

to better safeguard the interests of the Province. Their promise to get an amended agreement has saved them temporarily. What will happen in the future depends largely on their success in implementing that promise. For the sake of Alberta's good name and for the sake of men like Messrs. Rutherford and Cross, who have done much good work on behalf of the baby province, it is to be hoped that the bargain can be amended so as to prevent serious loss.

A PLAY known as "Brewster's Millions" describes the difficulties which beset a man who had to spend a million dollars in twelve months, without actually giving away any portion of it. Those who went to the play returned home feeling that the spending of a million dollars a year was not quite such an easy task as our previous notions had prophesied. Now comes the news that a young man has undertaken to wisely spend TWELVE MILLION DOLLARS A YEAR. What a task is his!

That young man is Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., one of the incorporators of the Rockefeller Foundation which is to administer the wealth of Mr. Rockefeller, Sr. This wealth is estimated at three hundred million dollars, and invested at four per cent. it should yield twelve millions a year. This sum is to be spent for the following purpose: "To promote the well-being and to advance the civilisation of the peoples of the United States and its Territories and possessions and of foreign lands in the acquisition and dissemination of knowledge, in the prevention and relief of suffering, and in the promotion of any and all of the elements of human progress."

Here in real life, we have a comedy which, in the words of the street, has "Brewster's Millions" beaten forty ways. A man, shrewd, calculating, cunning, grasping, spends a lifetime amassing wealth. As he draws near the end of life, he finds that he has lived in vain, and that he has done more harm than good. In his agony he cries out, "What shall I do to be saved?" And the answer comes back, ringing down the centuries for two thousand years: "Go sell all that thou hast and give to the poor." So the old, wizened-faced, stoop-shouldered man of the world turns to his broad-shouldered son and asks him to undertake to expiate the sins of the father. Is it not ludicrous? Is it not a most striking commentary on human selfishness, human weakness and inhuman commercialism?

SOMETHING there must be that is radically wrong in the much vaunted western civilisation when such a spectacle is possible. Benjamin Kidd should revise his estimate. The richest men in America and Europe are devising means to dissipate their great fortunes, and at the same time thousands of men are sacrificing virtue, manhood, intellect and the lives of their fellowmen to attain large fortunes. Previous to this foundation, Mr. Rockefeller had given away one hundred and twenty millions. Mr. Andrew Carnegie has given away nearly as much; the exact figures do not matter. Mr. John S. Kennedy and Mrs. Russell Sage have distributed twenty-five million each. Lord Strathcona and Sir William C. Macdonald, two Canadian millionaires, have given away more than five millions each.

The only excuse for these tremendous aggregations of wealth is the splendour of the atonement. Yet, at best, this is but a partial excuse. It is neither a justification nor a palliation. These gifts may increase the diffusion of knowledge and assist the advancement of civilisation—but at what a price! Let us remember, nevertheless, that it is not the individuals who are to blame so much as the system.

LAST WEEK IN PARLIAMENT

By OUR SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT

Ottawa, March 12th, 1910.

THE division on the second reading of the Naval Bill took place just before midnight on Thursday and resulted in a majority of forty-one for the Government. There is a feeling that the Government is gradually gaining strength on this matter. At the first blush the idea of an immediate monetary grant to the Old Country seemed the more useful, the more loyal and the more patriotic course to adopt under the circumstances. Now the German scare has to a large extent blown over, it is more generally recognised that the strengthening of the various parts of the Empire best contributes to the stability of the whole.

The raising of the militia in this country has done much to increase patriotism in a way hardly realised at first even by the most blatant imperialists. The marching of the troops through the streets with their bands and gay uniforms and other military display have done much to arouse and increase an interest and respect for the flag, and it is felt that corresponding enthusiasm will be raised by having a naval fleet, however small, in home waters.

The scene in the House at the second reading was dull compared to its brilliant appearance on Wednesday night when divisions were taken on the amendment to the amendment and the amendment itself. The earlier division proved an ante-climax and circumstances added a touch of colour and a thrill of electricity which was quite lacking on Thursday evening. The wives of the ministers were holding a reception in the building and when the division bells rang the hundreds of ladies with their glad costumes thronged and filled the

galleries, giving a touch of colour which, added to the fact that members themselves were strung to the proper pitch of excitement, caused a scene which will be forgotten by few who had the privilege of being present. Patriotic songs and cheers were given with a force which roused the most lethargic onlooker. The most effective speeches during the week were those delivered by Mr. Emmerson and Mr. Clare. These gentlemen, although speaking from opposite sides of the House, singularly enough took up a neutral position based upon the same convictions, and equally singularly, these convictions drove them to vote on opposite sides. Mr. Clare began by a spirited eulogy on the progress and development of Germany, which was cheered to the echo by the Conservatives. It seems to be the fashion at the present time for the self-styled patriots to extol every country but their own. Mr. Emmerson and Mr. Clare both favoured the same policy, the devotion of the money to the construction of large docks and the general development of the country. They both think that the interests of the country would be best considered in this way, instead of entering upon a policy of battleships and war. "Especially," added Mr. Clare, "as many people come to this country in appreciation of its freedom from the military restrictions and burdens which they have experienced in their own country." Mr. Emmerson was particularly anxious to deny parentage of the phrase "Tin-pot navy," which has been so frequently used from the Conservative benches. Two other excellent speeches from opposite sides, both clever, well thought out and highly technical, were delivered by two notable lawyers, Mr. Honore Gervais and Mr. Northrup.

* * *

Mr. W. F. Maclean voiced the coming sentiment of the people on Thursday evening. His speech was a good example of the short but effective utterance. Mr. Maclean holds a peculiar position in the House. Conservatives call him an Independent Liberal, Liberals call him an Independent Conservative, whilst he calls himself Independent without any appendage. He expressed himself strongly in favour of the Bill, which he said did not go far enough. No country, he declared, could grow unless she developed her sea power. He cited illustrations from Athens to Port Arthur and from Themistocles to Bismarck. He shattered the argument that the proposed Canadian navy would be of no practical utility by pointing out that the same objection was made to Japan's navy in its initial stages but that it had grown to its present enviable position in twelve years.

* * *

Although the naval debate has consumed most of the time of the House during the week, lively breezes have sprung up over other matters. An attempt was made on Monday to block the Nelson River Railway Bill, several members of the opposition suddenly rising to a sense of their duties in protecting the interests of the community with regard to water-powers. The outcome is that, if necessary, legislation shall be forthcoming on the matter although the Minister of the Interior stated that the point raised is already covered. There have been mutterings and murmurs over the Lumsden Committee, foretelling of a storm which will probably break next week. The three Conservative members of the committee have absented themselves as a protest against not being allowed to name counsel for the public interests involved. Meanwhile the committee is proceeding without them.

I remember my friend, Mr. Spencer Leigh Hughes, M.P., wrote an amusing series of parliamentary tales. In one he speaks of a rural M. P. who was called over the coals by his constituents, who discovered that he was frequently absent from the debates in the House. In his despair he consulted an old parliamentary hand who undertook to run down and speak for him at the indignation meeting which had been called in order that the defaulting member might be censured. At that meeting things went very badly for the people's representative until his friend spoke. This ally pointed out that attendance at debates was nothing. Debates were only the glossy veneer covering the real work of the House. He told the voters that there were such things as committees and that there the real work of the House was done. Whilst they were imagining their member dissipating in the gay city of London he was really hewing wood and drawing water in committees, without which the whole fabric of Parliament would fall to the ground. He carried his audience and an enthusiastic vote of confidence was passed. Unfortunately some busy-body—the bane of every M. P.—obtained a record showing the attendance of members at committees. Their representative's name was conspicuous by its absence.

During the week I have been visiting some of the committees and find the speeches made there more eloquent, sensible and convincing than those made in the House. Members are not speaking for Hansard. There was a veritable pandemonium in Room 62 last Tuesday when the Hamilton, Guelph & Waterloo Railway Bill was being discussed. The point in dispute was whether the company should have to do local traffic within the boundaries of the city of Toronto. A vote being taken the privilege was granted upon the restriction that they must obtain the consent of the Railway Board, who must hear counsel for the city of Toronto. This is but one of the important committee meetings being held every day in the House concerning the work of which the outside public has little knowledge. It keeps members busy and gives them a moral sense of justice when they draw their salaries.

WYNNE GRANVILLE.