

in view of the alteration in number of the members of the board, and the addition of a medical officer, it is difficult to say; but a considerable time must elapse before the newly appointed medical officer can become acquainted with his duties, which are necessarily of a special nature, and only to be acquired by constant visiting and association with prison routine. To his care and knowledge vast improvements will be confided, improvements not the less real because hitherto they have not been brought prominently forward—changes in the present system which fetters and retards the prison medical officers in the due performance of their functions; which will permit them, while not relaxing discipline, to maintain health, and protect those under their charge from undue severity. How readily and how thoroughly those reforms can be effected, mainly depends on the amount of co-operation which may be obtained from the medical officers of prisons, a co-operation which I can safely affirm will not be withheld if sought for in a friendly spirit, but which cannot be obtained unless a different method be adopted in the future from that which has prevailed in the past.

VII.—*Some Considerations on the Industrial Remuneration Conference, 1885.* By Professor Bastable, M.A.

[Read, Tuesday, 30th June, 1885.]

THERE has been an increasing tendency of late years to give greater prominence to social as opposed to political questions, and to bring more distinctly into notice the various plans suggested for social reform. One evidence of this changed feeling is to be found in the meeting of the Industrial Remuneration Conference. The aim of the originator of that conference was to bring before the public the opinions of the most widely separated schools of thought, as to what is known on the continent as the "Social Question;" or, to use his own words—

"To make some provision for keeping before the public mind this vital question—namely, what are the best means, consistent with equity and justice, for bringing about a more equal division of the accumulated wealth of this country, and a more equal division of the daily products of industry between capital and labour, so that it may become possible for all to enjoy a fair share of material comfort and intellectual culture, possible for all to lead a dignified life, and less difficult for all to lead a good life?"

As the best means of carrying out this idea, a committee was organized for the purpose of assembling a conference composed of delegates from various societies,* and arranging for papers to be read on the different points laid down for discussion.

* The conference was constituted as follows. Invited readers, 20; Delegates of Chambers of Commerce, 10; Associations of Capitalists, 10; Agricultural Associations, 10; Trades Unions, 50; Friendly Societies, 10; Distributive Co-operative, 5; Productive ditto, 10; Economic, Literary, and Social Societies, 20.

As a result of the labours of the committee, the conference was held in London, on 28th, 29th, 30th January, under the presidency of Sir C. Dilke. In order to limit the scope of the debates, a series of questions was submitted—one being assigned to each day, and the papers read were directed to the particular question under discussion. In all, twenty-seven papers were brought forward, and over fifty delegates took part in the debates. Finally, an elaborate report, containing all the papers and speeches, with some additional statistics, has been published within the last month. As the representative of this society at the Conference, I venture to submit to you some considerations on those portions of the proceedings which are likely to prove of general interest.

The first question submitted for consideration was one of fact. It was: Who had gained most by the increase of wealth during the last hundred years—capitalists and employers, or the working classes?—an exact answer to which of course required a knowledge of the actual distribution of wealth. Few, however, will be surprised to hear that no definite answer could be given to this question; that there were in fact no adequate *data* for forming even an approximate estimate. A considerable body of statistical information has, indeed, been collected on various aspects of our national life, while as to reports and minutes of evidence of committees and commissions, we have more than we can read or even remember the names of. But a complete account of the incomes of the working classes, and the proportion of their total income to that of other classes, we do not possess. Various estimates have indeed been made;* but the great differences which exist between them prevent our placing reliance on what is necessarily to a great degree dependent on conjecture. One suggestion which received general approbation was that of Sir T. Brassey, who advocated the collection of labour statistics, on the model of those published by the State of Massachusetts. The advantage of such information is obvious, and it is to be hoped that the action of the English Statistical Society will be effectual in inducing the state to undertake this function. Details of wages and prices are quite as much needed in Ireland, and, with the aid of employers, trade societies, and officials, might be easily obtained. It seems a special duty of this society to urge this reform, and even to make some efforts to secure the collection of proper statistics. The theoretical and practical importance of exact *data* can hardly be over-estimated. Economic theories require the most careful verification, and should never be unreservedly accepted without it; but in the absence of suitably arranged statistics, this cannot be done. Again, great inequalities in wages and prices may prevail even in neighbouring districts, but the movements of labour or commodities which would alter this state of things will not, owing to ignorance of the facts, take place.

*The principal estimates of national income are by—Porter, 1842; Leone Levi 1866; Dudley Baxter, 1868; Giffen, 1878; Mulhall, 1881. The latter writer declares that the increase of wealth can as easily be defined as the distance from York to London; but the wide variations in the estimates of the various authorities do not bear out this view. See Report, p. 35.

In the absence of complete details, the various readers of papers fell back on special facts. A careful paper by Mr. Cunningham gave the rates of wages paid by the Dundee Harbour Board for twenty-five years;* Mr. Lothian Bell also gave various details as to the wages paid in certain special industries in the north of England—both showing a considerable increase. But the weakness of this mode of treating the subject was proved by the fact, that the figures brought forward were objected to as being selected from exceptional cases, while other readers (as Mr. Hutchinson), concluded that in some industries wages had fallen since 1833. The defects of special statistics are, I think, well exemplified by a table, which in very similar form appears in two places in the report.† In the former place, the average profit on twelve co-operative productive societies is shown to be 19 per cent; in the latter, the profit of fifteen companies is shown to be 12 per cent; but the only difference in the second form of the table is the addition of three companies who incurred losses. A third table might be constructed, consisting of the details relating to these three omitted companies, by which the average loss on productive co-operation would be shown to be one-half per cent.—not an encouraging prospect. The difficulties of the question are enhanced by an ambiguity in the term “wages,” which in one sense means the reward of the labourer, or “real” wages, in another, the share of the total produce which the labourer obtains, or “proportional” wages. Moreover, as money wages are those given in all returns, the varying price of commodities has to be considered. Making all allowances for the uncertainty arising from imperfect knowledge, it may I think be stated with sufficient confidence that there has been a considerable improvement in the position of the labouring classes during the last fifty years—more especially in the case of the higher kinds of skilled labour; and a still greater improvement during the last hundred years. Evidence of this fact, outside the documents submitted to the conference, may be found in the investigations of Mr. Giffen and Professor Leone Levi,‡ which are confirmed by all the various indications which can be gathered from economic history. But though, if a long period be taken for reference, improvement is evident, it is not so certain that during the last ten years there has been any advance; or rather, it may be said the tendency is towards a reduction of money-wages, combined with a slow and irregular decline in prices. Thus in Mr. Lothian Bell’s table I find earnings of Scotch colliers in 1873, 9s. 11d. per day; in 1878, 3s. 2d. per day. These of course are extreme figures; but according to Professor Levi, colliers’ wages were in 1877, 28s. 7d. per week; while in 1883, they were only 26s. 3d. It must also be borne in mind that in some respects arrest of progress is equivalent to a reverse; for men discount, so to speak, the advance of industry, and assume that if trade increase steadily for a number of years it will go on doing so for an indefinite period at the same

* Report of Congress, p. 42.

† *Ib.* pp. 19, 310.

‡ Giffen: *The Progress of the Working Classes during the last half century* (1883). Levi: *Wages and Earnings of the Working Classes* (1885).

rate. The failure of this anticipation leaves a larger population with the same amount of wealth to divide, and therefore with a lower average for each.

As regards the comparative advance of the different classes, little of value was contributed by the various readers. Sir T. Brassey dwelt on the low rate of interest as a proof that capital did not receive an undue share, while Miss Simcox maintained that the largest capitalists and employers had gained the most. It is necessary, however, to distinguish between the *mass* and the *rate* of profit. The former may be rapidly increasing, though the latter is declining. The position of the *employer*, as apart from the capitalist, is a matter which also requires to be emphasized. It is quite true that the former has in many cases gained a large reward; but it can hardly be denied that this is due to peculiar skill or aptitude, and is in fact a clear addition to the wealth of the world. Most of the prejudice excited against capital is in fact directed against the large earnings of successful employers. Among the papers contributed on the subject was one by Mr. Saunders on the rates of agricultural wages, which he stated were as low as in 1835—(meaning *real* wages; money wages he stated at 10s. a week, as against 7s. in 1835). His evidence was drawn from a district in Wiltshire, and his views were controverted by subsequent speakers, one of whom pointed out that in Bucks the rate was 15s. per week in 1874, and is now 16s. or 17s., with extra wages in harvest. It was mentioned by Mr. Bell that in the Cleveland district wages in agriculture were 17s. per week. As regards Ireland, it is not I believe disputed that there has been an advance in agricultural wages; but as to the measure and generality of that advance no trustworthy evidence is forthcoming, and the difficulties of the question can only be met by endeavouring to procure it. On the whole it is established that the number of large fortunes is increasing. The returns necessary for the various death duties prove so much; but there is no proof that their increase is out of proportion to the general increase of wealth or that their existence in any way retards that increase.

To pass to the second question submitted for debate, which asked whether any remediable causes affected the continuity of employment, the rates of wages, or the well-being of the working classes? It is plain that a wide field was opened for advancing all the favourite remedies for social distress—an opportunity still further extended by the third question: "Would the more general distribution of capital or land, or the state management of those agents of production, promote or impair the production of wealth and the welfare of the community?" No very clear line was drawn between these topics, and it may therefore be more convenient to consider them together, adopting the following order—(1) examining those agencies which have sought to promote the welfare of the labourers and which are in actual work; (2) to consider some proposed partial remedies for industrial depression; and finally (3) to notice those plans which assume a complete alteration of the existing social and economic structure.

Under the first head, three methods of raising the condition of

workers were specially represented in force, namely—trades unionism, profit-sharing, and co-operation both distributive and productive. The advocates of unionism, who contributed three papers, and took a prominent part in the debates, claimed for their system that it had succeeded in gaining many advantages for its adherents, by raising the rate of wages and by producing a steadier average wage; also that even in a time of depression like the present that it had retained the advance previously won. Moreover, Messrs. Burnett and Maudsley promised that unionism would continue to get further benefits for its supporters. That part of these arguments were sound, cannot I believe be denied. Unionism has undoubtedly benefited the skilled workmen who are its principal adherents. It has accelerated advances of wages, and has modified the regulations under which work is carried on, and as a moral force it has raised the status of unionists generally, by encouraging a spirit of providence and fellowship. On the other hand its limitations and its drawbacks have to be clearly noticed. Its members constitute an aristocracy of labour. Some years ago they numbered 1,250,000, and it is not believed that their number is increasing. It is with the utmost difficulty that the unionist system can be introduced or worked among agricultural labourers, the very class who would most require its aid; nor is this surprising, since the conditions requisite for its effective action seem to be (1) concentration of the workmen within a narrow area, and (2) high energy and skill in the individual workman, both of which are wanting in the special case of agriculture. Other papers read at the conference tend to show that unskilled labourers may suffer from the action of the more highly trained workmen who constitute a union: Mr. Lynch* pointed this out in the case of the ship-building industry, and Mrs. Paterson † showed that women had suffered owing to the action of unionist rules; while at the same time she advocated the formation of women's unions as a remedy. To obviate an objection it may be added that from the economic point of view unionism has produced its effect by consolidating and combining the holders of a commodity (labour) so as to enable them to obtain its full competitive value. It thus gave the workman the power of putting a reserved price on his services, and getting the highest market value of his work. The limits within which such a course can be profitably pursued are fixed by the productiveness of industry and the supply of other productive agents; and unionists have the powerful incentive of self-interest to lead them to keep within the bounds thus determined. Nor have the best unionist leaders regarded their organization as more than a transitional stage in the evolution of industry; they look forward to greater possibilities in the future. It is to be regretted that no careful study of Irish trades-unions has been made since the report presented to this society in 1853 by Professor Cliffe Leslie. Here again well arranged statistics would be very valuable. ‡

* *Ib.* 114-118. † *Ib.* 199-206.

‡ *The Social Science Congress Report, 1860*; and the *Reports of the Royal Commission on Trades Unions, 1867-8-9*, deal with English trades-unionism.

The second method of improving the workers' condition and securing a fairer distribution of wealth, was that known as profit-sharing, or division of some of the gains of a business among the wage-earners of the establishment, which was vigorously advocated by Mr. Sedley Taylor, in an interesting paper, and approved of by several supporters of other plans. The evidence collected on the subject is at first sight very strong; and there can be no doubt that in special cases the method has achieved great success; but I feel convinced that it can have only a limited field of operations, since everything depends on the character of the employer. With a man like Leclaire whose "real aims were of an entirely different order from those of the self-interested speculator with whom in his anxiety to avoid the dangerous reputation of an innovating visionary he professed to identify himself," and who "was at bottom . . . an ardent social reformer passionately desiring the emancipation of the wage-supported classes from the precarious situation in which the present relations between labour and capital hold them bound"* many things are possible, which would break down in the hands of ordinary men; and it is a striking fact that the apostles of profit-sharing (as Chaix, Boucicaut, Von Thunen) have been men of this stamp. Two objections to the plan were advanced at the conference. Professor Beesly argued that the essence of the system lay in inducing the workmen to work harder in order to realise more profit for the employer; and in return they obtain only a part of the extra profit thus gained. The answer is plain. It is not from *harder* but more efficient and economical work that the gain arises; and thus, without loss to the workmen, the total produce is increased, and a larger amount remains to be distributed. Again, it was urged that without inspection of the books of the employer it would be impossible to rely on a fair division; but Mr. Taylor suggests the intervention of a skilled accountant who may confidentially examine the accounts of the business. Whatever be the limits of the method, it is certain that good results have been obtained, and proof is given of what can be done by special efforts to improve the workman's condition when those efforts are directed by high principle and intelligence. Except the well known experiment at Rahaline there is no mention of any Irish attempts at profit-sharing.

The co-operative system, both productive and distributive, takes a higher place than either of the preceding methods, since it claims to be able to give an ultimate solution of the difficulties which beset the relations of labour and capital, and it can appeal to facts in support of its services in actually improving the condition of a large number of the working classes. Co-operative distribution has, with some failures, as a whole proved a success. The returns for 1883, obtained by the Co-operative Central Board, show very satisfactory results.† A population of two and a half millions is affected by their

* Sedley Taylor: *Profit-Sharing*, p. 24.

† Co-operative Stores:—

Number of stores,	1,211
Share and Loan Capital,	£8,416,914
Members,	648,994
Reserve Fund,	£291,638
Sales,	26,289,722
Net profit after allowing 5 per cent. on capital,	£2,247,431

action, which it need hardly be said tends to increase real wages, by giving the purchaser better quality and quantity, while it encourages providence, by the rule of cash payments. One curious feature is the localization of these societies. Thus Rochdale, Leeds, and Oldham are remarkable for the number of these stores. In some other districts it is impossible to establish them. The extension of co-operative distribution in England, and its adoption in Ireland, especially in the more remote districts, would appear most desirable. It would lead to the reduction of the undue number of small shops which exist in so many of the small Irish towns, and confer a benefit on the labouring classes. The difficulties, however, in the way of starting such societies are great, since prejudice would naturally be excited against them; and the training requisite for managing the business would not be easily obtained among the class who would have the chief interest in their success. The co-operators have hardly obtained their desires as regards co-operative production. It is true that some few societies have realised fair profits; but as a whole the efforts made have not been successful; nor are the causes of failure far to seek. Experience establishes the fact that the employer is an essential factor in the modern system of extended production; but the co-operative method proposes to eliminate this factor, and distribute the profits due to it among the workers. The action of a board of working men as directors, even supported by an ill-paid manager, is not able to give the energy and vigorous initiative which is characteristic of the best class of employer. In industries where routine exists and where care is more needful than speed, co-operative production may, when established, hold its ground; but more need not for many years be expected from it. Some ardent co-operators have proposed that the stores should procure their goods from co-operative producers—or, in other words, should give artificial support to what would otherwise not be able to endure. Such a course would only injure the already successful stores, and in the end would not improve the position of the producing societies.

It is of course impossible to pronounce a positive judgment on these agents of social reform. There is no very sharp opposition between the advocates of each; many trades-unionists are co-operators, and most co-operators look with sympathy on profit-sharing. As to which is the best no one can say with any certainty. It is here that the caution of the German economists against "absolute solutions" which is so often misused, is really helpful. The comparative merits of individualistic production, of profit-sharing and of co-operation must be determined by experience; all that can be done is to afford a free field for the operation of these various methods, and it may safely be believed that the fittest will survive, or if in some cases each retains its place, it will prove that in *that* case it was the best suited to meet the special circumstances.*

In addition to the great agencies just examined, some partial

* All these agencies are in operation in the New England States, and each is in some places successful. For an interesting account see Pidgeon, *Old World Questions and New World Answers*, especially pp. 250-1.

remedies were put forward by Prof. Marshall * and Mr. B. Jones, † which are deserving of notice. The former suggested (1) that emigration from the large towns (especially London) should be encouraged, as it is only where his earnings are high that a workman can afford to pay the rent needed for decent accommodation in a large city; (2) that the changes of fashion which inflict so much misery on special trades should not be followed; (3) that efforts should be made to discourage the spirit of gambling which led to over-speculation and consequent industrial crises; (4) that a greater amount of statistical information should be collected as a guide to producers; and (5) that the bankruptcy laws should be more stringently administered. In the soundness of these remedies most people will agree, even if they doubt that they will produce much effect. Mr. Jones, in addition to a general advocacy of co-operation, dwelt on the great advantages of a reform in expenditure as a means of raising the well-being of the community, and gave several powerful illustrations in support of his statements. He also advocated a higher class of education as the means of bringing the people to adopt these wiser methods of consumption.

Another proposal, which happily received little support, was that of the fair-traders, whose views were stated by Messrs. Harris, M.P. and Harding, but in a very mild form—taxes on manufactures only being advocated. Mr. John Morley had little difficulty in refuting the arguments advanced in favour of this retrograde proposal, which seems to meet no favour among the better class of British workmen.

Among the proposals which contemplate a radical transformation of the existing social system, Positivism, which was ably represented by Mr. F. Harrison and Professor Beesly, claims our notice first. Doctrines which have received the support of so many eminent men, and which admittedly contain so many elements of truth, deserve attentive examination. The traditional attitude of the Positivist school was maintained by both its advocates, who defended the principle of private property, but advocated the moralization of industry and especially of capital. This idea, which is common to Carlyle and Comte, was dwelt upon by Professor Beesly in a condensed and powerful paper, ‡ and further developed by Mr. Harrison. § It seems, unless carefully guarded, to suggest some fallacious ideas. First, does it not confound two different things—the ultimate perfection of the human race, and the proximate amelioration of industrial conditions? Granting freely that the former result can only be obtained by a complete revolution in opinion and practice—if that be possible, apart from a changed human nature—why may not special agencies produce a decided improvement in the labourers' lot? Assuming that trades-unionism, profit-sharing, and co-operation accomplish each in some degree what their supporters hope, would not the change be so vast as to be almost inconceivable at present? Secondly, is it not, perhaps unconsciously, tainted with the socialist fallacy that the action of capital is evil? The truth seems to be that it is *revenue* and not *capital* the use of which requires to be brought under the restraints

* *Ib.* pp. 173-183.‡ *Ib.* pp. 215-221.† *Ib.* pp. 265-304.§ *Ib.* pp. 428-462.

of morality, for in one sense the use of capital is always moral, since the capitalist, as such, spends nothing on himself and all his capital goes to aid or support producers. If, indeed, the proposition be altered, and it be said that the revenue derived from capital should be better spent, this statement may be accepted and even extended to all revenue. (Mr. B. Jones' paper, before mentioned, points out much defective expenditure on the part of the working classes.) But the administration of capital need not be directly touched, since the modes in which capital is invested are determined by the modes of expenditure which exist in the community, and therefore the really efficient way to act on capital is to influence expenditure. Little is really gained by some men refusing to enter a business which they regard as immoral, since others are ready enough to take their places, and perhaps, owing to the dislike excited against them, obtain extra profit. The position of influence which the employer, as apart from the capitalist, holds is one which rightly used may greatly benefit his employees and society in general, but which is quite distinct from the capitalist's function. If the expenditure of society be under proper moral control, those modes of employing capital which will yield the highest profit are those which are most beneficial to the community; and they are urged on the capitalists attention by the powerful motive of self-interest.

The various schools of land-nationalisers were strongly represented—four readers of papers* advocating this plan, and an evident leaning in favour of exceptional land legislation was shown by a majority of the delegates; but the various methods suggested were not clearly defined. Thus land nationalisation pure and simple was entangled with proposals for a peasant proprietary, though the two are almost necessarily opposed. Land nationalisers propose with or without compensation to take the rent of land for the state. Peasant proprietary implies the ownership of land by cultivators who hold in small lots. Under the former system large holdings might be the rule. In the latter case, the rent of land is indeed distributed among a large number of persons, but in no way belongs to the state. An easy test by which to distinguish between the two systems may be given. It is: Can land be sold? If it can, land is not nationalised; for if it were, the occupier, apart from his improvements, would have nothing to sell. Another confusion running through many of the papers and speeches was the assumption that land is kept out of cultivation, as well as that more capital is needed to be applied to English agriculture. It seems an obvious deduction from demonstrable principles that if a country is a large exporter of manufactures it will largely import other products. When in addition we consider the rapid opening up of American resources, and the improvement in the means of transport, it may be reasonably held that agriculture is not likely to be a growing branch of industry in England, or at all events that its form must change, and secondary products must become its main support. Again, it was assumed that small plots are refused

* Messrs. Saunders, pp. 107-114; Cherrie, pp. 311-321; Wallace, pp. 368-392; Newman, pp. 392-397.

to labourers by landlords, merely through folly or obstinacy, and that higher rents are demanded from small than from large farmers,* no allowance being made for the larger expenditure on buildings and management which small holdings require.

The defects of the land-nationalisation scheme were pointed out by Mr. F. Harrison (who effectively criticised Mr. George), Lord Bramwell,† Mr. Balfour, M.P.,‡ and Professor Nicholson,§ the last being the most practical in his arguments. It cannot, however, be denied that exceptional legislation as to landed property is approved of by the majority of the working class leaders, and that proposals for a heavy land-tax are not unlikely to be submitted to a reformed Parliament.

Efforts were made by the organising committee to procure papers from the leading advocates of English socialism (as Messrs. Morris and Hyndman), but without success. Only one paper by Mr. Adolphe Smith,|| represented French socialism in its modern form; but the representatives of the Social Democratic Federation in the course of the discussion put forward the usual socialist view, viz.: that all wealth is the result of labour, and therefore that labour should enjoy all wealth—a position supported by a set of phrases borrowed from continental socialists, such as “exploiting,” “profit-mongering,” “wage slaves, etc.” The socialist schools naturally fall into two divisions—(1) The revolutionary socialists, who hope to introduce their system by a general insurrection. The visionary nature of such an idea is quite plain. The propertied classes are strong enough to meet such attempts, and if necessary to protect their possessions by sacrificing their liberty to a despot who can easily dispose of anarchical movements. Such has hitherto been always the case, and such would assuredly be the outcome of a formidable socialist effort in any European country at present. Revolutionary socialism therefore can never hope to succeed in its aims; but it may have an important influence in checking real advance. It may strengthen the hands of a reactionary party; and thus do incalculable mischief. The speeches of the socialist delegates¶ were almost enough to alienate all sympathy even from reasonable claims. (2) The paper contributed by Mr. Adolphe Smith represented a more dangerous school of socialism, which may fitly be called evolutionary, since it does not aim at violent changes but seeks to steadily extend state-action. The recent French legislation on the price of bread in Paris is an instance of the influence which this class of thinkers can bring to bear on the state. It seeks to hand over the railways to a state department, to endeavour to introduce state manufactures. In the case of tobacco, this already exists in France. State authorities are to provide houses for the poor, and the outcome of this action, carried on from year to year, will be that all means of production will in the end be under the direct management of the state. The policy just described is an

* *Ib.* pp. 110-111.

† *Ib.* pp. 419-425.

‡ *Ib.* pp. 336-366.

§ *Ib.* pp. 462-473.

|| *Ib.* pp. 473-481.

¶ Messrs. Burns, pp. 69 and 483; Macdonald, p. 242; Williams, pp. 79 and 387.

application of the views of Lasalle, who allowed two centuries for the development of complete socialism.

It is well to state distinctly this aspect of the socialist movement, for many persons who would feel highly indignant at being accused of aiding the advance of a socialistic system are doing all in their power to secure the realization of the design. Each legislative intervention is made an argument for fresh extensions of state agency—a movement which, unless carefully watched, will be likely to grow in speed under a more popular suffrage. At all events, if we are to finally adopt socialism, it is more decent to do so consciously and after counting the cost than to stumble into it unawares.

A few words may be added on the double fallacy which underlies the socialistic principle that “all wealth is the result of labour, and therefore that labour should enjoy all wealth.” First, it is untrue that all wealth is the result of (manual) labour, which is evidently what the proposition means. Direction and organisation render the wealth of the world greater, and need reward, as also does the abstinence which accumulates wealth to be used for further production. If the proposition be extended so as to include these important elements, it can give no support to the socialist view. Second, admitting the truth of the first clause of the dogma, the second does not follow, for it is—all wealth is the result of labour, therefore labour (that is the present labourers) should have all wealth. The term “labour” is used in two widely different senses. In the former, it means the sum total of human labour since the origin of the race; in the latter, it means the present body of manual labourers. And yet this obvious fallacy seems to impose on many who are not socialists, and leads them to accept views which they would otherwise reject.

In conclusion, I must apologise for the imperfect nature of this paper, and can only plead as my excuse the great difficulty of presenting in a concise form the many points of interest raised during a three days’ discussion, itself of a very condensed character. I can only express a hope that the members of the society will prefer to examine the report for themselves. It is the duty of all to examine these problems apart from passion or prejudice, and to endeavour to hasten their solution in the manner which seems to them best.

VIII.—*Proceedings of the Statistical and Social Inquiry Society of Ireland.*

THIRTY-EIGHTH SESSION.—FIRST MEETING.

[Tuesday, 2nd December, 1884.]

The Society met at the Leinster Lecture Hall, 35 Molesworth Street, J. K. Ingram, LL.D. S.F.T.C.D., ex-President, in the chair. The President (Mr. James McDonnell) delivered his Inaugural Address.