

of a provident fund. After these charges are provided for out of the profits of the concern, in the distribution of the balance it is recognized that a dollar's worth of work is entitled over and above ordinary pay to the same share that a dollar of capital is entitled to over ordinary interest. This is generally the basis of the division in industrial partnership. If the profits are large, labor gets a large return over ordinary wages. If the profits are small, the share to labor will be correspondingly small. If there is no profit, or if there is an actual deficit, labor receives its full wages, the loss being borne by the employer and not by the employee. The employee is interested in making the enterprise a financial success. If it is not, he receives his full wages only—if it is he shares with the capital of his employer whatever the surplus may be. There is nothing to be gained by industrial partnership if the system and the business in which it is operated does not produce more benefit with it than without it; if it does not result in more effective labor and for a better and more cordial understanding and agreeable relations between employer and employee. Where labor is employed by the day a share in the ultimate gains of the business is an incentive to greater industry. Where labor is bestowed upon piece work, the incentive is to produce better articles, to avoid waste of materials, and to take greater care of machinery and tools. All gains from these sources accrue to the benefit of the employee as well as to the employer; while on the other hand carelessly made goods, inferior workmanship, wasted material, ill-used machinery and slovenly kept or unnecessarily broken or destroyed tools injure the workman as well as the proprietor.

This method of industrial partnership is not a new or untried thing. It has been a practical success in France, where it originated, for a great many years; and it is also in successful operation in Great Britain, in many states of Europe, in the United States, and also in Canada. One of the most noticeable instances of this method of profit sharing in this country is that of Messrs. T. S. Simms & Co., St. John, N.F., regarding which we have kept our readers fully advised. It will be remembered that that concern adopted the system a little more than a year ago. We are informed by them that, although they have since then labored under certain adverse circumstances, the scheme has proved a success, working so well and so satisfactorily to all concerned that the agreement previously entered into has been renewed for the current year.

It would be well if manufacturers generally would investigate this system, and if it commended itself to their better judgment, adopt it in some of its many forms. It might be worthy of a trial; and if it resulted as successfully here as it has in many other places, one of the greatest problems of the age would be solved. A general adoption of it, and its successful operation, would introduce a millennium where strikes, lock-outs, labor disputes and unpleasant relations between employer and employee would be known no more.

DEAN SWIFT said:—"Whoever makes two blades of grass to grow where only one grew before, deserves better of mankind, and does more essential service to his country than the whole race of politicians put together." Jay Gould was not that sort of a man. He was not a producer, but an accumulator, and the world is no whit better because of his having lived in it.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

Two big steel works in Middlesborough, England, are about to close down owing to depression. What's the matter with free trade?—*Toronto Empire*.

The consumption of steel in Canada would give constant occupation to two or more big steel works, and if we had the right sort of protection we would have just such works. Will the *Empire* please answer "What's the matter with protection?"

CANADA has a government of the manufacturers, by the manufacturers and for the manufacturers.—*Toronto Globe*.

If this were a fact it would be much better to have such a government than one of professional politicians. If the Government of Canada were in the hands of the manufacturers it would be better for the whole country. It would be a government of business men, by business men, for business men. More than that—it would be a government of Canadians, by Canadians, for Canadians. See!

ANY subscriber to or advertiser in the CANADIAN MANUFACTURER who may desire to purchase any sort of machine or machinery, or any sort of mill, factory, workshop, foundry or other supplies; or any materials for manufacturing purposes, and will notify us of his wants; the same will be published in a prominent department of this paper; and his name and address will be furnished to any subscriber or advertiser who may desire to supply the want; for which services no charge whatever will be made. Our friends are cordially invited to avail themselves of this invitation.

THE Brickmakers' section of the Builders' Exchange will send a deputation to interview Dr. Chamberlain, Inspector of Prisons, with a view to making some arrangement for the withdrawal of prison-made bricks from the Toronto market. And still the *Star*, the new labor advocate, preaches that the laboring men of Canada need no protection—that they would be better off with free trade. This despicable competition of convict-made goods with the products of free labor ought to be suppressed; but the existence of it is an object lesson which laboring men would do well to study.

TARIFF reform is coming with sure foot across the border, and it behooves Canada to lead the procession.—*Montreal Star*.

Lead what procession? If the *Star's* "tariff reform" means correcting the anomalies and incongruities which exist in the tariff, then we say, Let the procession proceed. But if it means cutting down the duties looking in the direction of free trade and the destruction of our manufacturing industries, then we are "agin it." Why not Canada hold off from tariff reduction until the reduction of the United States tariff is brought down to the level of ours? But if we wait until then we will linger a long, long time.

THE forthcoming edition of the chart of the Mining Statistics Division of the United States Geological Survey, in showing the metallic products of the United States for 1891, states that the production of nickel in that country in that year was 118,493 pounds, valued at \$71,099. This quantity is not