

State Historical Library

Labor Day Oration

Rev. F. L. Buzzell Delivers Address of the Day at Great Falls—Workers' Celebration

Fellow Laborers and Fellow Citizens: In the midst of the pleasures of this National holiday, in honor of labor, we turn aside for an hour to serious consideration of the world's greatest problem, the Labor Problem. We take it for granted that when you honored us with an invitation to address you, you desired us to speak according to the light we had. On last Labor Day at Kalispell, I heard Hon. Ex-Governor Smith declare that the laborer should receive the full product of his labor, but Mr. Smith did not show how the laborer is to obtain the full product of labor. This is the labor problem. How can labor secure its full product?

But can this problem be solved when there is no general agreement to the question "What is the full product of labor?" The land and the machinery or the means of production that labor has to use to produce wealth, are owned and controlled not by labor, but by another and smaller class of men called capitalists. These capitalists truthfully say that without our tools labor could not produce, and they retain for themselves the lion's share of the product of the laborer, who has to use their tools. Carrol D. Wright says that the capitalist keeps four-fifths of this product for the use of his machinery, and gives the labor one-fifth for his labor. The laborer is not satisfied with this division, and thus arises the ever present industrial war between capital and labor, that fills the country with strife and lockouts, the laborer's home with want, and society with strife. But what is labor's full product? Last year the Boston & Montana paid labor three and one half millions, and after all expenses and improvements, they had for their share seven millions, or twice as much as they gave labor. These capitalists claim that these seven millions were only a fair return for the money invested in their plants. The laborer answers them that their plants were created by their labor, that it was built out of the surplus value of their labor. The laborer's argument runs like this, Robinson Crusoe lives by working a little garden on his lonely island, his man Friday puts in an appearance, and is hungry, he hires Friday to work the garden, and Mr. Crusoe does the planning or brain work. Friday uses the stick for a hoe, having some inventive genius, Friday thinks out a machine which, if it could be materialized, would enable him to produce ten times as much as by his stick. Mr. Crusoe sends Friday along the coast to find some iron that some stranded ship may have deposited. Friday returns with a variety of iron and tools that he has collected. Mr. Crusoe and Friday together materialize Friday's invention, and the machine is built by which Friday produces ten times as much as before. Mr. Crusoe is on the road to a modern capitalist. Friday's work in the garden produces a living for both, and a surplus. Something must be done with this surplus. Mr. Crusoe begins to exercise his brain, and he sends Friday to the coast with instructions to flag any ship that he may chance to spy. A ship is hailed, the captain lands, and Mr. Crusoe shows him his fine garden of fruits and vegetables. The captain makes a large purchase, for which he leaves a pile of gold, and agrees to make this island a trading post. In a few months several passing ships have called, and loaded up with the much desired fresh fruits and vegetables. Mr. Crusoe has a big pile of gold, but a poor house and undesirable surroundings. The land is fertile, but he has but one laborer. He arranges with the captain of a ship to bring him one hundred laborers, and a surplus of modern machinery. The laborers and the machinery arrive. Mr. Crusoe owns the land. The laborers are hired to work the land with machinery. They are paid with the wage that represents one-fifth of what they produce. Mr. Crusoe sets them to work building cottages for themselves and families, and rents them these cottages, or sells them on notes bearing ten per cent interest. They build a store, and he sells them goods that are given by the ships in exchange for the products of their labor. Mr. Crusoe has a fit of loneli-

ness, engages a foreman at a big salary, sails for America, and registers at the Waldorf-Astoria, as Lord Robinson Crusoe. This is all that is necessary. There is excitement among the millionaire society belles of the American metropolis. Lord Robinson Crusoe makes a satisfactory contract with one of these society belles. Her father puts up ten million dollars in hard cash, and Mr. Crusoe off-sets it with his lordship. The press comes out with large headlines "Marriage of Lord Robinson Crusoe to Miss America Millions. They sail today for her lord's estate, located in the heart of the Pacific." Mr. and Mrs. Lord Robinson Crusoe find when they arrive home that American workmen to the number of a thousand have anticipated them. The ten million dollars are used to employ these workmen, and buy material to build this new couple a nice little "cottage by the sea," after which mines are opened, forests are felled, land is rented or sold for notes bearing ten per cent interest, a modern town is built, and the lonely island of Robinson Crusoe becomes a modern American civilization, where one man owns as much as the other ninety-nine, where the income of ten is equal to the income of ninety, where fifty out of the hundred own nothing, where the land and machinery is owned by the few, where the work is done by the many who give the few four-fifths of their product for the privilege of using the machinery and the land. These laborers organize, strike, get a rise of wages, pay more rent, higher prices for the necessities of life that they have created with the capitalist' machine, strike again, receive more wages, pay more rent, a higher price for their living, strike again, pay more rent, and so on to the end of the chapter. This picture is the true representation of the history and of the present conditions of the world of labor and the war between capital and labor. Now, who will tell us, first, how much of the products created by the laborers using the machinery and the land owned by Lord Robinson Crusoe, and the few others who have become lesser capitalists, belongs to the laborers? I could answer my own question, but I will not on this occasion, but I will leave you to solve that problem. But I will answer the next question, "How can labor obtain the full product of its labor? Organized labor, or the Unions, on the one side, are the highest developments of labor. Organized capital, or the trust, on the other side, are the highest developments of capital. Here they stand in battle array. War is always a conflict of interests. Labor's interest, and capital's interest are diametrically opposed. It is labor's interest to obtain all possible of the product of their labor; it is capital's interest to retain all possible of the product of labor for the use of their machines. Labor comes forth and demands four things. First, the right to say how many hours shall constitute a day's work. Second, how much work they shall turn out in that time. Third, how much pay they shall receive for the labor done, and fourth, who the capitalist shall employ to do that labor. Capital comes forth and says: We, and not you, have the absolute right to say how many hours shall make a day's work, how much work you shall do in that time, how much we shall pay you for that work, and who we shall employ to do our own work. Thus, both capital and labor claim the absolute right to the same identical things. Thus arises the conflict, the destructive war, between these two elements of society. Now, which side is in the right? When labor makes such a demand of capital, it virtually says to capital, You have no right to run your own business; and if capital should acquiesce in the demand of labor, capital might as well go out of business. On the other hand, give capital the right to dictate all of these demands that both claim, and labor would be reduced to a state of abject slavery, and would be forced to give up the struggle, to maintain a decent life for themselves and for their families. So it is evident that these same de-

mands, made both by capital and labor, are not only conflicting, but unreasonable. But the present industrial system that makes necessary these two conflicting elements of our society, makes it necessary for both sides to fight for the same rights.

Arbitration is being suggested as a remedy for this unpleasant situation, and as the only thing that can protect the capitalist, and at the same time, protect the laborer. But will arbitration succeed in securing for the laborer the full product of his labor, or what he may decide to be the full product of his labor? I would like to see arbitration tried in this country. It works well in New Zealand, but the New Zealand government sets a minimum wage, which it believes to be high enough to provide a man with a family a decent and comfortable living, and any man there attempting to hire a man for less than this wage, would be sent to the penitentiary. This minimum wage has destroyed the slums and sweat shops of New Zealand and any capitalist there whose business will not permit him to pay this minimum wage, must go out of business. And arbitration in this country, without the minimum wage law, would be a failure. But has New Zealand, by arbitration and the minimum wage secured for the laborer the full product of his labor?

But suppose, we have arbitration and all disputes between capital and labor are referred to a committee who are above the influence of graft, and this committee grants the increase in wages, will that secure, not the full product of labor, but an advance, or a larger share of his product? The laborer is a consumer, and four-fifths of the public are dependent for the thing they consume upon the wage of the laborer. Now, is it not a fact when wages have advanced by the efforts of organized labor, that organized capital have advanced the price of the commodities consumed by the public? The Great Falls Tribune, a few months ago, in an editorial showed that the man who ten years ago received a wage or a salary of a thousand dollars a year, and who now receives the same amount in salary or wages, actually receives \$667, because \$1,000 today will purchase no more than \$667 ten years ago. Now, if organized capital advances the cost of living as rapidly as organized labor secures a raise in wages, this will be

just as possible and just as probable when we secure compulsory arbitration of the labor difficulties, and the fact that the price of living, as agreed by all, has been put by the trusts, higher than the advance of wages secured by the unions, have we any assurance that arbitration alone can give labor its full product?

We see at this point that to accomplish anything there must be a method that will prevent organized capital from advancing the price of the cost of living, or in other words, organized labor must find some way of controlling the price of commodities, but no one has suggested arbitration of what the laborer shall pay for what he consumes but there must be some method of controlling the price of living, in order to secure even an advance of the purchasing power of a man's wages, to say nothing about his securing the full product of his labor.

There are two remedies proposed for the securing of this end. First, the government control of monopolies. Take the Beef Trust as an illustration of government assisting the laborer in preventing the capitalist who has just advanced the laborer's wage from offsetting that advance by raising the price of his meat. All laborers must have meat; but after the government has expended three million dollars in controlling and regulating the Beef trust, does the laborer pay any less for his meat? It may be possible for the laborer through the government to keep the Beef trust from poisoning him, like he did three thousand of our country's soldiers in our late war. As an illustration of government control of the price of beef, I refer you to the fact that the beef trust has recently purchased a complete plant that was organized with a million dollars capital, for the express purpose of forcing a reduction in the cost of our meat.

For another illustration of government control of the cost to the people of the necessities of life, I refer you to the fact that the railroads, after the Railroad commission had reduced their rates, that it actually costs 20 per cent more to ship lumber on the railroads of the state of Montana, besides, who is going to prevent the trust or organized capital from manufacturing a poorer quality of goods, even if they could control the price; and if the theory of competition for

(Continued on Page Four)

GOVERNOR TOOLE FAVORS SCABS

Executive Office, Helena, Montana.

Aug. 22, 1907.

Gentlemen: In response to your request for me to have removed from the capitol all telephones of the Bell to make the following statement for your information:

At the request and for the convenience of the various state officers, the Bell Telephone company installed its instruments in the capitol building at a stipulated price, with the consent of the State Board of Examiners.

If so disposed it would be an assumption of authority upon my part to order their discontinuance, but so far as I am concerned, any state officer now having a telephone who wishes to discontinue its use, is at liberty to do so.

Speaking for myself and as an official, I do not hesitate to say that the telephone in the governor's office is indispensable for the proper transaction of the public business. While the service is imperfect on account of the existing strike, it is nevertheless, valuable as a means of official intercourse with the various state institutions and the officers of the law, with whom this department is in constant communication.

Instead, therefore, of dispensing with the instruments now in use, I am in full sympathy with the purpose of the pending application of a writ of mandamus compelling the company to furnish continuous adequate service to its patrons.

Very respectfully,

J. K. TOOLE,
Governor.

Isn't This Slavery?

It has been one of the stock statements of injunction judges in order to gild the nauseous pill they were about to administer to assert that a man had a right to work for whom, and where and at what time he pleased. Another of their gild sayings is that a man has an inherent right to quit work whenever conditions do not suit him.

That is all very well in its way, but like all legal fictions uttered by the alleged learned judges, it becomes a nullity in its application, for instance: Some telegraph operators in Denver desired to leave their employment because the wages and conditions did not suit them. The supposition and judge-declared right instantly vanished when some stock gambler went before Judge Reddie in Denver and secured an injunction against the telegraphers for bidding them to leave an employment where wages and conditions did not suit them.

Now, what is that but a condition of slavery or peonage and involuntary servitude? This illustrates in the fullest degree the usurpations and tyrannical conduct of the judiciary toward working men. We are told in a river of words that the judiciary must be respected, but who respects the Dred Scott decision or who should respect Judge Reddie in his slave-making edict.—United Mine Workers Journal.

Prof. Elliot's Heroines...

The following are scabbing on the telephone girls in the Helena exchange of the Rocky Mountain Bell Telephone company:

- Mrs. Todd.
- Miss Nason.
- Miss Heldt.
- Miss Osborne.
- Miss Laura Warrington.
- Miss Libbey Nelson.
- Miss Edith Hughes.
- Miss Jeannette Hodge.
- Miss Leslie.
- Miss Maud Clemens.
- Miss Edna Wood.
- Miss Pauline Eastman.
- Miss Nina Smith.

The Important Work.

Who is that thin, starved-looking little woman who hurries by here early every morning, and hurries back late every evening?

She? Oh, she's a school teacher. She gets about forty dollars a month for handling a roomful of children.

And who is that big, fat, well-dressed man who strolls by here now and then, smoking a good cigar and looking at ease with life?

He? Why, he's an inspector of ash barrels, or smoking like that. He gets two hundred a month from the city. —Life.

Convention Resolutions

Call on State Officials to Discontinue Use of Unfair Telephone—Condemn Merchants

Whereas, The Rocky Mountain Bell Telephone company is now trying to do business in the state of Montana on the government injunction plan, and

Whereas, all political parties in the past have declared against government by injunction, and whereas, any man or class of men who are in earnest in what they advocate, will practice what they preach,

Therefore, Be it resolved, That if the officials of the state capital are opposed to government by injunction, they will take means to sever all business relations between the state capital and the Rocky Mountain Bell Telephone company, and be it further resolved, That we will judge them by their acts.

Whereas, the Retail Merchants' Exchange of the city of Helena at a meeting held in the said city, adopted a resolution to the effect that telephones would not be removed in compliance with the suggestion of strike sympathizers so long as the company continued to give service, the resolution reading as follows:

"Be it resolved by the Retail Merchants' Exchange of Helena, in special meeting assembled, that every member if this exchange keep his telephone so long as the telephone company continues to give service."

Whereas, this resolution unqualifiedly conveys the information that the business men of Helena have no desire, and express no intention of rendering any assistance whatever to the Telephone operators and linemen in the states of Montana, Utah, Wyoming and Idaho in their struggle for living wages and fair conditions against the Rocky Mountain Bell Telephone company, which company with its corporate greed, is endeavoring to deal organized labor a death blow in these states; and

Whereas, the labor organizations in the city of Helena in particular, have at all times used their influence and power in furthering the efforts of the business men to make a greater and better city by patronizing home institutions and home products; and

Whereas, the aforesaid resolution cannot be mistaken but to mean that the business men of Helena intend to take an unfair advantage of the striking Telephone operators and linemen who have been deprived of their rights in this fight for their freedom by temporary injunction from the Federal court; and

Whereas, this resolution, made by the Retail Merchants' Exchange, was adopted without the Telephone operators and linemen being given an opportunity to state their side of the case, an official of the Bell Telephone company being the only interested party heard, and therefore snap judgment taken and

Whereas, the aforesaid resolution amounts to a declaration that the business men of Helena have decided that the Rocky Mountain Bell Telephone company is to be allowed to conduct its business on an open-shop basis and employ "scabs" at any wages and under any conditions the company may suggest, while all other institutions in the states of Montana, Utah, Wyoming and Idaho, and in the city of Helena in particular, are, in the main, compelled to recognize, and do recognize, organized labor;

Therefore, Be it resolved, that all members of organized labor in the state of Montana and in the city of Helena in particular, are implored to remember those who are true to them in this, their hour of need; and to remember that there are merchants in the cities of Butte, Billings, Livingston and in other cities who are fair to union labor; and

Be it further resolved, that if the necessity exists, the mail order catalogue be brought from its resting place in the waste paper basket and put to a laudable and justifiable use."

The Santa Fe has tried to borrow six engines from the C. & S. and were nearly successful in their attempt, in fact all arrangements were made to loan them, and engineers had been sent to Trinidad, Col., to get the engines. While the engineers were on their way

from Raton to Trinidad, the machinists were in conference with the management, notifying them that if they loaned the Santa Fe engines the machinists would go on strike on that road. The arrangements were changed and the Santa Fe did not get the engines from the C. & S.

The train men were on strike at that time on the C. & S. and they said they had all the trouble they wanted.

The Santa Fe is in the market "strong" to borrow engines from other roads, as the question of buying them is a dead issue. Brothers, they will continue to bear watching, so keep your eye on the Santa Fe, and see that they don't get any engines that you have repaired until they settle with their machinists that are on strike.

It is a disgrace that a working class that expects to make headway against capitalist exploitation should support capitalist printing shops. The working class must make their labor press a power. Publicity is the most effective weapon in combating the enemy.

Has the state a right to seize private property in the interest of the public? Undoubtedly it has—any state has that right. When Horatio Seymour was governor of New York state, a strike occurred on the N. Y. Central railway. The road was tied up and business was suffering. Seymour was equal to the emergency. He sent for the officials and said to them, "Gentlemen, this road was chartered to do the business of a common carrier for the benefit of the people of the state. I will give you just twenty hours to settle the strike and resume business, or I shall seize the road and operate it in the interest of the state." In less than the stated time the officials had made terms with the strikers and business was resumed. That was the spirit of true democracy in Seymour's times and should be in our day and time.

If rational law were carried out, the people would own all telegraph lines in the United States, as is contracted. If any doubt it, let them examine the records. There is a strike between the owners and the workers in that line. And when the telegraph system does not do as was contracted, the only thing to do is for the people to appoint appraisers to appraise the property. This is provided for in the following Postal laws (Postal Laws and Regulations, pages 56, 57, 58, Section 93, companies to file acceptance): "Before any telegraph company shall exercise any powers or privileges conferred by law, such company shall in writing accept the restrictions and obligations required by law (R. S. P. 52-68, Section 96.)" The United States may for postal, military or other purposes purchase all the telegraph lines, property and effects of any or all companies, acting under the provisions of the Act of July 24, 1866, entitled: "An Act to aid in the construction of telegraph lines and to secure to the government the use of the same for postal, military or other purposes," or under this title at an appraised value by five competent disinterested persons, two of whom shall be selected by the Postmaster General of the United States, two by the company interested, and one by the four so previously selected (R. S. P. 52-67, Section 97.) The following companies have filed acceptance pursuant to section 93, prior to December 5, 1892, and on the dates respectively stated: "Western Union Telegraph Company, June 8, 1867; Postal Telegraph company, August 31, 1882; ninety-eight other companies, which include every one ever organized, have also signed. This agreement covers every mile of telegraph lines in the United States. Why shouldn't the people take them? They are a menace to the people, as they are now in private hands. The people have to demand these laws carried out so vitally affect their interests. But will they do it? Not till they are squeezed so hard, they can barely live. Then they may take some political action. They will have to act soon or they will not have a chance after a few years, if persecution and prosecution go on unhindered.

State Historical Library

Labor Day Oration

Rev. F. L. Buzzell Delivers Address of the Day at Great Falls—Workers' Celebration

Fellow Laborers and Fellow Citizens: In the midst of the pleasures of this National holiday, in honor of labor, we turn aside for an hour to serious consideration of the world's greatest problem, the Labor Problem. We take it for granted that when you honored us with an invitation to address you, you desired us to speak according to the light we had. On last Labor Day at Kalispell, I heard Hon. Ex-Governor Smith declare that the laborer should receive the full product of his labor, but Mr. Smith did not show how the laborer is to obtain the full product of labor. This is the labor problem. How can Labor secure its full product?

But can this problem be solved when there is no general agreement to the question "What is the full product of labor?" The land and the machinery or the means of production that labor has to use to produce wealth, are owned and controlled not by labor, but by another and smaller class of men called capitalists. These capitalists truthfully say that without our tools labor could not produce, and they retain for themselves the lion's share of the product of the laborer, who has to use their tools. Carrol D. Wright says that the capitalist keeps four-fifths of this product for the use of his machinery, and gives the labor one-fifth for his labor. The laborer is not satisfied with this division, and thus arises the ever present industrial war between capital and labor, that fills the country with strife and lockouts, the laborer's home with want, and society with strife. But what is labor's full product? Last year the Boston & Montana paid labor three and one half millions, and after all expenses and improvements, they had for their share seven millions, or twice as much as they gave labor. These capitalists claim that these seven millions were only a fair return for the money invested in their plants. The laborer answers them that their plants were created by their labor, that it was built out of the surplus value of their labor. The laborer's argument runs like this, Robinson Crusoe lives by working a little garden on his lonely island, his man Friday puts in an appearance, and is hungry, he hires Friday to work the garden, and Mr. Crusoe does the planning or brain work. Friday uses the stick for a hoe, having some inventive genius, Friday thinks out a machine which, if it could be materialized, would enable him to produce ten times as much as by his stick. Mr. Crusoe sends Friday along the coast to find some iron that some stranded ship may have deposited. Friday returns with a variety of iron and tools that he has collected. Mr. Crusoe and Friday together materialize Friday's invention, and the machine is built by which Friday produces ten times as much as before. Mr. Crusoe is on the road to a modern capitalist. Friday's work in the garden produces a living for both, and a surplus. Something must be done with this surplus. Mr. Crusoe begins to exercise his brain, and he sends Friday to the coast with instructions to flag any ship that he may chance to spy. A ship is hailed, the captain lands, and Mr. Crusoe shows him his fine garden of fruits and vegetables. The captain makes a large purchase, for which he leaves a pile of gold, and agrees to make this island a trading post. In a few months several passing ships have called, and loaded up with the much desired fresh fruits and vegetables. Mr. Crusoe has a big pile of gold, but a poor house and undesirable surroundings. The land is fertile, but he has but one laborer. He arranges with the captain of a ship to bring him one hundred laborers, and a surplus of modern machinery. The laborers and the machinery arrive. Mr. Crusoe owns the land. The laborers are hired to work the land with machinery. They are paid with the wage that represents one-fifth of what they produce. Mr. Crusoe sets them to work building cottages for themselves and families, and rents them these cottages, or sells them on notes bearing ten per cent interest. They build a store, and he sells them goods that are given by the ships in exchange for the products of their labor. Mr. Crusoe has a fit of loneliness,

engages a foreman at a big salary, sails for America, and registers at the Waldorf-Astoria, as Lord Robinson Crusoe. This is all that is necessary. There is excitement among the millionaire society belles of the American metropolis. Lord Robinson Crusoe makes a satisfactory contract with one of these society belles. Her father puts up ten million dollars in hard cash, and Mr. Crusoe off-sets it with his lordship. The press comes out with large headlines "Marriage of Lord Robinson Crusoe to Miss America Millions. They sail today for her lord's estate, located in the heart of the Pacific." Mr. and Mrs. Lord Robinson Crusoe find when they arrive home that American workmen to the number of a thousand have anticipated them. The ten million dollars are used to employ these workmen, and buy material to build this new couple a nice little "cottage by the sea," after which mines are opened, forests are felled, land is rented or sold for notes bearing ten per cent interest, a modern town is built, and the lonely island of Robinson Crusoe becomes a modern American civilization, where one man owns as much as the other ninety-nine, where the income of ten is equal to the income of ninety, where fifty out of the hundred own nothing, where the land and machinery is owned by the few, where the work is done by the many who give the few four-fifths of their product for the privilege of using the machinery and the land. These laborers organize, strike, get a rise of wages, pay more rent, higher prices for the necessities of life that they have created with the capitalist' machine, strike again, receive more wages, pay more rent, a higher price for their living, strike again, pay more rent, and so on to the end of the chapter. This picture is the true representation of the history and of the present conditions of the world of labor and the war between capital and labor. Now, who will tell us, first, how much of the products created by the laborers using the machinery and the land owned by Lord Robinson Crusoe, and the few others who have become lesser capitalists, belongs to the laborers? I could answer my own question, but I will not on this occasion, but I will leave you to solve that problem. But I will answer the next question, "How can Labor obtain the full product of its labor? Organized labor, or the Unions, on the one side, are the highest developments of labor. Organized capital, or the trust, on the other side, are the highest developments of capital. Here they stand in battle array. War is always a conflict of interests. Labor's interest, and capital's interest are diametrically opposed. It is labor's interest to obtain all possible of the product of their labor; it is capital's interest to retain all possible of the product of labor for the use of their machines. Labor comes forth and demands four things. First, the right to say how many hours shall constitute a day's work. Second, how much work they shall turn out in that time. Third, how much pay they shall receive for the labor done, and fourth, who the capitalist shall employ to do that labor. Capital comes forth and says: We, and not you, have the absolute right to say how many hours shall make a day's work, how much work you shall do in that time, how much we shall pay you for that work, and who we shall employ to do our own work. Thus, both capital and labor claim the absolute right to the same identical things. Thus arises the conflict, the destructive war, between these two elements of society. Now, which side is in the right? When labor makes such a demand of capital, it virtually says to capital, You have no right to run your own business; and if capital should acquiesce in the demand of labor, capital might as well go out of business. On the other hand, give capital the right to dictate all of these demands that both claim, and labor would be reduced to a state of abject slavery, and would be forced to give up the struggle, to maintain a decent life for themselves and for their families. So it is evident that these same de-

mands, made both by capital and labor, are not only conflicting, but unreasonable. But the present industrial system that makes necessary these two conflicting elements of our society, makes it necessary for both sides to fight for the same rights.

Arbitration is being suggested as a remedy for this unpleasant situation, and as the only thing that can protect the capitalist, and at the same time, protect the laborer. But will arbitration succeed in securing for the laborer the full product of his labor, or what he may decide to be the full product of his labor? I would like to see arbitration tried in this country. It works well in New Zealand, but the New Zealand government sets a minimum wage, which it believes to be high enough to provide a man with a family a decent and comfortable living, and any man there attempting to hire a man for less than this wage, would be sent to the penitentiary. This minimum wage has destroyed the slums and sweat shops of New Zealand and any capitalist there whose business will not permit him to pay this minimum wage, must go out of business. And arbitration in this country, without the minimum wage law, would be a failure. But has New Zealand, by arbitration and the minimum wage secured for the laborer the full product of his labor?

But suppose, we have arbitration and all disputes between capital and labor are referred to a committee who are above the influence of graft, and this committee grants the increase in wages, will that secure, not the full product of labor, but an advance, or a larger share of his product? The laborer is a consumer, and four-fifths of the public are dependent for the thing they consume upon the wage of the laborer. Now, is it not a fact when wages have advanced by the efforts of organized labor, that organized capital have advanced the price of the commodities consumed by the public? The Great Falls Tribune, a few months ago, in an editorial showed that the man who ten years ago received a wage or a salary of a thousand dollars a year, and who now receives the same amount in salary or wages, actually receives \$667, because \$1,000 today will purchase no more than \$667 ten years ago. Now, if organized capital advances the cost of living as rapidly as organized labor secures a raise in wages, this will be

just as possible and just as probable when we secure compulsory arbitration of the labor difficulties, and the fact that the price of living, as agreed by all, has been put by the trusts, higher than the advance of wages secured by the unions, have we any assurance that arbitration alone can give labor its full product?

We see at this point that to accomplish anything there must be a method that will prevent organized capital from advancing the price of the cost of living, or in other words, organized labor must find some way of controlling the price of commodities, but no one has suggested arbitration of what the laborer shall pay for what he consumes but there must be some method of controlling the price of living, in order to secure even an advance of the purchasing power of a man's wages, to say nothing about his securing the full product of his labor.

There are two remedies proposed for the securing of this end. First, the government control of monopolies. Take the Beef Trust as an illustration of government assisting the laborer in preventing the capitalist who has just advanced the laborer's wage from offsetting that advance by raising the price of his meat. All laborers must have meat; but after the government has expended three million dollars in controlling and regulating the Beef trust, does the laborer pay any less for his meat? It may be possible for the laborer through the government to keep the Beef trust from poisoning him, like he did three thousand of our country's soldiers in our late war. As an illustration of government control of the price of beef, I refer you to the fact that the beef trust has recently purchased a complete plant that was organized with a million dollars capital, for the express purpose of forcing a reduction in the cost of our meat.

For another illustration of government control of the cost to the people of the necessities of life, I refer you to the fact that the railroads, after the Railroad commission had reduced their rates, that it actually costs 20 per cent more to ship lumber on the railroads of the state of Montana, besides, who is going to prevent the trust or organized capital from manufacturing a poorer quality of goods, even if they could control the price; and if the theory of competition for

(Continued on Page Four)

Convention Resolutions

Call on State Officials to Discontinue Use of Unfair Telephone—Condemn Merchants

Whereas, The Rocky Mountain Bell Telephone company is now trying to do business in the state of Montana on the government injunction plan, and

Whereas, all political parties in the past have declared against government by injunction, and whereas, any man or class of men who are in earnest in what they advocate, will practice what they preach,

Therefore, Be it resolved, That if the officials of the state capital are opposed to government by injunction, they will take means to sever all business relations between the state capital and the Rocky Mountain Bell Telephone company, and be it further resolved, That we will judge them by their acts.

Whereas, the Retail Merchants' Exchange of the city of Helena at a meeting held in the said city, adopted a resolution to the effect that telephones would not be removed in compliance with the suggestion of strike sympathizers so long as the company continued to give service, the resolution reading as follows:

"Be it resolved by the Retail Merchants' Exchange of Helena, in special meeting assembled, that every member if this exchange keep his telephone so long as the telephone company continues to give service."

Whereas, this resolution unqualifiedly conveys the information that the business men of Helena have no desire, and express no intention of rendering any assistance whatever to the Telephone operators and linemen in the states of Montana, Utah, Wyoming and Idaho in their struggle for living wages and fair conditions against the Rocky Mountain Bell Telephone company, which company with its corporate greed, is endeavoring to deal organized labor a death blow in these states; and

Whereas, the labor organizations in the city of Helena in particular, have at all times used their influence and power in furthering the efforts of the business men to make a greater and better city by patronizing home institutions and home products; and

Whereas, the aforesaid resolution cannot be mistaken but to mean that the business men of Helena intend to take an unfair advantage of the striking Telephone operators and linemen who have been deprived of their rights in this fight for their freedom by temporary injunction from the Federal court; and

Whereas, this resolution, made by the Retail Merchants' Exchange, was adopted without the Telephone operators and linemen being given an opportunity to state their side of the case, an official of the Bell Telephone company being the only interested party heard, and therefore snap judgment taken and

Whereas, the aforesaid resolution amounts to a declaration that the business men of Helena have decided that the Rocky Mountain Bell Telephone company is to be allowed to conduct its business on an open-shop basis and employ "scabs" at any wages and under any conditions the company may suggest, while all other institutions in the states of Montana, Utah, Wyoming and Idaho, and in the city of Helena in particular, are, in the main, compelled to recognize, and do recognize, organized labor;

Therefore, Be it resolved, that all members of organized labor in the state of Montana and in the city of Helena in particular, are implored to remember those who are true to them in this, their hour of need; and to remember that there are merchants in the cities of Butte, Billings, Livingston and in other cities who are fair to union labor; and

Be it further resolved, that if the necessity exists, the mail order catalogue be brought from its resting place in the waste paper basket and put to a laudable and justifiable use."

The Santa Fe has tried to borrow six engines from the C. & S. and were nearly successful in their attempt, in fact all arrangements were made to loan them, and engineers had been sent to Trinidad, Col., to get the engines. While the engineers were on their way

from Raton to Trinidad, the machinists were in conference with the management, notifying them that if they loaned the Santa Fe engines the machinists would go on strike on that road. The arrangements were changed and the Santa Fe did not get the engines from the C. & S.

The train men were on strike at that time on the C. & S. and they said they had all the trouble they wanted.

The Santa Fe is in the market "strong" to borrow engines from other roads, as the question of buying them is a dead issue. Brothers, they will continue to bear watching, so keep your eye on the Santa Fe, and see that they don't get any engines that you have repaired until they settle with their machinists that are on strike.

It is a disgrace that a working class that expects to make headway against capitalist exploitation should support capitalist printing shops. The working class must make their labor press a power. Publicity is the most effective weapon in combating the enemy.

Has the state a right to seize private property in the interest of the public? Undoubtedly it has—any state has that right. When Horatio Seymour was governor of New York state, a strike occurred on the N. Y. Central railway. The road was tied up and business was suffering. Seymour was equal to the emergency. He sent for the officials and said to them, "Gentlemen, this road was chartered to do the business of a common carrier for the benefit of the people of the state. I will give you just twenty hours to settle the strike and resume business, or I shall seize the road and operate it in the interest of the state." In less than the stated time the officials had made terms with the strikers and business was resumed. That was the spirit of true democracy in Seymour's times and should be in our day and time.

If rational law were carried out, the people would own all telegraph lines in the United States, as is contracted. If any doubt it, let them examine the records. There is a strike between the owners and the workers in that line. And when the telegraph system does not do as was contracted, the only thing to do is for the people to appoint appraisers to appraise the property. This is provided for in the following Postal laws (Postal Laws and Regulations, pages 56, 57, 58, Section 93, companies to file acceptance): "Before any telegraph company shall exercise any powers or privileges conferred by law, such company shall in writing accept the restrictions and obligations required by law (R. S. P. 52-68, Section 96.)" The United States may for postal, military or other purposes purchase all the telegraph lines, property and effects of any or all companies, acting under the provisions of the Act of July 24, 1866, entitled: "An Act to aid in the construction of telegraph lines and to secure to the government the use of the same for postal, military or other purposes," or under this title at an appraised value by five competent disinterested persons, two of whom shall be selected by the Postmaster General of the United States, two by the company interested, and one by the four so previously selected (R. S. P. 52-67, Section 97.) The following companies have filed acceptance pursuant to section 93, prior to December 5, 1892, and on the dates respectively stated: "Western Union Telegraph Company, June 8, 1867; Postal Telegraph company, August 31, 1882; ninety-eight other companies, which include every one ever organized, have also signed. This agreement covers every mile of telegraph lines in the United States. Why shouldn't the people take them? They are a menace to the people, as they are now in private hands. The people have to demand these laws carried out so vitally affect their interests. But will they do it? Not till they are squeezed so hard, they can barely live. Then they may take some political action. They will have to act soon or they will not have a chance after a few years, if persecution and prosecution go on unhindered.

GOVERNOR TOOLE FAVORS SCABS

Executive Office, Helena, Montana.

Aug. 22, 1907.

Gentlemen: In response to your request for me to have removed from the capitol all telephones of the Bell to make the following statement for your information:

At the request and for the convenience of the various state officers, the Bell Telephone company installed its instruments in the capitol building at a stipulated price, with the consent of the State Board of Examiners.

If so disposed it would be an assumption of authority upon my part to order their discontinuance, but so far as I am concerned, any state officer now having a telephone who wishes to discontinue its use, is at liberty to do so.

Speaking for myself and as an official, I do not hesitate to say that the telephone in the governor's office is indispensable for the proper transaction of the public business. While the service is imperfect on account of the existing strike, it is nevertheless, valuable as a means of official intercourse with the various state institutions and the officers of the law, with whom this department is in constant communication.

Instead, therefore, of dispensing with the instruments now in use, I am in full sympathy with the purpose of the pending application of a writ of mandamus compelling the company to furnish continuous adequate service to its patrons.

Very respectfully,
J. K. TOOLE,
Governor.

Isn't This Slavery?

It has been one of the stock statements of injunction judges in order to gild the nauseous pill they were about to administer to assert that a man had a right to work for whom, and where and at what time he pleased. Another of their gild sayings is that a man has an inherent right to quit work whenever conditions do not suit him.

That is all very well in its way, but like all legal fictions uttered by the alleged learned judges, it becomes a nullity in its application, for instance: Some telegraph operators in Denver desired to leave their employment because the wages and conditions did not suit them. The supposition and judge-declared right instantly vanished when some stock gambler went before Judge Reddie in Denver and secured an injunction against the telegraphers for bidding them to leave an employment where wages and conditions did not suit them.

Now, what is that but a condition of slavery or peonage and involuntary servitude? This illustrates in the fullest degree the usurpations and tyrannical conduct of the judiciary toward working men. We are told in a river of words that the judiciary must be respected, but who respects the Dred Scott decision or who should respect Judge Reddie in his slave-making edict.—United Mine Workers Journal.

Prof. Elliot's Heroines...

The following are scabbing on the telephone girls in the Helena exchange of the Rocky Mountain Bell Telephone company:

- Mrs. Todd.
- Miss Nason.
- Miss Heldt.
- Miss Osborne.
- Miss Laura Warrington.
- Miss Libbey Nelson.
- Miss Edith Hughes.
- Miss Jeannette Hodge.
- Miss Leslie.
- Miss Maud Clemens.
- Miss Edna Wood.
- Miss Pauline Eastman.
- Miss Nina Smith.

The Important Work.

Who is that thin, starved-looking little woman who hurries by here early every morning, and hurries back late every evening?

She? Oh, she's a school teacher. She gets about forty dollars a month for handling a roomful of children.

And who is that big, fat, well-dressed man who strolls by here now and then, smoking a good cigar and looking at ease with life?

He? Why, he's an inspector of ash barrels, or smoking like that. He gets two hundred a month from the city. —Life.

State Historical Library

Labor Day Oration

Rev. F. L. Buzzell Delivers Address of the Day at Great Falls—Workers' Celebration

Fellow Laborers and Fellow Citizens: In the midst of the pleasures of this National holiday, in honor of labor, we turn aside for an hour to serious consideration of the world's greatest problem, the Labor Problem. We take it for granted that when you honored us with an invitation to address you, you desired us to speak according to the light we had. On last Labor Day at Kalispell, I heard Hon. Ex-Governor Smith declare that the laborer should receive the full product of his labor, but Mr. Smith did not show how the laborer is to obtain the full product of labor. This is the labor problem. How can Labor secure its full product?

But can this problem be solved when there is no general agreement to the question "What is the full product of Labor?" The land and the machinery or the means of production that labor has to use to produce wealth, are owned and controlled not by labor, but by another and smaller class of men called capitalists. These capitalists truthfully say that without our tools labor could not produce, and they retain for themselves the lion's share of the product of the laborer, who has to use their tools. Carrol D. Wright says that the capitalist keeps four-fifths of this product for the use of his machinery, and gives the labor one-fifth for his labor. The laborer is not satisfied with this division, and thus arises the ever present industrial war between capital and labor, that fills the country with strife and lockouts, the laborer's home with want, and society with strife. But what is labor's full product? Last year the Boston & Montana paid labor three and one half millions, and after all expenses and improvements, they had for their share seven millions, or twice as much as they gave labor. These capitalists claim that these seven millions were only a fair return for the money invested in their plants. The laborer answers them that their plants were created by their labor, that it was built out of the surplus value of their labor. The laborer's argument runs like this, Robinson Crusoe lives by working a little garden on his lonely island, his man Friday puts in an appearance, and is hungry, he hires Friday to work the garden, and Mr. Crusoe does the planning or brain work. Friday uses the stick for a hoe, having some inventive genius, Friday thinks out a machine which, if it could be materialized, would enable him to produce ten times as much as by his stick. Mr. Crusoe sends Friday along the coast to find some iron that some stranded ship may have deposited. Friday returns with a variety of iron and tools that he has collected. Mr. Crusoe and Friday together materialize Friday's invention, and the machine is built by which Friday produces ten times as much as before. Mr. Crusoe is on the road to a modern capitalist. Friday's work in the garden produces a living for both, and a surplus. Something must be done with this surplus. Mr. Crusoe begins to exercise his brain, and he sends Friday to the coast with instructions to flag any ship that he may chance to spy. A ship is hailed, the captain lands, and Mr. Crusoe shows him his fine garden of fruits and vegetables. The captain makes a large purchase, for which he leaves a pile of gold, and agrees to make this island a trading post. In a few months several passing ships have called, and loaded up with the much desired fresh fruits and vegetables. Mr. Crusoe has a big pile of gold, but a poor house and undesirable surroundings. The land is fertile, but he has but one laborer. He arranges with the captain of a ship to bring him one hundred laborers, and a surplus of modern machinery. The laborers and the machinery arrive. Mr. Crusoe owns the land. The laborers are hired to work the land with machinery. They are paid with the wage that represents one-fifth of what they produce. Mr. Crusoe sets them to work building cottages for themselves and families, and rents them these cottages, or sells them on notes bearing ten per cent interest. They build a store, and he sells them goods that are given by the ships in exchange for the products of their labor. Mr. Crusoe has a fit of loneliness,

engages a foreman at a big salary, sails for America, and registers at the Waldorf-Astoria, as Lord Robinson Crusoe. This is all that is necessary. There is excitement among the millionaire society belles of the American metropolis. Lord Robinson Crusoe makes a satisfactory contract with one of these society belles. Her father puts up ten million dollars in hard cash, and Mr. Crusoe off-sets it with his lordship. The press comes out with large headlines "Marriage of Lord Robinson Crusoe to Miss America Millions. They sail today for her lord's estate, located in the heart of the Pacific." Mr. and Mrs. Lord Robinson Crusoe find when they arrive home that American workmen to the number of a thousand have anticipated them. The ten million dollars are used to employ these workmen, and buy material to build this new couple a nice little "cottage by the sea," after which mines are opened, forests are felled, land is rented or sold for notes bearing ten per cent interest, a modern town is built, and the lonely island of Robinson Crusoe becomes a modern American civilization, where one man owns as much as the other ninety-nine, where the income of ten is equal to the income of ninety, where fifty out of the hundred own nothing, where the land and machinery is owned by the few, where the work is done by the many who give the few four-fifths of their product for the privilege of using the machinery and the land. These laborers organize, strike, get a rise of wages, pay more rent, higher prices for the necessities of life that they have created with the capitalist' machine, strike again, receive more wages, pay more rent, a higher price for their living, strike again, pay more rent, and so on to the end of the chapter. This picture is the true representation of the history and of the present conditions of the world of labor and the war between capital and labor. Now, who will tell us, first, how much of the products created by the laborers using the machinery and the land owned by Lord Robinson Crusoe, and the few others who have become lesser capitalists, belongs to the laborers? I could answer my own question, but I will not on this occasion, but I will leave you to solve that problem. But I will answer the next question, "How can Labor obtain the full product of its labor? Organized labor, or the Unions, on the one side, are the highest developments of labor. Organized capital, or the trust, on the other side, are the highest developments of capital. Here they stand in battle array. War is always a conflict of interests. Labor's interest, and capital's interest are diametrically opposed. It is labor's interest to obtain all possible of the product of their labor; it is capital's interest to retain all possible of the product of labor for the use of their machines. Labor comes forth and demands four things. First, the right to say how many hours shall constitute a day's work. Second, how much work they shall turn out in that time. Third, how much pay they shall receive for the labor done, and fourth, who the capitalist shall employ to do that labor. Capital comes forth and says: We, and not you, have the absolute right to say how many hours shall make a day's work, how much work you shall do in that time, how much we shall pay you for that work, and who we shall employ to do our own work. Thus, both capital and labor claim the absolute right to the same identical things. Thus arises the conflict, the destructive war, between these two elements of society. Now, which side is in the right? When labor makes such a demand of capital, it virtually says to capital, You have no right to run your own business; and if capital should acquiesce in the demand of labor, capital might as well go out of business. On the other hand, give capital the right to dictate all of these demands that both claim, and labor would be reduced to a state of abject slavery, and would be forced to give up the struggle, to maintain a decent life for themselves and for their families. So it is evident that these same de-

mands, made both by capital and labor, are not only conflicting, but unreasonable. But the present industrial system that makes necessary these two conflicting elements of our society, makes it necessary for both sides to fight for the same rights.

Arbitration is being suggested as a remedy for this unpleasant situation, and as the only thing that can protect the capitalist, and at the same time, protect the laborer. But will arbitration succeed in securing for the laborer the full product of his labor, or what he may decide to be the full product of his labor? I would like to see arbitration tried in this country. It works well in New Zealand, but the New Zealand government sets a minimum wage, which it believes to be high enough to provide a man with a family a decent and comfortable living, and any man there attempting to hire a man for less than this wage, would be sent to the penitentiary. This minimum wage has destroyed the slums and sweat shops of New Zealand and any capitalist there whose business will not permit him to pay this minimum wage, must go out of business. And arbitration in this country, without the minimum wage law, would be a failure. But has New Zealand, by arbitration and the minimum wage secured for the laborer the full product of his labor?

But suppose, we have arbitration and all disputes between capital and labor are referred to a committee who are above the influence of graft, and this committee grants the increase in wages, will that secure, not the full product of labor, but an advance, or a larger share of his product? The laborer is a consumer, and four-fifths of the public are dependent for the thing they consume upon the wage of the laborer. Now, is it not a fact when wages have advanced by the efforts of organized labor, that organized capital have advanced the price of the commodities consumed by the public? The Great Falls Tribune, a few months ago, in an editorial showed that the man who ten years ago received a wage or a salary of a thousand dollars a year, and who now receives the same amount in salary or wages, actually receives \$667, because \$1,000 today will purchase no more than \$667 ten years ago. Now, if organized capital advances the cost of living as rapidly as organized labor secures a raise in wages, this will be

just as possible and just as probable when we secure compulsory arbitration of the labor difficulties, and the fact that the price of living, as agreed by all, has been put by the trusts, higher than the advance of wages secured by the unions, have we any assurance that arbitration alone can give labor its full product?

We see at this point that to accomplish anything there must be a method that will prevent organized capital from advancing the price of the cost of living, or in other words, organized labor must find some way of controlling the price of commodities, but no one has suggested arbitration of what the laborer shall pay for what he consumes but there must be some method of controlling the price of living, in order to secure even an advance of the purchasing power of a man's wages, to say nothing about his securing the full product of his labor.

There are two remedies proposed for the securing of this end. First, the government control of monopolies. Take the Beef Trust as an illustration of government assisting the laborer in preventing the capitalist who has just advanced the laborer's wage from offsetting that advance by raising the price of his meat. All laborers must have meat; but after the government has expended three million dollars in controlling and regulating the Beef trust, does the laborer pay any less for his meat? It may be possible for the laborer through the government to keep the Beef trust from poisoning him, like he did three thousand of our country's soldiers in our late war. As an illustration of government control of the price of beef, I refer you to the fact that the beef trust has recently purchased a complete plant that was organized with a million dollars capital, for the express purpose of forcing a reduction in the cost of our meat.

For another illustration of government control of the cost to the people of the necessities of life, I refer you to the fact that the railroads, after the Railroad commission had reduced their rates, that it actually costs 20 per cent more to ship lumber on the railroads of the state of Montana, besides, who is going to prevent the trust or organized capital from manufacturing a poorer quality of goods, even if they could control the price; and if the theory of competition for

(Continued on Page Four)

GOVERNOR TOOLE FAVORS SCABS

Executive Office, Helena, Montana. Aug. 22, 1907.

Gentlemen: In response to your request for me to have removed from the capitol all telephones of the Bell to make the following statement for your information:

At the request and for the convenience of the various state officers, the Bell Telephone company installed its instruments in the capitol building at a stipulated price, with the consent of the State Board of Examiners.

If so disposed it would be an assumption of authority upon my part to order their discontinuance, but so far as I am concerned, any state officer now having a telephone who wishes to discontinue its use, is at liberty to do so.

Speaking for myself and as an official, I do not hesitate to say that the telephone in the governor's office is indispensable for the proper transaction of the public business. While the service is imperfect on account of the existing strike, it is nevertheless, valuable as a means of official intercourse with the various state institutions and the officers of the law, with whom this department is in constant communication.

Instead, therefore, of dispensing with the instruments now in use, I am in full sympathy with the purpose of the pending application of a writ of mandamus compelling the company to furnish continuous adequate service to its patrons.

Very respectfully,
J. K. TOOLE,
Governor.

Isn't This Slavery?

It has been one of the stock statements of injunction judges in order to gild the nauseous pill they were about to administer to assert that a man had a right to work for whom, and where and at what time he pleased. Another of their gild sayings is that a man has an inherent right to quit work whenever conditions do not suit him.

That is all very well in its way, but like all legal fictions uttered by the alleged learned judges, it becomes a nullity in its application, for instance: Some telegraph operators in Denver desired to leave their employment because the wages and conditions did not suit them. The supposition and judge-declared right instantly vanished when some stock gambler went before Judge Reddie in Denver and secured an injunction against the telegraphers for bidding them to leave an employment where wages and conditions did not suit them.

Now, what is that but a condition of slavery or peonage and involuntary servitude? This illustrates in the fullest degree the usurpations and tyrannical conduct of the judiciary toward working men. We are told in a river of words that the judiciary must be respected, but who respects the Dred Scott decision or who should respect Judge Reddie in his slave-making edict.—United Mine Workers Journal.

Prof. Elliot's Heroines...

The following are scabbing on the telephone girls in the Helena exchange of the Rocky Mountain Bell Telephone company:

- Mrs. Todd.
- Miss Nason.
- Miss Heldt.
- Miss Osborne.
- Miss Laura Warrington.
- Miss Libbey Nelson.
- Miss Edith Huges.
- Miss Jeannette Hodge.
- Miss Leslie.
- Miss Maud Clemens.
- Miss Edna Wood.
- Miss Pauline Eastman.
- Miss Nina Smith.

The Important Work.

Who is that thin, starved-looking little woman who hurries by here early every morning, and hurries back late every evening?

She? Oh, she's a school teacher. She gets about forty dollars a month for handling a roomful of children.

And who is that big, fat, well-dressed man who strolls by here now and then, smoking a good cigar and looking at ease with life?

He? Why, he's an inspector of ash barrels, or smoking like that. He gets two hundred a month from the city, —Life.

Convention Resolutions

Call on State Officials to Discontinue Use of Unfair Telephone—Condemn Merchants

Whereas, The Rocky Mountain Bell Telephone company is now trying to do business in the state of Montana on the government injunction plan, and

Whereas, all political parties in the past have declared against government by injunction, and whereas, any man or class of men who are in earnest in what they advocate, will practice what they preach,

Therefore, Be it resolved, That if the officials of the state capital are opposed to government by injunction, they will take means to sever all business relations between the state capital and the Rocky Mountain Bell Telephone company, and be it further resolved, That we will judge them by their acts.

Whereas, the Retail Merchants' Exchange of the city of Helena at a meeting held in the said city, adopted a resolution to the effect that telephones would not be removed in compliance with the suggestion of strike sympathizers so long as the company continued to give service, the resolution reading as follows:

"Be it resolved by the Retail Merchants' Exchange of Helena, in special meeting assembled, that every member if this exchange keep his telephone so long as the telephone company continues to give service."

Whereas, this resolution unqualifiedly conveys the information that the business men of Helena have no desire, and express no intention of rendering any assistance whatever to the Telephone operators and linemen in the states of Montana, Utah, Wyoming and Idaho in their struggle for living wages and fair conditions against the Rocky Mountain Bell Telephone company, which company with its corporate greed, is endeavoring to deal organized labor a death blow in these states; and

Whereas, the labor organizations in the city of Helena in particular, have at all times used their influence and power in furthering the efforts of the business men to make a greater and better city by patronizing home institutions and home products; and

Whereas, the aforesaid resolution cannot be mistaken but to mean that the business men of Helena intend to take an unfair advantage of the striking Telephone operators and linemen who have been deprived of their rights in this fight for their freedom by temporary injunction from the Federal court; and

Whereas, this resolution, made by the Retail Merchants' Exchange, was adopted without the Telephone operators and linemen being given an opportunity to state their side of the case, an official of the Bell Telephone company being the only interested party heard, and therefore snap judgment taken and

Whereas, the aforesaid resolution amounts to a declaration that the business men of Helena have decided that the Rocky Mountain Bell Telephone company is to be allowed to conduct its business on an open-shop basis and employ "scabs" at any wages and under any conditions the company may suggest, while all other institutions in the states of Montana, Utha, Wyoming and Idaho, and in the city of Helena in particular, are, in the main, compelled to recognize, and do recognize, organized labor;

Therefore, Be it resolved, that all members of organized labor in the state of Montana and in the city of Helena in particular, are impertuned to remember those who are true to them in this, their hour of need; and to remember that there are merchants in the cities of Butte, Billings, Livingston and in other cities who are fair to union labor; and

Be it further resolved, that if the necessity exists, the mail order catalogue be brought from its resting place in the waste paper basket and put to a laudable and justifiable use."

The Santa Fe has tried to borrow six engines from the C. & S. and were nearly successful in their attempt, in fact all arrangements were made to loan them, and engineers had been sent to Trinidad, Col., to get the engines. While the engineers were on their way

from Raton to Trinidad, the machinists were in conference with the management, notifying them that if they loaned the Santa Fe engines the machinists would go on strike on that road. The arrangements were changed and the Santa Fe did not get the engines from the C. & S.

The train men were on strike at that time on the C. & S. and they said they had all the trouble they wanted.

The Santa Fe is in the market "strong" to borrow engines from other roads, as the question of buying them is a dead issue. Brothers, they will continue to bear watching, so keep your eye on the Santa Fe, and see that they don't get any engines that you have repaired until they settle with their machinists that are on strike.

It is a disgrace that a working class that expects to make headway against capitalist exploitation should support capitalist printing shops. The working class must make their labor press a power. Publicity is the most effective weapon in combating the enemy.

Has the state a right to seize private property in the interest of the public? Undoubtedly it has—any state has that right. When Horatio Seymour was governor of New York state, a strike occurred on the N. Y. Central railway. The road was tied up and business was suffering. Seymour was equal to the emergency. He sent for the officials and said to them, "Gentlemen, this road was chartered to do the business of a common carrier for the benefit of the people of the state. I will give you just twenty hours to settle the strike and resume business, or I shall seize the road and operate it in the interest of the state." In less than the stated time the officials had made terms with the strikers and business was resumed. That was the spirit of true democracy in Seymour's times and should be in our day and time.

If rational law were carried out, the people would own all telegraph lines in the United States, as is contracted. If any doubt it, let them examine the records. There is a strike between the owners and the workers in that line. And when the telegraph system does not do as was contracted, the only thing to do is for the people to appoint appraisers to appraise the property. This is provided for in the following Postal laws (Postal Laws and Regulations, pages 56, 57, 58, Section 93, companies to file acceptance): "Before any telegraph company shall exercise any powers or privileges conferred by law, such company shall in writing accept the restrictions and obligations required by law (R. S. P. 52-68, Section 96.)" The United States may for postal, military or other purposes purchase all the telegraph lines, property and effects of any or all companies, acting under the provisions of the Act of July 24, 1866, entitled: "An Act to aid in the construction of telegraph lines and to secure to the government the use of the same for postal, military or other purposes," or under this title at an appraised value by five competent disinterested persons, two of whom shall be selected by the Postmaster General of the United States, two by the company interested, and one by the four so previously selected (R. S. P. 52-67, Section 97.) The following companies have filed acceptance pursuant to section 93, prior to December 5, 1892, and on the dates respectively stated: "Western Union Telegraph Company, June 8, 1867; Postal Telegraph company, August 31, 1882; ninety-eight other companies, which include every one ever organized, have also signed. This agreement covers every mile of telegraph lines in the United States. Why shouldn't the people take them? They are a menace to the people, as they are now in private hands. The people have to demand these laws carried out so vitally affect their interests. But will they do it? Not till they are squeezed so hard, they can barely live. Then they may take some political action. They will have to act soon or they will not have a chance after a few years, if persecution and prosecution go on unhindered.

State Historical Library

Labor Day Oration

Rev. F. L. Buzzell Delivers Address of the Day at Great Falls—Workers' Celebration

Fellow Laborers and Fellow Citizens: In the midst of the pleasures of this National holiday, in honor of labor, we turn aside for an hour to serious consideration of the world's greatest problem, the Labor Problem. We take it for granted that when you honored us with an invitation to address you, you desired us to speak according to the light we had. On last Labor Day at Kalispell, I heard Hon. Ex-Governor Smith declare that the laborer should receive the full product of his labor, but Mr. Smith did not show how the laborer is to obtain the full product of labor. This is the labor problem. How can labor secure its full product?

But can this problem be solved when there is no general agreement to the question "What is the full product of labor?" The land and the machinery or the means of production that labor has to use to produce wealth, are owned and controlled not by labor, but by another and smaller class of men called capitalists. These capitalists truthfully say that without our tools labor could not produce, and they retain for themselves the lion's share of the product of the laborer, who has to use their tools. Carrol D. Wright says that the capitalist keeps four-fifths of this product for the use of his machinery, and gives the labor one-fifth for his labor. The laborer is not satisfied with this division, and thus arises the ever present industrial war between capital and labor, that fills the country with strife and lockouts, the laborer's home with want, and society with strife. But what is labor's full product? Last year the Boston & Montana paid labor three and one half millions, and after all expenses and improvements, they had for their share seven millions, or twice as much as they gave labor. These capitalists claim that these seven millions were only a fair return for the money invested in their plants. The laborer answers them that their plants were created by their labor, that it was built out of the surplus value of their labor. The laborer's argument runs like this, Robinson Crusoe lives by working a little garden on his lonely island, his man Friday puts in an appearance, and is hungry, he hires Friday to work the garden, and Mr. Crusoe does the planning or brain work. Friday uses the stick for a hoe, having some inventive genius, Friday thinks out a machine which, if it could be materialized, would enable him to produce ten times as much as by his stick. Mr. Crusoe sends Friday along the coast to find some iron that some stranded ship may have deposited. Friday returns with a variety of iron and tools that he has collected. Mr. Crusoe and Friday together materialize Friday's invention, and the machine is built by which Friday produces ten times as much as before. Mr. Crusoe is on the road to a modern capitalist. Friday's work in the garden produces a living for both, and a surplus. Something must be done with this surplus. Mr. Crusoe begins to exercise his brain, and he sends Friday to the coast with instructions to flag any ship that he may chance to spy. A ship is hailed, the captain lands, and Mr. Crusoe shows him his fine garden of fruits and vegetables. The captain makes a large purchase, for which he leaves a pile of gold, and agrees to make this island a trading post. In a few months several passing ships have called, and loaded up with the much desired fresh fruits and vegetables. Mr. Crusoe has a big pile of gold, but a poor house and undesirable surroundings. The land is fertile, but he has but one laborer. He arranges with the captain of a ship to bring him one hundred laborers, and a surplus of modern machinery. The laborers and the machinery arrive. Mr. Crusoe owns the land. The laborers are hired to work the land with machinery. They are paid with the wage that represents one-fifth of what they produce. Mr. Crusoe sets them to work building cottages for themselves and families, and rents them these cottages, or sells them on notes bearing ten per cent interest. They build a store, and he sells them goods that are given by the ships in exchange for the products of their labor. Mr. Crusoe has a fit of loneli-

ness, engages a foreman at a big salary, sails for America, and registers at the Waldorf-Astoria, as Lord Robinson Crusoe. This is all that is necessary. There is excitement among the millionaire society belles of the American metropolis. Lord Robinson Crusoe makes a satisfactory contract with one of these society belles. Her father puts up ten million dollars in hard cash, and Mr. Crusoe off-sets it with his lordship. The press comes out with large headlines "Marriage of Lord Robinson Crusoe to Miss America Millions. They sail today for her lord's estate, located in the heart of the Pacific." Mr. and Mrs. Lord Robinson Crusoe find when they arrive home that American workmen to the number of a thousand have anticipated them. The ten million dollars are used to employ these workmen, and buy material to build this new couple a nice little "cottage by the sea," after which mines are opened, forests are felled, land is rented or sold for notes bearing ten per cent interest, a modern town is built, and the lonely island of Robinson Crusoe becomes a modern American civilization, where one man owns as much as the other ninety-nine, where the income of ten is equal to the income of ninety, where fifty out of the hundred own nothing, where the land and machinery is owned by the few, where the work is done by the many who give the few four-fifths of their product for the privilege of using the machinery and the land. These laborers organize, strike, get a rise of wages, pay more rent, higher prices for the necessities of life that they have created with the capitalist' machine, strike again, receive more wages, pay more rent, a higher price for their living, strike again, pay more rent, and so on to the end of the chapter.

This picture is the true representation of the history and of the present conditions of the world of labor and the war between capital and labor. Now, who will tell us, first, how much of the products created by the laborers using the machinery and the land owned by Lord Robinson Crusoe, and the few others who have become lesser capitalists, belongs to the laborers? I could answer my own question, but I will not on this occasion, but I will leave you to solve that problem.

But I will answer the next question, "How can labor obtain the full product of its labor? Organized labor, or the Unions, on the one side, are the highest developments of labor. Organized capital, or the trust, on the other side, are the highest developments of capital. Here they stand in battle array. War is always a conflict of interests. Labor's interest, and capital's interest are diametrically opposed. It is labor's interest to obtain all possible of the product of their labor; it is capital's interest to retain all possible of the product of labor for the use of their machines. Labor comes forth and demands four things. First, the right to say how many hours shall constitute a day's work. Second, how much work they shall turn out in that time. Third, how much pay they shall receive for the labor done, and fourth, who the capitalist shall employ to do that labor. Capital comes forth and says: We, and not you, have the absolute right to say how many hours shall make a day's work, how much work you shall do in that time, how much we shall pay you for that work, and who we shall employ to do our own work. Thus, both capital and labor claim the absolute right to the same identical things. Thus arises the conflict, the destructive war, between these two elements of society. Now, which side is in the right? When labor makes such a demand of capital, it virtually says to capital, You have no right to run your own business; and if capital should acquiesce in the demand of labor, capital might as well go out of business. On the other hand, give capital the right to dictate all of these demands that both claim, and labor would be reduced to a state of abject slavery, and would be forced to give up the struggle, to maintain a decent life for themselves and for their families.

So it is evident that these same de-

mands, made both by capital and labor, are not only conflicting, but unreasonable. But the present industrial system that makes necessary these two conflicting elements of our society, makes it necessary for both sides to fight for the same rights.

Arbitration is being suggested as a remedy for this unpleasant situation, and as the only thing that can protect the capitalist, and at the same time, protect the laborer. But will arbitration succeed in securing for the laborer the full product of his labor, or what he may decide to be the full product of his labor? I would like to see arbitration tried in this country. It works well in New Zealand, but the New Zealand government sets a minimum wage, which it believes to be high enough to provide a man with a family a decent and comfortable living, and any man there attempting to hire a man for less than this wage, would be sent to the penitentiary. This minimum wage has destroyed the slums and sweat shops of New Zealand and any capitalist there whose business will not permit him to pay this minimum wage, must go out of business. And arbitration in this country, without the minimum wage law, would be a failure. But has New Zealand, by arbitration and the minimum wage secured for the laborer the full product of his labor?

But suppose, we have arbitration and all disputes between capital and labor are referred to a committee who are above the influence of graft, and this committee grants the increase in wages, will that secure, not the full product of labor, but an advance, or a larger share of his product? The laborer is a consumer, and four-fifths of the public are dependent for the thing they consume upon the wage of the laborer. Now, is it not a fact when wages have advanced by the efforts of organized labor, that organized capital have advanced the price of the commodities consumed by the public? The Great Falls Tribune, a few months ago, in an editorial showed that the man who ten years ago received a wage or a salary of a thousand dollars a year, and who now receives the same amount in salary or wages, actually receives \$667, because \$1,000 today will purchase no more than \$667 ten years ago. Now, if organized capital advances the cost of living as rapidly as organized labor secures a raise in wages, this will be

just as possible and just as probable when we secure compulsory arbitration of the labor difficulties, and the fact that the price of living, as agreed by all, has been put by the trusts, higher than the advance of wages secured by the unions, have we any assurance that arbitration alone can give labor its full product?

We see at this point that to accomplish anything there must be a method that will prevent organized capital from advancing the price of the cost of living, or in other words, organized labor must find some way of controlling the price of commodities, but no one has suggested arbitration of what the laborer shall pay for what he consumes but there must be some method of controlling the price of living, in order to secure even an advance of the purchasing power of a man's wages, to say nothing about his securing the full product of his labor.

There are two remedies proposed for the securing of this end. First, the government control of monopolies. Take the Beef Trust as an illustration of government assisting the laborer in preventing the capitalist who has just advanced the laborer's wage from offsetting that advance by raising the price of his meat. All laborers must have meat; but after the government has expended three million dollars in controlling and regulating the Beef trust, does the laborer pay any less for his meat? It may be possible for the laborer through the government to keep the Beef trust from poisoning him, like he did three thousand of our country's soldiers in our late war. As an illustration of government control of the price of beef, I refer you to the fact that the beef trust has recently purchased a complete plant that was organized with a million dollars capital, for the express purpose of forcing a reduction in the cost of our meat.

For another illustration of government control of the cost to the people of the necessities of life, I refer you to the fact that the railroads, after the Railroad commission had reduced their rates, that it actually costs 20 per cent more to ship lumber on the railroads of the state of Montana, besides, who is going to prevent the trust or organized capital from manufacturing a poorer quality of goods, even if they could control the price; and if the theory of competition for

(Continued on Page Four)

GOVERNOR TOOLE FAVORS SCABS

Executive Office, Helena, Montana.

Aug. 22, 1907.

Gentlemen: In response to your request for me to have removed from the capitol all telephones of the Bell to make the following statement for your information:

At the request and for the convenience of the various state officers, the Bell Telephone company installed its instruments in the capitol building at a stipulated price, with the consent of the State Board of Examiners.

If so disposed it would be an assumption of authority upon my part to order their discontinuance, but so far as I am concerned, any state officer now having a telephone who wishes to discontinue its use, is at liberty to do so.

Speaking for myself and as an official, I do not hesitate to say that the telephone in the governor's office is indispensable for the proper transaction of the public business. While the service is imperfect on account of the existing strike, it is nevertheless, valuable as a means of official intercourse with the various state institutions and the officers of the law, with whom this department is in constant communication.

Instead, therefore, of dispensing with the instruments now in use, I am in full sympathy with the purpose of the pending application of a writ of mandamus compelling the company to furnish continuous adequate service to its patrons.

Very respectfully,

J. K. TOOLE,
Governor.

Isn't This Slavery?

It has been one of the stock statements of injunction judges in order to gild the nauseous pill they were about to administer to assert that a man had a right to work for whom, and where and at what time he pleased. Another of their gild sayings is that a man has an inherent right to quit work whenever conditions do not suit him.

That is all very well in its way, but like all legal fictions uttered by the alleged learned judges, it becomes a nullity in its application, for instance: Some telegraph operators in Denver desired to leave their employment because the wages and conditions did not suit them. The supposition and judge-declared right instantly vanished when some stock gambler went before Judge Reddie in Denver and secured an injunction against the telegraphers for bidding them to leave an employment where wages and conditions did not suit them.

Now, what is that but a condition of slavery or peonage and involuntary servitude? This illustrates in the fullest degree the usurpations and tyrannical conduct of the judiciary toward working men. We are told in a river of words that the judiciary must be respected, but who respects the Dred Scott decision or who should respect Judge Reddie in his slave-making edict.—United Mine Workers Journal.

Prof. Elliot's Heroines. . . The following are scabbing on the telephone girls in the Helena exchange of the Rocky Mountain Bell Telephone company:

- Mrs. Todd.
- Miss Nason.
- Miss Heldt.
- Miss Osborne.
- Miss Laura Warrington.
- Miss Libbey Nelson.
- Miss Edith Huges.
- Miss Jeannette Hodge.
- Miss Leslie.
- Miss Maud Clemens.
- Miss Edna Wood.
- Miss Pauline Eastman.
- Miss Nina Smith.

The Important Work.

Who is that thin, starved-looking little woman who hurries by here early every morning, and hurries back late every evening?

She? Oh, she's a school teacher. She gets about forty dollars a month for handling a roomful of children.

And who is that big, fat, well-dressed man who strolls by here now and then, smoking a good cigar and looking at ease with life?

He? Why, he's an inspector of ash barrels, or smoking like that. He gets two hundred a month from the city. —Life.

Convention Resolutions

Call on State Officials to Discontinue Use of Unfair Telephone—Condemn Merchants

Whereas, The Rocky Mountain Bell Telephone company is now trying to do business in the state of Montana on the government injunction plan, and

Whereas, all political parties in the past have declared against government by injunction, and whereas, any man or class of men who are in earnest in what they advocate, will practice what they preach,

Therefore, Be it resolved, That if the officials of the state capital are opposed to government by injunction, they will take means to sever all business relations between the state capital and the Rocky Mountain Bell Telephone company, and be it further resolved, That we will judge them by their acts.

Whereas, the Retail Merchants' Exchange of the city of Helena at a meeting held in the said city, adopted a resolution to the effect that telephones would not be removed in compliance with the suggestion of strike sympathizers so long as the company continued to give service, the resolution reading as follows:

"Be it resolved by the Retail Merchants' Exchange of Helena, in special meeting assembled, that every member if this exchange keep his telephone so long as the telephone company continues to give service."

Whereas, this resolution unqualifiedly conveys the information that the business men of Helena have no desire, and express no intention of rendering any assistance whatever to the Telephone operators and linemen in the states of Montana, Utah, Wyoming and Idaho in their struggle for living wages and fair conditions against the Rocky Mountain Bell Telephone company, which company with its corporate greed, is endeavoring to deal organized labor a death blow in these states; and

Whereas, the labor organizations in the city of Helena in particular, have at all times used their influence and power in furthering the efforts of the business men to make a greater and better city by patronizing home institutions and home products; and

Whereas, the aforesaid resolution cannot be mistaken but to mean that the business men of Helena intend to take an unfair advantage of the striking Telephone operators and linemen who have been deprived of their rights in this fight for their freedom by temporary injunction from the Federal court; and

Whereas, this resolution, made by the Retail Merchants' Exchange, was adopted without the Telephone operators and linemen being given an opportunity to state their side of the case, an official of the Bell Telephone company being the only interested party heard, and therefore snap judgment taken and

Whereas, the aforesaid resolution amounts to a declaration that the business men of Helena have decided that the Rocky Mountain Bell Telephone company is to be allowed to conduct its business on an open-shop basis and employ "scabs" at any wages and under any conditions the company may suggest, while all other institutions in the states of Montana, Utha, Wyoming and Idaho, and in the city of Helena in particular, are, in the main, compelled to recognize, and do recognize, organized labor;

Therefore, Be it resolved, that all members of organized labor in the state of Montana and in the city of Helena in particular, are impertuned to remember those who are true to them in this, their hour of need; and to remember that there are merchants in the cities of Butte, Billings, Livingston and in other cities who are fair to union labor; and

Be it further resolved, that if the necessity exists, the mail order catalogue be brought from its resting place in the waste paper basket and put to a laudable and justifiable use."

The Santa Fe has tried to borrow six engines from the C. & S. and were nearly successful in their attempt, in fact all arrangements were made to loan them, and engineers had been sent to Trinidad, Col., to get the engines. While the engineers were on their way

from Raton to Trinidad, the machinists were in conference with the management, notifying them that if they loaned the Santa Fe engines the machinists would go on strike on that road. The arrangements were changed and the Santa Fe did not get the engines from the C. & S.

The train men were on strike at that time on the C. & S. and they said they had all the trouble they wanted.

The Santa Fe is in the market "strong" to borrow engines from other roads, as the question of buying them is a dead issue. Brothers, they will continue to bear watching, so keep your eye on the Santa Fe, and see that they don't get any engines that you have repaired until they settle with their machinists that are on strike.

It is a disgrace that a working class that expects to make headway against capitalist exploitation should support capitalist printing shops. The working class must make their labor press a power. Publicity is the most effective weapon in combating the enemy.

Has the state a right to seize private property in the interest of the public? Undoubtedly it has—any state has that right. When Horatio Seymour was governor of New York state, a strike occurred on the N. Y. Central railway. The road was tied up and business was suffering. Seymour was equal to the emergency. He sent for the officials and said to them, "Gentlemen, this road was chartered to do the business of a common carrier for the benefit of the people of the state. I will give you just twenty hours to settle the strike and resume business, or I shall seize the road and operate it in the interest of the state." In less than the stated time the officials had made terms with the strikers and business was resumed. That was the spirit of true democracy in Seymour's times and should be in our day and time.

If rational law were carried out, the people would own all telegraph lines in the United States, as is contracted. If any doubt it, let them examine the records. There is a strike between the owners and the workers in that line. And when the telegraph system does not do as was contracted, the only thing to do is for the people to appoint appraisers to appraise the property. This is provided for in the following Postal laws (Postal Laws and Regulations, pages 56, 57, 58, Section 93, companies to file acceptance): "Before any telegraph company shall exercise any powers or privileges conferred by law, such company shall in writing accept the restrictions and obligations required by law (R. S. P. 52-68, Section 96.)" The United States may for postal, military or other purposes purchase all the telegraph lines, property and effects of any or all companies, acting under the provisions of the Act of July 24, 1866, entitled: "An Act to aid in the construction of telegraph lines and to secure to the government the use of the same for postal, military or other purposes," or under this title at an appraised value by five competent disinterested persons, two of whom shall be selected by the Postmaster General of the United States, two by the company interested, and one by the four so previously selected (R. S. P. 52-67, Section 97.) The following companies have filed acceptance pursuant to section 93, prior to December 5, 1892, and on the dates respectively stated: "Western Union Telegraph Company, June 8, 1867; Postal Telegraph company, August 31, 1882; ninety-eight other companies, which include every one ever organized, have also signed. This agreement covers every mile of telegraph lines in the United States. Why shouldn't the people take them? They are a menace to the people, as they are now in private hands. The people have to demand these laws carried out so vitally affect their interests. But will they do it? Not till they are squeezed so hard, they can barely live. Then they may take some political action. They will have to act soon or they will not have a chance after a few years, if persecution and prosecution go on unhindered.