WILEY

Review

Author(s): G. P. Macdonell

Review by: G. P. Macdonell

Source: *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 4, No. 15 (Sep., 1894), pp. 501-503

Published by: Wiley on behalf of the Royal Economic Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2955736>

Accessed: 26-06-2016 13:58 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*

who will not know, without more of a hint than the author gives them, what is the signification of 'demarcation differences' (p. 108).

The subject of industrial conciliation and arbitration involves the consideration of many difficult questions of an economic nature, and with these it can scarcely be said that the work under review deals in an entirely adequate manner. Take, for example, the statement, which Mr. Jeans makes in refutation of the complaint that the regulation of wages by a sliding scale tends to promote cut-throat competition and the consequent undue lowering of wages, that 'it is always the interest of the employer to obtain the very best price that the circumstances will allow.' Certainly, it is not always to the interest of a body of coal-owners to obtain the very best price per ton that the circumstances will allow; for it may suit them better to sell a large quantity at a low price rather than a smaller quantity at a higher price per ton. Again, is it not somewhat misleading to assert that according to 'the elements of political economy' 'no amount of resistance can keep up either prices or wages in a falling market'? But for the subtle reasonings of economic science Mr. Jeans has, in fact, but little respect; he evidently regards with considerable contempt 'abstract political economy, with all its glib and plausible theories,' and has, apparently, a special mistrust of our old friend, the law of supply and demand. 'The so-called law of supply and demand,' says Mr. Jeans, 'does not provide for a steady demand at all times alike'; as who should warn us that the 'so-called' law of gravitation cannot be relied upon to keep up the weight of the four-penny loaf at all times alike.

DAVID F. SCHLOSS.

Back to the Land. By HAROLD E. MOORE. (Methuen, 1893.)

THE title of Mr. Moore's book suggests the platform, a programme, and votes. The book itself is far away from these disturbing influences, and yet it recognises the real and grave troubles which stimulate agitation. It is the work of a practical agriculturist. But, unlike most practical agriculturists, Mr. Moore is not content with demonstrating the impracticability of the schemes of the land reformers. It is pleasant as it is rare to find anything written about land with knowledge of the subject, and at the same time with a perception that the land question involves other matters than the rise of rates and the fall of wheat. The agricultural labourer has a hard, dreary, and hopeless life. Will an allotment better his condition? In the towns there are great numbers with no regular employment, badly housed and badly fed. Can a useful and profitable life be found for them on the land? Mr. Moore has not very much that is new to say about allotments. Where they have succeeded, they have not been larger in area than the labourer with his family can cultivate in spare hours; their

produce has been for home consumption or easily marketable ; the allotment has been near the labourer's home ; and it has been worked with unremitting industry. On this last point an estimate of Mr. Moore's is interesting : " It may be considered that every acre of land, if fully worked, will require 320 hours of labour in the course of the year, in addition to the assistance of the family for lighter work." The returns from a quarter of an acre allotment growing produce for home consumption are estimated at from £3 to £4. Putting the two estimates together, we get a confirmation of Mr. Thorold Rogers's statement that a day's work by a labourer on his own land is worth about 10s. to him for the maintenance of his family.

Mr. Moore deals in greater detail with the case of small holdings, on which the tenant is wholly dependent. Under ordinary conditions he considers less than six acres insufficient for the purpose ; the work will be hard and more anxious than that of an agricultural labourer ; it is skilled work, and an untrained man is out of place ; there must be a readiness to turn to indoor industries during the many idle weeks of the year ; and, to start with, a capital of £80 or thereabouts is necessary. This, moreover, is the case of a tenant whose landlord has erected the buildings. If he means to be owner his case is harder, and Mr. Moore is evidently right in doubting whether the Small Holdings Act of 1892 will greatly increase the number of peasant proprietors. No one, he thinks, could properly avail himself of the Act if he possessed less than £200. It is not along this way that the unemployed, having neither skill nor capital, will get " back to the land." The want of capital, indeed, is not the chief difficulty, for, if it were shown how large numbers of men could find profitable employment on the land, the preliminary capital would soon be found. How shall they acquire the necessary skill ? It is skill of a very high order that is necessary, and mere schemes for turning loose on vacant land the failures of towns are useless and mischievous.

Mr. Moore faces the question with full appreciation of this consideration, but without believing that it is fatal. It is possible, he thinks, to organise training farms which shall be self-supporting. The qualifications for admission are to be inability to get other employment, and willingness to give labour in any capacity upon the farm in exchange for food and lodging. After a few months' trial the unfit will have to leave. For the others the scheme comprises a home settlement divided into small farms of five or seven acres and subject to general supervision, and also the establishment of colonial settlements. At home or abroad the man who after being carefully tested has proved himself capable of agricultural work will be provided with the means of obtaining an independent living. Methods of co-operative agriculture and profit-sharing are also discussed, but not very hopefully. Mr. Moore has worked out his scheme after careful study of such experiments as the German and Dutch labour colonies and the

Hadleigh Farm Colony of the Salvation Army, and claims that it is financially sound and otherwise feasible. In favourable conditions it may be so. The small farmer, being less dependent on fluctuating markets than the large farmer, has a great advantage. But, as Mr. Moore insists, he must be a capable man, and must be prepared for a life of incessant labour. That there are men of this stamp now vainly seeking for regular employment is not to be denied, and by some such plan as Mr. Moore's they may be usefully settled on the land. Do they not, however, form a small fraction of the unemployed? For the case of the others, the physically and morally weak, the scheme gives no remedy; for them the hard life of the peasant farmer is impossible. There is no reason, then, for thinking that the mass of the unemployed would be sensibly diminished. Nevertheless, Mr. Moore's scheme might save many useful lives, and one would gladly see a trial of an experiment which has several novel and interesting features. His little book is full of practical information on the whole subject. It will be found of special interest if it is read after a study of the admirable account of foreign labour colonies by Professor Mavor contained in the Board of Trade report on agencies and methods for dealing with the unemployed.

G. P. MACDONELL

Profit-sharing and the Labour Question. By T. M. BUSHELL.
With an Introduction by Sedley Taylor. (London: Methuen
and Co., 1893.)

THE serious, kindly and public-spirited temper which pervades this little book must recommend it and its author to public esteem. At the same time it is a somewhat trying book to the reviewer, because it ranges with extreme rapidity over a great number of topics and includes a great variety of extracts from well-known speakers and writers upon social questions. It falls into three parts. The first, and to our mind the most valuable, describes the system of profit-sharing adopted in the writer's firm and its effects on the welfare of employer and employed. The second part treats of profit-sharing generally. It is interesting, but it is scanty. Mr. Bushell accepts Mr. Schloss's definition of profit-sharing as an 'arrangement under which an employer agrees with his employees that they shall receive in partial remuneration of their labour, and in addition to their ordinary wages, a share fixed beforehand in the profits of the business (p. 113).' Profit-sharing is therefore distinct from 'gain-sharing' defined by Mr. Bushell as 'an arrangement under which a fixed or minimum wage is supplemented by a premium proportionate to the efficiency of the workman, so far as this exceeds a specified standard (p. 135).' Still more does profit-sharing differ from industrial partnership with which it is sometimes confounded. For industrial partnership implies what is not implied in profit-sharing, that the