonds, and as to rates or tolls, and the regulation thereof, and as to running powers over or other rights in connection with the railway of any company by any other company, and the exercise of powers conferred upon railway companies shall apply to the companies from the time such act goes into effect; but this section shall not be construed to imply that such Act would not apply to the company without the enactment of this section."

Why did they not put that clause in this railway bill? If they are to have a Railway Commission, as is hinted in the House and in the country, why do they not retain some right over this railway by that Railway Commission when it does come?

Railway Commission Needed.

An honest Railway Commission could do a great deal to ameliorate transportation difficulties in this country, and this road above all other roads, which is to be built entirely by means of the land of the people, requires to be controlled by a commission in the interests of the people. Do hon. gentlemen opposite say that Mann and McKenzie are building this road? I say it is the people who are building it, and who ought to own it and control it, and regulate its rates, and be in a position to give running rates to any other railway to whom they may see fit to give them. The Government have not even retained the right to submit those matters to arbitration; they provide that in five years and in ten years, different times, the rates shall be reduced, but they should retain the power to regulate these rates from the start, and compel the company to accept reasonable terms.

Times Have Changed.

But hon. gentlemen opposite, despite all their protestations when in Opposition, are now doing the very thing in an ill-advised way. Every proposal in that bill is in direct antagonism to the public interest to recognize principles of modern railway legislation, and especially to the principles that these hon. gentlemen advocated when in Opposition. They then contended for the submission to tender of the construction of all public works. They then declared that no public work of any importance should be constructed without everybody having had a chance to compete. But here to-day we have them calmly ignoring this cardinal principle of theirs in Opposition, and making a private arrangement for this most important and expensive undertaking without the slightest pretence of having invited tenders. Had they invited competition they would have had inside of three days a proposal just as good as the one offered to them by Mr. Hamilton Smith. But, instead of inviting competition, they made a secret contract and now must take the consequences.

Reason Why it Should be Defeated.

I hope the bill will be defeated; first, because it is wrong in itself; second, because it is against progressive railway principles, the principles of progressive railway legislation; third, because it is opposed to the true interests of the people. It only requires a few independent men to stand upon the other side and state boldly what they think and this bill will not go through. A cave of five men on the other side would upset this proposition. If the men of the Northwest are true to their principles and provinces, they will stand up in opposition to this iniquitous measure, for, if only four men on the other side rose and spoke against it, that would be sufficient to defeat it. The members from the Northwest cannot sit there quietly and vote for a monopoly of this kind; they cannot vote for this squandering of the public lands of this country. The people of the Northwest want to see the railway legislation of this country established on a better basis. There is not one of the representatives of the Northwest who dare get up in this House and vote and support the shackling of the miners of the Yukon in the way proposed by this contract and then justify their claim that the farmers of the Northwest should have the shackles of that have been put on them by the C. P. R. broken. If the Northwest claims that she has been badly treated by the C. P. R., then her representatives cannot with any grace support the putting of similar shackles on the miners of the Yukon. I believe that the public opinion of the Northwest and of British Columbia is against the feeling among the merchants in the two large cities out there, is against this proposition. Hon. gentlemen opposite claim that we must have the road built, and we must be built this year. I do not deny that, but I do object to the monopoly. I object to the land grant, and I say that for one-fourth of that land grant you could get the road built and keep the control in the hands of the Government. If that be the case, the representatives of the great West and British Columbia must, as honest men, oppose this measure.

A Challenge.

Mr. Morrison: As far as the remarks of the hon. gentleman relate to British Columbia, may I tell him that he is talking twaddle.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. gentleman should not make use of that expression.

Mr. Maclean: I am not talking twaddle, and I will go into the hon. gentleman's country. I hope to be there this summer, and if he will call a public meeting I will attend it and tackle him on that question and we will find out where the twaddle is. (Opposition cheers).

Can the hon. gentlemen stand up here and justify this land grab? Can they go back to their people and justify such a proposition, in the face of all their pledges and of the new offer just read to the House? If hon. gentlemen will stand up here and condemn the C. P. R. monopoly which has been fastened on the farmers of the Northwest, I do not see how they can consistently justify this monopoly which is being put upon the miners of the Yukon.

I may have wearied the House, but I think I am speaking for the progressive public opinion of this country—a progressive party, perhaps, I will call it—the forward Conservatives of the country, who recognize the fact that the transportation problem is the one above all others, and that if we do not approach it in the right spirit and in the right way, we shall do our country incalculable damage. But it we start in now to get on the right line, if we regulate every railway as it comes up and take control over its running rates, we will have gone a long way to improving the position. I appeal to the hon. gentleman who leads the Government to withdraw this proposition, or at least to modify it. But if they choose to go on and refuse to withdraw or modify the bill, I appeal to the country and ask the people to approve this iniquitous measure, the sooner they will find out that they stand condemned by the people as a whole. [Cheers].

MR. FRASER REPLIES.

Agreed With Mr. Maclean as to Monopolies, But Brought in a Far-Fetched Accusation.

Mr. Fraser (Liberal, Guysboro) agreed with the last speaker as to the disadvantages of monopolies, but accused Mr. Maclean of helping to fasten a street railway monopoly on Toronto by advocating Sunday cars.

Mr. Maclean, interposing, said he had advocated the municipalization of the street railway, including civic control.

Mr. Fraser, continuing, said, while he believed that the value of the land grant was exaggerated by the Opposition, he would favor giving it, even if it were worth $50,000,000 to enable Canada to control the Yukon trade. Better offers were all very well now, within ten days of the time set for the completion of the sleigh road, which is the first part of the contract.

N. CLARKE WALLACE.

The Member for West York Makes Some Strong Points Against Mr. Blair's Arguments.

Mr. N. Clarke Wallace took up the debate after dinner. Dealing with Mr. Blair's argument that a deep draft vessel, by transshipping direct into the smaller river craft at Fort Wrangel, would escape control of the United States customs, he pointed out that it would not be permitted under the American Customs Act, any more than a United States vessel could transship in this way at a Canadian port. It was contended that Canada could get clear of this disability by transshipping into river craft at Fort Simpson. But he could tell the Government that neither the Minister of Marine nor any of his officers would dare to give a river steamer a certificate to carry passengers from Fort Simpson to Fort Wrangel, that being an ocean voyage, for 60 miles of the trip at least.

Mr. Wallace pointed out that Mr. Blair had misrepresented him as estimating the earning capacity of the railway on the basis of $100 per passenger for the railway trip alone. As Hansard showed, he had estimated the charge for the through trip to Dawson at $100 per passenger, and $50 per ton for freight, which, for 50,000 passengers and 50,000 tons of freight, would yield $10,000,000 on an expenditure of $4,000,000, or a profit of $6,000,000. Was 50,000 passengers an extravagant estimate? Well, Mr. Sifton had given it as a fact that 250,000 people would be going into the Yukon this year. Knowing all these things, it was shameful that the Government should have taken no practical steps to meet the situation until 10 days before the assembling of Parliament.

"Canada for the Canadians," according to Mr. Fraser, was the policy of the Government. This was another plank of the Conservative party appropriated by the Liberals without acknowledgment. It was satisfactory to have this eleventh-hour turning to the right course, but it could not be forgotten that Mr. Fraser himself was at one time in this House the most ardent advocate of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. Would Canadians get the trade of the Yukon under such a policy? [Applause.] No; what would save the trade of the Yukon to Canada was the National Policy continued, Mr. Wallace denied the statement that these lands would only become valuable through the exertions of the company.

Prospectors Would Make it Valuable.

As a matter of fact this immense concession would become valuable by the work of prospectors. All the company need do is build their tramway and get their land grant. Then, they could make terms with prospectors to explore and locate claims, report them immediately to McKenzie and Mann, so they could claim a location there, and in exchange for the information the company could give right of fee simple to the discovery of claim. That would pay the prospector better than recording with the Government, at which charge him a $15 recording fee and 10 per cent. on his output. Then if miners in some remote district should unknowingly open up property within the Mann & McKenzie area, would the Government not be bound to recoup the company for the gold taken out. [Hear, hear.]

It was contended this was not a monopoly. There was monopoly in every line of it. These gentlemen knew what they were about; they had been in communication with the Government and spying out the land since last July.

Sifton and Blair Sneaked Out.

Mr. Wallace asked a question of the Minister, and, observing the absence of Messrs. Sifton and Blair, complained that during the discussion of this important contract the Minister of the Interior and Railways had been out of the House more than half the time. [Hear, hear.] "We have before the House," said Mr. Wallace, "this question, which was so important that all others must be laid aside until it is finally dealt with, and yet the two gentlemen charged with the measure treat it with such indifference that they cannot be here to give information." A few minutes afterwards Mr. Blair made his appearance, bland and smiling, an d for his delectation Mr. Wallace, to the edification of the Opposition, after remarking that he was pleased to see the Minister of Railroads and Canals present, repeated his complaint.

Continuing, Mr. Wallace quoted the challenge of Mr. Sifton to "Come on with your offer, and the Government will accept it," and, holding up the Hamilton Smith syndicate's proposal to build the road for one-fourth the land subsidy given to McKenzie and Mann, the member for West York enquired of the Government, "What are you going to do about it?"

It surprised Mr. Wallace that the Minister of the Interior should have bolstered up his case by quotations from the all-together mistaken views of The New York Commercial Advertiser. Mr. Sifton read with approval the statement in that paper that the grant was to be take up along the line of the railway, where the land had no ascertained mineral value. Mr. Sifton knew when he read it that not an acre of the grant was along the line of railway but in the rich Yukon district, where the contractors have the choice of mineral lands.

But why, he asked, was not Parliament called to deal with this question on Jan. 1, as at first proposed? This was going to be a very short session, and the Government knew it long ago and should have prepared for it. True, the Premier was not to blame, "He," contended Mr. Wallace, "was in England last summer on Imperial business, but we had in his place (I was going to say a better man) the Minister of Trade and Commerce. That hon. gentleman was not lacking in mental physical vigor, however, or we should not, I believe, have this monstrous bargain before us to-day. [Applause.]

I have for this land grant, it was undesirable. He said that with the facilities which the contractors had for selecting locations, they had a tremendous advantage over the Government, because, as he pointed, it would pay successful prospectors to communicate new discoveries at once to Messrs. McKenzie and Mann.

Mr. Wallace, in conclusion, urged that a new arrangement should be made, one more in the interests of the country than the contract now under consideration. [Cheers.]

MR. SMITH'S OFFER.

Hon. Wm. Paterson Did Not Know Mr. Smith Personally—Was Informed Who He Was.

Hon. William Paterson (Minister of Customs) said that Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann had referred the offer made to the Government by Hamilton Smith. The two gentlemen evidently knew a good deal about that offer. Possibly they had assisted in the drafting of the letter. They had mentioned that Mr. Smith represented the Rothschilds. He (Mr. Paterson) had always understood that the Rothschilds to be an honorable firm. Mr. Maitland Kersey had submitted an offer to build the railway for $6000 per mile and he represented that he was backed by the Rothschilds. In view of Kersey's offer that there would be no cash bonus, simply a land grant, he withdrew his proposal. How, then, did it happen that this Mr. Smith came in with an offer to build the line for a land grant of one million acres when the Rothschilds would not look at it some weeks ago for three and three-quarter million acres. Mr. Paterson, in thundering tones, declared that there was not much in Mr. Hamilton Smith's offer, and the Grits cheered the statement.

Mr. Smith Vouched For.

Sir Charles Tupper said he had seen the credentials of Mr. Smith and he could testify that he represented half a dozen of the most powerful financial corporations in London.

Mr. Paterson proceeded to consider the question of the route. He contended that it was the only one which could have been adopted under the circumstances.

Mr. Paterson, referring to the problematical results of the defeat of this measure, said for any member to express the hope that the Senate would throw this bill out was an insult to the other branch of the Legislature.

Mr. Paterson, in conclusion, stated that having regard to the best interests of the country, Parliament ought to pronounce a favorable verdict on the bill. [Government cheers.]

Mr. Monk moved the adjournment of the debate. The House adjourned at 11.45.

STUDENTS AND MISSIONS.

Third Day's Proceedings at Trinity College—List of the Delegates—Papers and Discussion.

Yesterday was the third day of the convention of the Church Students' Missionary Association, which is being held at Trinity College. The delegates in attendance are Messrs. L H Littell, H H Sland and J R Oliver of the Theological Seminary, New York; Malcom Taylor and J E Doane of the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.; P M Kerridge and George Siller of Berkeley Divinity School, Middleton, Conn.; D W Thornbury, Kenyon College, Ohio; Gibson Bell, Cambridge University; G Ballard, Hobart College; T B Kilvert and T N Wright, Episcopal Theological Seminary, Philadelphia; M J Simpson and T Cameron, Seabury Divinity School; A R Van Meter, Trinity College, Hartford; A R Hill, St. Stephen's College, Annadale, N.J.; P L Ancell, G E Perkins, Episcopal Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Virginia; R Herbert, Huron College, London; J R Hooper, King's College, Windsor, N.S.; W B Heeny, Diocesan College, Montreal; Rev C A Seager, D A Madill, J Bushell, D T Oliver, Trinity College, Toronto; Messrs Holmsworth, Heard and Rennie, Wycliffe College, Toronto.

An address was delivered in the morning by the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Toronto, in which he extended the delegates a hearty welcome.

Mr. James R. H. Warren, president of the convention, read a paper, in which he outlined the work of the association. Reports were then received from seventeen chapters of the association.

In the afternoon the vice-president of the association, Mr. Malcolm Taylor, spoke upon the missionary events of the past year, and Rev. R. L. Paddock, general secretary, gave an account of the work done by the colleges. Mr. C. E. Perkins read a paper on the "Development of the Spiritual Life"; Mr. Weyman, a paper on the "Jesuits in North America," and Mr. M. J. Simpson, a paper on "The Lack of Missionary Spirit." Mr. Siller closed the afternoon's proceedings with an appeal for workers.

In the evening a public missionary meeting was held.

GUINANE'S GUINANE'S

Tuesday Morning.

Men's Shoes

These extraordinary specials, exactly as advertised, are for To-day and Wednesday only —their quantities are limited —we cannot guarantee all the styles to last even through the day.

There is not a mean shoe amongst them—they are all to be sold in two lots:

Lot 1—Shoes worth $3 and $4, for 1.90

Lot 2—Shoes worth $5 and $6, for 2.90

THE GENERAL DESCRIPTIONS ARE AS FOLLOWS:

Colors: Black—Brown—Tan.
Patterns: Laced—Gaiter.
Toes: From narrow coin to wide plain.
Soles: Oak tanned, sewed or Goodyear welted.
Tops: Kangaroo Skin—Cloth — Dull Goat Skin.
Leathers: Boxed, Waxed, Metallic and Harvard Calf Skin — Patent Leather — Chrome Kid Skin.

W. J. GUINANE
510 QUEEN W. 210 YONGE.

IT IS AGAINST MRS. MALONE

The Coroner's Jury Connects Her With Thomas Perth's Death.

Mrs. Malone Apparently Fainted During the Evidence, but Dr. Spencer Said Nothing Was the Matter With Her—An Infant Witness—A Juror Discharged—A Reporter's Testimony.

"We, the jury, find that the infant Thomas erth cameto his death from starvation and exposure, and we believe that the child was taken by Mrs. Elizabeth Malone to the corner of Perth and Bloor-streets, Toronto, where she claims to have found it."

Such was the verdict rendered by a coroners jury last evening in the West End baby case.

There were three unusually interesting features in connection with last night's session of the inquest at the Police Court. When the enquiry was reopened, Juror Langley was excused from further service, owing to his having expressed his opinion of the case too freely at the previous session. The second interesting feature was the appearince of a witness only seven months old and the third was a peculiar move on the part of the woman who is accused of causing the child's death. Contrary to the young woman who is supposed to be the mother of the child found strangled at Weston last October was being taken, Mrs. Malone fell over on her chair apparently in a deep faint. She was taken into the matron's room and laid upon the floor, where Coroner Spencer attended her, and returned to the court room with the remark that there was nothing the matter with her. The woman came back to the court room a few minutes afterward, but did not remain to hear the balance of the evidence.

Identified the Infant.

The baby that Mrs. Malone said right along was her sister's was produced in court and positively identified by Mrs. Harriett Ward of John-street as a child born at her house on John-street on June 12 last, the mother being a young woman named Maud Holden, who is now supposed to be in Buffalo. Miss Holden was not Mrs. Malone's sister, but the accused had accepted the baby for adoption by stating that she would send it to a good home in Berlin, if she was given $10 for clothes and a carriage. Mrs Malone eventually took the child and $5 on account of the $10, and when witness went to the house of the accused to pay the other $5 she saw a delicate little baby in a cradle, and Mrs. Malone said that it was likely to die, as six babies had already died in the cradle in which it lay.

The Supposed Mother's Testimony.

The young woman who is supposed by the Crown to be the mother of the child found dead at Weston, or the deceased Thomas Perth, told the story of giving her baby and $5 to Mrs. Malone, who afterwards assured her that the child was comfortably adopted by Mrs. Johnston, Oakley-avenue, Whitby, and the young mother accepted the woman's statement. The witness said she had never seen the baby since, and has no idea where it is now. "I was satisfied at the time the baby was found at Weston that it was not mine, as I was told so by Mrs. Malone and Sergt. Vaughan," said the witness.

Witness was shown the clothing found on the Perth baby, and identified a small shirt as a garment she had given Mrs. Malone with her baby. She was not positive that the "bootees" found on the baby Perth were the ones she had given Mrs. Malone, although they looked like them.

The Reporter's Fruitless Errand.

Walter Armstrong, a World reporter, said that at the time of the Weston case he went to Whitby and discovered no trace of the Mrs. Johnston to whom she accused said she had given the baby. He found there was no such locality as Oakley-avenue in Whitby, nor was there a Mrs. Johnston who had adopted a baby within a radius of 15 miles of the town, as he had seen all the families of that name.

Crown Attorney Raney produced a letter from the Chief of Police, Whitby, which corroborated Armstrong's evidence.

Weston Depositions Admitted.

The depositions taken at the inquest on the Weston child were admitted as evidence, notwithstanding the strong objections of Lawyer C. E. Macdonald for the prisoner.

George Chapman of the Morality Department told of his investigation in this case, and his testimony was distinctly contradictory to the evidence given by the accused. Fourteen babies have been received at the Infants' Home since last May.

The Coroner Speaks Out

Coroner Spencer, in reviewing the evidence, dwelt upon the pitiable circumstances in connection with the child's death. He regretted that Mrs. Malone's statements throughout had not been characterized by truthfulness, but rather by an utter disregard for the truth from beginning to end. This had been shown by many witnesses.

It took the jury nearly an hour to reach a conclusion.

Mrs. Malone was sent back to the jail at midnight, shortly before the verdict was rendered.

Coroner Macdonald made a strenuous objection to the Crown Attorney and Coroner having been admitted to the jury room to shape the verdict, but Coroner Spencer maintained that the action was quite legal.

Asked if the charge now against Mrs. Malone would be changed to manslaughter, Mr. Raney was unable to say just what proceedings would be taken.

THE ROYAL GRENS.

Good Reports Presented at the Annual Meeting—Letter of Condolence to Lady Middleton.

At the annual meeting of the officers of the Royal Grenadiers reports were received from the following committees, viz., Regimental, Band, Mess, Rifle, Equipment and Athletic, all showing the various departments of the regiment to be in a satisfactory condition.

Satisfaction was expressed by the Rifle Committee with the efficiency of the new magazine rifle. The cost of the ammunition was, however, a drawback to more extensive practice.

A motion expressive of regret at the death of the late Lieut.-General Sir Fred Middleton was passed, and it was decided to send a copy of the same to Lady Middleton, the Royal Grenadiers having served under General Middleton's immediate command in the Northwest.

The following committees were appointed:

Regimental—Major Bruce, Surgeon-Major King, Captain Stimson, Captain Cartwright.

Mess—Captain Boyd, Captain Goodeham, Lieut. Slonne, Lieut. Shanly.

Band—Captain Cameron, Lieut. O'Reilly, Lieut. MacInnes.

Equipment—Major Trotter, Captain Montgomery, Captain Brooke.

Rifle—Major Bruce, Major Trotter, Lieut. Meyers, Lieut. Craig, Lieut. Mason.

Entertainment—Surgeon-Major King, Captain Montgomery, Lieut. Martin, Lieut. Wilkie, Lieut. Winans.

Athletic—Captain Boyd, Captain Cartwright, Lieut. Martin, Lieut. Mason, Lieut. Shanly.

LIVER, LANGUOR AND CONSTIPATION.

When your liver gets sluggish, inactive, your whole health suffers, your bowels become constipated, tongue coated, complexion muddy, your head aches, you have the "blues."

Helping the liver to resume its proper function, removing the bile that is circulating