

opponents of Lloyd George were congratulating themselves on having him in a corner. The Chancellor, however, was able to announce that British trade and British prosperity were increasing so rapidly that all the additional revenues and probably a million dollars more, would be produced without increasing a single item of taxation. He estimated that the increase in the death duties, the income tax and the super-tax, all taxes on the rich, would amount to \$13,200,000, and on customs and excise, \$12,825,000, the balance being made up from other sources. This budget, more than any other, has justified and demonstrated the wisdom of what has come to be known as Lloyd George finance. Ever since Lloyd George has been Chancellor of the Exchequer his opponents have been declaring that he would ruin the country and that nothing but Protection would save Britain. Meanwhile Britain has prospered as she never did before. Her trade has grown enormously, unemployment has been reduced to the lowest percentage recorded in a generation, and there is every sign that prosperity will continue. The secret of Lloyd George's success as finance minister has been that the changes in taxation he has made have been such as to relieve the producers of the nation's wealth from some of their burdens and to make those who were benefitting by the industry of others contribute more. The taxes upon mining royalties, undeveloped land, and increased land values are along this line, and beside bringing in a considerable revenue have caused large areas of land which were hitherto idle, to be brought under cultivation, thus giving employment and increasing the production of wealth. Oh, for a Canadian Lloyd George.

THE BELGIAN STRIKE

The Socialist workingmen of Belgium have demonstrated to the world the effectiveness of a peaceful strike in securing relief from injustice. In Belgium the ordinary workman has one vote, those who are better off have two votes and university graduates and officials three. Through this system the minority has controlled the government, and a few days ago 500,000 workingmen announced that they would do no more work until their disabilities were removed and the principle of one man one vote was established. The government, of course, scorned the idea that they could be coerced, but after ten days they yielded and agreed to give the workers substantially what they demanded. During that time absolute peace prevailed. There was no damage to property, no attacks upon such workmen as declined to join the strike, no violence of any kind. The strikers had right on their side, their labor was absolutely indispensable to the nation, and they gained their point through organized, peaceful effort. The woman suffragists might well learn a lesson from the Belgian workingmen. If the women of England or any other country refused to cook and perform their other household or business duties until the right to vote was conceded to them they would very soon have the ballot. The militants, however, would have no part in a strike of this kind. They are too busy breaking windows and setting bombs to be caring for homes or pursuing business or professional life, and consequently they are not indispensable and cannot strike effectually.

The "shrieking sisterhood," however, comprise a very small section of the believers in woman suffrage and if the rest of the women go on strike they will accomplish more in a week than the militants have in the years they have been on the war path.

It is with mixed feelings that we watch the erection of one of Col. Sam Hughes' armories within one hundred yards of The Guide office. We do not know whether Col. Sam had any special object in view in locat-

ing so close to us and neither are we aware whether this warlike equipment is for offensive or defensive operations. We believe we are justified in asking Col. Sam to declare his intentions before he proceeds further, or we shall be inclined to call for the intervention of the Powers or take the matter before the Hague Tribunal.

THE NAVAL QUESTION

Considering the amount of time which Parliament has spent in the discussion of the naval bill, it is remarkable how little interest the public generally take in the question. When the reciprocity bill was before the country the subject was on everybody's lips. It was an economic problem in which every person in Canada was directly and personally interested, and wherever two or three people were gathered together, there reciprocity was debated. In the home, in the restaurant, on the train, in offices, shops and factories, from the time the result of the negotiations between the representatives of Canada and the United States was made known in January, 1911, until the question had been settled for the time being by the election in September, reciprocity was the chief topic of conversation from one end of Canada to the other. And even yet though the opponents of reciprocity declare that it is dead and buried, it is still a matter of considerable public interest and is frequently discussed. On the naval question, however, a very large proportion of the people are quite indifferent. Very few people appear to care two straws whether Canada contributes the price of three dreadnoughts to the British Navy or establishes a navy of its own. The majority would probably prefer that the question should be left alone, and that Parliament should give its attention to some of the great problems that affect the development of the country. It is easy, of course, to understand why the politicians of Ottawa are seriously worked up. Premier Borden having introduced the Navy Bill, the Conservatives must either secure its passage or suffer a loss of prestige. The Liberals on the other hand saw what they believed to be an opportunity to force an election and possibly to regain office and all that goes with it. Hence the stubborn long drawn out debate, the days and nights of quibbling on technical points of order and scenes of disorder in which members on both sides of the house took part, and which have lowered the Canadian Parliament in the eyes of the world. The question might have been settled long ago by means of a referendum, which would have permitted the people to give their decision. The House of Commons does not represent the views of the people of Canada on the naval question. The rival policies put forward in the House of Commons represent but two views, that of the Government on the one hand and that of the Liberal caucus on the other. A very considerable body of public opinion which conceives Canada's part to be that of a leader in the growing movement towards peace, and which would have nothing to do with the perpetuation of the horrors of war, is entirely unrepresented at Ottawa. We believe that there are enough people holding this view to defeat both of the naval proposals if they were given an opportunity. Neither the Government nor the Opposition, however, is willing to allow the people to decide the naval question by a direct referendum vote. A general election, which the Liberals demand, would not secure the voice of the people on the question, and the passage of the Government proposal by the application of the closure would destroy any moral and sentimental value which might have been attached to a unanimous and spontaneous gift. Unable to settle the matter amicably in the House and unwilling to allow the people to decide it, the best course Parliament could pursue would be to suspend

its decision at least until the next Hague Peace Conference, as suggested by Christopher West, author of "Canada and Sea Power." At that Conference the Powers will very probably agree that private property at sea shall be exempt from seizure in time of war. One of the strongest reasons which is given as to why Canada should spend \$35,000,000 or more on naval armaments is that the Imperial navy protects Canadian commerce on the high seas, and if the Powers agree that private property at sea shall not be subject to attack, there will be no more need to protect the trade routes and there will be less excuse for big navies. The emergency plea has been exploded by Winston Churchill's statement that the proposed Canadian dreadnoughts are not to be used for the defence of the British shores, but will form part of an Imperial squadron which will spend its time in cruising around the world. Another important development is the announcement that W. J. Bryan, secretary of state in the Wilson Cabinet, is endeavoring to arrange arbitration treaties between the United States and all the great Powers. There are many reasons why Canada's decision on the naval question should be deferred, and none sufficient to justify our embarking on a policy of building armaments which are not needed.

More and more the people of the leading nations are coming to see that the war game is very largely one huge graft. Dishonesty and deceit mark every move of the game. The periodic war scares, without which no people would consent to pour their money and manhood into the bottomless pit of militarism are the product of lying and malice. The armor plate combine would rather stir up ill-feeling between two hitherto friendly nations than have any slackening in the belching forth of war supplies and therefore smaller dividends for themselves. The peculiar and profitable brand of patriotism possessed by the makers of war supplies is becoming well known. They are just as anxious to make guns and build dreadnoughts against as for their own country. Germany is now agitated by the discovery of a horde of speculators and parasites getting a fat living out of the huge war expenditures of the government. Middlemen speculators recently charged the German government \$115,500 for an exercise ground at Essen, the owners of the land receiving only \$25,000. This proportion of three parts graft to one part value is thought to hold throughout the whole \$3,250,000 spent by the government for land at Essen. A Krupp scandal is now being exposed by the German press, showing that 30 per cent. of the \$50,000,000 demanded from the public coffers would be switched into the pockets of speculators and patriotic parasites. For the strange thing about war scares and war preparations is that every citizen is supposed to make sacrifices for the sake of country except the gentlemen in the armor trust. Verily war is a killing game, the war scare is a costly game for the people, but a mighty paying one for the armament clique.

An article printed elsewhere in this issue explains why coal is dear in Western Canada. If the figures given are correct—and if they are not we invite a responsible colliery official to correct them—it is not the high cost of labor nor even high freight rates that make coal dear in the West so much as the toll which the mineowners are able to exact. The mineowners have this privilege because the natural resources of the country have been handed over to them by the people's representatives in governments past and present. For these natural resources they have paid little or nothing. The taxation of land values would place the value of the natural resources in the public treasury instead of into private pockets.

On F
April 1
organize
evidence
at the I
suggested
made in
benefit
man, e
Guide,
Friday.
before t
cancelled
sent to
Prairie
interest
to 12 pe
er char
dence w
before t
possible
banks d
8 per c
charged
tically e
Minister
ested lis
that in l
was exte
very nec
more pu
banking
stead of
ed out
bank me
vidual r
where tl
the amo
each bra
money lo
security,
loans ma
nation v
tunity t
branch b
States to
bank no
large nu
showing
panies,
chants
farmers