LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
MAY 18 1920
VICTORIA, B.C.

DESTROY THE RULE OF GOLD BY ESTABLISHING THE "GOLDEN RULE."

The Week

Work For All! Leisure For All! Abundance For All! Why Don't We Get It?

New Edition—Vol. 1, No. 2 | VICTORIA, MAY 8th, 1920 | $3.00 Per Year 10c. Single Copy

Peter Collins and the Ninth Commandment

"Thou Shalt Not Bear False Witness."

Peter Collins spoke last week at the Alexandra Club under the auspices of the "Knights of Columbus." On the platform with him were Mr. J. D. O'Connell and Bishop McDonald, with Mayor Porter in the chair. With such men as those to support him one would have expected Mr. Collins to keep to the truth. But he was dealing with a subject that could not be supported by facts, and consequently he had to prevaricate. The Week does not know how far those on the platform agreed with him, but as they offered no contradiction they laid themselves open to the charge of allowing the ninth commandment to be seriously violated.

Mr. Collins was strong on the ten commandments. For that reason he should have been very careful not to infringe any one of them.

He made the statement that Socialism and Christianity were opposed to one another, and that Socialism was antagonistic to every one of the ten commandments. When questioned as to the Bishop of Birmingham's stand on Socialism he denied that the Bishop was a Socialist, and insisted that he was simply a social reformer.

For the benefit of readers who have not read what Bishop Gore says on the matter The Week here produces part of a pamphlet written by the Bishop on "Christianity and Socialism."

He starts out with the statement:

"Socialism, in its strict sense, describes a certain economic theory, viz., that for the present system of private capital should be substituted collective ownership by the state or community of all the instruments of production, i.e., land and capital in all forms."

After describing some of the differences of opinion among Socialists, he says:

"But Socialism as a theory is not bound up with hostility to the Christian idea of marriage, or with materialistic narrowness, or in ignoring of the conditions of free personal development. And leaving aside for the moment those tendencies which often accompany socialism, **but are not to be identified with it,** and concerning myself only with the socialistic theory strictly considered,, I would lay it down that there is nothing in the socialistic idea of the constitution of society which is antagonistic to Christianity, and that its main idea is closely allied to the Christian idea."

Further on he says:

"With the motives and aspirations of this 'current Socialism' Christianity is very vitally concerned, for they are ethical and involve a certain idea of human brotherhood."

In acknowledging the failure of the Church he says:

"We have administered much charitable relief. We have tried hard as a church to pick up the sick and wounded in the social struggle." This is quite true; and it is something. But all observers are agreed as to the ineffectiveness on a large scale of our "ambulance work." And, what is much more important, the Christian Church was created to be no mere ambulance corps, but the organ of the kingdom of God in the world; the power of positive and militant righteousness; the vindicator and defender of the weak; the irresistible foe of oppression and injustice. **And how vast has been our failure:"**

"We have then, no effective plea to advance against the accusation that the Church as a body failed to champion the cause of the weak and the oppressed.. Our only present plea is effective repentance.. We must identify ourselves with the great impeachment of our present industrial system. We must refuse to acquiesce in it.. But more than this, we must identify ourselves, **because we are Christians,** with the positive ethical ideal of socialistic thought."

And yet Mr. .Collins says that Bishop Gore is not a Socialist and that Christianity and Socialism are antagonistic.

Further than that, Mr. Collins, in answering questions as to conditions in Russia, said that the reports of Mr. Bullitt could not be accepted because he had no authority for going to Russia. Mr. Collins made a flat denial that Bullitt was sent by the United States, and seeing that Mr. Collins was supported by such men as the Bishop and the Mayor, no doubt most of the audience believed him.

In the report of Bullitt's mission to Russia before the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, the following appears on page 4:

"Ordered to Russia

"Senator Knox: What was your mission to Russia, and when did you go?

"Mr. Bullitt: I was ordered to go to Russia on the 18th of February. I received the following order from Secretary Lansing (reading):

"American Commission to Negotiate Peace"

18th February, 1919.

"Sir: You are hereby directed to proceed to Russia for the purpose of studying conditions, political and economic, therein, for the benefit of the American commissioners plenipotentiary to negotiate peace, and all Amerian diplomats and consular officials are hereby directed to extend to you the proper courtesies and facilities to enable you to fulfil the duties of your mission.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

"Robert Lansing,
"Secretary of State of the
United States of America.

"Senator Knox: "What is the date of that?

"Mr. Bullitt: Feb. 18th, 1919. I also received at the same time from Mr. Joseph C. Grew, the Secretary of the American Commission, the following (reading):

"American Commission to Negotiate Peace.

18th February, 1919.

"To whom it may concern: I hereby certify that Mr. Wm. C. Bullitt has been authorized by the American commissioners plenipotentiary to negotiate peace to proceed to Russia, for the purpose of studying conditions, political and economic, for the benefit of the commission, and I bespeak for him the proper courtesies and facilities in enabling him to fulfill the duties of his mission.

"J. C. Grew,
"Secretary of the American Commission
to Negotiate Peace."

Now, Mr. Bullit brought back information from Russia which was absolutely contradictory to the stuff that has been appearing in the daily press, and which showed Russia up in a light altogether different to that in which she has been held up. He made disclosures that were liable to cause phblic opinion to look with anything but disfavor on the Russian Reds.

He showed that no less a person than Lloyd George had been guilty of deliberately deceiving the British Parliament.

For this reason Bullitt's report has not received any publicity in the press, and anti-Socialists try to discredit it by saying that Bullitt had no authority.

Mr. Collins either did not know the facts or he was deliberately lying. There is no other word for it. In either case he was guilty of misleading the public, and it is up to the gentlemen who were on the platform with him to acknowledge that Mr. Collins was wrong.

The Week is anxious to get at the truth, not only about Russia but about everything else. Sometimes it is not very palatable, but it is the safest stuff to handle.

At an early date, we will give a brief summary of Bullitt's report. In the meantime, those who are anxious to read it for themselves can secure copies from the publishers, B. W. Huebsch, New York.

The Winnipeg Strike Trials

MAY-DAY MASS MEETING OF PROTEST

Stirring Addresses on Behalf of the Men in Gaol by Rev. W. Stevenson, Major Burde and C. Sivertz

Last Saturday night, in the Crystal Theatre, the workers of Victoria gathered to voice their protest against the methods adopted by the Government to secure the conviction of the Winnipeg strike leaders. The meeting had not been well advertised, and the attendance suffered somewhat in consequence. Mr. E. S. Woodward occupied the chair. His remarks were brief. He reaffirmed his stand—taken during the progress of the strike—that the Government itself was largely responsible for the industrial disturbances which swept over Western Canada in the early Summer of 1919. It had deliberately allied itself with the employers in a futile attempt to crush the working class movement. It had tried to accentuate the differences between the One Big Union and the Internationals in order to keep the workers divided and powerless. To prove that the Winnipeg strike was a bona fide effort of the workers to improve their condition and in no sense an attempt at revolution, he read the telegram sent by Mayor Gray to Senator Robertson on the eve of the sympathetic strike. This telegram showed the origin of the strike and the willingness of the men to return to work, once the right to bargain collectively was conceded. Mr. Woodward further showed that never before was a strike conducted with fewer breaches of the peace, and he quoted The Methodist Recorder in proof of this statement. In conclusion he urged the workers to stand united for their rights regardless of their internal differences on the subject of organization. He then introduced Rev. Wm. Stevenson, who spoke as follows:

"I am not here to-night to enter into a discussion of the merits or demerits of the trial at Winnipeg. I am not in possession of sufficient data; I have not read the full report of the proceedings. Before one can express a justifiable judgment he needs all the facts of the case before him. There are some things, however, which, it seems to me, are not in dispute. First, the action of the Minister of Labor, who, whilst the case was pending and evidence being collected, came out with a public declaration that there was evidence of a conspiracy to work up a revolution, or words to that effect. Now why did the government permit a responsible minister of the Crown to go about making statements practically pre-judging the case against the prisoners, and thus helping to create a feeling that the men were guilty before they had even had a chance before the courts? In my opinion any government with a sense of decency would have recalled this man and sent him about his business. It is a misnomer to call Senator Robertson a Minister of Labor; a more fitting title would be Minister to the Interests of Capitalism.

"Another thing I think is undeniable in connection with this trial is the way in which the evidence against the prisoners was collected, the kind of persons sent out to collect it and the unfair or one-sided use made of the evidence available. This has gone far to create the feeling that the motives behind the prosecution were not entirely disinterested and not entirely consistent with a desire to do justice. We know something of the methods employed across the line to hound down people who become obnoxious to the government. Listen to the statement made by a great detective, Thomas Beet, the American representative of the famous John Conquest, ex-Chief Inspector of Scotland Yard, is the speaker:

"There is a phase of the private detective evil which has worked untold damage in America. This is the private constabulary system by which armed forces are employed during labor troubles. Ostensibly these armed private detectives are hurried to the scene of the trouble to maintain order and prevent destruction of property, although this work should always be left to the official guardians of the peace. . . . Have you noticed that most of the disorderly outbreaks were so guided as to work harm to the interests of the strikers? . . . During a famous strike of car builders in a Western city some years ago, to my knowledge, much of the lawlessness was incited by private detectives who led mobs in the destruction of property. In one of the greatest of our strikes, that involving the steel industry, over two thousand armed detectives were employed, supposedly to protect property, while several hundred more were scattered in the ranks of strikers as workmen. Many of the latter became officers of the labor bodies, helped to make laws for the organizations, made incendiary speeches, cast their votes for the most radical movements by the strikers, participated and led bodies of the members in the acts of lawlessness that eventually caused the sending of State troops and declaration of martial law. While doing this these spies were making daily reports of the plans and purposes of the strikers."

This is only a mild sample of the methods adopted in the States, and there is the strongest reason for believing that these same methods have already invaded Canada. When a government of a country resorts to methods of that kind it will find, sooner or later, that it is handling a dangerous weapon, and one which may act like a boomerang and strike back on the user.

"What impresses me most in connection with this trial is the parallel which it gives you with what happened in England just about a hundred years ago. Let any one read "The Town Laborer," by Hammond. Those were the days when the great industrial struggle began in England. You read then of harsh measures employed to dominate and enslave the workers; to prevent trades unions forming, and to wring the last drop of blood out of the worker. The labor legislation of the period: the exactions made upon the worker; the hard conditions of servitude, the penalties which men suffered for making the slightest complaint, forms one of the wickedest and blackest pages in British history. But British labor has won out against all that tyranny and is on the march to industrial freedom and democracy. Canada is far behind. She is a hundred years behind both in industrial freedom and religion. The trials and sentence of the prisoners at Winnipeg show where Canada stands to-day. If these men are criminals, there are many thousands of others who are equally guilty. But they are not criminals. Their crimes are virtues compared with the crimes of the profiteers. Why does not the government prosecute the profiteers, who are exploiting the people and living on their life-blood? If the Winnipeg prisoners have technically broken the law the law should be changed. It is up to the workers to send members of their own class to parliament. Too long have you sent men who have used the scourge of economic force to lash you into subjection. You have the choice before you of accepting the defeat to your aspirations which this verdict imposes, or you can choose to get together and by every lawful and reasonable means put labour in the place of power. I support the resolution in asking that these men be set at liberty. The government surely should be satisfied by what the men have already suffered, and will gain for itself only credit by acting with clemency toward them."

Christian Sivertz dwelt on the financial needs of the prisoners and their families and appealed for liberal support. He said: "I want to say something about the collection. We cannot give the families of the imprisoned men that sense of comfort and security which the presence of their natural protectors gives them. We cannot still the inquiring minds of the children when, at the close of the day, they ask why papa doesn't come home; but we can see that they do not suffer for want of bread. We can establish and assert kinship with the prisoners by looking after the essential needs of their loved ones, until their sentences expire or we pull them out of jail.

"I am expected to say something about the strike and the trials. Being a public servant, it is held by some to be an improper thing for me to say anything that may be construed as criticism of the government. I am not insensible of the value of my position, but I value my citizenship even more, and cannot therefore allow anything to abrogate my rights as a subject. Moreover, I regard it as part of my duty to express myself freely in any matter concerning the practices, policies or administrations of our institutions to the end of improving them and thus rendering the measure of well-being and happiness of the people greater.

"Regarding the strike itself, I know this and want you to remember it, that the great sympathetic strike of Winnipeg was, first of all, and right through, a craft union strike, instigated and carried out to its end by craft unions of the international trades. It is true that some of those arrested and tried were in sympathy with a new system of organization, which system shaped itself into practical expression by the formation of the One Big Union. But at the beginning and during the strike the new organization was not in existence. The name of the One Big Union was used in connection with the prosecution of these men for the purpose of discrediting them among their fellow workers and the people at large. The strike itself was the same as every other strike, with this exception, it was better and more thoroughly organized. It was, in fact, what the leaders of all similar strikes wish them to be. It tied up the works. It accomplished what it was designed to do. In that respect if the Winnipeg strike leaders are guilty then all strikers are guilty in any place and at any time. If the Winnipeg strike was unlawful, then all strikes are unlawful. No doubt, many mistakes were made. Many hasty actions were decided on, when judged

from the standpoint of material interests of special groups. My own organization would have been infinitely better off if it had seen its way clear to approach the strike question from a different angle, or if it had found it possible to step out when the Government gave its ultimatum. But they had joined the strike under the influence of the strike psychology, and once they were out they determined to stay out and win or lose with their brethren. The bitterest results would be sweet compared to the alternative of breaking faith with their fellow workers and losing their own self-respect.

As to the policy adopted by the Government, I regard it as a mistaken policy. It was a policy of panic. They acted as if they could stop the wave of radical thought now sweeping over the earth by arresting a dozen or so persons prominently identified with the strike. Looking at the incident at this time and place, and taking into consideration what Britain is doing in the matter. I am more and more convinced that the Government's action was an unfortunate one. Great Britain, instead of witholding or attempting to deny free speech in any sense, has long since cancelled every vestige of limitations imposed during the war. I have always admired the British spirit and the British temperament. The Ottawa spirit respecting the strike is non-British. It is an imported article.

Regarding the future, I want to see the workers industrially and politically organized. I want to see them send to Councils, Legislatures and Parliaments representatives who know their viewpoint and understand their ideals; those who have experienced workingmen's hardships and disappointments; shared in their progress and setbacks, their joys and their sorrows.

"I wish to see the workers give their visions a chance to materialize. After all, it is our vision of a better world, our ideals of rendering service for the betterment of conditions in life for others, that gives us strength to face risks and hardships."

The hour was rather late when the Chairman called on Major Burde. This speaker gave personal anecdotes and experiences which kept the meeting convulsed with laughter. He showed that the labor troubles of the West had been fomented deliberately by employers in order to break the unions, and quoted speeches he had heard in the Hotel Vancouver in proof of this statement. He gave the names of parties who had conspired to foment industrial discord. At the conclusion of his remarks a resolution was unanimously adopted condemning the attitude of the government and the tortuous methods it had adopted in securing the conviction of Winnipeg strike leaders and the leniency it had displayed in handling the profiteers.

———o———

THE WEEK

(A Socialist Paper)

Published Every Saturday in the interests of all who by hand or brain make any useful contribution to society.

W. E. PEIRCE, Editor

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

One Year - - - - - - - -	**$3.00**
Six Months - - - - - - - -	**$1.75**
Three Months - - - - - - - -	**$1.00**

Address All Communications to

"The Week," 625 Courtney St., Victoria, B.C.

$5 per day. Men, send me your address, and I will start you in a business of your own, earning $5 to $10 daily the year around. Sample case and plans free. Address H. V. Martin, Windsor, Ont.

The Double Standard

Sermon Preached by Rev. W. D. Spence on Sunday, May 2nd

"I will lift up my standard." Isiah 49, 22.

———

When the sky is red and lowering the farmer prepares for rain. He seeks to save his hay and grain from the gathering storm. Are we as wise as he?

Guizot tells the story of the great explosion in Paris in 1789. The people lost confidence in their leaders, then came a long trail of lawlessness and crime, a wave of avarice, greed, and the love of fleshly pleasures. Men forsook the churches, denied God, refused to recognize the Sabbath, and made every tenth day a disgusting orgy from morn till night.

In some instances the parallel with our own day is marked. A certain clearly defined spirit of lawlessness is abroad. Again I ask, "Are we, like the farmer, to act wisely?"

Law—in the Universe—in Nature—is God's thought organized and made automatic. In the animal world these laws take the form of instincts. While by the workings of other laws in the vegetable kingdom, the juices of fruits, the color of flowers, and the markings of leaves—all are fixed. God's laws are uniform and like always produces like. Nor are God's laws irksome—they do not bring bondage. In fact we are free in proportion as we master the uniform laws. The artist with color, the musician with harmony, alike find that laws are not fetters but wings, and a Universe in which laws are not uniform becomes unthinkable.

Now if God's laws are right and obedience to them makes for harmony surely the ideal for society is a state wherein the people's laws will also be right, so that there is the greatest possible incentive for the people to be law-abiding. It is a large part of the Church's work to teach the maintenance of law and order.

But there is one sine qua non—one indispensable thing. If we are to be law-abiding in the human sphere as in the divine we must have laws which command respect because they are just. Russia's condition to-day is largely the result of Russia's condition yesterday. I am sometimes asked if there is not danger of a revolution in Canada of a like nature to that in Russia, and my answer is that whatever revolution we may have in Canada will differ from that in Russia just in so far as the causes producing the revolutions differ. Like produces like, and without having had Russia's history we cannot have Russia's revolution.

There is no doubt, however ,that changes are coming. The old Roman Catholic motto, "Semper Eadem," is not to be applied to modern society and democracy. Relief is being craved in many directions. Both farmers and industrial workers are tired of taxation, and they have made up their minds, and—they have the votes. They are going to force, through Parliaments and Legislatures, through Congress and Assemblies, national Prohibition laws, and they are going to assault other evils and inequalities, both industrial and political.

Amongst other evils that of the Double Standard will have to go. There is only one standard of truth, of right, of purity, and to get people sympathetic, respectful and obedient to these laws we must have them such as to command respect.

How great the need of truth to-day! How many evils would go from the home, the store, the office, the factory, even from the Church, were truth to be enthroned. But our laws and the enforcement of them are so lax that the guilty frequently find that "it pays to lie." Here Mr. Spence contrasted the readiness of Old Country courts to punish a witness guilty of perjury with the almost total lack of respect for truth in many Canadian courts.

Men must be taught to respect truth.

There is also a double standard of right. The war has been made the scapegoat for more than the Kaiser's sins. Looking at a gullible public, men with metallic soul and the greed of gold as an obsession have hidden behind the double standard and played the traitor. Are there traitors who are shot and traitors who are knighted? Undoubtedly. A traitor is not only a person who betrays his country when she is at war. Our dictionaries tell us "a traitor is one who betrays his trust—a treacherous person. Am I my brother's keeper? All Scripture and all humanity saith, Yes. Then if I keep not that trust I am a traitor.

I claim we shall not get respect for law until we do away with the double standard that orders to be shot one traitor and bedecks with a knighthood another. For every man who, especially in a time of need, gambles in the people's food and causes untold suffering while the Almighty continues to provide enough for all is a traitor and should be punished accordingly.

If the law which shoots one traitor is just the same law should apply to every traitor who would betray a sacred trust and deny his hungry fellows the necessities of life.

And now we have a double standard of purity by which sinning women are censured, ostracized and sent out of our communities, while their partners in guilt are allowed to go scot free and are taken into the bosom of the family and social life.

Why this attitude toward the woman alone? No one denies her guilt, No one suggests she is not a source of danger and cause of disease. But we do ask, is she one whit more so than her partner? Is it not true that if we had no bad men, we would have no bad women?

Our present laws are a farce in this respect: punishing counterfeiting by a twenty-year sentence or the maiming of animals by a 15-year sentence: protecting wealth and property for all of life and even after death, but only protecting a girl's virtue till she is 16, and theen only with a 2-year sentence to the brute who robs her. Just think of the difficulty met in the British Parliament to pass a law to provide the lash for all guilty of two offences of procuring girls for immoral purposes. Not till Will Crooks had said, "This is a punishment which every one can escape by not committing the offence" was the passage of the bill assured.

To have a law-abiding people we must have laws which are not a farce—laws which are uniform—laws which admit of no double standard, and there must be, as the Scriptures claim, "One law for thee and for the stranger in your midst."

———o———

Socialism does not want to "divide up." It wants to stop the dividing up and give everybody a chance to have all he or she can earn.

———o———

If we want more war we can always have it by just keeping on the way we are going.

The only way to stop it is to stop the causes that lead up to it.

Road to the Co-operative Commonwealth

By WILLIAM H. WATTS, Sandusky, Ohio.

The Difference Between Socialism and Public Ownership Explained

[It is frequently charged against the Socialist that he has no plan. Here is something constructive as well as revolutionary.—Ed.]

Government ownership is not Socialism. Government ownership is State Socialism, so-called, which is not Socialism at all, but State Capitalism. Government Ownership, State Socialism and State Capitalism are synonymous terms. Government ownership is the wilderness through which we must travel to reach the Promised Land of the Co-operative Commonwealth. How long it will take depends upon the state of mind of the people. The Hebrews could have marched from Egypt to Canaan in about six weeks if they had been prepared for it, but it was necessary for them to wander around in the wilderness for forty years.

To illustrate the title of this article I shall use the Postal Service. The Postal Service is frequently spoken of as a Socialist or Socialistic institution. The Postal Service is, perhaps, the nearest approach to Socialism that we have, and it is an illustration of the practicability of Socialism; but the very fact that it may be said to be the nearest approach to Socialism that we have makes it a striking illustration of how very far we are, not in point of time, but in point of achievement, from Socialism.

The Postal Service is a capitalist institution. It is an institution absolutely necessary to the life of the capitalist system. It is the instrument by which the infinite amount of correspondence necessary to capitalist production and exchange, and the necessary expansion of the capitalist system itself is carried on at the minimum of expense to the capitalists. The capitalists are perfectly willing to let the Postal service remain in the hands of the government, because by so doing capitalistic communication is carried on at the very lowest possible expense, while if the Postal Service was in private hands the increased expense and the lessened mail facilities would make the Postal Service a clog upon the operation of the capitalist system.

The Postal Service is also a patent milking machine by which the capitalists systematically rob the United States Treasury. Many contracts for the carrying of mail, for the building of postoffices and for furnishing supplies to the Postal Service are acts of theft by which business men get their fingers into the public till.

Public Industries Must Be Independent of Private Capital

It takes something more than Public Ownership to make an institution an example of Socialism. Before the Postal Service can be a Socialist institution it must become absolutely independent of the capitalist world; it must become not only self-supporting financially, but self-maintaining, economically. As long as Uncle Sam has to deal with any private individual or corporation in order to secure any article or have any service performed necessary to the operation or maintenance of the Postal Service, that institution is not a Socialist institution.

The first thing necessary, therefore, to make the Postal Service an example of true Socialism is not only that it shall be publicly owned, but that every contributory industry and every source of supply necessary to the establishment of post offices and post roads shall also be publicly owned. Uncle Sam must be independent of the capitalists.

Article I, Section 8, of the U. S. Constitution provides that "Congress shall have power to establish post offices and post roads." This delegation of power to Congress necessarily implies that the Federal Government may properly own and operate everything necessary to the establishment and maintenance of post offices and post roads, and it is my purpose to indicate somewhat how near we can come to establishing true Socialism under this clause of the Constitution alone.

In order to make the Postal Service a Socialist institution we must own the railroads and steamship lines, for these are postal roads on which the mails are carried. We must also own the telegraph lines, for two reasons: because the telegraph is necessary to the operation of the railroad and also because telegraph messages are really postal messages. The fact that electricity and wires are used instead of pens and paper does not make a telegraph message any the less a postal message. The same arguments apply equally to the Telegraph lines.

We must extend the Parcel Post to cover the entire express business. The carrying of packages is as much a part of the Postal Service proper as the carrying of messages. The king's courier, who was the first postman, and from whom the Postal Service of the present day has been developed, carried such packages as were possible and necessary for him to carry. The express business naturally includes the freight traffic; for, unless we draw an arbitrary distinction, we cannot say when an express package ceases to be an express package and becomes a parcel of freight. Besides that, the heavy freight business is necessary to the building and furnishing of post offices and railroads. The freight business naturally goes with the railroads.

In order to operate railroads we must have cars and locomotives. We must own the Car Works and Locomotive Shops, and Shipyards. That makes it necessary for us to own the Rolling Mills, Smelters, and Iron Mines. We must have fuel, so we must own the Coal Mines. We use a great deal of lumber, so we must own Planing Mills, Saw Mills and Forests. There is a great deal of glass used, both on the railroads and in post offices. We must own the Glass Works; also the Paint and Varnish Works.

We must own the Brick Yards, Quarries and Cement Factories. There is a great deal of concrete work in these industries. We must own the Electrical Works. We must have electrical equipment. We use furniture. We must own the Furniture Factories, Wagon Works and Automobile Factories. The time will come when Uncle Sam's automobile trucks will run over smooth paved roads to every farm house in the country delivering packages and freight, as well as letters, and gathering up letters, packages and freight.

Mail bags and other things are made of leather. We must own the Leather and Harness Works and Tanneries. Then we must own Tool Works—a very important item—and Paper Factories.

Well, if we are going to use leather, we must have the hides, and hides come from the Packing Houses. That opens up another line of industries. But let it go as it is. You can pursue this line of inquiry for yourselves. Those I have mentioned include about 30 different industries, employing about 6,579,182 men, and $8,987,597,019.00 of capital, with a bonded debt of $6,835,364,014.00.

Improving Industrial Conditions

Now, having all these various industries owned by the government, it becomes possible to improve industrial conditions. We can reduce the hours of labor to the lowest practicable minimum and raise wages to the highest practicable maximum. We can make the national workshops light, roomy, convenient, sanitary and safe. We can provide the public employees with Sick Benefits, Accident Insurance and Old Age Pensions. The Government might go into the housing business, either building model homes for its employees, renting them at such a nominal rental as would maintain the premises in good condition, or loaning them money to build their own homes.

All this could be done without any change in the Constitution. There is no Constitutional limitation upon Uncle Sam's benevolence as an employer. No court can say that anything the Federal Government sees fit to do for its own employees is unconstitutional. It is possible under our present constitution to provide for public employees as good working and living conditions as they could enjoy in an ideal social system.

But this combination of public ownership and paternalism does not make Socialism. I say "paternalism" advisedly; for the bestowal of ideal working and living conditions upon public employees by a benevolent government is, properly speaking, paternalism, and let us not make the mistake of calling it Socialism.

Getting Possession

How shall we get possession of the industries? Some Socialists, whose fanaticism is only equalled by the shallowness of their judgment, declare loudly for confiscation. The man who proposes confiscation is unwise. If it were merely an ethical proposition that we were considering, confiscation would be a sound proposition. All the capital of the world is simply accumulated wealth produced by labor and taken by the capitalist class from the working class, and if we were to confiscate capital and make it public property, we would simply be restoring that wealth to the ownership of the people who produced it. But the question of getting possession of the industries cannot be settled upon its merits as an ethical proposition; it is a matter of practical statesmanship. Confiscation is ethically sound, but practically impossible.

If a Socialist government were to decree the confiscation of capitalist property it would bring on the worst civil war the world has ever seen. True Socialists do not propose to repeat the awful mistake made by this nation in 1861. The national government could have paid the market price of every slave in the Southland several times over and presented every slave family with a farm for what the war cost in bond issues alone, to say nothing of the hun-

dreds of thousands of lives and millions upon millions of dollars worth of property destroyed, besides the loss to the nation of the earning power of the men killed and crippled in the conflict.

"But," says the howling advocate of confiscation, "where is the working class to get the money wherewith to pay for these industries?" Well, where do we get the money now? We are paying for them now, or else the capitalist would not own them. Practically all the money the capitalist has to invest in the industrial property of the country he gets from the labor of others, and if the capitalist system should last to the end of time we would keep on paying for them over and over again till the crack of doom. A business that will not pay for itself does not run very long under capitalism, and we are certainly not going to buy up a business that won't earn its own purchase price.

There is a form of confiscation, however, that we might use, and that is the confiscation of competition. The capitalists have no scruples whatever about using that method on each other, and we might, in some instances, establish competing plants and destroy the value of the capitalists' business by competition until they would be glad to sell out to the government for what they could get.

One method that we might use is the method that was used by the German Government in getting possession of her railroads. The minister who had charge of the operations went secretly into the stock markets and bought railroad stock for the government until the government owned the controlling interest in a line of railroad. Then he proceeded to vote the stock for the government in such a way as to cut rates to a point where competing lines were ruined, and it was possible to buy their roads at a sacrifice. He actually ran railroads at a loss in order to ruin competitors and to make the stock of the minority stockholders worthless and so squeeze them out. Possibly we could use the same system, though we might find a difficulty in keeping the government's stock purchases secret.

Squeezing Out the Water—Raising the Revenue

But before we undertake to purchase the stock of capitalistic concerns for the government it would be well to see what we can do toward squeezing out the water and reducing the stock quotations to where they will represent something like the actual investment. There are two forms of stock watering. One is to increase the capitalization without increasing the investment, the other is to sell the original shares of stock for a fractioin of their face value. Anyone can see that where a new company is formed and the shares of stock are given a face value of $100 and are sold for say $20, that the other eighty per cent is water. This is where the "innocent investor" comes in. After the first issue of stock has been sold for a fraction of its face value the company's manager robs the public on the one hand and the employees on the other so successfully that the enormous profits earned make the stock actually worth its face value because of its earning power, and the man who buys the stock at its face value buys perhaps $20 worth of property and $80 worth of the capitalized power to extort from the public, and when anybody talks about reducing the valuation to the actual investment he puts on an aggrieved and saintly expression of countenance and poses as the "innocent investor." Socialists will make short work of the innocent investor. We know that he invested his money in order to make us support him in idleness, and his hypocrisy is transparent.

Standard Oil stock has been sold as high as $750 a share, while its face value is only $100; and when a man buys a share of Standard Oil stock he buys $100 worth, or less, of refineries and pipelines, etc., and $650 worth, or more, of the power to extort from the public; and so far as any ethical right that he has to the earnings of his stock is concerned he might as well have invested that $650 in ships and guns and gone into piracy!

Cannot Pay for Earning Power

In considering the question of the purchase of the industries, then, we can lay it down that we will not pay for their earning power; for the earning power of the stocks of the corporations is simply the power of the corporations to rob the working class. Before purchasing these stocks we must find ways and means by which to reduce their value to something like the actual investment, and at the same time raise the funds for their purchase.

The first weapon that comes to our hands is the taxing power. We now have an amendment to the U. S. Constitution allowing for an income tax. Socialists will make use of that in good earnest. Then we might enact a corporation tax, by which the incomes of corporations would be heavily taxed as well as the incomes of persons; and every reduction of income caused by taxation will cause a corresponding fall in the prices of securities.

Then there is the possibility of taxing land site values; the so-called Single Tax. Socialists have always been in favor of the taxation of land values. The proposition was put into the Communist Manifesto by Marx and Engels in 1848. We are not in favor of the taxation of land values as a Single Tax, as a substitute for all other forms of taxation, nor as a solution of the evils of society, but simply because as long as we have to have some system of taxation the taxation of land values is a more equitable and effective system of raising revenue than the one generally in vogue.

Then there are the possibilities of the inheritance tax. There is no good reason why any person should be allowed to inherit anything from his forbears, excepting mere personal property, but an equal opportunity to earn his living by some form of useful service to society. As a matter of fact, no man ever did or ever can earn a living for his heirs. The food we eat and the clothes we wear were not produced by our grandfathers, but by contemporary labor. Inheritances should be heavily taxed, and where the estate is largely in securities there is no reason why the government's share should not be collected in securities.

Some superficial Socialists have lost patience with any discussion of the matter of taxation, and they are ready to brand anyone who gives his attention to the subject of tax reform as a mere capitalist reformer. Because of shallowness and ignorance, they fail to perceive that from the standpoint of Socialism the question of taxation is a vital one.

The whole question of the peaceful, rapid and easy transition from the capitalist system to the co-operative system is bound up in the matter of a wise and effective use of the taxing power. It is only through taxation [and the net earnings of publicly owned industries which are a form of tax.—Ed.] that we can get the money into the public treasury to pay for the industries and to liquidate the public debt.

Industrial Unionism

In the meantime we may expect that there will be developed the industrial organization of the workers. When the workers become organized by industries instead of by crafts every strike will be won before it is called; they will be able to dictate terms to the capitalists and capitalist securities will be crushed between two millstones: The taxing power of the government exerted at the top and the solidarity of the industrial unions at the bottom, and the water will be squeezed out very rapidly and effectively. Face to face with such a situation, the capitalist will soon be ready to surrender his securities to the government for the best bargain he can make.

We can help the organized workers to better their conditions by taking the unemployed off the labor market and setting them on public works. The capitalist system constantly produces an army of unemployed, and depends upon that army of unemployed for its life. Every new invention throws more men out of employment, and the capitalist depends upon the men so thrown out of employment to furnish strike-breakers, armed guards and deputy sheriffs for every labor disturbance. We can take every unemployed man and woman off the labor market; then there won't be any strike-breakers nor any strikes lost.

There are sections of our country where an army of men could be employed, for ages, perhaps, in just picking up loose stone and hauling it out by the train load, and putting it through rock crushers, and spreading it on the country roads, and rolling it down with steam rollers and covering it with crude oil, until Uncle Sam's automobile postal trucks can run over a smooth and waterproof pavement to every farm house in the land. So, set the unemployed to building roads. It is more honorable business than strike breaking.

Then there is the improvement of our rivers and harbors; and here we want to abolish what President Taft aptly called "pork barrel" legislation. The improvement of our rivers and harbors ought to be undertaken upon a national and comprehensive scale. Our rivers ought to be dredged out almost to their sources; and the soil so collected should be used to fill up low places that now are idle and worthless because they are too swampy for use.

And there are the canals. We are told that not only is it commercially cheaper to move freight by water than it is by rail, but that it is physically more economical; that freight can be moved by water with a less expenditure of energy than by rail. If this be true, there is only one explanation of why our canals are not in use, and that is that our canal system has been strangled by the railroad corporations. But even if our canals were only to be used for pleasure purposes it would be worth while to improve our old canals and dig more, for the time is coming and coming rapidly when not only thep rivileged few but the workers themselves are going to have their own motor boats.

Vast irrigation projects should be set on foot. Every fairly well informed person now knows something of what has been done by the national government in this line in the west. Not so much, perhaps, is known of what the government is doing in the matter of swamp drainage. A great work is being done in draining the Everglades of Florida, but there is much more that ought to be done—that must be done and will be done in other parts of the country.

Then there is reforestation and aforestation work to be done. We have all heard enough, perhaps, of how the slopes of our hills and mountains have been denuded of timber, until there is nothing to hold the rainfall and the water has washed away the soil until in some places the rocks are bare; but we have heard nothing yet of the government attempting to replace that timber; and every year the rivers overuow their banks, spreading death and destruction on every side. The loss of life and destruction of property in the Ohio Valley in the spring of 1913 was partly, at least, the price which outraged nature compelled us to pay for our criminal waste of our timber resources.

There are also vast areas that nature has left bare for us to plant to trees, and which may be covered with forests if we will plant such trees as are suited to the soil and climate. There is enough work in this country along the lines just indicated, to employ every spare man and woman and millions more for generations to come.

We can put the unemployed to work; and we can do for them what the government has done for the employees on the Panama Canal. We can build model rooming houses and hotels, restaurants and homes for them. We can open stores and sell them supplies at cost, and we can not only put the unemployed to work but we can draw from the industrial world so that the capitalists will be compelled to allow their workers ideal conditions of labor to keep them from deserting their plants; and when we have that condition of affairs the capitalists will soon be ready to surrender at discretion.

Possession by Condemnation

It remains now to consider one more method of getting possession of the industries as fast as we decide to nationalize them, and that is their condemnation for public purposes and their purchase under condemnation proceedings. For this purpose stock quotations can be ignored; all we need is a physical valuation of the property to be acquired. In securing a physical valuation under condemnation proceedings there are three bases of valuation: First, the value of plant as a going concern, which is simply its earning power capitalized, and which, of course, equals the stock quotations. Second, the value of the property if it could be separated and sold on the market: Land, buildings and euipqment. Third, the actual investment.

The first basis of valuation is, of course, out of the question, for we certainly will not pay for the water in the stock. We want to get as near as possible to the value of the actual investment. In some cases it might be to the public advantage to appraise the property at its market value, because it may have depreciated in value and we could thereby get the advantage of that depreciation; but that will not usually be the case. The fairest way generally will be to return to the capitalist his actual investment.

In any case the capitalists are not entitled to the increase in the value of their lands. A capitalist concern may have bought land many years ago for $25 an acre. That land to-day may be worth $25,000 an acre; but the capitalists did not create that increased value; it came into existence because of the increase in the population. It wascreated by the people in common, who gave that land its value by their presence in the vicinity. It is a community value, and belongs of right to the people. The capitalist may say that he has given the land a value by building his plant upon it. But take the plant away and the value of the land is just the same as other unoccupied land in the vicinity, which proves that its supposed value inheres in the plant. Its convenience as a site is a free gift of nature. It has a use value which the capitalist appropriates, but its valuation or price is merely what somebody is in a position to extort from somebody else for its use.

In order to prevent the Federal courts from giving the corporations the benefit of the increased valuation of their land we can fix the basis of appraisal by Act of Congress, providing in the act itself that the act shall not be subject to review by the courts. The Federal Constitution itself provides that we may do this.

The Public Debt

But suppose we purchased the industries as nearly as possible at the actual investment; suppose that we provided the public employees with ideal working conditions, with good wages and a short working day, with sick benefits, accident insurance, old age pensions; suppose that all the unemployed have been provided for on public works, and distressing poverty has been abolished, and everyone is provided for, have we got Socialism? No. Not yet.

We have an enormous national debt on our hands, and so long as the mass of our people are working to support the creditors of the government in idleness we have not got Socialism. We have only got state capitalism. State capitalism may be a very good thing; a very much better thing than private capitalism; but it is not Socialism. The nation must be free from debt before we can have Socialism.

By the use of the taxing power in the ways already indicated we can provide money in the national treasury for the liquidation of the national debt; but, even so, under our present bonding system we can never pay off the national debt. The Civil War debt has been paid several times over, measured by the quantity of goods we produce now as formerly, but we are no nearer paying it off now than we were in '61. The original war bonds may not be in existence, but the debt is not paid because as fast as government bonds become due the debt is refunded by the issuance of more bonds in payment of those coming due, so the interest on our public debt becomes an endless drain on the public treasury.

For that reason the creditors of the government do not want the national debt paid off. They will bribe senators and representatives, debauch elections by the purchase of voters wholesale, they will do anything that is dishonorable and desperate to prevent the loss of their incomes in the form of interest on U. S. bonds; and if we should purchase the industries and pay for them with the same kind of bonds as are issued now, there would be no hope for us. Unless some time we should be driven in desperation to repudiate the national debt we should have to go on working for the creditors of the government to the end of time.

Why can not we pay the national debt? Why, because the bonds are payable in a lump sum when they become due. If they were payable by instalments we could pay them off. Now it is just as easy to print a bond whose coupons represent instalments of the principal as it is to print a bond whose coupons represent interest.

For myself, I am opposed to the payment of any interest on the public debt. I propose instead of interest coupons instalment coupons by which we could pay off the principal instead of paying interest. If we paid five per cent instalments the nation would be clear of debt in twenty years.

Industrial Democracy

But suppose we have got the industries, and have introduced all the good things we have just been considering and have paid off the national debt. For the first time in the history of the world here is a nation that owns its industries and is free from debt; poverty is abolished and all its people provided for. Have we got Socialism? No. Not yet! What more do we want? We want Industrial Democracy, and unless we have made other changes in the meantime the payment of the national debt will not give us true Socialism. So far we have only got an industrial bureaucracy. We have a system of government governed from the top down, whereas democracy means government from the bottom up. We must not only have the industries owned by the nation and have the nation free from debt, but we must give the national employees some voice in the election of their industrial officers; their foremen, superintendents and managers.

There are four possible ways of selecting the officers of a national industry: By executive appointment, by technical examination under Civil Service rules, by popular election, or by industrial election; that is, allowing the employees themselves to elect their officers. Or we can use a combination of any two or three of these methods. The first and second methods are in use now. The third method, electing industrial officers by popular election, has been discussed to some extent in connection with the suggestion that postmasters should be elected by the patrons of the office. The fourth method, allowing the public employees to elect their own officers, has never been seriously discussed outside the ranks of Socialists.

The public employees must have some voice in the selection of the men who are to direct their labors. If the selection of postmasters were turned over to the patrons of the post-offices the postmasters might become slave-drivers, more concerned about pleasing the public than about doing the fair thing by the employees. On the other hand, if the selection of the postmaster were turned over to employees they might elect a "good fellow" who would be more concerned with his standing with the employees than about rendering efficient service to the public. Some system of industrial elections combined with public accountability will have to be devised.

All this that we have been talking about can be accomplished without any change in our national constitution; and Socialists are wasting time in agitating amendments to the Federal Constitution.

The Socialist who knows his business knows that the form of a nation's government is not a matter of vital importance. Whether it be an absolute monarchy, a limited monarchy, an aristocratic republic or a democratic republic, the government will always be an instrument in the hands of the industrial ruling class.

The important and vital thing is not the national constitution, but the ownership and control of the means of production and distribution. If the people owned the means of production and distribution our present government and constitution might work fairly well. Mind, I do not say that the Federal constitution is perfect; I do not say that it does not need radical changes; but it will be time enough for us to talk of changing the constitution when we have lifted up our national life up to the limits of its possibilities. When we have tested its possibilities and reached its limitations what changes are necessary will be plainly seen.

Industrial Representation

There is one change in the constitution, however, that we shall have to make in order to establish true Industrial Democracy, and that is some provision for Industrial Representation. For instance, the Postal Service has no representation in the Government, for the Postmaster-General is not a representative of the Postal Service but a representative of the government, and through the government of the business interests that control the government. The postal employees have no one to speak for them at Washington.

The national industries must be represented at Washington by men chosen by the employees themselves, because of their technical knowledge, experience in the work and vital connection with each particular industry, to represent the economic interests of the workers in each industrial group.

Here are a lot of men working in different industries that may have ramifications throughout the nation, like the railroads and pipe-

lines. Are a part of these men from various industries, just because they live in the same Congressional District to depend upon a professional politician to represent their interests in Washington? It is manifest that the politician could not do so, no matter how honestly he might desire to; for he could not understand the inside workings of every industry in his district. The National Convention of the Socialist Party of 1912, rather prematurely demanded the abolition of the U. S. Senate. It might as well have demanded the abolition of the House of Representatives. It is not of much importance which house is abolished, if either.

It has been suggested that the Congress of the Co-operative Commonwealth should be a bicameral body; one house to be a house of territorial representation and the other to be a house of industrial representation, consisting of representatives elected from our national industries. By this plan it would be necessary to register each national employee as a voter in his own industry as well as a voter in his home precinct.

As stated at the beginning of this article, we are a long way from Socialism in point of achievement, but we are not necessarily very far away in point of time. As already indicated, we should be able to carry out this entire programme, and make our country an industrial paradise for every person willing to earn an honest living, in not more than forty years, and there is no practical difficulty in the way of our doing it in twenty years, when we are once ready to begin, and many a slow-moving working-class mind must be trained in the principles of Socialism before the Socialist movement will be in position to direct our national destiny.

ONE BIG UNION NEWS

SUPPLIED BY THE O.B.U.

President Ebert Loses His Union Card

By a vote of 1,200 to 5 the harness makers' union, of which President Eberts was a member, have decided to expel him. The reason given for their action is that he signed the death warrant of a man named Kopff. The resolution calling for his expulsion reads "That this assembly no longer recognizes the President of the Empire as a colleague, inasmuch as he violated all socialistic principles, which do not admit of punishment by death."

So now they have a non-union man at the head of affairs in Germany.

The Bakers' Strike

According to the president of the master bakers, all the trouble with the bakers has been caused by the O.B.U. He says "We are ridden to death with them. We do not have trouble with the drivers. They have an international organization and their union is fair. They always act like gentlemen."

So far as we know, not one of the striking bakers have cards in the O.B.U., so it is hard to see where Mr. Hanbury's argument comes in.

Incidentally the strike emphasizes how much we are dependent on one another. We all need bread—and need it pretty regularly—and when it fails to appear we want to know the reason. Well, the reason that bread is not coming in as regularly as it used to is just the same reason that other things are not coming in as regularly as they used to. Our industrial system is breaking down. Wages are not keeping pace with the cost of living, and under the "profit system" they never will. Not until we socialize the means of life will we be able to strike a balance and keep it.

Whether the O.B.U. are "gentlemanly" or not they know what is wrong with the system. "Gentlemanliness" is all very well, and nice in its place, but when it comes down to dealing with economic facts a little plain "common sense" is a whole lot more use.

SOVIET RUSSIA IS NOW RUSSIA

A short time ago The Chronicle (London, Eng.) summed up the situation in Russia as follows:

"All candid minds must recognize that as no anti-Bolshevik organizations exist any longer **Soviet Russia is now Russia.**

When not one per cent of the publications in Canada had anything but abuse for the Bolshevists The Week persistently held to view that they would come out on top and prove to be the ultimate power in Russia. Time has vindicated us, and to-day the press, which has deliberately lied for over two years, is gradually veering round with the idea of getting on the right side before it is too late. The Allied statesmen are also finding out that they must change their tactics. They are now throwing out feelers for some way of making peace with Soviet Russia.

And these gallant gentlemen are not doing so because of any sfmpathy they have with "my lady Soviet." Not a bit of it. They would strangle her even now if they had the ghost of a chance. After spending millions and millions of money and sacrificing thousands and thousands of lives in a vain attempt to stamp out a new idea they would still crush the Bolsheviki by force—if they could. But they can't do it. They have carried on till they can carry on no longer, and Russia has beaten them at their own game. Now the greatest political contortionist of modern times, the versatile Welshman, is laying out plans to take up negotiations with Soviet Russia. But he will have his hands full. While with one hand he is offering peace to Russia, with the other he is attemyting to strangle the Soviet sympathizers in Britain.

Lloyd George will either have to get down and out or learn this lesson, that **permanent peace with soviet Russia can only be made by soviet England.**

The world is now too small for two forms of society, Capitalism and Socialism, to exist in. One or the other must go, and there is no longer any doubt as to which is the one. No longer is it necessary for us to ask whether we will or will not accept the soviet form of government. The question for us to decide is **how soon** we will accept it.

VICTORIA ONE BIG UNION MAY-DAY BENEFIT SOCIAL

About $75 has been handed over to a struggling woman with a young family recently deprived of their bread-winner as the financial result of a very enjoyable evening spent by a couple of hundred young people last Saturday, May 1st. It is a mere nothing, of course, and is only one of the numerous cases of similar hardship within the ken of the Woman's Auxiliary of the O.B.U.—a common happening in our boasted civilization; but those who played and those who worked Saturday night may be encouraged by the happiness given, and continue to "educate, agitate, organize" towards a better society.

International Labor Day was thus celebrated at the K. P. Hall, and the social took the form of a concert of excellent vocal and instrumental music, during which the audience joined heartily in the "Internationale," and "Red Flag"; a dance on a perfect floor, to a very sympathetic orchestra; a whist drive, in which one of the prizes was a treatize on "The High Cost of Living"; and a bountiful supper-table, at which real coffee and wonderful sandwiches were lavishly bestowed for the asking.

Mr. W. Moulton officiated as chairman, and interpolated a few brief words of wisdom appropriate to the occasion. The orchestral arrangements and the concert programme were very efficiently and appreciatively undertaken and presented by Mr. and Mrs. R. Fanthorpe and family, and friends, and when the seats were shifted and the decks cleared for action, the impatient dancers were shepherded by Mr. Elsmore, who satisfactorily filled the bill as M.C. The self-sacrificing card-player who didn't play but saw that others did, was Mr. Tommie Smith, in charge of whist drive and prize distribution department.

Messrs. Harmon, Litchfield and Mackie were busy taking tickets and money, and issuing refreshment checks, while the foundation, corner-stone, back-bone, and crown of the whole business was—and is—undoubtedly the Women's Committee, of whom Mrs. Litchfield, Mrs. Peirce, Mrs. Bell, Mrs. Brewis, Mrs. Moir, Mrs. Stevenson, are merely a few names out of all who are working early and late to make a success, to enrol new members, and to spread the light.

For next in series, see The Week.

Open Forum Alternate Fridays for educational purposes. Next Open Forum, Friday, May 14th. Room 3,, 1424 Government Street.

Women's Auxiliary, O.B.U. Meetings held second and fourth Wednesdays, at 8 p.m. All women welcome.

COMING!

REV. A. E. SMITH

The Socialist Preacher
of Brandon, Man.

May 12th, 13th, 14th,

at

CRYSTAL THEATRE

Afternoon and Evening;
and

Sunday, May 16th,

Morning, Afternoon and Evening

If you believe in the possibility of a better order being established, come and hear him.

Do You Believe in a Better Day for Humanity?

ARE YOU WILLING TO WORK FOR IT?

A PEOPLE'S CHURCH

At a meeting held in the Crystal Theatre on March 28th, following an address by the Rev. A. E. Smith, of Brandon, who has recently established a "People's Church" in that city, it was decided to form a similar one in Victoria, and a small temporary committee was appointed to undertake the necessary organization work, and to issue a pamphlet setting forth the aims and objects of the proposed church, with the intention of calling a public meeting of all who are interested, at which meeting permanent officers could be elected and the organization launched for service.

The committee have therefore drawn up the following statement:

The Need

The need for a means of interpreting the aspirations of the masses of the people in their struggle for a fuller life has long been felt amongst us. That this may be accomplished it is necessary that regular meetings be held for the purpose of fellowship, mutual understanding, education and spiritual development

A social need carries with it a social responsibility which must be assumed unless we are willing to allow what we have of civilization to drift back into barbarism, and the measure of law and order thus far established by mankind to become the law of "tooth and claw."

This need should be met by organized Christianity in the form of the Church, but it is quite evident that the Church as it exists to-day has become so tangled up with creeds and traditions that it is unable to function in the great crisis that is facing the world.

The Organization

An organization that will be able to grasp the opportunity before us to-day is imperatively necessary, and we know of none that can fulfil this function so well as a "People's Church," a church based upon the religious instincts of mankind, but free from any of the confusing creeds and traditions that the world has outgrown.

A simple belief in the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man is all that is needed. The membership in such a Church will be open to any person who believes in the need for and the possibility of a better day for human society, and who is willing to make some systematic, consistent and constructive contribution of thought, time, influence, and means towards that end. All who desire to make their lives effective for the bringing about of an order of society based on fraternity in a commonwealth of good will find in it an opportunity for so doing.

The Objects

The objects of "The People's Church" will be to enlighten the public mind, to strengthen the will in righteousness, to develop increased faith in ourselves and in the cause of truth, to encourage charity and forbearance towards one another and to exert spiritual compulsion in ourselves to hasten the coming of a better day for humanity. It will proclaim the ethical truths laid down by the founder of Christianity, with the determination to apply them to every detail of private and public life, no matter how revolutionary they may be or what forms of society have to go by the board in the process. No section of human need will be outside the scope of its activities. Wherever the cry of a soul in a trouble is heard it will be the duty and privilege of the "People's Church" to respond; not only by furnishing, so far as is possible, relief for the trouble, but by searching out the cause and destroying it.

"The People's Church" will essentially be a "Church of Service" organized with the express purpose of getting to the bottom of our social troubles and destroying the root of them.

With objects as broad as this, and with the world hesitating between a plunge back into anarchy, and a step forward towards a new era, we believe it will appeal to many of the common people of to-day. In spite of the appalling selfishness bred into human nature by years of capitalistic domination we still cherish the faith that mankind is capable of a higher impulse than that of greed, and that if a way can be shown out of the great unrest the people will take it, even though it be the way of sacrifice.

The Finance

A movement of this nature will require financial support to enable it to perform the functions for which it is being organized. Its success will depend largely upon the assistance its friends are prepared to give. We insert therefore the following pledge, and ask that if, after due consideration, you believe the People's Movement would be furthered by such an organization, you will sign your name to it, stating the amount you are willing to give, and forward to the secretary:

I, ...

promise to contribute to the funds of "The People's Church" the sum of.....

per week for the period of.....weeks.

Signed.....

Address.....

Signed on on behalf of the provisional committee:

W. E. PEIRCE, Chairman;
GEO. IVES, Secretary,
310 Arnott Ave., Tillicum.

Rev. Smith will be back again in Victoria next week. He will speak at the Crystal Theatre on the 12th, 13th, 14th and 16th with the object of completing the organization of the Church. Calgary and Vancouver are also in line with the same object, and it is hoped that it will not be long before similar organizations are in operation in every town in Canada. Mr. Smith hopes to meet all who are in any way interested in the bringing in of a new order, and for that purpose will hold meetings every afternoon and evening on the week days, and morning, afternoon and evening on the Sunday.

ANIMALS AT THE CIRCUS

(Copy of letter in Vancouver Province, June 7, 1919.)

Editor Province,—May I ask the favour of a little space in which to call attention to a matter which I think demands consideration from all right-minded persons. I allude to the visit which was paid to the city a few days ago by a circus, which I personally visited in order to satisfy myself as to the manner in which the animals were treated.

I was struck by that amount of actual brutality used in order to make the animals go through their performances.

First let me call attention to the "Boxing Kangaroo," a sickly member of its species, with no more idea of protecting itself by boxing than a small child. Its arms hung limply by its sides while a man punched it, knocking it down several times. This, however, was not the worst instance of cruelty. Trained horses, examined by me immediately after their exit from the ring, showed weals across their forelegs where the trainer's whip had slashed them in order to make them "work."

I may say that in order to make the animals punctual in their movements in conformity to the ringmaster's whistle, wire tips are added to the lashes, and these practically cut the skin of the animals, whilst another feature of the cruelty is the manner in which the reins are jerked to make the horses "fox-trot," their mouths being, in several instances, sore and tender.

Next I would mention the manner in which the wild beasts were treated, iron bars and goads being used in order to force them from their cages, while the use of the revolver added to the cruelty.

Surely the time has arrived when the public do not need to be entertained in such a manner, and despite the fact that the parade is a pleasure to the younger generation, the inhuman treatment of animals should be stopped. A man on the street would be prosecuted by me, as inspector for the S.P.C.A., yet the circus can come to town and, in addition to taking away many thousands of dollars, be permitted to use such methods, the fact that they are only here for a day making prosecution impossible.

The Society I represent is endeavouring to form a branch of the "Jack London Club," the members of which are pledged to voice their disapproval of animal acts, and I trust that the day is not far distant when such will be entirely done away with.

(Signed) JAMES BATES,
Inspector S.P.C.A.

—o—

Federated Labor Party.—Monthly Executive meeting at 523 Sayward Block on Monday evening.

—o—

"The Master Assassins," by Hamish. A keen satire on the press reports from Russia that have been received in the past two years. Price 25c, or free with three months' subscription to The Week.