

the Lambeth Conference, or some other body, has not done this or that, is that some particular party feel aggrieved that some other party is not put down.

Now the thing has been tried. Bishop Phillpotts, quite conscientiously no doubt, made a deliberate attempt to drive the Calvinistic school, in the person of Mr. Gorham, out of the Church of England, and for his pains secured a complete justification of the position of that school, not only from the Law Courts, but from a High Church theologian of great learning and ability like the late Dr. Mozley. Next came the turn of the Broad Church or so-called Latitudinarian party, when Messrs. Williams and Wilson, of "Essays and Reviews," were charged with teaching false doctrine on the subjects of inspiration and future punishment. The same result followed in the acquittal of the accused and in the general acceptance of the justice of the verdict. Last of all came the prosecution of the extreme High Church or Ritualistic party, a party which goes a long way beyond the position of the old-fashioned High Anglican. In various points of ritual the accused of this party were condemned: it is easier to deal with tangible matters like church ceremonies than with doctrines. In regard, however, to that which men like Bishop Ryle consider the very heart of the controversy, the Eucharistic teaching of the school, Mr. Bennett, perhaps the most advanced man of the party, was acquitted.

And yet, in the face of these historical facts, there are people clamouring for new definitions and restrictions. It is indeed very difficult, as we have already pointed out, to make any such definitions of the subtle matters of dispute which are continually emerging in the history of the Church, as will put an end to controversy; and perhaps it is better that they should be left to settle themselves. In fact, even as regards the weightier matters of the law, they generally have settled themselves. Students of Church history who have only grazed the surface of the question are under the impression that the controversy of the Person of Christ was settled by the Council of Nicæa. It would be nearer to the truth to say that it was distinctly opened by that Council. Doubtless the Creed of Nicæa is one of the most precious of ecclesiastical documents, but it was the heroism of Athanasius, and, as orthodox persons believe, the power of truth, which, after many a conflict, gave it a lasting authority as embodying the faith of the Church.

"He that believeth will not make haste." We believe that our ecclesiastical and episcopal assemblies may often give us useful guidance, especially in practical matters. With regard to questions of controversy, it is, perhaps, better to have them settled by the ordinary courts of the Church, and by the common sense of the people. As we now dismiss the subject of the Lambeth Conference, we are glad to express our belief that the Bishops have done wisely and well, both in what they have said and in what they have left unsaid.

THE REMUNERATION OF LABOUR.

In a former article attention was drawn to the fact, that the very nature of the contract between labourer and employer makes them essentially co-partners, contributing each a share towards the production of a joint result. The inference was accordingly drawn, that in the remuneration of labour there can be no adequate fulfilment of the claims of justice, until there is a full recognition of this co-partnership. This inference, however, is merely an abstract principle; and it must be borne in mind, that in practice the main difficulty is, not to find the abstract rules of action, but to apply these to the concrete circumstances in which we happen to be placed. For these circumstances are often so complicated that the acutest mind is baffled in attempting to clear a satisfactory path through their entanglements. This perplexity, we shall now see, becomes peculiarly bewildering amid the vast and complicated enterprises of modern industrial life.

It was not so in earlier stages of industrial development. When the labourer is his own employer,—when he owns all the materials and tools required for his labour,—no difficulty can arise about his remuneration: he contributes all the factors that go to make up the product; the whole of the product, therefore, must go to himself. Even when employer and employee are different persons, the relation may be such as to admit of some simple arrangement, by which substantial justice may be attained in the division of the product between the two parties. In point of fact, the general principle of equity has in numberless instances been adopted for determining the relative proportion between the wages of labourers and the profits of their employers. Since the subject of co-operation has attracted attention, and inquiries have in consequence been started into its history, it has been found that industries of various kinds have, almost from time immemorial, been carried on under some form of this principle. Not to multiply

examples, it is sufficient to point out that the *metayer* system of cultivating land is essentially a case of co-operation. Under all variety in its forms the system implies an agreement between the landowner and the tenant who is the actual cultivator of the soil, that the whole annual produce shall be divided between the two, either share and share alike, or in some other proportion determined by an equitable regard for all the circumstances of the case.

But agreements of this kind imply a comparatively simple relation between the labourer and his employer. It is a very different relation, however, that arises in many of the vast industrial undertakings, like the construction of a railway, a canal, or a large public building. Here the work may require years for its completion, it can yield no return in its incomplete state, and therefore during its progress the labourers must be supported by means derived from the unconsumed fruits of former labour. In such cases evidently the actual product of the labour expended cannot be divided,—certainly, at least, cannot be divided from day to day to meet the demand of the labourers for their daily food. It is difficult to estimate the value of the product at all; it is still more difficult to determine how much of the whole value has been created by the general body of labourers, and the difficulty becomes a practical impossibility when an attempt is made to apportion the total value among the different labourers in any sort of equitable proportion to the labour of each.

These are the difficulties which perplex us more or less in all the larger enterprises of our industrial activity; and it is mainly the pressure of such difficulties, that has led to the continuance of the system of remunerating labourers by the simple device of a fixed wage. The system is especially convenient for legal purposes. Law seeks, as it requires, the most precise definition possible of the terms agreed upon in any contract; and when the wages, for which a labourer contracts to do his work, are a fixed sum, there can be no difficulty in deciding what is the exact remuneration which he is entitled to receive. When the labourer's contract is in this form, law can have no choice but to treat the contract in its lowest aspect as if it were a mere contract of sale, and to decide simply whether the *quid pro quo* has been given and received on both sides.

Law, however, takes necessarily but a limited view of human transactions; it looks at them almost exclusively in their external aspect. It demands therefore the utmost exactness as to the nature of the action to be done in order that it may enforce what is required, and no more. Accordingly, it is a familiar principle, not of religion alone, but of morality also, that the full obligations of human life exceed in their details, and still more in their spirit, the requirements implied in the bare letter of the law; and therefore there has always been a more or less distinct recognition of the fact, that the requirements of a higher morality are not necessarily fulfilled by paying to the labourer merely the exact wages to which he is entitled by law. In truth a large proportion of men, without claiming more than average honesty, do in practice recognise these claims of a more spiritual law, and seek to settle them in a rough and ready sort of way by additional rewards which are familiarised in language by numerous expressions, with varying degrees of elegance, as *tips*, *drinkmoney*, *douceur*, *handset*, *gratuity*, *present*, *bonus*, *honorarium*, etc. These additions to the fixed wages of labour, however unnecessary or even improper at times, are by no means in all cases the result of an irrational custom or of spendthrift extravagance. In many instances, especially where the giver has reason to believe that he has been served with unusual intelligence or fidelity, such gifts are evidently prompted by the conviction that the recipient does not get his full due in the bare wages of his legal contract.

Still it must unfortunately be acknowledged, that the just claim of the labourer to his full share of the wealth which his labour produces has, throughout the whole history of the world, been accorded to him only in the stingiest measure; and the human mind has thus become so accustomed to this state of things, that probably to the vast majority of men it seems to be an irreversible ordinance of nature. Among the well-to-do classes at least there seems to be an assumption of indolent habit, that those who do the hard manual labour of the world should receive but a meagre share of the world's wealth, while there are in every society a favoured few to whom the larger portion of that wealth must fall as a mere matter of course. How does it come about that the toilers of the earth, who, being in the majority, must have might as well as right on their side, should yet continue to labour for the scantiest pittance out of the abundant wealth which they produce? This is a problem, to which I may return at some future time. Meanwhile it is clear that, to remedy the existing state of things, much *may* be done, and *can* for a long time be done only, by noble-minded employers recognising, in all their benevolent efforts, the first claim of their own employees upon any of their superfluous wealth.

J. CLARK MURRAY.

THE chief paper of Japan is published at Yedo, the capital, every morning in the week, except Monday. It consists of eight pages, about twelve inches deep by nine wide. From five to six pages are devoted to news, and from two to three to advertisements. Instead of beginning on the front page, it begins at the right-hand corner of the last column of the last page, and thus it reads backward from our page 8 to our page 1. There are few head-lines in it, and the printing is close and trying to the eyes, hardly any difference being made between the type of the title and of the text. It is printed mostly in Chinese. Their first page is given over to official notices and legal paragraphs. The leading article begins on page 2, and is followed by local and general news. The next items comprise correspondence, telegrams, news from abroad, and so on. It has a daily circulation of 10,000 copies, and is sold at 3½d. a copy. Copies are delivered to subscribers; but though it has no street sale, it may be got at the news-agents.