

his own party will see that he does not get the party nomination.

It will be pointed out that we have accounted for only six months of each year, and that the member has the remaining six months to attend to his own business. This argument holds good to a certain extent for Quebec and Ontario members who can spend every week end at home during the session, but the member who lives in the Prairie Provinces is practically compelled to give up any business he may have as he cannot get home from the opening to the closing of the session without losing considerable time, and he is only allowed fifteen days away from the session without being docked \$15 a day. If he desires to come home for the Christmas holidays he has a free pass on the railroad, which is now statutory and not a gift by the railways, but that does not pay the travelling expenses for his family, nor for his berth and meals on the train, nor for the time he spends in travelling. If he is fortunate enough to be the head of a big concern that will run satisfactorily during his absence, all well and good, but how many farmers could carry on their business successfully being absent six months in the year. But further than this, a good, honest member between sessions will have to travel over his constituency and meet the people, explain the work of the session and ascertain their needs. Also, if he is to do good work he should visit other parts of Canada, in order to see what others are doing. If he does this his \$2,500 per year will leave him poorer every year.

The point we want to make is that present conditions largely tend to hand over political control to men of independent means or of low standards of public morality. We are not by any means placing all members of Parliament in these classes, but the tendency of the times is towards that end. We would also point out that many members of Parliament are expected to donate liberally to nearly every church and community organization in their constituency. There is \$5 each for the many local hockey clubs, \$5 each for the local base-ball clubs, \$10 for church building funds, and endless other requests. If this condition is to continue it is quite obvious that we cannot have in Parliament the men who will accurately and fearlessly represent the people in the Prairie Provinces. What, then, is to be done? How are we to get the representatives we want? Can it be done otherwise than by the people themselves paying all the expenses of the candidates they nominate to represent them? Many farmers do contribute to the expenses of the candidate they support, even giving them actual aid during the campaign. But how many farmers do not contribute anything to the expenses or to the work of the campaign. Undoubtedly there should be a law limiting the expenses of all candidates, and also compelling the publication of contributions to the campaign fund, before as well as after the election. But before that happy time arrives is there not something can be done to improve conditions. Let us suppose that the farmers in a certain rural constituency decide that they would like to have a certain man represent them at Ottawa. Let us suppose that the only thing they ask of this man is his time and talent, and that the farmers themselves contribute every cent of the candidate's expenses, and each farmer devotes as much time as he can to the work of the campaign, and that the candidate is not asked for any subscription to local institutions. If the candidate is elected he is then an independent man, and can afford to stand by the people who elected him. His sessional indemnity of \$2,500 will meet his legitimate expenses and he knows he can vote for what he believes to be right, without fearing any corporations or any political leaders. He can also be assured of re-election if he honestly works in the interest of his own people. This is merely one phase of the question that is brought up by a consideration of the statement at the beginning

of this article. We will be glad to have it discussed by our readers and believe that much good can come from a frank discussion of the conditions as we have shown them. We will deal with the subject further later on.

### THE RAILWAYS AND THE PEOPLE

One of the most important questions now prominently before the Canadian public is that of the control of railway corporations. The fact that freight, express and telegraph charges are exorbitant and that they are considerably higher in the West than in the East, has been amply demonstrated, and it is evident that there will be continued agitation in the West until this unfair discrimination, at least, is removed. The question, however, is not only one of discrimination between East and West, or even of rates. We are face to face with the position that either the people, through the government, must control the railways, or the railways, through the government, will control the people. Nominally, and according to the law, the government controls the railways at present, but judging from actual experience it would seem that the railways do pretty much as they please and that the chief functions which the government performs are to grant the requests of the railways, guarantee their bonds, and give them subsidies in cash and lands. The right of the public to control the railways cannot be questioned. If a railway company was an ordinary private business enterprise, enjoying no special privilege which could not be obtained by any citizen, the public might not have any right to interfere with their charges or to enquire what profits they secured, but the Canadian railways are very far from being in that position. A railway franchise in itself contains very valuable privileges. It gives the railway company the right to take any man's land by expropriation if it is required for the purposes of the railway. A railway may cross public highways and do many things which a private business man may not do. And in Canada railways have been given huge sums of money and immense areas of land, and the credit of the nation has been pledged to enable money to be borrowed at low rates of interest. Railways are relieved of taxes, and the taxes of private individuals are higher in consequence. Everything possible has been done by Canadian governments to make the cost of providing means of transportation as low as possible, with the intent that the service to the public should be the best and the charges the lowest. The result, however, has been to create an immense monopoly so powerful that it can often dictate to the government, and which operates the railways, which have been created with public funds and public credit, not in the interests of the public, but in the interests of the shareholders and officials. The extent to which the public has assisted the Canadian Pacific Railway is told in a series of articles which is concluded in this issue of The Guide. We trust that our readers will carefully study these articles and so place themselves in a position to form an intelligent opinion as to the rights of the public in this matter. If the C.P.R. had been built directly by the government it would probably not have cost the public one cent more than it has done. Canada has paid for the C.P.R. and might have owned it and operated it for the benefit of the people. Instead, it is owned by 25,000 shareholders, and operated for their benefit. And of these 25,000 shareholders only 2,000 are residents of Canada.

For the week ending December 7, the Canadian Pacific Railway earnings amounted to \$2,771,000, an increase of \$293,000 or 12 per cent. over the corresponding week last year. For the same week the Canadian Northern Railway earnings amounted to \$567,900, an increase of \$106,300, or 23 per cent. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway earnings

for the same week amounted to \$1,005,097, an increase of 11 per cent. over last year. The total of these three roads for this one week amounted to \$4,343,097. With the railways skimming off between four and five million dollars every week, a large share of which at this season comes from the grain growers of the West, is it any wonder that there is not as much money in circulation as might be expected? Money may be scarce for country merchants, wage earners, salaried workers, and the people generally, but the railways make sure of their millions first and foremost.

Since the two naval policies have been announced at Ottawa every Liberal considers Premier Borden's policy to be decidedly unsound and in fact dangerous to the future growth and self-respect of the Canadian nation. In fact the Liberals have completely condemned the Conservative policy. The Conservatives, on the other hand, declare that Sir Wilfrid Laurier is playing party politics and that the Liberal naval policy will tend to separate Canada from the Empire. In fact the Conservatives regard the Liberal naval policy as a complete mistake. But though the two parties disagree with each other, yet they both unite in condemning equally honest patriotic citizens who cannot agree with either of these policies. Surely the situation thus prevailing is sufficient indication that the wisest policy in connection with the navy is to submit the question to a referendum of the people.

We appreciate the co-operation of those of our readers who have sent in their renewal subscriptions so promptly. But there are still several thousand who have not yet renewed. Many of these subscriptions do not expire until some time in January, but we want our readers to send their renewals in advance and thus save us a lot of work and expense in the office. Please renew at once for from one to five years, as best suits you. Don't wait till we have to send you several notices because they all cost money and we have no money to spare. If our old friends help us in this way it gives us more freedom to secure new friends.

If the naval question is to be discussed from the loyalty standpoint it would be well to consider the tariff we impose on British goods. Of what use is it for the Canadian people to talk of their love of the Mother Country and then show it by placing prohibitive tariffs on goods from this same Mother Land. What is the Mother Land but its people? What is the use of telling them we love them and then punish them by keeping them out of our markets when they allow us free access to theirs. The loyalty argument should be dropped.

It is very interesting to have the western organ of the manufacturers, known as "Country Life in Canada," pegging away at The Guide. We would suggest that this organ alter its name to "Country Death in Canada," which would be more appropriate, considering its teachings. This journal might also interest its handful of readers by explaining how much assistance it gets from the protectionists in return for preaching protection and snarling at The Guide.

The Krupp gun works, of Germany, annual report shows a surplus for the year just ended of \$12,500,000. A 12 per cent. dividend was declared and 5 per cent. was added to the reserve fund. Verily, war is a paying business—for the armor manufacturers.

When the navy question has exhausted the eloquence of the politicians it is to be hoped they will devote themselves to some of the vital problems, such as reducing the burden of taxation on the common people and compelling the rich to bear a fair share.