

The Klondike Nugget

TELEPHONE NUMBER 12
(DAWSON'S PIONEER PAPER)
ISSUED DAILY AND SEMI-WEEKLY.
ALLEN BROS., Publishers

From Monday and Tuesday's Daily.
A QUESTION OF INTERPRETATION.

The suggestion has been made that the government in reducing the royalty to five per cent, intends by the same measure to lay the tax upon the entire output, without allowing any exemption.

We can scarcely believe that such is the intention. It is not so stated in the telegram received by Gold Commissioner Senkler yesterday and until an official interpretation to that effect is given it is fair to assume that the exemption continues.

As a matter of fact, without the exemption cause, the advantage of the reduction, so far as the general interests of the territory are concerned will be comparatively slight. The exemption of \$5000 does not mean a great deal to owners of claims which are heavy producers, but it is a consideration of the utmost importance to the great body of claim owners whose properties are not of Eldorado richness.

A great many claims will not produce in the course of a year an amount of gold to exceed \$10,000. In such cases, if the exemption is withdrawn, the reduction in the royalty affords no relief whatsoever. It is just as easy to pay ten per cent on \$5000 as it is to pay five per cent on \$10,000. If a claim yields between \$5000 and \$10,000 the amount of royalty will be greater at five per cent without the exemption than at ten per cent the exemption being allowed. For instance under the former regulation a yield of \$8000 would require payment of ten per cent on \$8000 or \$800. Under the new regulation without any exemption the same claim would pay five per cent on \$8000 or \$400, a difference of \$400 against the claim owner.

Such an interpretation of the new law would result entirely to the benefit of the heavy producer and against the small owner, which, as noted above, we do not believe to be the government's intention.

THE END CROWNS THE WORK.

On the fifth of July, 1898, in the fifth issue of this paper after its publication had been begun, the opening gun in the fight which has since been waged against the ten per cent royalty tax was fired. The Nugget was the only paper in Dawson which sought to represent the public thought of the community and for more than a year this paper stood single handed and alone in demanding from the government complete abolishment or at least a substantial reduction in the royalty tax.

For a period of almost three years the Nugget has maintained the attitude originally assumed in the matter and today we have the satisfaction of recording the fact that a substantial victory—a victory which will be far reaching in its effects—has been won.

There is no longer any doubt respecting the matter—official confirmation of the private advice recently received has arrived and the royalty has been cut in two. It is a matter of intense satisfaction to the Nugget to contemplate the part which it has played in this work. In season and out of season this paper has steadfastly applied its efforts in the direction of attaining from the federal government the rights which it was evident must be granted to the miner and prospector before the development of the resources of this territory could fairly be said to have begun.

This work, undertaken, as noted above, almost single handed and alone, has been participated in finally by almost every person having substantial interests in the territory. Men who at first were apathetic because they believed nothing could be done, came around at last to the point where they pulled off their coats, figuratively speaking, and threw their entire energies into the work.

Others who supported the govern-

ment's attitude simply because they feared to go on record as opponents of any governmental policy, were brought finally to see that a change must be brought about or the territory was doomed.

The local officials, after acquainting themselves thoroughly with the conditions came, one after another, to realize that something must be done, and their influence has been a potent factor in securing the concessions which one after another have been granted during the past eight months.

We doubt very strongly if an instance can be noted where a better or more successful fight has been made for recognition of the rights of a new country.

Changes have been made in the mining regulations which many people maintained in 1898 would never be made. Concessions have been granted to the miner and prospector which it was claimed, and claimed by those who were in a position to know whereof they spoke, would never be granted and at the present time we have the highest of authorities in the United States paying the Canadian government the compliment of giving to the Yukon territory the best mining regulations in the world.

This is what has been accomplished since the fifth day of July, 1898, when the Nugget originated the first systematic effort to gain the recognition for this territory to which it is entitled. The results of this work speak for themselves. The Nugget does not lay claim to the entire credit for what has been accomplished, but we are well satisfied with the part which this paper has performed.

The fight for the rights of the Yukon territory to which this paper promised its every assistance in its initial number has been fought out to a successful conclusion. We congratulate the people of the territory that our mutual efforts have been so gloriously crowned.

PUBLIC OPINION.

The history of the Yukon territory during the past three years has furnished a most striking example of the force of public opinion. If the people of a community unite in a determination to secure a certain object or objects, they cannot fail to meet with success, if honesty of purpose is shown. The effort to secure proper recognition for this territory from the federal government has met with many hindrances. There has been no direct representation at Ottawa. Communication with the capital has been slow and uncertain and many stumbling blocks have, at times been thrown in the way as the result of misrepresentations on the part of men who have sought personal favors from the government. But in spite of all obstacles, the great work of rescuing the territory from the burden of unjust and oppressive legislation, placed upon it three years ago, has been pressed unceasingly, until nearly everything that was sought has been attained.

No responsible government can fly in the face of public opinion and survive. Popular sentiment intelligently directed is all powerful, which fact has been demonstrated in this territory in a manner absolutely unmistakable.

LONG-RANGE POLITICS.

A representative of the News has announced through a Skagway paper that Dawson is to be incorporated immediately; that all the big commercial concerns are favorable to the project and that Mr. John Grant will be mayor of Dawson before June 1. This is all very refreshing news. There is a delightful tinge of romance about it which is characteristic of the sayings and doings of our amateur neighbor. We must say, however, that the News has not been absolutely just to its candidate. It looks very much to us like a case of long-range politics. Why should our contemporary go all the way to Skagway to boom Mr. Grant for the Dawson mayoralty? Why should it go 500 miles away from home in order to break the news that Dawson's commer-

cial interests are supporting incorporation?

If these marvelous things are all true why not say so in Dawson rather than in Skagway? Why does not the News come out in Dawson to the support of the gentleman whom the representative of that paper has assured the people of Skagway will be mayor of this city before the first of June?

Certainly the News cannot expect to secure incorporation, or elect its candidate through the newspapers of Skagway, and we doubt very much if the aforesaid candidate is looking for that particular class of newspaper support. Here is a most remarkable situation to which the explanation editor of our contemporary may well devote consideration of a most serious nature.

The decision of the supreme court of the United States in refusing to interfere on behalf of Alex McKenzie, now serving a sentence of one year in jail for contempt of court, will be well received by the people of the States generally. McKenzie transgressed the laws of his country and although influences of a most powerful nature were brought to bear in his behalf, the decision of the court of appeals could not be shaken. While the integrity of the courts remain unimpeachable the liberties of the people are safe.

Carnegie has given away to public libraries and charitable institutions almost as much money as the total output of this territory for one year.

To the News re Capt. Woodside: De mortuis nihil nisi bonum.

How many times were you fooled.

TOMORROW THE LIMIT.

Mrs. McConnell Must Then Appear in Person or by Counsel.

Only echo answered this morning when the McConnell case was called in police court by Magistrate Starnes. Previous to the opening of court it was known that the defendant would not be present for the reason that the warrant issued yesterday to compel attendance this morning either in person or by attorney was not executed. In again postponing the date of hearing until 2 o'clock tomorrow the court said:

"I carefully considered the matter of having the warrant issued yesterday served on Mrs. McConnell, and decided to not do so, but to give her one more opportunity of coming before the court either in person or by attorney. I will write her today telling her she must be so represented tomorrow at 2 p. m. No more of Dr. Catto's certificates will be accepted but if Mrs. McConnell cannot come and is represented by counsel, Dr. Catto must also appear before me and answer such questions as I shall put to him relative to the defendant's condition in order that I may satisfy myself as to her physical condition. She has written me numerous letters in which she states she is unable to secure an attorney when I well know she is able to do so. She may be sick, but she should consent to see some other doctor, as she was asked to do some days ago. This matter must be brought to a head, and if the defendant is really not able to be present in person she can be represented by counsel and the case can be proceeded with. If there is no representation of defendant present at 2 o'clock tomorrow, the warrant already issued will surely be served."

Attorney Pattullo, for the prosecution notified all his witnesses to be present tomorrow.

There was no other business before the court this morning.

Over the Ice.

Abe Stein, the intrepid ice traveler who made several round trips between Dawson and Skagway last winter, and who went out over the ice this year, arrived this morning with two heavy sleds laden with general merchandise. He says reports that the trail is breaking up are unfounded and he expects to return to Whitehorse on the ice. He says there are many teams now on the river headed this way. Mrs. Sam Wall is up the river a short distance and will reach Dawson some time tomorrow.

Mr. G. H. Hartman, of Philadelphia arrived on the stage last evening and will join Mr. Schrader's arctic exploration party. While in Dawson he is stopping at the McDonald hotel.

PREMIER'S GREAT SPEECH

In Parliament in Reply to Mr. Bourassa.

Took Him But Thirty Minutes to Answer Speech Five Times as Long—Everybody Cheered Him.

Ottawa, March 13.—The reply of Sir Wilfrid Laurier to Mr. Bourassa was a splendid effort of oratory, and is being generally commented upon as another great tribute of Canadian loyalty to the empire. Mr. Bourassa's speech lasted two hours and a half. The premier occupied but half an hour in replying, but in that time he effectually disposed of the arguments of the lonely Canadian pro-Boer.

Sir Wilfrid said:

"I must confess Mr. Speaker, that it is with a great deal of regret and with some surprise that I have seen my honorable friend persist in his determination to present the motion of which he gave notice some few days ago, and which he has now placed in your hands. Well remembering the uncompromising hostility which my honored friend showed to our policy nearly two years ago, of sending contingents to South Africa, well knowing from a long acquaintance and a long friendship the logical mind of my honorable friend, remembering also that he had on more than one occasion announced himself as entirely opposed to what he called Imperialism, remembering also that he had somewhat ostentatiously and most persistently refused assent to the policy we advocated of sending troops to South Africa for the prosecution of the war, I must say I was little prepared for the attitude he has now adopted. I would have supposed that he would be a stalwart to the end, and that having refused to send troops to South Africa he would not ask us to send advice to England, but my honorable friend has taken an attitude altogether different from that. He now wants to send advice. He would not fight for the cause of England, but he is willing to sit at the council board in discussing the cause of England today. (Hear, hear.) Whether this conduct of my honorable friend is in keeping with his former well known views, is a problem as to which I shall offer no opinion of my own, but which I shall leave for his own pondering."

"As to the right on our part, asserted in this motion, of making representations to the imperial authorities on all questions that may affect the British empire in whole or in part, this is a right which is no longer in question. We asserted it nearly twenty years ago, when on the 20th of April, 1882, we passed a resolution in favor of home rule for Ireland. We asserted it again a few days ago, when we passed a resolution on coronation declaration. The fact that we sent contingents to South Africa almost two years ago does not in any way affect our right in this respect. It is today what it was before. It has not been altered in any way. It is no longer and no smaller than it was. We have a perfect right to offer advice, and we claim we have the privilege of making representations to the imperial authorities. Therefore, we can approach the question submitted by my honorable friend on its merits and on its merits alone.

"The question which we have before us is not so much the speech of my honorable friend, which has no bearing on the motion which he has presented, but upon the motion itself. Shall we adopt this motion or shall we not? The conclusions of it are to be found in the last two paragraphs. First let me take the last one, which states that no Canadian troops should be sent to South Africa, and that no enlistments for the South African police should be permitted in this country. As to the first conclusion of this proposition—that there is no necessity for sending Canadian troops to South Africa—I must admit I altogether agree with our honorable friend, not for the same reasons that have prompted him, but for the reason that the war is at an end. (Hear, hear.)

"There may be still some guerilla warfare, there may be still some brigandage under the name of war, but war is no longer at issue. Though my honorable friend pretends to be very much in doubt as to the issue of war, for my part I am ready to leave the issue in the hands of the men who have it in hand now and to say with my honorable friend that there is no necessity for sending Canadian troops to South Africa. As to the other portion of the conclusion, namely, that the enlistment of recruits for the constabulary should not be allowed to take

place in Canada, I ask my honorable friend what reason can there be why enlistment of men for this force should be put an end to in Canada? If there are men in Canada, I care not for what motive, whether high or low, whether dignified or undignified, whether because they desire to get a living or from a spirit of adventure, or from the nobler impulse of fighting for their sovereign, who wish to take service in South African constabulary on what principle should a Canadian government interfere and prevent their liberty being so exercised?

"My honorable friend has spoken well and eloquently upon the cause of liberty of which he has constituted himself the almost sole champion in this house, but I must ask him what kind of liberty is it which will not permit a British subject if he chooses to offer his king to serve him in any capacity?

"I am a Liberal as, my honorable friend declares himself to be, but my idea of liberty does not agree with one that will not allow that freedom to every British subject in Canada. (Cheers.) But, sir, the gist of the motion of my honorable friend is in the last paragraph of this motion which means that we are to invite the British authorities to restore the two republics, the South African republic and the Orange Free State to their independence.

"My honorable friend will not deny that this is the meaning he has in his mind, although, strange to say, he never said a word as to that proposition. I would have expected him to deal at length with this point which after all was a noble and worthy subject to consider, and which after all might invite discussion. I would have expected him to give his reasons and arguments why the British authorities should be invited by the Canadian parliament to undo what they have done and to restore to the two republics the independence which they forfeited on the 9th of October, 1899.

"My honorable friend did not speak a word upon that subject, and, sir, perhaps I might sit down and not utter another syllable upon this subject, and I would do so were it not for the fact that my honorable friend in some of his arguments has been so unjust, so unfair, to the British government, that I feel constrained to put before the house the other side of this question." (Cheers.)

Sir Wilfrid proceeded to review his story of the war before and after hostilities broke out, to show that the war was a just one, the British government could not have made any other course than it did, and that Kruger was entirely to blame.

The premier went on to say: "The issuing of the fatal ultimatum was the mistake. It was the sending of this fatal ultimatum which brought all these calamities upon the Boers which Mr. Bourassa deprecates now. Let me tell the honorable gentleman that the responsibility for this does not lie upon any other head than on the ex-president of the Transvaal republic, who has been the first victim of his own doings and notwithstanding all his faults and notwithstanding that he has brought all this on his own head, considering his age, I cannot help feeling for Mr. Kruger a great deal of sympathy."

"Mr. Bourassa deprecates the war. I do not deprecate it as much as he does, but I believe perhaps it is the greatest calamity which has befallen England within the last 40 years or so, because it places on England the burden and the duty of governing South Africa with its two races estranged perhaps for generations by the cruel memories of war, but, sir, even from that view we must take the situation as it is. The problem of South Africa is this: That you have in that country two races so mixed and intermingled that it is not possible to separate them. These two races must be governed by the same power and the same authority and that power has either to be the power of England or the power of the Dutch. It has either to be the liberal and enlightened civilization of England of today or the old bigoted and narrow civilization of the Dutch of 200 years ago. (Hear, hear.)

"Let my honorable friend forget for a moment that he and I are British subjects and in the name of civilization and the name of humanity I ask him which is the power that ought to govern in that distant land? Is it the enlightened power of England or is it the semi-barbarous civilization of the Dutch? (Hear, hear.)

"There is but one future for the Dutch. They have been conquered, but I pledge my reputation and name as a British subject that if they have lost their independence they have not lost their freedom. (Hear, hear.)

"There is but one future for South Africa, and that future is a grand confederation on the pattern of the Canadian confederation. It is federation on which Cape Colony, Natal, the Orange River colony, the Transvaal and Rhodesia will be united together in a federal constitution under the British flag and under the sovereignty of England. My honorable friend will agree with me that with the British flag flying over South Africa they shall have that which has been found everywhere during the last 60 years under that British flag—liberty for all, equality for all, justice and civil rights, for English and Dutch alike.

"For this reason I have to ask the house that they shall not agree to this motion but shall vote it down." Prolonged cheering from both sides of the house followed the premier's speech.