

ardently and zealously to be sought after. To bring the hitherto conflicting forces—the makers and the possessors of wealth—of industrial society together, and to show them, not only how identical are their interests, but how essential, even in a democratic age, the one is to the other, and how desirable it is that each should not misunderstand or mistrust the other, ought to be the object of our most solicitous effort. In the last twenty-five years much has been done by humane legislation in removing the disabilities under which the toiling masses have wrought and in improving their social as well as political condition. To these gains have to be added what philanthropy has so nobly accomplished in realizing the obligations and fulfilling the duties of the employer to the employed, and in helping to allay the resentment caused by social inequality, with its “stinging sense of wrong.” But it is not so much to philanthropy as to practical business effort that we must hopefully look for the future avoidance of industrial strife and the removal of that sense of injustice in the relations of capital and labour which has so embittered the working class against the employer, and interfered so seriously with the well-being of society. The cure, if it comes at all, must come not from without the workshop but from within; not from disinterested onlookers, but from those who are jointly interested with labour in the varied work which labour produces, and who, realizing the defects of the wage system, seek to supplement it by more just methods of compensation, which shall not only satisfy but encourage the working class, and give it the stimulus arising from some real, though modified, form of partnership. It is such a mode of cure as this that Mr. Gilman ably and warmly advocates in the instructive and highly interesting volume on “Profit-Sharing” which he has just published, and which, in our judgment, is the most valuable contribution we have yet had to the literature of the labour problem.

The experiments tried in the industrial world of both continents, to give to the workman some share beyond wages in the profits of labour, have been many and varied. These experiments, which date chiefly from the introduction of machinery, have been most interesting. Even where they have failed, they have not been without value to the student of economical and social questions; while to the philanthropic employer of labour they have been welcome as aids to renewed effort, warned and guided by the results of practical experience. Aside from the co-operative principle, the experiments in more justly recompensing labour have been tested in various forms—in a percentage on sales; in piece-work, with prizes for good quality; in gratuities for the avoidance of waste and the care of materials; in contributions towards a provident fund for the workman; and in bonuses, either in cash or in shares in the business. Varying circumstances have given or withheld success in the case of each, and indeed we might say in the case of all, of these different forms of compensating labour. Some of them have been wrecked by the ignorance and perversity, and some by the recklessness and cupidity, of the workman himself; while all of them have had to contend against trade competition, and been more or less affected by the ups and downs of the industrial market. Few of these experiments have proved more satisfactory in the past or promise better for the future than has profit-sharing, the system which Mr. Gilman enthusiastically advocates and supports with a wealth of facts which speak eloquently for the soundness of the principle. It may be feared that the author, like other philanthropists, is over-sanguine in his view of the benefits accruing from the adoption of his scheme; but it must be said in its favour that it is a commendable advance over the system of pure wages, and does not appear to conflict with economic laws. Moreover, it has been put to the test of a lengthy, extensive and varied experience, in all manner of trades, and in the Old World as well as in the New; and the almost universal testimony of those who have adopted the system and practised it for many years is conclusively and convincingly in its favour. Our author regards it as the most equitable and generally satisfactory method of remunerating the three industrial agents—capital, business skill and labour. More than the wages system does, he urges, it involves a fuller recognition of the employee as something more than a machine, and meets the advancing democratic element of the time with a hearty recognition of the duties of prosperity and all that is implied in human brotherhood. More practically, he concludes that profit-sharing “advances the prosperity of an establishment by increasing the quantity of the product, by improving its quality, by promoting care of implements and economy of materials, and by diminishing labour difficulties and the cost of superintendence.” In support of this opinion he cites the results of inquiry in the case of hundreds of establishments, embracing a variety of industries, in which the system of profit-sharing has been long in vogue with the best results. Nor does the author withhold the statistics of failure, where the experiment has either not worked well or for other reasons has been abandoned; but in these cases he analyses the cause of abandonment and satisfies the inquirer that the principle itself is not at fault, but that failure has been the result of specially adverse and unfavourable circumstances. “The influence,” says Mr. Gilman, “of labour organizations, or of socialistic agitation, upon attempts at profit-sharing is distinctly traceable. It is a palpable inference from the record that the comparatively modest scheme of participation in simple profits stands little chance of impressing workmen favourably when their minds are filled with ideas of a universal division, or a common enjoyment of property, under the name of Socialism. No moderate reforms,” he adds, “could prosper in such an atmosphere.”

For some special industries Mr. Gilman thinks profit-sharing specially advantageous, though in the enumeration he seems unconsciously to cover a wide field. His opening chapter, after an introduction on the “Industrial Problem,” deals with the system, or rather with its equivalent, “product-sharing,” as applied in agriculture, in the fisheries, and in mining. In chapter four we see the system in use on the European continent, in the various handicrafts, in iron, brass and steel works, in cotton and woollen factories, in paper, typographical and miscellaneous industries, and in insurance and banking companies. In the two following chapters it is presented to us in the experience of transportation and distributing companies, and in England, in the form of industrial partnerships and profit-sharing, in coal mining and iron works, in co-operative productive societies, and in many miscellaneous establishments. Lastly, and very fully, we have the experience of all manner of firms and corporations in the United States who have adopted profit-sharing and, after a lengthy trial, found it to give complete satisfaction. The testimony of these establishments is most gratifying, as the chapter proves which deals with the summary and analysis of experience. There is, of course, no hard and fast rule imposed upon those who have taken up the scheme; but each establishment is free to work out the details of the principle as circumstances require or as the heads of the house elect. The house which the author, with high approval, holds up as an example to be followed, is that of “the father of profit-sharing,” the Maison Leclaire, a great Parisian house-painting and decorating establishment, in which workmen, from 1842 to the present time, have been admitted to a participation in the profits of the business. Space will not allow us to note all the features of the scheme in practical operation in this great establishment; nor perhaps is it necessary, for it is referred to with pardonable pride in the works of the more notable economists of the time. It will suffice if we quote from our author the position a workman in the Maison Leclaire occupies financially at the present day: “1st. He receives at least as high wages as are generally paid in Paris, and in addition a bonus which has varied between 1870 and 1886 from 12 to 24 per cent. 2nd. In case of sickness he gets five francs a day from the Mutual Aid Society and other sources organized by the house. 3rd. If permanently disabled through disease or injury, he comes into a pension of 1,200 francs a year, one-half of which is continued to his children during their minority, or to his widow for life. He is entitled to retire on the same pension when he has been twenty years in the service of the house and is fifty years old. 4th. His sons, if he desires it, will be taken by preference as apprentices; they will receive pay from the first, increasing in proportion to the value of their services. 5th. At his death 1,000 francs, the amount of his life assurance, will be paid to his family, and his funeral expenses defrayed.” Such, in this model establishment, are the economic advantages enjoyed by a permanent workman, and such the philanthropy which its founder exercised in the interest of those to whom he owed his fortune. “The sagacity of M. Leclaire,” adds our author, “so constructed his institution that moral benefits of the first order are inextricably interwoven with them. The house is a school of industry, honesty, sobriety, thrift, self-respect and common kindness.” It is needless to say that the Maison Leclaire does not suffer from strikes.

Professor Jevons has remarked that the best trade union is a union of employer and employee. This axiom will be amply borne out by all who read Mr. Gilman's instructive volume, particularly the chapter in the work which summarizes the experience of firms that have conducted their business on the system of permitting their employees to participate in the profits, and the one reciting the argument from profit-sharing. Viewed in the light of these chapters, with their rich detail of facts for and against the scheme, no one, we think, can fail to commend the plan of profit-sharing as generally adopted by the industries that look to this means of rewarding labour and of gaining its friendly and interested co-operation. Under its operation antagonism between capital and labour and collision of interests are reduced to the minimum, if not got rid of altogether. Before it, beneficently vanish nine-tenths of the complaints of the master against the man and nine-tenths of the grievances of the man against the master. All are bound together in a common interest, while the system calls into play ready and conscientious effort and establishes the friendliest and most enduring relations between the co-operating powers. The great point is to master the system, with a careful consideration of all the circumstances in the business in which it is to be adopted, then to make the employees see and appreciate its manifest advantages, and finally to give it a lengthened and fair trial. In adopting the principle, while it is the employer who must take the initiative, it must not be supposed that he is parting with his privileges or is unfairly called upon to sacrifice his profits. It is the employer who makes the agreement—always subject, of course, to modification and withdrawal—and it is the employee by whose superior industry, care and economy, and in view of a bonus, the fund is created out of which his bonus is to be drawn. As Mr. Gilman puts it, “far from being a mere theory, it is pre-eminently a practical, common sense measure. In broad contradiction to schemes of productive co-operation, it begins with the employer, and it keeps his interest in view throughout.” To the employee, to whom the project comes as a friendly overture, profit-sharing should be no less acceptable. It will not only stimulate him and give him scope for the freer play of his powers, but it will treat and reward him “as a partner in toil, not a mere hired hand.”

G. MERCER ADAM.

FLEMING—IN APRIL.

HARD—in this beautiful weather,
Not to enjoy it together!
Hard—to stand by the gate
With that sense of a dead dull weight,
Pressing upon the heart,
Settled above the brows,
That sense of a sad frustration
No hope of a meeting allows—
Most of the flowers I prize
Are over—their petals shaken
To earth, and their places taken
By later and hardier ones.
The bloodroot blossoms waken
First of the buds demure,
And after the warmer suns
Have shone for a day or two,
On the ivory immature
Of crumpled petal and plume,
There steals to the air the perfume
Of the sweet arbutus—tinged
With the faintest of rose; star-fringed
Will the edge of the wood soon be,
Where the clustered anemone
Makes of earthy a milky way.
The delicate starflower too will be seen,
Walled in its leaves of pallid green;
And tall splashed trilliums, mauve and pink,
Green and purple, striped and gay,
With here and there,
A specimen rare
Of deepest puce with a heart of ink,
And up in your path,
With that way he hath
Of flaunting sudden in empty air,
The aquilegia's jester's frock
Will suddenly flare.
At the side of a rock
You frequently meet his red and yellow,
He is the wit for all the wood,
Known by his colours and pointed hood.
Already the beauty of noon has passed;
As I stand by the gate
And moodily wait
For a face, for a sign,
For I know not what,
I dimly divine
A change in the air,
A chill, a despair,
That is foreign to hope,
To shimmering green
On the wooded slope
Of the rushing river.
No one will come though I wait all day,
Let me go in—what use to stay!

SERANUS.

ART NOTES.

THE late Exhibition of the Ontario Society of Artists proved an unexpected success, both in regard to the attendance of visitors and the number of works disposed of. As it was held in a rather out of the way locality, and in a room not well lighted or adapted to the purpose, it was considered rather in the light of an experiment, and we are informed that the members are satisfied that it is no longer necessary in Toronto to maintain an expensive establishment on King Street, as the art-loving public will not object to a less prominent situation if within reasonable distance.

It is contemplated to build a gallery as a permanent home for the society, we believe, so soon as a good site can be found.

Many members, assisted by some of our prominent art-loving citizens, with Hon. G. W. Allan at their head, are taking hold of the Art Union, and propose to revert to the old system of monthly meetings. There is no doubt that a prosperous career is before them.

Now that the exhibitions at Ottawa, Montreal, and Toronto are all over, the artist members of the Academy and Ontario Society are preparing for the summer campaign. L. R. O'Brien has already departed for England, where two other Canadian artists are residing, viz., Homer Watson and John A. Fraser. M. Matthews intends to revisit the Rockies. F. M. Bell-Smith is holding an exhibition of his works at the Canadian Institute, preparatory to a lengthy visit to France for purposes of study. T. Mower-Martin proposes to sketch his way down the St. Lawrence, with a view to illustrating that noble river in a series of water-colour drawings and etchings. M. Hannaford is doing the same thing for the Niagara River, with its points of historical interest, and the “white umbrella” will be in time a familiar institution here, as it is in the older sections of the continent.

In the current number of *Academy* we read of the the National Academy's Exhibition in New York: “The current of pictorial art in America is all in the direction of landscape and portrait, including in portrait studies of single figures in costumes. Of anything American there is little trace, except an occasional negro; of the ‘nude’ or of the ‘ideal’ there is no example.”

TEMPLAR.

LEPROSY is increasing in Russia. During the last ten years forty-nine patients were treated in the St. Petersburg hospitals, half of whom were natives of the city. The Baltic provinces suffer most from the disease.