

WHAT GLOVES ARE MADE OF.



ANY of the gloves that are sold in this country under the comprehensive title of 'kid,' said a glove manufacturer are really made of goatskin. There is hardly a country in the world that does not supply some sort of materials which are made up into gloves, and many of which pass for kid in the retail stores. The supply of kidskin of the finest quality is naturally limited. The greater part is absorbed in the manufacture of women's gloves. Men's gloves, therefore, are frequently made of fine lambskin, which is better than the second-rate kid. The genuine, fine kidskins are mainly of French origin, and those obtained from mountain slopes of southern France are world-famed for their excellence. All the best conditions of climates, air and diet appear to unite in exactly the degree required to secure perfection in this district. Nowhere else are the conditions equally favorable, although kidskins of great excellence are produced throughout the mountain ranges of southern Europe. Their production is the principal industry among the mountaineers.

"Great pains must be taken to secure the softness and delicacy of texture and freedom from blemish, which form the value of the kidskins. The diet is the most important factor, and mother's milk is required to keep the kid in perfect condition. If the animal is allowed to eat grass, its value declines, as the skin immediately begins to grow harder and coarser in texture. To keep the skin in perfect condition the young kid is kept closely penned and carefully guarded against injury from scratches, bruises, and so on. As soon as the kids have reached the age at which their skins are in the best condition for the glover, they are killed and the skins are sold to traveling peddlers, who bear them to the great centers of the tanning industry at Grenoble, Annonay, Milhau and Paris.

"Fine lambskins are raised in great quantities in southern Europe and throughout Hungary, Servia, Bulgaria and Roumania. The American glovemakers buy most of their lambskins at Vienna or Muhlburg.

"London is the chief market of all the miscellaneous skins. Here may be found the Cape sheepskins, tough and durable, from the Cape of Good Hope; colt and calfskins from Buenos Ayres and other cities of South America; hogskins from Mexico and Brazil; antelope from India, Brazil, Colorado and Africa. Of late years many of these skins have been brought directly to New York, and American buyers no longer find it necessary to go to London. While fine lambskins are the staple in men's gloves, coltskins are rapidly coming into favor, and fine calfskins are also extensively used. Each has a grain peculiar to itself, which, while not visible to the ordinary buyer, can be instantly perceived by the expert.

"Calfskins are good looking, soft and pliable, but are apt to crack. This fault is not found in coltskins, which are durable and handsome, and in many respects make model gloves. The wrinkles are objectionable, but these disappear when the glove is on the hand. The 'jacks' of Venezuela contribute the majority of deer-skins at present. The castor comes from the antelopes of the West. Heavy leather gloves are obtained from elks. Hogskins are used to a moderate extent. Patnas, or Calcutta, ox hides are also used.

"Every invoice of heavy skins contains more or less curiosities, and the kind of leather that will be evolved from a stray moose, muskox, llama or kangaroo skin depends upon the skins that accompany it. Dogskins are occasionally made up into gloves, but their use is very uncommon. Everything that goes by the name of dogskin nowadays is likely to be Cape sheep. Ratskins in gloves are about as frequent as rat sautes in Chinese laundries."—New York Sun.

THE PROFIT SHARING SYSTEM.

A manufacturer of Minneapolis, Minn., whose establishment is conducted under the profit sharing system, gives his views concerning it as follows:—

"I don't find profit sharing a cure-all for all labor problems and troubles; no, indeed. The trouble with the system is just this: the average employee gets the idea into his head that the amount of profits he is to receive is part of his salary. So he contracts debts, to be paid with his share of the profits long before he ever receives the portion coming to him. One man argues that whereas he received \$25 as his share when the last dividend was declared he will of necessity receive the same the next time, and so figures that he can get in debt for that amount.

"Then when he finds that he gets only \$10 or \$15 at the next time he is disappointed, as he is \$10 or \$15 in the hole. When the employee looks at the scheme in that light it becomes a dismal failure. But then employees are different. Some are very grateful for the extra allotment, while some feel it is but due them. I look for the good effect in the matter of profit sharing in the recognition among my people that I have their interests at heart and have more regard for them than that merely hemmed in by a mere question of daily wages. The trouble with the employee is his failure to recognize the principle of the scheme. He shouldn't feel that his share is a lump of accumulated salary at the end of six months, which might just as well have been given him along with his regular earnings.

"This feeling utterly destroys the whole idea, which is to make the share a gratuity, an extra. The share isn't a present given according to the amount of salary that a man draws, but it is his pro rata share of the entire net profits of the company, be they small or be they large, and is pre-eminently just. From the boy who sweeps out the store to the highest priced man we employ, the same just ruling is carried out. In other words, the share of each employee represents a certain percentage of the net profits for the six months or year, as the case may be, in the same proportion as the amount of capital employed bears to the gross salary list. Or state it in figures: Let \$50,000 stand for the employer's capital and \$25,000 the salary list. The employer is entitled to the interest on his money, say \$4,000, and a fair salary for his services, say \$5,000. This makes \$9,000 the capitalist is to receive as against \$25,000 his men receive.

"Suppose \$10,000 represents the total net earnings. Of course, the \$9,000 must come out of that, leaving \$1,000 to be divided between himself and his employees. Now, the employer has put into the business two-thirds more than the employees, so that he is entitled to receive two-thirds of \$1,000, the net profits, for his share, leaving one-third for the employee. This is the equitable basis on which the plan is drawn; it is fair for both parties, and is, I think, a good scheme. There are between thirty and forty firms in this country at present using this system, and they will find the same troubles, I think, to overcome as I do. The system cannot be explained too often to the employee, the fairness and justness cannot be brought out too much. An honest dividing up of the profits on an equal basis—that is the idea."

THAT'S SO.

A true philosopher thus discourses to his wholesale friends: "I don't care how much pains you take in getting it up, the circular as an advertising medium is no good. Retailers have a way of throwing into the waste basket every kind of an announcement they receive unless it appears in a trade paper which they subscribe to and pay for. The latter comes to them periodically as guide, philosopher, and friend. Therefore, its pages are scanned and their contents noted. A good advertisement in a trade paper going directly to the people whom you want to address pays a bigger profit than a whole ton of circulars mailed in sealed or unsealed envelopes. At least, that is the way we find it in our business, and I am sure we are not an exception to the rule."