

**THE LABOR ADVOCATE**

**A WEEKLY LABOR REFORM PAPER**

Entered by the Toronto Trades and Labor Council, and is a LEAFLET OF L.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY THE GRIP PRINTING & PUBLISHING CO.

20 E. DUNDAS STREET WEST, TORONTO, CANADA.

Proprietor - J. A. WRIGHT  
Manager - F. H. WILSON  
Yearly Subscription, \$ 2.00, in advance. Single Copies, 2c.

PHILIPPS THOMPSON, Editor

Mr. George A. Howell is the authorized agent of the LABOR ADVOCATE for receiving advertisements in this city and neighborhood.

Mr. R. H. Pettigrew is our duly 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 failure in the delivery of the paper.

TORONTO, CANADA, JUNE 10, 1901.

**CIVIC REGULATION OF WAGES AND HOURS.**

The principle of regulating the wages and working hours of civic employees, and those in the service of corporations existing under municipal franchises, is making the organizing head way. In Friday last the City Council, acting upon the resolution passed by the joint committee representing the labor and social reform organizations, amended the agreement with the Bell Telephone Company by the insertion of a clause fixing the minimum rate of pay, and limiting their daily labor to eight hours. The Council, in fact, encroached upon the unanimity of the various bodies interested in the measure even went further than the original proposal, which only asked for a five dollar a week minimum.

The thinks of all interested in securing to the workers improved conditions, and fair treatment at the hands of employers, are due to Ald. Bell who, at the risk of incurring the displeasure of the privileged classes, had the courage to move the amendment embodying the changes asked for, and to the other aldermen who supported the measure. We hope that, when the electors are scrutinizing the records of each of the present Council as may present themselves for reelection, they will not overlook this important vote. It is regretted, for their own sakes, as well as on account of the labor movement, that Mayor Clarke and others, who have in some respects shown themselves in sympathy with progressive views, should have seen fit to range themselves on the wrong side in this matter.

frinds to insist on the carrying out of the system of regulation of conditions of labor in every matter over which the City Council has control. The labor bodies should now make a united and in perant demand that, if the improve ment of the marsh and Ashbridge Bay is to be handed over to a corporation a clause should be inserted in the agreement fixing the minimum wages at not less than fifteen cents per hour, and limiting the working day to nine hours.

**FREE RAILROAD PASSES.**

The New York Standard in a paper, we were about to send of one bill, but as a matter of fact it has two—Single and Double. The Single is radical enough on these questions, but on many others having a bearing on social reform and labor emancipation it is so conservatively, not to say reactionary. In its last issue it has an article based on an interview between a New York Herald reporter and Russell Harrison, son of the President, in which it takes a position that no consistent labor reformer can approve.

It seems that young Harrison was suspected of travelling extensively on free railway passes. The Herald, with commendable enterprise, sent a reporter to investigate the matter. He sought out Harrison and put the question straight to him, whereupon he flew into a towering passion and gave vent to a volley of splurghous language, telling the reporter that it was "none of the Herald's damned business," and so on. The Standard's comment on the affair is that "the reporter ought to thank his stars that the victim of his impudence was content to damn him and did not kick him out of the place."

If we did not know the Standard's inconsistencies it would be a surprise to find a paper claiming to be in the very vanguard of the social reform movement, justifying by implication one of the worst abuses by which the monopoly system is perpetuated. The giving of railway passes to people in possession of more or less influence is in no sense a private affair. It is a matter of public concern. It monopolies of any sort, are not particularly railroad monopolies, are not actuated by generosity or philanthropy in granting such favors. With them it is simply a matter of business. They dispense passes to journalists, legislators, judges, politicians and others in influential positions, as bribes to secure their support when questions arise affecting monopoly interests. The free pass system is a means of wholesale corruption, and is one of the principal causes why corporations, in spite of the strong feeling against them among the people at large, are able to dictate charts to the legislatures, decisions to the courts, and opinions to the readers of the political press. If the President's son is in the habit of selling such influence as he may possess to the railroads for free passes, surely that is a thing which the people of the monopoly-ridden republic have a right to know, and the Herald instead of being guilty of an impertinence in making the inquiry, was performing a public service of no small magnitude.

One of the most valuable pieces of information which could be laid before the people of the United States and Canada would be the names of those who are the recipients of railroad "courtesies" of this kind. Such a list would account for the milk in the cocoanut in many a case of legislative impotence in this question as on several others outside of the single Tax indicates, that it has little sympathy with the general labor reform movement.

**"LARRY" AS A JOURNALIST.**

Some of our friends belonging to various advanced movements are, it seems to us, taking unnecessary trouble to refute the lying assertions of a writer in the *Man*, signing himself "Flanzer," who, under the mask of a pen-name, takes delight in repeating false and exploded slanders against leading social reformers, with such audacity as his naughtiness suggests. This fellow, whose real name is Henry J. Wiltshire, is a cockney end of the "Arry" type, the incarnation of conceit and vulgarism whose pretensions to an extensive acquaintance with "high life" make him the laughingstock of all with whom he is brought in contact. There are just two ways of dealing with the published utterances of such blackguards—one is to write no notice of them—the other is to tell him that you cannot continue to support a paper which permits such a creature systematically to assail in its columns noble minded men and women whose lofts he is not worthy to black. As for boot he is not worthy to black. As for boots he is not worthy to black. As for boots he is not worthy to black. As for boots he is not worthy to black. As for boots he is not worthy to black. As for boots he is not worthy to black.

**"FOR ITS GREATLY TO HIS CREDIT."**

Sir:—The death of Sir John Macdonald a good many of our partizan contemporaries are recalling his noted utterance in the last campaign:—"A British subject I was born and a British subject I will die!" As a saying reflecting a good deal of glory upon its author, and deserving of lasting and grateful remembrance. We notice, however, that nobody has undertaken to point out wherein lies the special merit of originating it, indeed the late Premier did originate this observation. It cannot surely be "heroic merit" as an epigram, for it is literary merit as a collection of words as could well be put together by anyone acquainted with the English language. It does not indicate any great amount of research, or give to the public any previously unacquired and important fact. It did not require any heroism or self-sacrifice on the part of the speaker either to mention a circumstance for which he was in no way responsible, or to indicate a determination to remain in a position of honor and endurance, for it is obvious that it has been the object of his life to secure and retain. All his interests, hopes and expectations were dependent on the retention of his allegiance. Neither did the remark involve anything like unpopularity or social ostracism. On the contrary, it was a bid for the applause of the unthinking crowd, and a very successful one.

Yet, to hear some fools and hero-worshippers prate, you might suppose that this childish or rather senseless expression was not only the name of political wisdom, but that to utter on a moral platform required a fortitude and a physical courage hardly second to that of the martyr who foresees the rack and stake as the result of the expression of his convictions.

It is only in a colony—perhaps only in such a colony as Canada, where a public man would indulge in such a piece of idiotic bombast. In England, the politician who would make use of such a phrase seriously would be laughed off the platform. Gilbert's inimitable line in *Pinafore* is—"For he himself has said it. And it's right to his credit. That is an Englishman."

Appealing irresistibly to the national sense of humor, here put an effective quietus on the huckstering patriotism and jingo beastfulness which finds vent in such sayings. If the late Premier's admirers were who they would certainly not recall this silly piece of expatriation clapnet as one of his claims to be remembered as a statesman.

**BLAME THE SYSTEM, NOT THE MAN.**

The inconsistency of British public opinion was never more strikingly shown than in the unreasoning clamor now being raised by the English public over the gambling habits of Walter P. Reilly, and in no way scandalous an incident. The truth and craft was merely an eye, in the ordinary routine of private life. It and the other violations of the accepted code of morality, are simply the natural results of the monarchical system. That a prince should be a gambler, a spendthrift and a libertine is strikingly a contradiction with the traditions of British monarchs and the practices of most occupants of or heirs to the throne. It is no new development, either in the character of the Prince of Wales or the history of his life, or help wondering what all the fuss is about. How is it that the intelligent portion of the English public have not long ago discovered that the monarchical system—like any system which enslaves men to live in luxury without work and without responsibility—breeds prodigates and sensualists just as naturally as carrion breeds maggots?

It is not fair or reasonable to blame and denunciation upon the Prince as an individual. He is merely the outcome of his heredity and surroundings. Inheriting from his birth the faulty tendency towards dissolute courses, brought up in the midst of obsequious courtiers and servile dependents ready to gratify his every wish—placed abode and outside of the healthy restraint of public opinion, which does so much to keep the ordinary citizen in the path of respectability—having ample wealth and leisure, and being cleared from adopting any career in which worthless ambitions might find scope—is it any cause for wonder that Albert Edward Prince of Wales should have become a gambler and a spendthrift? Would it not rather have been cause for surprise had he settled into a staid and steady-going member of society?

It is not the individual who is blamed, but the system. Monarchy, by casting an individual above the responsibilities which attach to the ordinary citizen, by keeping one luxury in cherishing and demoralizing family, and surrounding them continually with pimps and parasites, adulterers and grog-sellers, who, while they minister to every whim, dare not tell them any wholesome truth or impose the slightest check upon their impulses, places in the way of kings and princes temptations which are only the strongest means of an arbitrary, easy-going, merely an ostentatious, easy-going moral, general and pleasure-loving, who, in his tenths of mankind would do as his prince, "takes the good the gods provide him," and as the spheres of laudable ambition open to such are denied him, tries to get as much satisfaction out of life as possible. The wonder is, not that he is so bad, but that he is not far worse.

So long as the English people will cling to monarchism they must expect to see at the head of their public and social fabric such legitimate products of the system as the Prince of Wales. The tremendous outcry over his recent escapades is illegal and unreasonableness. "Do not snatch grapes of thorns or figs of thistles!" Only those can consistently condemn such developments of the English social system, who are opposed to the institutions under which some men are enabled to enjoy the good things of life without labor or forethought, while the industry of others is taxed for their maintenance. Monarchism is responsible for George V., and the Prince of Wales, but its American critics should remember that it is in no respect worse in its demoralizing effects than the system of capitalism, under which, in the large centres of this Continent, there are tens of thousands of immensely wealthy loafers and prodigates, who have all the vices with which Albert Edward is charged, without the redeeming traits of his character.

Quotum from the circular addressed by the labor and social reform organizations on the results of land monopoly. The *Globe* says, "The subject of the farmers of the address says, 'is one worthy of the thoughtful consideration of Christian ministers.' Let us say shortly the thoughtful consideration of Christian editors, or even of writers who are not Christians?"

A vigorous and emphatic protest should be made all along the line against the closing of three branches of the Public Library, on the ground of insufficient funds to sustain them. The money must be found somehow, and the Council must be given closely to understand that this importunate means of popular education. The excuse of insufficient funds comes with an ill grace from a body that scouted all considerations of expense when it was proposed that the entire City Council should travel to Ottawa and King John at the public cost to attend Sir John Macdonald's funeral—an wholly unnecessary proceeding. The Trades and Labor Council and other bodies should speak out on the matter in no uncertain tones.

The difficulty of finding an acceptable successor to Sir John Macdonald has, after much trouble, been temporarily settled by the selection of Senator Abbott, as Premier. He is a mere figure head, however, being an old man of seventy who has never taken a leading part in politics. The real leader of the Government will be Sir John Thompson. Mr. Abbott, as a railroad politician, is completely under monopoly influences and out of sympathy with the masses of the people. The difficulty between the rival Quebec leaders, Langens and Chalmers, has been patched up, the latter consenting to remain in a subordinate position and to defer his claims to the portfolio of Railways. The whole deal is a mere makeshift arrangement, and a nobody expects it to last more than a few months. The best thing that can be said for the ministry is that it is too weak to do very much mischief.

We have previously called attention to the fact that the *Globe*, though professing to stand apart sympathetically for the cause of labor, ranges itself against nearly every practical measure proposed in the interests of the toilers. Another instance of this unbecoming contumacious and ill-affected attitude of the *Globe* in connection with his interference with action in moving the insertion of a clause in the Bell Telephone agreement regulating the wages and hours of employees. Ald. Bell is, or at least was lately a Conservative in politics, and that is quite enough for the "double" charge, but with acting in a "double" capacity, and proffers nothing but evil as the result of his amendment. We can only say that if Ald. Bell acted in a "double" spirit on that occasion, we heartily wish that more of our representatives were similarly influenced. Which of the *Globe* directors, we wonder, holds stock in the Bell Telephone Company?

Amos all the absurd and crazy suggestions to which the dilemma of the Tory party over the Premier has given rise, about the wildcat, was the proposal, seriously put forth in some quarters, to make Principal Grant, of Kingston, Premier. Clergymen, failures, even in subordinate positions. Their whole training and habits of thought unfit them for the exigencies of public life, and there is no reason to suppose that, had the experiment been tried, Principal Grant would have reversed the rule. He is a vastly overrated man with a talent for using grandiloquent language and well rounded sentences of his no given given any evidence of genuine profundity as a thinker, let alone of capacity for practical leadership. In short, Principal Grant is a good deal of a humbug. He is nothing more than a fluffy talker and a dealer in the verbiage and windy abstractions of the perfume patriotism