

Editorial Comment

AFTER THE WAR, WHAT?

What great powers will begin to shape up for further conflict? One can see China, Russia, and probably a Mohammedan confederacy in southwestern Asia; he can see also a new India to the south and a developing but limited Japan to the far east. Away to the west will be Britain, and in between a number of smaller states which will be to the three great Asiatic powers, what Belgium now is to Germany. On this side of the Pacific will be another great power the United States, whose policy in world matters must be the same as that of Canada (the greatest unit in the British dominion).

At present Britain and Japan are working in harmony, and the union is to the advantage of both. Should Japan aim at (what must be to her a necessity) an extension of territory, there may arise a conflict with China that will be ended only by another world's war. Should Russia as a result of her successes, have her appetite for war whetted, what will prevent her from impressing Slavic ideals upon the whole Eastern world? Indeed what is to prevent a conflict between any of these forces—Russ-Chinese; Russ-Mohammedan; Mohammedan-Christian; Yellow-White? There is only one thing that will prevent any or all of these conflicts—a determination on the part of all the nations at the time of settlement to begin afresh the conduct of the world's affairs in a new spirit and according to a new method. Unless this war is the beginning of peace, it is the most miserable failure. Nor is it absurdity to think that some such understanding can be reached. The militarists have had their day. Their pet doctrine is hopelessly confounded. It is not true that the surest way to prevent war is to be ready for war. It must be that so long as one nation is ready for war another must be, but that is not the question. We have reached that stage in experience and culture when it is possible to settle all international difficulties by arbitration or by sale and purchase, provided only there are no armaments. Take away from men liquor and how many would get drunk? Take away guns and how many would fight? It is time the acts of peace had a chance; it is time the gospel of peace had a fair trial.

In the Atlantic Monthly, Bertrand Russell has well expressed it:

"It is even more necessary to alter men's conception of glory and patriotism. Beginning in childhood, with the school text books of history, and continuing in the press and in common talk men are taught that the essence of 'glory' is successful robbing and slaughter. The most 'glorious' nation is the one which kills the greatest number of foreigners and seizes the greatest extent of foreign territory. The most patriotic citizen is the one who most strongly opposes any attempt at justice or mercy on his country's dealings with other countries, and who is least able to conceive of mankind as all one family struggling painfully from a condition of universal strife toward a society where love of one's neighbor is no longer thought a crime. The division of the world into nations is a fact which must be accepted but there is no reason to accept the narrow nationalism which envies the prosperity of others and imagines it a hindrance to her own progress. If a better and saner world is to grow out of the horror of futile carnage, men must learn to find their nation's glory in the victory of reason over brute instincts, and to feel the true patriotism which demands that a country should deserve admiration rather than extort fear. If this lesson can be taught to all beginning with the children in the schools, we may hope for a lasting peace, and the machinery for securing it will grow out of the universal desire. So long as hate and fear and pride are praised and encouraged, war never can become an impossibility, but there is now if men have the courage to use it an awakening of heart and mind such as the world has never known before: Men see that war is wicked and that war is foolish. If the statesmen will play their part by showing that war is not inevitable, there is hope that our children may live in a happier world and look back upon us with the wondering pity of a wider age.

THE COST OF LIVING

Not how much but how little: Well the experiment has been tried. Down in Chicago a man named Charles G. Dawes built a great hotel to keep alive the memory of his son. He decided to run the hotel at cost, and to let those who roomed and boarded there get the benefit. During the year 179,000 men stopped at the hotel at a cost of 14 cents for a bed and a meal. The hotel is run like any other, but the capital is so used as to make the cost of lodging and eating almost nominal. Mr. Dawes wishes it to be understood that the hotel is a business matter, and that its customers pay their way.

The idea is being taken up for other cities. By careful management many live amply and respectably on a few cents a day. It really requires little money for a man to live. The Dawes hotel is run as decently as any in Chicago. The rooms are clean and in order, and the custom genteel and honorable. There is a good lesson for everybody in the Dawes Hotel.

The Place to Die

How little reck's it where men die,
When once the moment's past
In which the dim and glazing eye
Has looked on earth its last;
Whether beneath the sculptured urn
The cofined form shall rest,
Or in its nakedness, return
Back to its mother's breast.

The soldier falls 'mid corpses piled
Upon the battle-plain,
Where reinless war-steeds gallop wild
Above the gory slain;
But though his corse be grim to see,
Hoof-trampled on the sod,
What reck's it when the spirit free
Has soared aloft to God?

'Twere sweet indeed to close our eyes
With those we cherish near,
And wafted upward by their sighs,
Soar to some calmer sphere;
But whether on the scaffold high,
Or in the battle's van,
The fittest place where man can die
Is where he dies for man!

ECONOMY

No one would be so foolish as to think that the affairs of a country could be administered for nothing, and all good citizens are willing to be taxed directly or indirectly to pay a reasonable cost of administration. There has been a growing conviction on two points—first, that the cost of administration is not reasonable, and second that the tax levied upon the people is not evenly distributed.

With regard to the first point there need be no argument. It is not alone in national affairs but in affairs pertaining to the provinces that excess has run riot. No words are sufficiently strong to condemn those who have been responsible for unwarranted expenditure. What with the bonusing of railways, the erection of palatial public buildings, the squandering of immense sums on unprofitable public works, there is scarcely a province that does not feel the pinch of poverty. Yet as a nation, Canada is richer in resources than any other that can be named. Our statesmen—save the mark—have not learned the meaning of economy; they have acted like boys who have just come into an inheritance, and who desire to show the world how lavishly they can expend their income. The thing is disgusting—not only wrong, but in exceedingly bad taste.

With regard to the second point it has only to be said that the present method of raising funds by indirect taxation—through a tariff—is monstrously unfair to certain classes. It is all very well for manufacturers to clamor for a high tariff, and to endorse the horizontal rise of seven and one-half per cent. It is a different thing for a man to realize

that for every dollar he earns, he pays out thirty cents to these manufacturers for the privilege of earning the dollar. That is what it amounts to. A twelve dollar suit is taxed about four dollars; a three dollar pair of boots is taxed over one dollar; a hat is taxed another dollar, and so it is all the way through. The only free thing is air—and one can't get much of it in small rooms, which is all he can afford to live in. Conditions are becoming intolerable. Direct taxation would make people watch those who are responsible for legislation and administration. Before long we shall have it, unless things change.

THE JITNEY

It has struck western Canada, and it is here to stay—the jitney. Up till to-day the man who wanted a ride had to take a street-car or trust to the luck of striking a friend who owned a car. Now, he is part owner of a car, for all practical purposes, and can ride for one or two miles for five cents. That is something.

The jitney is going to strike hard at the street railway. It may make it impossible for the railway to pay dividends—at least dividends of twelve per cent. It will strike harder at the taxicab and bus business. A good illustration of this was at the Panama Exposition. A bus company was organized and began a most promising business, the charge of transportation to the grounds being seventy-five cents. Then came the first jitney. In a month there were 1,500 jitneys and such a business did they carry on that the bus company went into the hands of the receiver. The jitney in the cities of Western Canada will accomplish a similar purpose.

Last summer I engaged a taxi for an hour in order to visit the park. The driver saw that it took about 10 minutes over the hour. The cost was \$7.00. That was a pretty good charge and surely paid interest on investment, salary of the chauffeur, and everything else. Indeed I have reckoned that the owner was making over 1000 per cent on his investment. Along comes the jitney. I can now go to the park with my friends, stay for an hour and then come back in another jitney for just 60c., or if double fare be charged on account of distance for \$1.20. Being forced to economize, I am not to be blamed for taking the jitney; being desirous to spend some time in the park rather than on the way to the park, I am sure to take the jitney.

This is how the thing is going to work out. Those who have been practising a hold up game are being called. Their day is done.

There is room for the jitney in other fields, and it is safe to predict that there is to be a general shaking up. Let us give two illustrations. At the store in the fall I can buy green beans for 15c. or 20c. a pound. Twenty miles away they can be had from the producer for 2c. (This was actually the case last fall.) Here is a chance for the farmer to get out his jitney. The trouble with the farmer is that he has not organized as yet. He enters the city on his own account and instead of charging two cents or five cents proceeds to ask the same as the grocer. The people are not looking for bargains of this kind. But let the producers enter directly into the field to supply city people during the fall months with cheap vegetables and they will soon capture the trade. The consumer will welcome the vegetable jitney. Or to take another case. Here is a new novel. It costs about 29 cents or 37 cents, to print it, yet because it is new it is marked \$1.50 and sold for that. Of course there is a difficulty here because of copyright; but thank goodness that there are some publishers willing to "jitney" the publishing business so soon as a copyright expires. Thank goodness too that good magazines are to be had at less than actual cost. There are unscrupulous dealers in every line. The "jitney" has attacked one great line—transportation. Look around and see if there are not some other lines that can be "jitneyed." How about lawyers' fees, doctors' fees, fees for service on political commissions? By all means let us have the "jitney" idea extended until it attacks every form of extortion. The man who enters the "jitney" field is a public benefactor.