

school of criticism within the territories of human thought. A school of criticism without principles would be nugatory; signatored contributions, unless they secured correct thought, would be vain; but if we could secure an approximation to a trustworthy Logic of Criticism, it would make little difference whether the signature of the thinker were attached to his production or not, and with or without a school it could scarcely fail to be advantageous.

Never in any age, perhaps, has honest criticism been more indispensable than in this. Not among amateurs alone is a want of knowledge of the conditions of effectiveness, and a deficiency of skill in the arts of securing it, discernible. In many of the works of our men of genius, signs of inadequate attention to the lessons to be learned from the best models, or from those who have deduced their precepts from the study of them, are clearly observable and sometimes very remarkable. So that in author-craft as well as in critic-craft, there seems to be a want of fixed first principles, of settled canons, obedience to which is obligatory, and a knowledge of and skill in which are consequently essential pre-requisites to success.

As a brief statement of the aim and duty of criticism, in our apprehension of it, the following may be taken. The object of the criticism should be the discovery of the right, the perfect, the best, in regard to that on which its researches are employed. This implies, it is true, the discernment and the denunciation of the wrong, the imperfect, and the objectionable; for without the power to detect worthlessness, no true adjudication on merit can be made. It answers the question, What is most excellent? by its previous study of the two preliminary questions, What constitutes true excellence? and, Why do we consider such qualities essential to excellence?

Criticism is the science which enables man to determine what is best in each sphere of activity open to his inspection. Given a distinct aim, it is for criticism to decide upon the manner in which that may be best effected, and the principles which must overrule the effort by which it is sought to be attained.

For every distinct species of effort there will be therefore distinct and peculiar canons of criticism, which must be observed by all those who desire to produce any masterly effect in that line. The epic, the drama, and the romance; the tract, the treatise, and the exposition; biography, history and philosophy; music, painting and sculpture; mechanical, artistic and scientific industries; policies, governments and politics; legal, medical and economical achievements; martial, moral and religious endeavours, have all and each their special qualities; and these depend for their effective existence on particular laws which demand observance in each, and therefore require special aptitudes, opportunities, or knowledge in those who would succeed in them. This is implied in the general adoption as a proverb of the rebuke of Apelles to the Athenian shoemaker—*Ne sutor ultra crepidam*.

The exigencies of the present day, however, appear to be such, that the same patient creature has to report a coroner's inquest, or "notice" an epic poem; from which labour he may be hurriedly called away for a trip through the common sewer, so that, he, from very force of circumstances,

"Applauds to-day what yesterday he curst,  
Lampoons the wisest, and extols the worst;  
While, hard to tell, so coarse a daub he lays,  
Which sullies most, the slander or the praise."

Criticism may be defined as the art of judging with propriety of the beauties and faults of any literary, dramatic or musical performance, or of any production in the fine arts, and taking this for our standpoint, may we not blush for the recent exposure of our weakness in this department of our education, as a community. It is scarcely too much to say that in the references to the visits of Miss Emma Abbott, Mrs. Scott-Siddons, and the Shaksperian performance of Mr. Bandmann, not one of our daily newspapers has furnished us with a faithful criticism; in the haste of daily journalism, we could not expect anything like an exhaustive treatment of the subject, but at least we might look for a truthful record of facts; the criticism of these journals has been beneath contempt, but we should not be told that the Academy was filled, when only a couple of hundred people were in the house; it is very much to be feared that the editorial remarks in the SPECTATOR go to the root of the matter, the advertising and printing are important factors in the breadth and length and strength of the criticism, *e. g.*; Mr. Bandmann left by train on Saturday night, (his printer's bill paid, we trust,) ergo, Mr. Bandmann was like a "sucked orange," nothing more was to be got out of him, therefore notice of any kind of his Claude Melnotte at the matinee, or Richard III on Saturday night, was either loosely done or conspicuously absent.

The disease, although it has reached a dangerous height at this time, is not a new one, its diagnoses were treated by Sterne in Tristram Shandy, more than a century and a quarter ago; after having marked its ravings on the drama, literature and art, he said:—

"Grant me patience, just Heaven!—of all the cants which are canted in this canting world—though the cant of hypocrites may be the worst—the cant of criticism is the most tormenting."

After all, it is "not in our stars, but in ourselves, that we are underlings," so long as the public are content with our present style of criticism, the work

will go on, and possibly it is good enough for a community which neglects the plays of Shakspeare; we are promised two Uncle Tom's Cabin troupes simultaneously, both with the original Topsy's, &c., which parts they have sustained any number of hundreds of times, and a "*trick donkey*." We may safely predict crowded houses and glowing criticisms, for from the Eleusinian Mysteries at Athens, the proverb has come down to us that "the ass carries the mysteries."

### A SCOTTISH STUDENT ON SOME PROTECTION FALLACIES.

All my points against the positions taken up by "Argus" have been stated by "Trade Reform" more strikingly than I have done, and are stated in a way better fitted to force "Argus" to look at them, and free them—if he can—and not continue his parable in utter *ignoring*, not to say *ignorance*, of what may be urged against his views. So I feel free to direct a few shots at the general mass of protectionism. As for "Marih," he scarcely needs any answer beside what he gives himself in his assaults on "Roswell Fisher." A man who acknowledges that Free-trade with the States would be a benefit to Canada were it united to them, has really given up the battle. Why not get the trade benefits when these can be secured without the necessity of plunging into the *cloaca* of American politics, in the course of which the leaders of each party are accused by the organs of the other with being *drunkards*, *liars*, and *swindlers*? I, for my own part, believe that ultimately the world will be united in a state something on the model of that of the United States,—let us hope, without its *election amenities*. If that awaits us in the future, why should we not secure the trade advantages just now? Then another question might be urged: Why not have Free Trade with Britain, at all events? For my own part, I do not believe in a Zollverein between Britain and her Colonies, save as a step to a wider Free Trade; but "Marih" ought to go in for it at once. But "Marih," who tells us he has profoundly studied Political Economy, and does not believe in Theorists, nor in Ricardo, nor in Adam Smith, may even disbelieve the laws of logic and arithmetic. We sadly fear he has not conjoined the use of them with his profound study of Political Economy, or he could never be a Protectionist, or deny that all the greatest names on the subject are against Protection—always excepting his own.

Leaving, then, "Argus" to be refuted by "Trade Reform," and "Marih" to be refuted by himself, we shall betake ourselves to some fallacies that lie behind the arguments of the Protectionists, but which have not always come clearly to the light. One of these that is often heard in conversation is: If the consumer buys from a manufacturer in the country, no money goes out of the country. Hence it is held that there will be a constant increase in the national wealth in this way. In boyhood I used to believe that if one could have estates all over the world, and use only the commodities grown thereon, that he not only would have immense wealth, which is obvious, but would by this means make immense saving by getting everything at first hand. What was my astonishment to find that those who had estates in Jamaica, &c., declared it actually cheaper to sell off and buy from the dealer. It is, in fact, just the old fallacy, which Adam Smith exploded, of thinking that a man saved money by uniting under his own hand all the processes of producing an article of manufacture, from the growing of the raw material to the selling it in retail quantities, rather than by developing to its utmost one part of the process. But let us take the question as it stands in regard to Canada. In a country that produces breadstuffs far in excess of the needs of its inhabitants, the price the farmer receives must be regulated by that to be got in markets of export. The price paid to the farmer must be less on the average than the foreign market price by the exporter's profit and the charge for freight. If, through a protective tariff, there are no goods brought back, then the ships must come back to Canada in ballast, and the railway waggon go up country again empty; consequently, as much must be charged for freight one way as would be charged both ways were goods conveyed in as well as out. The farmer then has to pay, in the lessened price he gets for his grain, the freightage that might have brought goods back were there no Protection. That this is the effect, in the long run, is indisputable, whatever may take place in exceptional circumstances. Then the tariff comes in and more than doubles every commodity the farmer has to purchase, thus diminishing his real purchasing power still more. Whereas, if there were no tariff, he would be able to spend all the difference between the tariff-made price and the price at which the goods could be imported in goods that could be produced with advantage in Canada, or could, if he were so minded, save it. Thus there would be as much money in the country and more comfort without the tariff than with it. But yet further, the farmer loses in another way. He pays the freight both ways in any case; but, if only one freightage instead of two were on the price of the grain in the market to which it was exported, it would be better able to keep competitors out of the market by that amount, and hence there would be the more of it sold. If, however, there were double freightage to pay, there would be the greater risk of being undersold; hence the exporter would have to protect himself again at the expense of the farmer. So that there is really less money