

Messenger and Visitor

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER,
VOLUME LXV.

THE CHRISTIAN VISITOR
VOLUME LIV.

Vol. XIX.

ST. JOHN, N. B., WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1903.

No. 48

Different Views. The *London Times* very cordially supports President Roosevelt and Secretary Hay on the back in reference to their management of the Panama business. "Apparently," says the *Times* "the consummate ability with which President Roosevelt and Secretary Hay have carried through the whole business has won reluctant approval even in very antagonistic quarters among their fellow countrymen. Seldom do the barriers of obstruction collapse so satisfactorily." Some of the United States legislators are by no means so complimentary. Senator Morgan, speaking in Congress the other day, criticized the action of the Administration in regard to Panama, and read the correspondence bearing on the resolutions to show that the President had known of the uprising in the Isthmus before it began, and stood ready with armed ships to protect those engaged in it. The senator contended that Colombia had had a perfect right to suppress the uprising on the Isthmus and declared that the United States had failed entirely to observe its treaty obligations in pursuing the course it had taken. That course, he predicted, would be disastrous and would involve the loss both of men and treasure.

Sir Louis Jetté on the Boundary

Decision.

The judgment of Sir Louis Jetté, the senior Canadian Commissioner, upon the Alaska boundary decision has just been published. It will be remembered that Sir Louis and Mr. Aylesworth, the junior Canadian Commissioner, were convinced that the decision reached by the majority of the commission was not judicial, and accordingly protested against the decision and refused to sign it. In the judgment referred to above, Sir Louis Jetté gives the reasons why he and his fellow commissioner found it impossible to agree with the majority or to sign the decision. Sir Louis calls attention to the composition of the tribunal and the duties of the commissioners as defined by the first article of the treaty, which is as follows: "The Tribunal shall consist of six impartial jurists of repute, who shall consider judicially the questions submitted to them, each of whom shall first subscribe an oath that he will impartially consider the arguments and evidence presented to the tribunal, and will decide thereupon according to his true judgment."

This makes it clear, as Sir Louis shows, that the commissioners were not entrusted with the power to make a new treaty and it was not in their province to make concessions for the sake of an agreement, they had simply to give a judicial interpretation of the treaty submitted to them, and if a majority could not be found to agree, the way would still be left open for the Governments of both countries to settle the difficulty by mutual concessions if they found it to be advantageous. Sir Louis Jetté then proceeds to quote the terms of the arrangement of 1903, upon which the tribunal proceeded. And he goes on to deal with the seven questions upon which the tribunal were to answer. In regard to the second question—that having reference to the location of Portland Channel,—he says:—"When this second question was put to the commissioners, at the time of rendering the award, every one of them, as will appear by the official report, answered that the Portland Channel was the channel that passed—contrary to the American contention—to the North of Pease and Wales Islands. But on the sub-question being put, the majority of the Commission decided that after passing north of Pease and Kannaghunut Islands, which lie directly to the westward of Pease and Wales Islands; should make a curve there, and abandoning its northern course, should reach the sea through Tongass Passage instead of following the continuous straight line which at that moment before had been found to be the proper one. I voted against this sub-proposition because I found that it was totally unsupported either by argument or authority, and was, moreover, illogical. The Commission had, just a moment before, decided—and very properly, I believe—that Portland Channel, as described by Vancouver, was that channel indicated on all the maps running straight to the sea; it had refused to accept the contention of the United States to have it leave its northern course, and making a curve at Pease Island, to run through Observatory Inlet, and all at once it was decided that this very channel shall make a curve lower down, that it will now leave its straight northern course and run into the sea through Tongass Passage. The result of this last decision on the sub-question above mentioned, is to deprive Canada of the two islands which lie at the very entrance of Portland Channel, Sitklan and Kannaghunut Islands. It will strike the eye of everyone who looks at the map that the positions of those islands, at the entrance of the channel, is a most important one, from a military point of view, and that the loss of them to Canada may be felt seriously in the

future." Dealing with the other questions in the light of the treaty of 1825 with Russia and of the circumstances under which it was negotiated, Sir Louis Jetté finds it impossible to believe that the intention of the parties to this treaty was that the strip of territory secured to Russia should be traced so as to run up to the sources of all the rivers and the heads of all the inlets which passed through this strip to reach the sea. "This, however," says Sir Louis, is the meaning which the majority of the tribunal has given to this treaty when by an interpretation of the word coast, which appears to me to be forced and untenable under the circumstances, they are led to say that Lynn Canal is the ocean, and that the coast of the ocean means equally the coast of the Lynn Canal." The other most important point was as to how and where the commissioners should fix the new boundary line. The convention of St. Petersburg says that the boundary line, "Commencing from the southernmost point of the island called the Prince of Wales Island, which point lies in the parallel of 50 degrees 40 minutes north latitude, and between the 131st and the 133rd degree of west longitude (Meridian of Greenwich) the said line shall ascend to the north along the channel called Portland Channel as far as the point of the continent where it strikes 56th degree of north latitude; from this last mentioned point the line of demarcation shall follow the summit of the mountains situated parallel to the coast as far as the point of intersection of the 141st degree of west longitude of the said meridian; and finally from the said point of intersection, the said meridian line of the 141st degree, in its prolongation as far as the Frozen Ocean, shall form the limit between the Russian and British possessions on the continent of America on the northwest." The United States commissioners contended that there is no such chain of mountains and the line should be drawn thirty-five miles from the coast. On the other hand, the British contention was that such mountains do exist as are described in the treaty. Sir Louis says: "The treaty of 1825 clearly indicates, in my opinion, that the mountains which were to constitute the boundary line, were those nearest to the coast. In fact, when the treaty says: 'The summit of the mountains situate parallel to the coast,' it evidently points to the mountains on the coast, those which are situated on the border of the coast, and if we were to suppose two chains of mountains, one parallel to the other, the one which would lie the farthest from the coast would not be situated parallel to the coast, but it would be situated parallel to the other chain of mountains. Therefore, the first range of mountains, the one nearest to the coast, is the one which is alone indicated by the treaty. This, to me, seems unanswerable. Again, Sir Louis says: 'There is no doubt in my mind that the mountains indicated by the treaty are those situated nearest to the coast. Nevertheless, instead of following the evident meaning of the treaty, the majority of the tribunal have adopted a line which, at a number of points of its course, rests on mountains which lie far from the coast, and are separated from it by nearer ones, which ought consequently to have been chosen in their stead, as the points of demarcation of the line. I found it impossible, under such circumstances, to concur in this arbitrary determination of a line which, although it does not concede all the territory they claimed to the United States, nevertheless deprives Canada of the greater part of that to which she was entitled.'"

Duke of Devon- shire Speaks.

At a great demonstration in Queen's Hall, London, last week under the auspices of the Free Food League, the Duke of Devonshire was the principal speaker. It was the Duke's first public speech since his resignation as Lord President of the Council. The gathering is spoken of as the first important meeting of the Free Fooders as an offset to the active propaganda of the Tariff Reform League. As reported in the despatches, the Duke declared his decided opposition to taxation of food and to any form of preference. The taxation of food he regarded as the keynote of the entire policy to which he took exception. He was prepared to prove that Mr. Chamberlain's Glasgow budget would entail a tremendous loss on the consumer, while the working men's expenses would be increased ten per cent. He believed that no greater fallacy has ever been produced than that the prohibition or restriction of imports from abroad would increase the profitable employment of capital at home. The country, the Duke contended, was prospering everywhere, yet Mr. Chamberlain asserted that only stagnation existed. The Duke intimated that he was not altogether opposed to retaliation. There might be a difference of opinion as to the extent to which retaliation might legitimately go, and had he been assured that a moderate

use would be made of the power of retaliation, he might still be a member of the Government, but it would only make matters worse if in addition to the existing hostile tariffs against themselves, they built up walls which would prohibit and restrict the importation of goods which for their own advantage they took from other nations.

A Remarkable

Escape.

A remarkable instance of asphyxiation through coal gas, but happily without fatal effects, is reported from Galt, Ont. A Mrs. McKenzie and her ten year old daughter went to bed on Friday evening, and the time, from then until the following Sunday forenoon is a blank to them. A relative of the family, observing that the little girl was not at Sunday School on Sunday morning, called at the McKenzie house to see if all were well. He found the little girl walking around the house in a dazed condition and the mother unconscious. A new coal stove had been put into the house on Friday, and the fumes escaping from it had caused asphyxiation, but fortunately not so complete as to cause death. When the sufferers were removed to another house and medical assistance secured they revived, and it is expected they will recover. Their recovery under the circumstances is very remarkable.

Lord Rosebery on the Fiscal

Question.

Lord Rosebery delivered a vigorous and telling speech on the fiscal question in Surrey Theatre, London, on Wednesday evening of last week. There were 20,000 applications for tickets of admission, but the number admitted had to be limited to the capacity of the hall, which is about 3,000. His lordship afterwards addressed an overflow meeting, and at both meetings was given an enthusiastic reception. Lord Rosebery referred to Mr. Chamberlain as "a modern Jeremiah," whose assertions that the country had been desolated had been refuted by facts. Mr. Chamberlain said the country was ruined, while Mr. Balfour, on the other hand, said the country was extremely prosperous, but soon would be ruined. The Board of Trade blue book, however, had decided against both of these contentions. The speaker said that the condition of the people generally had been improved, while the workingmen were enjoying greater prosperity. If distress existed in the country it was because of the unwise expenditures of the Government, which during the last decade had increased sixty-two per cent., while during the previous ten years there had been an increase of only seven per cent. "Instead of curbing this growing expenditure," said Lord Rosebery, "Mr. Chamberlain discovered a disease which had no existence and proposed a remedy which would make the disease worse, namely, the increase in the cost of every commodity." Alluding to the cry that Great Britain was being made the dumping ground for the over-production of protected countries, Lord Rosebery said that during recent years Canada had "dumped" in Great Britain nearly as much iron as all the "dumping" countries put together. A committee of experts, said the speaker, would have to distinguish between foreign and imperially "dumped" and "sweated" goods. "The first result of Mr. Chamberlain's policy," continued Lord Rosebery, "would be to plunge Great Britain into a great fiscal warfare with our cousins, the United States; as the result of which Great Britain would lose everything and gain nothing. It would mean a practical severance, far more than a fiscal severance, and would blight the fairest hope of the two nations." In summing up, Lord Rosebery said that Mr. Chamberlain had not proved his case and that the evils of which he complained existed only in his imagination. A real remedy for adverse conditions could only be reached by stimulating practical, technical and commercial education, reducing the national expenditure and the drink bill of the people, encouraging the growth of cotton within the empire, teaching commercial travellers how to study the tastes of the people they visited, and through other simple and practical steps which would be a better training for trade competition than mandates for negotiat on with foreign countries.

For \$1.50 the Messenger and Visitor will be sent postpaid to any address from date until Dec. 31st, 1904.