WILEY

Review

Author(s): David F. Schloss

Review by: David F. Schloss

Source: *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 10, No. 37 (Mar., 1900), pp. 72-73

Published by: Wiley on behalf of the Royal Economic Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2956933>

Accessed: 21-06-2016 12:34 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Wiley, Royal Economic Society are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Economic Journal*

a system of private property and free transfer of property" (330). This description might lead us to conclude that justice is the preserver of property, but it might be turned as in the Republic of Plato into the *reductio ad absurdum* "justice is a thief." J. BONAR

A Dividend to Labour: a Study of Employers' Welfare Institutions. By NICHOLAS PAINE GILMAN. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin, and Company. Sold by Gay and Bird, London. 1899.)

MR. GILMAN, the author of a very lucid and well-arranged treatise on profit-sharing between employers and employed, which appeared in 1889, has now written a book giving a mass of details, some of which possess considerable interest, concerning institutions maintained by employers for the benefit of their workpeople, apart from any plan of dividing profits with employees, and supplying at the same time a certain amount of information serving to bring up to date the account of systems of profit-sharing contained in his earlier volume.

In Mr. Gilman's view, the "Welfare Institutions," to which he refers, "form an intermediate stage between a wages system, under which the workman receives his agreed wages and nothing more, directly or indirectly, and a profit-sharing agreement according to which he would receive, directly and regularly, a certain share of the profits made by the establishment." The examples of employers' benefactions adduced by Mr. Gilman show that their generosity takes very various forms, and includes the establishment of sick, accident, and pension funds, the provision of cheap houses, free baths, contributions to insurance funds, gifts of educational facilities, libraries, recreation halls, &c. The countries dealt with in the book comprise Germany, France, Holland, Belgium, Italy, Hungary, Denmark, and the United Kingdom, as well as the United States.

In his chapter on "British Employers' Institutions" Mr. Gilman gives a description of the benefits provided for their workpeople by Lever Brothers, the soap-makers, Cassell and Co., and Hazell, Watson and Viney, printers and publishers, the *Graphic* and *Daily Graphic* newspapers, the Clarendon Press, Smieton and Sons, jute manufacturers, Cadbury Brothers, the cocoa manufacturers, Tangyes, the Birmingham engineers, several railway companies, and a few other firms. The examples given by Mr. Gilman make no claim to be exhaustive; and in fact the author would not have found it possible to compile a list of British firms, which have founded "Welfare Institutions," giving anything like an adequate idea of the liberality of British employers, because there is an almost complete dearth of published information on this subject. A certain number of somewhat meagre details (many of them probably now out of date) may be found in *Answers to Schedules of Questions issued by the Royal Commission on Labour* (C. 6795, VII., VIII. and IX. of 1892). But, with this

exception, I am not acquainted with any publication which could have been consulted by Mr. Gilman; and if the account of British Employers' Institutions, which he gives, is extremely imperfect, this fact is not due to any fault of his. It is, however, proper to point out that institutions of various kinds maintained by British employers for the benefit of their workpeople are, as any diligent reader of our newspapers will be aware, very numerous. If, as Mr. Gilman says, "in England such institutions seem to be comparatively few," the reason is, that *carere vate sacro*—no one has thought it worth while to write a systematic account of them.

With regard to profit-sharing (as distinguished from other forms of "Dividend to Labour"), it is of interest to note that in the United States systems of this nature appear to have met with very little success. The best practical test of the success of profit-sharing is the number and importance of the firms, which have had a scheme of profit-sharing continuously in force for, say, ten years or upwards—firms, that is, which have given the system a fair trial, and have found the results sufficiently satisfactory to induce them to retain it. Now Mr. Gilman's list of profit-sharing firms in the United States includes no more than nine firms,¹ which are stated to have introduced profit-sharing before 1890, and which he records to have profit-sharing still in operation.

DAVID F. SCHLOSS

Wages in the United Kingdom in the Nineteenth Century. Notes for the Use of Students By ARTHUR L. BOWLEY, (Pp. 1-148, with 5 tables. Cambridge University Press. 6s. net.)

IN the present volume we have a further contribution to the complete history of wages in the nineteenth century. The groundwork of the book formed the Newmarch Lectures for 1898; but the material has since been so revised and expanded, that, for ordinary purposes, enough is given to provide a fairly complete view of the course of money wages in certain industries, from the time of Eden and Young to the present date. The author, however, regards this as only a preliminary contribution, and his work in this field will not be complete until he has finished his great scheme of a wage index-number throughout the century, and of which, so far, only those for agriculture and compositors have been published, in the *Statistical Journal*.

¹ Including one firm (Porter), with a scheme of which the nature is not stated, but excluding the Riverside Press, because the share in profits given to the employees is not "*fixed in advance*" (as is expressly required by the definition of profit-sharing adopted by the Profit-sharing Congress at Paris in 1889 and confirmed by the International Co-operative Congress at Delft in 1897); Rand, McNally and Co, because the share in profits is received by the employees simply as the holders of *shares* which they have purchased; and Rumford Chemical Works, because the employees merely receive extra *wages* for length of service ("without regard to the profits actually earned;" Gilman's *Profit-sharing*, p. 328).