

gentlemen associated with him on the Committee, will see to it that the House be given another opportunity of pronouncing on the Bill next session.

The names of the members of the Legislature who voted against the Bill are as follows:—Messrs. Auld, Barr, Beatty, Brown, Burt, Carnegie, H. Clark, Davis, Dickenson, Downey, Fryden, Laff, Eilbar, Evanturel, Fox, Gallagher, Graham, Guibord, Hislop, Holmes, Hoyle, Jessop, Joyest, Lackner, Lee, Michand, Munro, McCart, Macdiarmid, McLeod, Pardo, Pettypiece, Preston, Richardson, Rickard, Routledge, Spock, Stratten, Sutherland, Taylor, Thompson, Truax, Tucker, Whitney.

Flotsam and Jetsam.

Chief Justice Story attended a public dinner in Boston at which Edward Everett was present. Desiring to pay a delicate compliment to the latter, the learned judge proposed as a volunteer toast: "Fame follows merit where Everett goes." The brilliant scholar arose and responded: "To whatever heights judicial learning may attain in this country, it will never get above one Story."

The Alaska Commission—A prophecy fulfilled—Sir Richard Jebb, M.P., one of the professors at Cambridge, a year ago published an article in *The Empire Review* which is of special interest in view of what has subsequently taken place. Speaking of the constitution of the Alaska Boundary Commission he says: "We can only hope that our Government has not, in a moment of panic, reverted to the old colonial policy of once more making Canada pay for our blunders beyond the Atlantic. Nothing would more effectively check the movement towards Imperial co operation than to ignore the right of Canada to guide Imperial policy in matters primarily affecting her special interests. That right was recognized by us once for all when four Canadians sat with one Englishman at Quebec to conduct Imperial negotiations with the United States. The same principle demands that in the present case all three British commissioners shall be Canadians. For the American contention will prevail if a single British commissioner can be won over to the American view; therefore to appoint a single Englishman would be unjust to Canada and impolitic for the Empire. For it would be intolerable to Canada if her claim, supported, perhaps, by two Canadian commissioners, were rejected in favour of the Americans by the third, who, being an Englishman, might be thought to have felt more interest in forcing a verdict of some kind than in supporting the claims of justice." This is just where Lord Alverstone put his foot in it, brought discredit upon the Bench and sacrificed Canadian interests.