

THE
CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN.

No. VI.—JUNE, 1879.

PROGRESS IN THEOLOGY—BUTLER OR
MACAULAY?

BISHOP BUTLER, in his great work, writes as follows:—"As it is owned the whole scheme of Scripture is not yet understood, so, if it ever comes to be understood before the restitution of all things, and without miraculous interpositions, it must be in the same way as natural knowledge is come at. . . . Nor is it at all incredible that a book which has been so long in the possession of mankind should contain many truths as yet undiscovered. For all the same phenomena and the same faculties of investigation from which such great discoveries in natural knowledge have been made in the present and last age, were equally in the possession of mankind several thousand years before." The field of Scripture is here likened to the field of nature, and it is suggested that discoveries remain to be made in the former, similar in importance to those which are being made in the latter. In the context of the passage quoted, Butler distinguishes between "practical Christianity, or that faith and behaviour which renders a man a Christian," and "the study of those things which the apostle calls 'going on unto perfection,' and of the prophetic parts of Scripture;" and he wishes us to understand that it is upon the province more remotely connected with faith and practice that the knowledge which we may expect thus to increase will shed its light. This great and sagacious thinker is careful not to assert that the truths which he supposes may still lie concealed in Scripture, will, in the present state, be certainly brought to light; for he expressly says, "if the whole scheme of Scripture ever comes to be understood before the restitution of all things." Still, the words of Butler might well be cited in favour of the view that important discoveries in theology yet remain to be made—discoveries such as may prove of essential value in removing objections to the scheme of revelation. Theology, according to this

Science brings us face to face with them, but they are outside its jurisdiction, and when the scientist ventures to speculate regarding them, he may not claim to be guided by scientific lights: he speaks as an ordinary man. These mysteries are no part of the subject-matter of science; but, in theology, we have seen how entirely it is otherwise. Eliminate the mysteries, stop when you reach the mysteries,—and you shall have a meagre theology and an unscriptural. We insist, therefore, that another important difference has been indicated between theological and other scientific inquiry.

This paper is already too long, and we have no room left to show how the *history of dogma* lends confirmation to the view which distinguishes between natural science and theology as to the possibility of development; and, at the same time, helps us to estimate the kind and degree of progress of which theological science admits.

WILLIAM CAVEN.

THE PROBLEM OF THE LABOURING CLASSES.

I.—IN THE UNITED STATES.*

THE compact volume of Dr. Hitchcock, on Socialism,† in a quick succession of arrowy sentences, casts much important light upon many theoretical and practical aspects of a subject which needs all possible elucidation from every quarter. It is a good sign when men of this grade give serious attention to such subjects, and favour the public with the ripe results of their studies. The Answer‡ to it has value, not so much for any positive light it gives us, as for the revelations it makes of the forms which socialistic errors are assuming, and the schemes proposed to give them a practical realisation. The author avows himself a property-holder, and a defender of the right of property to the protection of society, in moderate amounts, if honestly acquired. So far it is a confirmation of Dr. Hitchcock's remarks, that outright, bold communism cannot make headway in the United States, in the face of its vast body of land and property holders. It denounces those "who advocate an equal distribution of property" as "only the fanatical few." It asserts "that large estates cannot be accumulated quickly and honestly, and it is quite obvious that most, perhaps all, large estates are not honestly obtained. As it is impracticable to return such estates into the hands of those from whom they were unjustly obtained, we would

* [This article will be followed up by others, by different writers, on the same subject in Germany, Britain, &c.—EDITOR.]

† Socialism. By Roswell D. Hitchcock, D.D. New York: Randolph & Co. 1877.

‡ A Reply to Roswell D. Hitchcock, D.D., on Socialism. By a Socialist. New York: Charles P. Sowerby.

have them, above a certain maximum sum, made over to the State for the benefit of the poor. Hence we would fix by statute an amount above which no individual should be permitted to hold property. . . . There would be no injustice in this, in the great majority of cases, since vast wealth is usually dishonestly obtained. . . . As most men would desire the privilege of securing a moderate competency, there would be little danger of this maximum sum ever being fixed below that which would ensure all the happiness that property is capable of affording us" (pp. 45, 46).

That the accumulation of some large as well as small estates has been tainted with fraud, is quite as undeniable as that much of the labour out of which property originally grows has in it the taint of eye-service. But, that the simple possession of great estates, however quickly acquired, is *prima facie* evidence that they are the spoils of fraud or robbery, is a charge demonstrably false, and simply atrocious. This is easily proved. There is, however, no need of it, even if we had the space. But it would be difficult to invent or propagate a doctrine more inflammatory, or more likely to scatter "firebrands, arrows, and death." On this basis, the author of the Reply proposes that the State should confiscate all of such estates exceeding a moderate amount, and distribute them, or the income and profits of them, to the poor. Several reasons show the fatuity of this plan. First, the amount of a competency in different situations of life is so variable. Different persons differ so much in the numbers dependent upon them, and the expenses which befit their station. The cost of a merely comfortable home in some of our cities would make a generous estate among scattered farmers in a rural town. Then, if such a communistic law existed, it would encounter evasions nameless and numberless, in the concealment and sequestration of property, or in its division, as to nominal title, among numerous owners; or it would be defeated by the spendthrift, by waste, or by refusal to accumulate property of which there could be no ownership, disposal, or enjoyment. This would cause the loss of large capital otherwise accumulated, and seeking and rewarding labour to utilise it. The result would be that this supposed surplus property would cease to exist for the purposes of spoliation by the State in order to distribution among the poor. Whereas, without any such maximum standard, under proper Christian and philanthropic guidance, large portions of these great estates would go for the relief of poverty and suffering, for the propagation of the Gospel, for the establishment and endowment of great institutions of religion, education, and charity, in whose benefits the poor often share most largely. The scheme of "Socialist" is thus simply suicidal, if not worse. It is proper to add, that "Socialist" exhibits a very bitter animus towards the living Christianity both of the present and the past. The only feasible scheme for depleting large estates by law, in the interest of equalising property, he has not touched. Taxation has reached a height in most countries which already forms an extremely

heavy, and if much increased must become a crushing incubus upon production and the rewards of labour as well. But there is a single form of tax—that upon incomes—which, rightly graduated, might check the immense accumulations of great estates without burdening or crushing production. There are serious evils attendant upon such a tax, and we are by no means as yet prepared to sanction it. We only advert to it as the most practicable method by which the State can abate the evil of which “Socialist” complains; but it is one which he entirely ignores.

We cannot, however, dwell longer on visionary schemes for increasing the resources of the labouring classes. We must hasten to real and practicable methods of amelioration. It will, of course, be understood that the following suggestions have for the most part a primary reference to the United States.

It is our business to show what are genuine and what are spurious plans for relieving the inequalities of property among men, and improving the straitened condition of the labouring classes, or of the poor who are without strength to labour.

We have no time to enter on some general considerations that bear on our subject—such as the increased comfort available for the working classes now, as compared with former times; or the changes wrought by steam, cheapening products on the one hand, but concentrating the working classes in great masses, exposing them to the evils of crowded and unwholesome dwellings, and rendering them liable, when a glut comes in the market, to be thrown hopelessly out of employment.

We assume the fundamental importance of moral and Christian training, and the sway of Christian love in harmonising the conflicts and smoothing the difficulties between employers and employees. We insist upon this, notwithstanding the bitter sneers of “Socialist” at Christianity and the Church. In the light of Christianity we all are brethren, members one of another, so that, in due form and measure, the prosperity of each is the prosperity of all, and that of all of each. So all have a care one of another, because if one suffers, all suffer, and if one rejoices, all rejoice.

I.

In seeking the economic improvement of the labouring classes, the trouble arises from the vast estates of a few confronting the poverty of the multitudes of toilers. A great middle class of small or moderate property-holders is the remedy. To this end, laws which permanently prevent the breaking up of vast land tenures, and the large increase of landholders, need to be abolished. The specialities of British pauperism, as set forth by her greatest statesmen and philanthropists, we shall be unable to touch. We have seen no better methods of treating pauperism, as we understand it, than those indicated by Thomas Chalmers—*clarum et venerabile nomen*.

The first and great effort should be to turn the largest number of labourers possible into capitalists, not by any communistic distribution

of the wealth already accumulated, but by the invention and promotion of methods to induce them to accumulate. Then, whatever else they may be, they will be anti-communists. These accumulations will, in the first instance, mostly be invested in homes, or otherwise for the household, thus intertwining with themselves the purest and strongest affections of nature ; all the more so, if they are ennobled and purified by grace. Every instinct of nature will then rise up against communistic and socialistic raids upon private property.

But how can this be done? In various ways—(1.) There is the simple process in which all accumulations have had their beginning,—of spending less than is earned. Let the surplus be never so little, it is one talent which, if well put to use, will soon increase. This process is evermore going onward with multitudes of people. It has been the original germ of most of the estates now in being, and has worked out its results without any special organisations or associations to promote it. Suppose now that, under the stimulus of ordinary motives, a labourer has acquired one or more hundreds of dollars—how shall he invest it? There can be no safer way than in a home, or the beginnings of a home, or in a Government bond, as now minimised in the United States so as to take up the smallest savings ; or a savings bank, founded substantially on Government bonds ; or other equivalent, unquestionable, accumulating security. The number of savings banks, however, that have failed of late points to the necessity of efficient Governmental supervision for the protection of depositors.

Another mode of investment is in the stocks of the manufactory or other business in which the labourer is employed, if its regulations admit of it. This has the advantage of identifying his interest with that of his employers, but along with this the disadvantage of subjecting his savings to the risks of the business—a very serious disadvantage in the light of recent economic history—so serious as to make its expediency more than doubtful, except in rare cases.

(2.) We pass on to notice methods of co-operation among the working classes, by which self-help in saving may be stimulated by organised mutual helpfulness. The principal kinds are co-operative building and loan associations, stores, banks, and manufacturing companies. Of these, the foremost are building and loan associations, in which those who, having nothing but earnings and small savings, may become shareholders by paying a regular contribution in sums that are practicable to the prudent labourer. Each share, for instance, is expected by the accumulations of constantly added principal, compound interest, and a bonus paid for loans, to amount to \$200 in a few years. Five shares will thus become worth \$1000 in a short period, sufficient, when lots and buildings are cheap, to erect a small but comfortable dwelling. This, or some larger sum, is borrowed, in anticipation, of the association by members wishing to build, upon a mortgage of the property, which is soon lightened by the accumulation of the shares in the association held

by the mortgager and owner of the property. The typical instance of the successful working of such institutions is in the city of Philadelphia, the largest hive, we believe, of manufacturing industry on the American continent. Thousands upon thousands of houses have come to be owned by operatives through this means, which have elevated the labouring population quite above the average of other cities, where they are too often rotting physically, mentally, and morally in slums fitted only for the communistic herding of brutes, or for breeding communistic riot and devastation.

Next come co-operative stores, of which those of the Rochdale Association in England furnish the typical, because by far the most successful, example. Beginning with a few weavers who combined their means in shares to form a co-operative store which should deal only in pure goods obtained from first hands at best cash prices, selling only for cash, avoiding all losses from bad debts, they divide a fair interest on their capital. They then divide, *pro rata*, to all their customers the surplus profits in proportion to the amount of their purchases, allowing all to become shareholders on payment of the amount for each share represented by itself, whether this be derived from the profits upon their purchases or from other sources.

Another mode is that of co-operative banking, in which a vast aggregate of shares, contributed from the savings of labourers, acquires the credit, and divides the profit of a vast amount of capital. This gives financial position to the owners as a class, while the bank is always ready to aid them with needed loans upon adequate security. We should fear the dangers of unwise or fraudulent management, judging from our experience in this country, and should hesitate, until such contingencies were duly provided for, to recommend our poorer classes to make such a disposition of their earnings. But we refer to it, as in Germany the great co-operative bank organised by Delitzsch on something like the foregoing plan, is reported to be a pre-eminent success, its operations reaching to hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

Co-operative manufacturing, in which the labourers, by combining small capitals, become capitalists and masters, as well as workers in production, are desirable on every account, whenever they can be arranged on a basis which secures trustworthy and competent management, along with efficient production. Instances are by no means rare of successful manufacturing corporations in which the operatives are owners either in part or wholly.

II.

We must now proceed to notice some hindrances to the prosperity of labourers which require to be removed, in order to the greatest possible improvement of their condition.

First come obstacles created by the perversion of the co-operative principle, obstructing efficiency in production. We refer especially to the manacles forged by labourers for themselves, by trades unions and strikes

not directed in proper ways. There is a legitimate sphere for trades unions beyond the forms of co-operation already alluded to—that of mutual improvement and helpfulness, including also, where the modes of individual and co-operative saving already pointed out are not available, the contribution or deposit by the members of the whole or a portion of their savings to form a guaranty fund to secure needful aid in case of sickness, disability, or death; thus combining substantially the benefits of savings banks and life insurance. So far as these unions are benevolent institutions for such purposes, we unqualifiedly bid them God-speed.

But there is a more prominent function by which they have been largely signalised—involving interference with the liberty of employers and employed, in hiring and working for whomsoever, and upon whatever terms they please; prohibiting variations in the wages of those employed in proportion to the amount or quality of the work done, thus destroying the strongest stimulus to superior skill and efficiency in the labour; and, in order the more effectually to do this, forbidding piecework; and also preventing the free employment of apprentices, in order to lessen the number of skilled workmen, and fortify and aggravate their monopoly. This turns unemployed youths into vagrants, tramps,* criminals, and paupers; while it vastly increases the wants of unskilled labourers, whose own wages are thus lessened by their increasing numbers and competition, while they are obliged, out of these reduced wages, to pay exorbitant prices for the articles made by the monopolists. The combination thus arising is that of a few labourers, not against capital so much as against employers, and not against employers so much as against the great mass of labourers, thus tending to degrade and impoverish them.

Now, we have nothing to say against the liberty of all to work or cease to work when they please, provided always that they violate no contract, express or implied, interfere with no one's liberty, and do not become a charge upon the public; all which, we make bold to say, ought to be prevented, if need be, by the strong arm of law, as a defence to the rest of society. So, also, all arbitrary rules which compel employers to hire hands not needed—for instance, tenders to masons whose work does not require them; or to buy dearer articles in preference to cheaper, as, for instance, to buy bricks made in a given place at a dearer rate than those manufactured in another place can be purchased.†

The success of these objectionable features of trades unions de-

* "Fifty years ago there were no tramps, but there were plenty of apprentices. Then everybody could learn a trade. Now boys are shut out from all trades by the arbitrary laws of trades unions. Manufacturers dare not employ any boys, and the beneficent, time-honoured apprentice system is entirely abolished. Boys without trades grow up without education, and become idle members of society, living upon their relatives while times are good, and when they cannot keep them longer, the youngsters are turned loose upon society perfect outlaws."—ANON.

† See "Wages Question," by Francis A. Wallser, pp. 406-8.

pends, in the long run, upon the success of strikes, and that generally involves some lawlessness and violence to ensure such success. For strikes can seldom be successful without some sort of violence or terrorism to prevent other workers from taking the places of the strikers. Against all such invasion of his liberty to work, every man should be protected, if need be, by the exercise of the extreme power of the State.

But there are some kinds of strikes which are so carried on as not to be mere combinations against employers. They are conspiracies against the welfare, safety, nay, if successfully persisted in, the very life of society. Of this sort are all strikes of railway operatives which are so conducted as to disable railways from running. If no contract is violated, railway proprietors and their employees should be protected in the liberty to continue or discontinue their relations to each other upon fair notice given. If all, or a given class of the employees of any railway, without violation of contract, choose to stop work upon it, upon such brief notice as will not disable the company, by leaving no time to procure substitutes, they should not be hindered or molested in so doing. But, if they agree to strike by stopping and deserting all trains on a given road at a given minute, no matter where they are, this is not merely a retaliation upon their employers, but a conspiracy against the peace and safety of society. It has occurred more than once. The laws of more than one State define such a procedure as conspiracy, and justly subject it to the penalties due to conspiracy against society. The most terrible instance of this kind occurred in the great railroad strike of the summer of 1877, extending over a considerable east-to-west belt of the United States, and culminating in the famous or infamous Pittsburgh riot on the Pennsylvania Railroad, in which an immense body of strikers and tramps, with recruits from all the "dangerous classes," held high carnival. They destroyed millions of property, turned that city on a beautiful Sabbath into a pandemonium of arson and bloodshed, more emblematic of the lake of fire than of the heavenly rest. This was not all. Railway transportation and travel were interrupted for weeks; mails were detained; people were disabled from fulfilling engagements and doing business dependent on quick travel. Vast quantities of merchandise, stopped in its progress, suffered ruin, when of a perishable nature; or, if not, seriously lost in value from not reaching its destination in due season for its proper use. Even the Government was hindered from transporting troops over these roads to keep the peace and suppress the insurrection. For a week or two there was a reign of terror. Now, we have no hesitation in saying that strikes upon railways which disable their owners from working them, are combinations not only against those owners, but against the very life of society. Railways have so much taken the place of waggon-roads and navigable streams, that to impede their operation by lawless methods is very much like barricading the common roads and water-courses of a country by mobs, or putting towns and cities in a state of siege. We do not hesitate to say that strikers of this

sort are strikers at the very life of the body politic, stopping the circulation of its life-blood. The quarrel with the owners of the railway is merely incidental. Strikes of this nature ought, on no pretext, and in no circumstances, to be tolerated, if there is power enough in society to suppress them. And no secret junto empowered to order them ought to be tolerated.

The same principle applies with needful limitations to the stoppage of the coal supply, whether by combinations of the owners, or of workers of mines to force up prices to abnormal rates.

In general it is evident, *a priori* and *a posteriori*, that all strikes to force up the wages on a falling labour market must fail. They issue in loss to the labourer and benefit to the employer, by enabling him to get rid of accumulated unsold stock ; of this the last five years abound in memorable examples. On a rising labour market they accomplish, often at an immense loss to all parties, what the competition of employers must certainly bring about in due time, if it be profitable to employ labour at the higher rates. It is not denied that, in some instances, strikes have availed to advance prices sooner than free competition would have done. But we doubt whether the cost has not exceeded the benefit in all but the most exceptional cases. The laws of trade and industry, left to the operation of free competition among intelligent men, will execute themselves in the end in spite of all abnormal obstacles put in their way.

Much has been said and printed of arbitration as a remedy or preventive of strikes and other forms of trades-union interference and dictation. We welcome these or any other rational expedients for softening or averting such conflicts. We do not doubt that arbitration may often be useful and sometimes effectual. Nevertheless, we do not see how the conclusions of any such tribunal can be, or of necessity ought to be conclusive. By what right can they compel employers to pay wages for labour which makes their business a losing one ? And of this who is to be the judge but the employer himself ? Or on what principle can they compel labourers to work at rates which they deem oppressive ?

One thing is certain, no combination of employers or employees can permanently raise wages higher than is consistent with a fair profit to the capitalist who employs labour, or make them lower than is necessary to the due sustenance of the labourer for the skilful and effective prosecution of his work. It is evident that in the United States and Great Britain the extreme limits of practicable wages have been reached for the present, because the cost of production is already such that the markets which they have hitherto controlled are in danger of being lost without such a lowering of prices as will render continued production unprofitable. Such difficulties now assail or threaten many branches of British and American production, and originate some of the hardest economic problems of the day. No strikes or trades unions can permanently force the price of labour above the rate at which it can be profitably employed.

Closely connected with this, as related to the labourer's welfare, is the

cultivation by him of all those qualities, physical, intellectual, and moral, which increase his efficiency and his ability to command employment at the best rates of compensation. Let him cultivate energy, skill, pre-eminent fidelity. The field is yet open with flattering prospects for all such. Whatever the over-crowding, there is always "room at the top." The loss primarily to employers, and indirectly to labourers, from "eye-service," is immense. Let none attend trades unions, or other organisations that so bind them hand and foot, that they cannot gain the normal advantage of any superiority they may possess or acquire. And this suggests the immense importance of general education in increasing the skill and the earnings of labourers.

III.

This, too, casts some light upon the vexed question of cheap labour. Labour is dear or cheap in proportion, not to the price paid for the time occupied, but for the services rendered. And it will surprise one who reads Mr. Thomas Brassey's book on "Work and Wages" to see how he proves, in his chapter on "Cost of Labour," that in countries where the lowest wages prevail, the cost of production is greater than in those where wages rule highest, on account of the greater inefficiency of the labourer. His father, in constructing railways all over the globe, found the cost of construction marvellously equal, notwithstanding prodigious differences in day-wages in different countries. He often found it advantageous to transport English labourers to the Continent and to India, at double, triple, and quadruple the wages of native workmen, on account of their superior energy and skill. This did not, indeed, extend to all varieties of service. But it was true on the whole. In the long-run, equal products of labour, efficient and inefficient, will tend to exchange for each other; and while, in reference to special conditions and circumstances, certain kinds of labour may be for the time relatively low or high, yet, under the law of free competition, all labour, *measured by its products*, will tend to become equally cheap or equally dear. The Chinese, with their immobility and imitativeness, may compete with us in narrow spheres; but this is only in lines which do not impede, but rather clear the way for the intelligent, flexible, and elastic work of the Anglo-Saxon. Here we notice the scheme for preventing cheapness of labour, by preventing those who, without crime, choose to work at the best rates they can get, even if these are below the average market rate; or by preventing prisoners from being compelled by the State to work in order to defray the cost of their support, so that, instead of allowing them to rot in idleness, it constrains them to form habits fitting them to resume their place as reformed citizens. The war against the labour of the State-prison convicts because their fabrics may enter into competition with those of other labourers in any given department is simply insane. No other possible interpretation of it would be so creditable. It is a disgrace, alike to the mechanics that insist upon it, and the politicians

who pander to them. The same is true of the attempt to prevent immigration to the United States of foreigners, who, in some departments, will labour for less wages than others already in possession, many of whom were themselves immigrants who, in their turn, began working at less rates than those on the ground before them. It is by this means that the United States have been developed and enriched, so that all prudent classes are able to live now far better than they could half-a-century ago. The very house servants in the United States get three times what they could have got then. They are mostly foreigners. Their wages keep up while those of all others have declined.

It is difficult, on economic principles, to discriminate between the effects of cheap labour, labour-saving machinery, and unusually bountiful harvests, in increasing the public wealth. All alike contribute to it, and contribute to the abundance produced for distribution among all classes, and for their increased comfort, including the labourer with his average amount of effort. To be sure, it is inevitable that, whether improved machinery, or exuberant crops, or cheaply-working labourers in any department, produce this increased abundance, some of the existing classes of labourers who are thus superseded may suffer temporary inconvenience and jostling, in their present spheres of employment. But, on the whole, the effect is that the classes crowded *out* by this cheaper labour are crowded *up* to the higher planes of more intelligent and better paid labour. The drudgery is very largely taken off their shoulders by those who thus underbid them. The United States have certainly reached their present wealth through the incoming of labourers from all parts of the world to aid in their development; and these, at the same time, have bettered their own condition. These cheap labourers have dug the roads and drains, and cleared the forests, to smooth the way for the less drudging and more productive labour of others. We apprehend that the effect of increasing the number of labourers in any country, or section of country, other things being equal, turns entirely on this—whether the undeveloped resources of that country are such as to admit of employing that increase with advantage to themselves and enlargement of the general wealth of society, in an average equitable distribution amongst its members? The answer to this question is, in new and undeveloped countries, Yes; in old and fully or over-populated, No. The importation of vice, irreligion, and corruption, is always an unmitigated evil, whether in the persons of labourers or others. But the importation of those who thrive on small gains, willingly accepted for large services, can only enrich countries still undeveloped, and all classes may be benefited by it.

We have no time to dwell on the improvement in the condition of the working classes which would be produced by discontinuing the use of intoxicating liquors, on which such a vast amount of their earnings is spent. We will simply add that the surest way out of present difficulties is for each one to go to work at what, on the whole, will yield him the best compensation employers can afford to pay him. Thus, if all are

employed in productive labour, the largest product will be made for the common enjoyment of all. If all commodities are produced at low rates for labour, and at the present low rates of compensation to capital, they themselves will be as cheap as the labour and capital which produce them. This may seem paradoxical to some, demonstrable as it is; and not only so, but at these rates their fabrics will be capable of competing successfully, like our agricultural products, in the markets of the world, and so of being, in some good degree, above the capricious fluctuations of markets in our own or any other single country.

Just here comes to view what we can barely suggest, as the only practicable solution of the most formidable economic paradox of this and most other periods of protracted financial disorder—viz., over-production in the face of appalling destitution. How is this seeming paradox to be explained and corrected? How is over-production possible in the face of abounding poverty and destitution, or, indeed, at all? For how can mankind ever have such material abundance that they do not crave more; nay, as a whole, might not advantageously have more? The difficulty lies not in any absolute over-production, but in misproportioned production, involving excess in some departments with deficiency in others; so that a surplus of articles in one department fails to find a sufficiency of articles in other departments ready to be exchanged for them.

What, then, is the remedy? Purely and simply this: let capital and labour both turn to the occupations and places which offer employment for each at the best rates. This may require time and entail inconvenience. But it is the only sure remedy in the end, always tending as it does to completeness just in proportion as all artificial inducements of monopoly-profits which lead to the temporary overcrowding of particular industries are withdrawn, and the fullest scope given to the operation of free and intelligent competition of well-trained and educated men in determining the sphere and uses of labour and capital. This and this alone is what, with the least friction, will put right all maladjustments of labour and capital, and issue in the most plentiful universal production for the largest enjoyment of all.

We cannot sum up our views better than in the words of the Hon. Abram S. Hewitt, in a recent lecture:—

“Inequality in the condition of men must exist. There must be capital on the one side to give employment to labour on the other. There are four distinct classes—first, the very rich; second, the great middle class; third, the industrious working classes; and fourth, the paupers. If the first and the fourth should cease to exist, the community would not have cause to shed tears. The problem is to get rid of these two classes. This cannot be done by legislation, but will be brought about by the action of causes now in operation, by which the possessions of the very rich will be distributed among the very poor. The conflict now existing will slowly but surely effect this transfer without revolution by the gradual growth of a better understanding between the employer and the employed. In Great Britain the legislation has been reformed with a view to admit of the joint ownership of employer with the employed; and this system adopted here will be productive of good results. This division of ownership must not spring from

charity, but from mutual interest. Abstinence on the part of the labourer will materially aid in producing this result. The money expended by him for tobacco and liquor and other indulgences would, in a single year, go very far toward the creation of a fund with which he might secure an interest in his employer's business."

LYMAN H. ATWATER.

THE RIGHTFUL PLACE OF FOREIGN MISSIONS.

[We insert this paper with sincere pleasure, as a layman's earnest pleading for an object of supreme importance, for attaining which it is necessary that the Churches should in some way be *shaken* into more earnestness. We do not concur in all his views of how this may best be done; but the subject needs to be placed in all lights, for there is no duty laid on the Church less earnestly performed than that of "preaching the Gospel to every creature."—Ed.]

THE first number of *The Catholic Presbyterian*, in finding a place for Dr. Livingstone's refreshing paper on "Missionary Sacrifices," and Mr. Fleming Stevenson's thoughtful and suggestive references to his "Mission Tour round the World," presented attractive features to all the friends of foreign missions. The subject of missions is worthy to be reproduced in each successive number, in one or other of its multiform aspects. Might not foreign missionaries be induced to become contributors, and thus help to keep alive the interest which is but too apt to flag when the enterprise is distant, and the labourers out of sight? Suffer one who is neither a missionary nor the visitant of mission scenes to offer some remarks on a subject which he feels is too high for him, but which (as he is deeply impressed) needs to be thoroughly ventilated; perhaps abler minds, when weighing the claims of the heathen world, will be led to present these claims in a worthy manner in the future pages of this magazine. In other ecclesiastical and theological Reviews there has but too frequently prevailed an ominous silence on this wide-reaching topic. Has not this been too much the case in Presbyterian circles; and is such silence significant of the state of opinion and feeling pervading the Churches in our connexion, or is it only an indication that the leading minds are absorbed with questions which appear to them of greater urgency than the solution of the problem of preaching the Gospel to every creature? Or may we not console ourselves, people and leaders alike, with the reflection that in this matter we are no worse, if no better, than our neighbours in other denominations; for do not they and we with singular and unscriptural unanimity largely disregard the word of the apostle—"Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others"? (Phil. ii. 4). Here I feel I am liable to be pulled up sharply whilst one and another friend points, with what some would call pardonable (?) pride, to the missionary triumphs of this century, and exclaims—"Behold the proof that we are seriously attending to the things of others!" Yes, truly, there are great missionary