	ESTABLISHED 1860
IHE	MONETARY TIMES,
TRAD	E REVIEW AND INSURANCE CHRONICLE,
INTERCOL	With which has been incorporated the ONIAL JOURNAL OF COMMERCE, of Montreal (in 1869), the RADE REVIEW, of the same city (in 1870) and the TORONTO JOURNAL OF COMMERCE.
	ussued every friday morning 🚤
CANADIAN SUBSC BRITISH " AMERICAN " SINGLE COPIES	IOS. 6d. Sterling Per Vear
D	ook and job Printing a specialty
BUSINESS	ARY TIMES PRINTING CO. OF CANADA, Limited JT, President ALFRED W. LAW, Sec'y-Treas. Office: 62 Church St., Cor. Court St. TELEPHONEB: AND EDITORIAL OFFICE, 1892 PRINTING DEPARTMENT, 1485
	ONTO, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1899.
	THE SITUATION.

the request of Canada. It is at the request of Canada again, as in the case of the Newfoundland treaty, that the Jamaica treaty is to be disallowed. We shall doubtless hear once more from across the border, that Canada is controlling the Imperial policy. But the case is one in which we had some right to speak; we have given Jamaica a preference, in our markets, and we have gone to the expense of setting up steam comnunication with the island, for the purpose of fostering the trade between us. On general principles, too, we can fairly object when Jamaica discriminates against a sister colony, which has gone out of its way to assist her, as best she could. It appears to be on the latter ground, discrimination against Canada, that the treaty is to be disallowed.

In the reciprocal remission of duties, under the treaty between the United States and Jamaica, the latter had agreed to reductions on American exports that, Would amount, according to one estimate, to \$120,000 a ^year. Our complaint is that there would be no corresponding reduction of duties on Canadian produce, but that the old duties would continue to be collected. If we had not some special grounds of objection, such as the first two named, it is not clear that Canada could offer valid objections to the treaty. We have ourselves been trying to make a commercial treaty with the Republic, in which we have in no way taken Jamaica into account. But there is not the same clashing of interests as in the case of the Jamaica treaty; there is, so far as we know, no clashing of interests at all; Jamaica, with the means of knowing generally what Was going on in the Canada-American negotiations, has made no complaint. Each case must, with the reservation of one cardinal principle, be taken on its own merits; the principle is that there shall not be wholesale discrimination against Great Britain. When the negotiation of the Jamaica treaty was entered on, it would have been well, if the Colonial Office, or the Foreign Office, if necessary, had laid down the rule that there must be no discrimination against the staple productions of Canada. Probably it was thought that, as Canada was going out of her way to discriminate in favor of Jamaica, as against foreign countries, there was no danger that Jamaica would consent to discriminate against Canada. However this may be, the absence of the rule led to the present complications.

Among the goods treated with discrimination are certain manufactures, in which England is interested; the nature of the bargain is that it favors the United States, at the expense of England. This of course is the business of England; but as the disallowance will be on account of Canada, this feature will not come into prominence. Once the question was raised here, whether Canada should not bodily adopt the American tariff; this question was negatived, and has now fallen out of sight; some of its past advocates would perhaps be pleased if it could forever be made to pass out of recollection.

The Chicago Tribune publishes what purports to be an interview with Senator Mills, Minister of Justice at Ottawa, on the Alaska boundary dispute, but which, it is easy to see, is a carefully prepared statement of the case of Canada, though he gives it as his own opinion only. Of all members of the Government, Senator Mills is best capable of disentangling the subject, if that be possible. He shows that it is full of intricacies and difficulties. In drafting the treaty, he infers, a mistake of nomenclature was made; that, on the water boundary, the Portland channel was named, when the Clarence channel must have been intended, since the Portland channel does not go north to the 56th degree of north latitude, as the treaty requires, from the starting point of the southernmost part of the Prince of Wales Island, the latitude and longitude of which are given, but that the channel, which lies immediately east of the Prince of Wales Island, does so extend. Some contend that the Portland channel has changed names, or that these two waters have exchanged names, since the treaty between England and Russia was made; Mr. Mills merely says another water than that known as Portland channel must have been intended. His contention is that the question of the name of the water, when Portland channel is mentioned, must be subordinated to the direction and description contained in the articles of the Though Senator Mills says nothing about it, treaty. our information is that the official maps in the British Foreign Office support this view of the case.

On the question of the boundary line, inland, Senator Mills distinguishes between the general coast line, eliminating the inlets, one of which, generally spoken of as the Lynn canal, the Americans treat as part of the windings of the coast. On this part of the subject Senator Mills touches lightly. "When you pass the Lynn canal," he says, "it will be found that the coast range embraces peaks from 10,000 to 18,000 feet high, and it does seem to me preposterous to contend