

The Great Peace Movement

OR

The Christ of the Andes

No doubt my readers will remember King Edward of England being asked to decide the boundary dispute between Chili and the Argentine Republic, both these nations agreeing cheerfully to accept his decision. The results of this treaty of peace are not so generally known, and therefore I will give you a brief outline of the results.

Much gratified with the outcome of the arbitration and urged forward by a powerful popular movement chiefly conducted by Senora de Costa, president of the Christian Mothers' association at Buenos Ayres, one of the largest women's organizations in the world, the two governments went further, and in June, 1903, concluded the treaty by terms of which they pledged themselves for a period of five years to submit all controversies arising between them to arbitration. This was the first general arbitration treaty ever concluded. Then, in a further treaty, they agreed to reduce their armies to the proportion of police forces, to stop the building of the great battleships then under construction, and to diminish the naval armaments which they already possessed. The provisions of this treaty have been in force nearly 8 years, and were carried out as fast as practicable.

Real Disarmament

The result of this disarmament—for it was a real disarmament—have been most remarkable. With the money saved by the lessening of naval and mili-

tary expenses internal and coast improvements have been made. One or two of Argentine's previous war vessels have gone into her commercial fleet and are now plying back and forth across the seas in honorable and lucrative employment. Good roads have been constructed, Chili has turned an arsenal into a school for manual training, she built a much needed breakwater in the harbor of Valparaiso and commenced systematically the improvement of commercial facilities along the coast.

The great Trans-Andian railway through the heart of the mountains, brings Buenos Ayres and Santiago within eighteen hours of each other and binds them together with the most intimate relations of trade and travel. But more significant than any of these material results has been the change in the attitude of the Argentines and Chilians towards each other. All the old bitterness and distrust has passed away and the most cordial good feeling and confidence has taken its place. The suggestion of the Bishop Benaventa as to the erection of a statue of Christ on the boundary at Puento de Inca was quickly carried into execution. Senora de Costa and the women of Buenos Ayres undertook to secure funds and have a statue erected. On May 21, 1903, the Chilian representatives bearing the treaties for final ratification came by sea to Buenos Ayres. They were met down the river and escorted to the city by a large fleet of gaily decked steam-

ers. For a week there was a round of festivities, when the treaties were finally signed on the 28th of May. Senora de Costa invited all the dignitaries present—cabinet ministers, foreign ministers, bishops, newspapermen, generals, etc.—to inspect the statue of Christ in the courtyard of the college, and, standing at the foot, with a distinguished audience about her, pleaded that it might be put on the highest accessible point on the Andes between the two countries.

Peace On Earth

It was not until February, 1904, that the final steps were taken for its erection. It was carried by rail in huge crates from Buenos Ayres to Mendoza, then on gun carriages up the mountains, the soldiers and sailors themselves taking the ropes in critical places. Hundreds of persons had come up the night before and encamped on the ground to be present at the ceremony. The Argentines ranged themselves on the soil of Chili, and the Chilians on the Argentine side. There was music and the booming of guns. The moment of unveiling after the parts had been placed in position, was one of solemn silence. The statue was then dedicated to the whole world as a practical lesson of peace and good will. The ceremonies of the day, March 13, 1904, were closed as the sun went down with the prayer that love and kindness might penetrate the hearts of men everywhere.

The base of the statue is in granite; on this is a granite sphere weighing some fourteen tons, on which the outlines of the world are sketched. Resting upon a granite column twenty-two feet high, the figure of Christ above, in bronze is twenty-six feet in height.

Peace Forever

The cross supported in his left hand is five feet higher. His right hand is stretched out in blessing; on the granite base are two bronze tablets, one of them given by working-men's union of Buenos Ayres and the other by the working women. One of them gives the record and creation of the statue; on the other are inscribed the words: "Sooner shall these mountains crumble into dust, than Argentines and Chilians break the peace to which they have pledged themselves at the foot of Christ the Redeemer."

It is not easy to compare events and say which is the greatest, but, take it all in all, the long quarrel of seventy years which it closed, the arbitration of the boundary dispute, the general treaty of arbitration, and the practical disarmament which proceeded from it, the remarkable transformation of public opinion expressed in its consummation, and the sublime prophecy of peace for the future which it gives not only for Chili and Argentine, but for the whole world, the erection of the Christ of the Andes stands without parallel in the events of recent years.—Peace Society.

The Mail Bag

RECIPROCAL DEMURRAGE

Editor, Guide:—I am enclosing Referendum form on the eight vital questions which you have chosen. You should have included one more, namely, reciprocal demurrage, which in view of the fact that the railway commission have increased the burden for the farmers to carry is a very vital one indeed. This last imposition is a gross insult to the farmers of the West and just goes to show what puny things we are. Until the farmers can combine and get to know what they really do want and what they do not want, this same system of legal robbery that is strangling this young and fertile country will still go on. And why? Simply because the farmers won't stand by their guns. When any question of importance comes up Mr. Farmer is too busy to think of it till the last moment, and then he listens to what the other fellow says about it and allows him to twist him around to suit his own ends. Take the Municipal Hail Insurance Bill in Saskatchewan. I venture to say that 75 per cent. of the farmers didn't know the least thing about it till they went to poll their vote. Again, take reciprocal demurrage. About the same percentage can talk on that, the others never heard of it. Some, alas, have a very tender spot in their hearts for the poor Canadian railways and say that it is unreasonable to expect the railways to take out this vast crop in such a short time. Is not the farmer in the same box? The season is short, he has got to keep a big force to rush in his seed and take his crop off quick or he gets frozen out, and his outfit, horses and machinery are lying idle half of the year, but the 10 per cent. interest is busy all the time. I hope you will keep this demurrage question before the people and show them just what they are losing by the present system.

THOMAS LEWIS.

Semans, Sask.

FROM A FARMER'S WIFE

Editor, Guide:—You have given lady readers your permission to take part in the discussion and I, for one, wish to take advantage of it.

1st. I want everyone to understand

that I have thought over, and thoroughly understand all of those eight questions, and if you ask me, I shall give a decided "yes" to each of them.

2nd. J. E. Conn, in Dec. 4 Guide, objects to the setting of a definite time within which to abolish the Canadian customs tariff, etc., and I would like to say that all important pieces of work must have a certain time set for them and must be done then or it ceases to be work worth while. Work that is done "maybe today," "perhaps tomorrow" or "sometime," ninety-nine times out of a hundred never gets done.

3rd. The same man also says, "It has been claimed that if women had the vote it would be more easy to pass legislation that would tend to better the condition of the people, both socially and morally." Rather say, sir, "It is claimed, and will come to pass, that as soon as women may vote, etc." It may be easy to enforce a law, if men would not look the other way, when bars are open Sunday nights with the blinds not even drawn, and doors locked, when, for a cigar, a drink, or a \$5 bill, or in some cases a bag of potatoes, or flour, a vote is bought of some ignorant man, who doesn't care what the result is, if an M.P. is elected who cares ditto for the welfare of his constituency, or maybe excepting a few towns that he knows will return him in the next election, if they are pampered. Do you think women are so blind and careless of their own welfare as that? Another thing, it is time the companies and private gentlemen who own sections and sections of land, and are doing nothing towards making roads or settling the country—and leaving the taxes unpaid, so that some unlucky buyer finds himself loaded with back taxes as well as the full value of the land—were made to pay up. J. E. Conn also states that a woman's vote would be influenced by a swell dresser and curly hair, etc. That is untrue. Just look around you at the men they marry. But granting that such was true of some. Could you bribe them with a drink, or any of the questionable ways that man will sell his "vote and influence" for?

Thanks, H. G. Ahern, I am glad to say

that there are a majority of the men in this neighborhood for equal suffrage.

Mr. Thomas C. Robson, why didn't you be man enough to say that female suffrage is the "gladdest of all glad fads" of the age? Are you married? Did your wife show any want of judgment there? When Eve took a bite of the apple, did Adam not want a bite, too? If not why did he take it? Did he not show a great want of judgment? She was truly right in making a try for something better, if she thought she saw it, but, unfortunately, she was mistaken, and it was impossible to return to the old condition. Adam would have had the bite first, but judging from some of the present generation, I doubt if he had the courage.

Wake up, if you succeed in buying Canadian flour as cheap here as it is sold in England, and other prices in proportion, and want to go back to the old way, there will be numbers of men willing to pocket all the cash you don't want.

Mr. Editor, I really couldn't say all I want to in any less space and I could go on for hours yet, but I'll give you a rest for awhile.

I am a farmer's wife and not ashamed of my name.

ELSIE PATERSON.

Plateau, Sask.

THE PARTY CHALK LINE

Editor, Guide:—In your issue of Dec. 18 is a letter entitled, "Which is the Low Tariff Party." There are a few statements in this letter which are not quite accurate. The one I take particular exception to is this, "We are all what you call 'party men' nor would our opinions be any better if we weren't." I have no objection to this statement if Mr. Fitzgerald is speaking for himself, but I object to being included. It is equivalent to an assertion that it is impossible to think correctly outside of party or party concerns.

I was under the impression that our system of government was democratic, but Mr. Fitzgerald seems to think it autocratic. We are supposed to elect representatives to put our ideas into operation and these representatives are supposed to be our servants. Their pay

is large enough to justify this assumption. But according to the letter before me what is good for us, or bad for us, is in the power of our servants to grant or afflict—To wit—"But should the present government reduce the tariff on machinery you may stake your bottom dollar I'll agree with them." We apparently do not employ our servants to carry out our wishes—we have no wishes—we don't know what we want or what is for our good. We employ these big brainy fellows to do our thinking. God help us if in religion, politics or economics we can't think for ourselves.

I have been always under the impression that the Liberal party cry was "Tariff for Revenue only" (don't forget the "only"), and the Conservative cry "Adequate Protection. The 'Tariff for Revenue' insured the support of the manufacturers and the 'only' caught the crowd. 'Adequate Protection' guaranteed big profits to the manufacturers and was an 'assurance' that the interests of the consumers would be safeguarded. Both cries came through Parliament straight from 'special privilege.' I do not know, Mr. Editor, if you ever saw that trick performed with the hen and the chalk line. Catch a hen (the older the better), draw a white chalk line on the ground, place her beak on the end of it and let her go. It is affirmed that she will look down that chalk line till the mesmeric effect dies out, if she survives that long. Now take two chalk lines, call one the Conservative and the other the Liberal and place a full grown human biped (the older the better) at the end of each, and tell me the difference between the intelligence of a hen and that of a party man. The writer of the letter referred to above seems to forget that there are a few men who in voting for a particular party have not got their nose to the party chalk line of limitation, "This far and no further," and that it is more possible for them to see the party through the principle than the principle through the party. At the last general election one of the parties made a move to get from under the domination of special privilege and deserved the support of every man not a recipient of tribute.