

LABOR ADVOCATE

A WEEKLY
LABOR REFORM NEWSPAPER
Entered by the Toronto Trades and Labor
Council and D A 125 K of L.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
GRIP PRINTING & PUBLISHING CO.
20 & 28 FRONT STREET WEST,
TORONTO, CANADA

President - J. A. WILSON
Manager - T. J. WILSON

Yearly Subscription, \$1.50, in Advance,
Single Copies, 5c. each.

PHILIP THOMPSON, Editor

Mr. George A. Howell is the authorized agent of the Labor Advocate for receiving advertisements in this city and neighborhood.
Mr. I. H. Sanderson and Capt. W. J. Coulman are authorized to take subscriptions for the Labor Advocate in this city and neighborhood.
Mr. R. H. Pettigrew is our daily authorized agent for the reception of subscriptions and advertisements in Hamilton.

The Grip Printing and Publishing Company guarantee that, in the event of the discontinuance of the LABOR ADVOCATE at any time, all money due to subscribers for the unexpired balance of their term of subscription will be refunded.

Unless subscribers, on removing, notify us of their change of address, we cannot be responsible for failures in the delivery of the paper.

TORONTO, CANADA, MAY 16, 1891.

A LAND GRABBERS' WAR.

The Tory Government of England has just entered upon another war of aggression, which, before it is ended, will probably cost many thousand lives of men who have no possible interest in the result, and many million pounds sterling. It is a case of wanton spoliation committed on behalf of that land-thieving corporation, the South African Company.

The Dutch settlers in South Africa, commonly known as "Boers," have, with the increase of population, been extending their frontiers northward, and now propose to occupy the large and fertile territory known as Mashonaland. Twenty thousand of these sturdy Dutch farmers intend to "trek" northward from the Transvaal and Orange Free State and establish a new community to be known as the "Republic of the North." But the land they have in view is embraced in the territory claimed by the British South African Company, and therefore troops are to be forwarded to oppose the Boer movement. The English people are once more called upon to pay in blood and money the cost incurred by the aggression, without a shadow of right, of a man-of-war corporation upon the people of Africa.

Strictly speaking, the land in question belongs neither to Boers nor to British, but to the native inhabitants. But as between the rival claimants, the Dutchmen have incontestably the best moral claim, as they propose to occupy and till the land themselves, while the luxurious aristocrats and polo-bellied magnates of Lombard Street who form the company are simply a gang of pirates and exploiters who mean to sell or leave it and inflict the curse of a grand landowning corporation upon the dawning civilization of that region.

It is a national disgrace that the English flag should be used to shelter a piratical, murderous expedition such as the Tories have set on foot, to enrich a small number of wealthy speculators, while taxing the public to foot the bills. What interest has the English workman in helping a clique of rich and lazy potentates of the Stock Exchange to rob the Africans or murder the Dutch? Yet the workman pays the great bulk of the taxes—furnishes nine-tenths of the actual fighters—bears the hardships, wounds, losses and humiliations of the campaign, while the rich carry off all the plunder—and then, like the idiot that

he brings to bear upon the moribund class which afflicted by gone generations. He can lash with his most withering sarcasm the brutal heartlessness of hereditary rulers who preserve the death penalty for trifling thefts and similar offences but he has no word of condemnation for the moneyed oligarchy of our day who in mentally "free" countries, can order troops or deputy sheriffs to shoot down workmen, whose only offence is that they will not be slaves. He riddles with his merciless logic the hereditary principle by which the descendants of the bastards of Nell Gwynne now sit in the House of Lords—but the self-perpetuating power of capitalism by which the equally worthless progeny of a Vanderbilt or a Carnegie may inherit the far greater power of controlling a railroad or an important branch of manufacture gives him not the slightest concern.

In short Prof. Smith, like many others who pass for radicals, is living in the past. His radicalism is the medievalism of a quarter of a century ago or more, and he is impervious as any moss-backed Tory to the significance of changed conditions and to any sense of the real perils and needed safeguards of society at the end of the century.

PROF. GOLDWIN SMITH ON "ARISTOCRACY."

Prof. Goldwin Smith's lecture on "Aristocracy" before the Young Liberals on Monday evening last was a brilliant presentation of the commonplaces of old fashioned English Liberalism, interspersed with some timely and pointed references to current Canadian politics. Those who were present and the larger audience who have since read the voluminous reports published in the leading dailies, no doubt, enjoyed greatly the Professor's keen and cutting sarcasms at the expense of the Tappans, Grants and other upholders of reactionary views. As a protest against the attempt to introduce into this country titular distinctions, and to reproduce and revivify here those survivals of feudalism which the English people are striving to throw off, and the lecture was convincing and ably reasoned production. But the idea which most forcibly presents itself in reading over the Professor's polished and epigrammatic indictment of aristocracy, is its utter inadequacy and lack of insight, as an arraignment of class privilege in its most menacing forms.

From a recognized titled nobility we in America, have little to fear. True it is a little exasperating at times to read of the so-called "nobles" of knight-land being notified upon men whose only claims to notoriety are their proficiency in the arts of political trickery, and their measureless impudence and profligacy. But the real injury to the people is not in the substitution of "Sir" for "Mr." in such cases, nor in any increased influence which the title confers, but in the fact that public spirit and right feeling are, such a low ebb that such men are able to attain leading positions. The real aristocracy which we have to dread is the aristocracy of the dollar. The class privilege, which is endangering liberty and making democratic institutions a sham and a mockery is the privilege of living without exertion on the labor of others. The political power which defies the popular will and controls legislatures, courts and the so-called organs of public opinion, is not the titled nobility or the influence of those who boast a long line of ancestry, but the power of corporations and vast aggregations of capital. It is easy in these days to ridicule the absurd pretensions to superiority of those who prize a handle to their names or the decoration on the breast, but the aristocracy of money is an active force, increasing force permeating every fibre of our social and political life and crushing out the freedom and the manhood of the masses, even while they boast of their free institutions.

It is surprising that a man of Prof. Goldwin Smith's intellectual grasp should be so keenly alive to the pernicious effects of a privileged order of nobility and at the same time so blind to the hundred times greater injuries inflicted on society by the despotic rule of capitalism. While the first is everywhere a rapidly defying force, the latter is everywhere increasing in extent and influence—inasmuch as it develops more sparsely with the material growth of the community and controls the resources of national life and industry. The professor, however, is by no means singular in his apparent inability to apply to present conditions the same powerful logic which

he brings to bear upon the moribund class which afflicted by gone generations. He can lash with his most withering sarcasm the brutal heartlessness of hereditary rulers who preserve the death penalty for trifling thefts and similar offences but he has no word of condemnation for the moneyed oligarchy of our day who in mentally "free" countries, can order troops or deputy sheriffs to shoot down workmen, whose only offence is that they will not be slaves. He riddles with his merciless logic the hereditary principle by which the descendants of the bastards of Nell Gwynne now sit in the House of Lords—but the self-perpetuating power of capitalism by which the equally worthless progeny of a Vanderbilt or a Carnegie may inherit the far greater power of controlling a railroad or an important branch of manufacture gives him not the slightest concern.

In short Prof. Smith, like many others who pass for radicals, is living in the past. His radicalism is the medievalism of a quarter of a century ago or more, and he is impervious as any moss-backed Tory to the significance of changed conditions and to any sense of the real perils and needed safeguards of society at the end of the century.

THEY ARE ALL "PUBLIC SERVANTS."

MR. BULLMAN'S *New Nation* has an excellent editorial on the claims of the families of men who die in the public service for a substantial provision at the hands of the community. In view of a recent catastrophe on the Lake Shore line, by which six mail clerks were killed in the discharge of their duty, the proposition has been made that a pension should be provided for the dependents of post-office employees dying under like circumstances. It is urged that there is no such essential difference between their case and that of a soldier killed in battle, as should demand the civil employe from the same provision for his family which is granted to the soldier in case of death or injury.

But logically, as our contemporary shows, other classes of men have an equal right to claim that their survivors shall be cared for in case of their death as either soldiers or civil servants. On what principle should mail clerks, killed in a railroad collision, be favored in this respect more than the engineers or firemen who are involved in the same disaster? Are the latter not also serving the public and risking their lives daily in an occupation that is necessary to the very existence of our modern civilization? The sudden stoppage of railroads for a few weeks would be more disastrous to the country than the ravages of an invading army.

Not only these classes of workers, but all engaged in any necessary occupation are really public servants, and it is a scandal and disgrace to civilization that when they are cut off by accident, their families, instead of being provided for, not as charity, but as a matter of right and national obligation, are left to starve.

The difficulty in the way, as the *New Nation* points out, is that the industries in which the great bulk of the army of labor are engaged, instead of being nationally organized and conducted in the public interest, are controlled by private individuals or corporations for their personal profit. The only way in which the families of the unnamed thousands who fall every year in the battle for bread, by accident, or disease contracted owing to unhealthy surroundings, can receive the support to which they are in justice entitled, is by the substitution of public for private management. As the *New Nation* says:—

As soon as the railroads are nationalized, the way will be clear to establishing pensions for railroad employes, not only in case of death in the line of duty but for accident and old age. When the coal mines are nationalized the same can be done for coal miners, and so on to all other trades and occupations.

If workmen only realized what might be accomplished for labor by securing public ownership of all indus-

tries, beginning with the railroads, mines and telegraphs, and gradually extending the sphere of national or municipal operation, they would devote their energies to this end instead of wasting them on party politics or strikes which bring them no permanent benefit.

ONE TELEPHONE LINE ENOUGH.

The telephone question is still undecided, the report of the Board of Works having been referred back by the City Council, for further consideration.

In the discussion of this matter by the Council and the press we have heard a great deal of the rights of claims or interests of the monopolists concerned and not enough as to the supreme rights of the public—which ought to outweigh all other considerations. It is a matter that could be very quickly and easily settled if the people's representatives would regard it solely from the standpoint of the public interest and convenience without at all troubling their heads as to how this or that speculator was going to come out of the transaction. The question has been bogged by conflicting private interests which ought not to be taken into account.

It is amusing at this stage to find some aldermen repeating the nonsense about telephone competition cheapening prices and being generally beneficial.

The mass of the public, by this time, fully realize the absurdity of having two or more competing telephony systems and are alive to the fact that in the end the people would have to pay for the worse than useless expenditure of means and enterprise involved in keeping up several lines to do the work of one. But some of the aldermen keep repeating, in parrot-like fashion, the platitudes about competition, entirely ignoring the costly experiences which have proved that rivalry between enterprises which are in their very nature monopolies always entails needless burdens upon the people.

From another point of view the proposal to give any other telephone company the franchise is to be condemned. A praiseworthy effort has been made of late to suppress the pole nuisance, and a beginning has been made in that direction. At present we have no fewer than five institutions, the Bell Telephone Co., two telegraph companies, the Electric Light and the fire alarm systems using street poles. Why, when an attempt is being made to abate the nuisance, throw additional obstacles in the way by giving the franchise to another, and in this case an entirely superfluous pole-using concern? This consideration alone ought to furnish a sufficient reason against telephone competition, apart from the absurdity of the thing itself.

The Single Taxers are enthusiastic propagandists and leave no stone unturned in spreading their views. They have recently secured a page in the "patent index" for the use of country newspapers, turned out by the Central Press Agency of this city, of which those editors desiring to keep their readers well posted with regard to the movement will do well to avail themselves. Much of the matter is excellent, but it is sadly marred by the evident jealousy shown by the editor towards the kindred but more comprehensive movement of Nationalism. It is to be regretted that some of our Single Tax friends seem disposed to restrict a movement which should be as broad as humanity within the limits of a narrow political economical creed, and antagonize all who cannot see in the Single Tax the health and the end of all social reform.

A particularly flagrant abuse of the judicial power occurred lately in New York, in the sentencing of Joseph Barondess, the leader of the striking cloakmakers to one year and nine months imprisonment on a trumped-up charge of extortion. The offence consisted in compelling a firm of employers to pay \$100 to settle a strike,

the money being openly demanded to partially recoup the losses sustained by the strikers, and handed over to the funds of the Union. The judge who imposed this villainously unjust sentence is named Van Brunt, and is noted for straining the law so as to punish labor reformers on any pretext. An appeal from the sentence has been taken, and Barondess in the meantime is out on bail. These fellows on the bench, with a few honorable exceptions, are all tarred with the same brush.

What do the Dakota papers say regarding the reports circulated detrimental to the interests of that State? Do they follow the line of the Toronto *Globe*, and for political purposes hand down the community which supports them? On the contrary, they speak cheerfully, though unlike the Grit organs which propose to the country for belittling the prospects of the grant, they could with justice allude to the crop failures, starvation and money sharks that have made Dakota of late years a good country to live out of—*Empire*.

In other words the Dakota papers deliberately lie and misrepresent matters in order to induce people to settle in their State. And the *Empire*, though as a truly loyal paper, it hates to see settlers roped in to build up Dakota, is so charmed with their superior living abilities that it cannot help commending their example to its Canadian contemporaries. The *Empire* has claims as a judge of artistic living which cannot be called in question.

The *Telegram* is taking a suspicious amount of interest in the cause of the overworked and underpaid street railway employes. Nobody who knows the paper will for one moment imagine that it really desires to better the condition of the men, as its record as the malignant and unscrupulous enemy of labor organization and the opponent of every movement calculated in the interests of the workers is notorious. The very fact that it is now writing up from an assumed sympathetic standpoint the agitation among the street railway men should induce alarm to every cautious in their movements. Evidently the *Telegram* has some sinister end to serve, and workmen ought to have sense enough to avoid becoming the catspaws of John Ross Robertson.

By the death of Madame Blavatsky, which occurred recently in London at the age of seventy, one of the most remarkable and influential women of this century has passed away. She was a woman of profound intellectual capacity and wonderful research. Most of her life was spent in India in the study of occultism, and of recent years she became widely known as the founder of the Theosophic cult. Like all promulgators of ideas which conflict with popularly received traditions or established institutions, she became the object of bitter abuse and vilification by the newspaper press. Before her death she had the satisfaction of seeing her cherished faith widely promulgated, especially in America, where its influence has given a marked though indirect impulse to all progressive movements.

The Montreal Trades and Labor Council and the *Echo* of that city strongly protest against the civic grant of \$2,500 in aid of the Royal Society of Canada. They say that no such grant was ever made for the reception of any labor organization holding its annual gathering in this city, and furthermore that the people interested in the Royal Society are quite wealthy enough to stand the expense themselves. This seems a reasonable view, but for ourselves we do not care to express any opinion about the Royal Society. We are afraid it might subject us to the infliction of another letter from Charles Durand, who, if he is not already a member of that body certainly ought to be.

The inveterate loggishness of Senator Frank Smith has been strikingly shown during the final week of his control over the street railway. In order