

servants. The dream of the mistress is to have around her devoted and conscientious domestics, animated by a sense of attachment as well as a sense of duty. Very nice, only devotion and attachment must be the result of respect and consideration. You may take a girl, isolate her in an underground kitchen, keep her hard at work from morn till night; but that is not the way to make her look up to and idolize you.

A central truth has been struck in a communication to a paper, by a servant, which I have before me. He—for it is a man-servant who writes—says: "My experience is that servants are not considered human beings at all by the people who employ them. I am convinced that they are regarded as having no feelings. If the master is kind, the mistress isn't; and if the mistress is pleasant, then the master is overbearing. Servants are the least expecting people in the world; all that they ask is that masters and mistresses should treat them as if they had feelings. By pretending that we are not men and women they only make hypocrites of us; that's the only alteration they make. They oblige us to tell lies and cant before them, only that we may not be forced to own that we're flesh and blood like they are." Of course mistresses will not admit that they are in fault, and urge that they dare not show servants the consideration they would, because if they are kind their kindness is abused, and their attempts to mend matters presumed upon. There is very much in this also. One of the special difficulties of the case is that a servant not being an automaton is apt even to indulge in the tender passion. This, says the authority I have quoted, is the unpardonable offence, yet "they *must* know that servants, being men and women, can't help falling in love like others who are not in service." Then comes the "followers" complication, and this is perhaps the hardest of all to treat with.

It is to be regretted that dinners cannot be cooked and house-work done by machinery; but Edison will be some time before he gives us that boon, and meanwhile what is to be done? Are we to go on blundering as we are doing? or is it possible to revise the social contract on a more satisfactory footing? I confess that I see no clear way out of the muddle, but it is perhaps possible to put things on a little better footing, if people will only throw aside their habitual notions and prejudices, and look facts steadily in the face. It will be something to realise distinctly that we cannot have the good old servant under the bad new conditions. In an active, pushing, excited age, we must not expect those that go into domestic service, any more than those who don't, to be uninfluenced by surrounding influences. They will not be content with the life their grandmothers led, or the food they ate, but will insist on more liberty and a good deal more amusement. These points, therefore, must be conceded. Something may also be done in the way of facilitating house-work. The speaking-tube may be substituted for the bell, which obliges servants to run up and down stairs unnecessarily—first to learn what is wanted, and then to attend to the wants. Other appliances should follow suit, and thus service would be rendered less hard. Again, it should be possible to have training schools for girls—not in big asylums, they are almost always a failure—but in houses like those the majority of the people live in. Whether the sweetheart question is capable of solution I am not prepared to say; but it *must* be looked into, with much more that is now left to mend itself, and if it is possible to concentrate public attention on the subject of domestic service generally, it is quite possible that some reform may be effected, and that our homes may be rendered much happier in the future than they are in the present.

*Quevedo Redivivus.*

### ON FREE TRADE—A REPLY.

From the prolonged silence of "Argus," I thought that Mr. Blake by his splendid exposition of Free Trade and exposure of Protection had killed him, and that so, Mr. Blake might assume the title of *Argeiphontes*, the slayer of "Argus," which Homer gives to Hermes. "Marib," too, I feared had perished in the fight. I am glad that Mr. Stephens has relieved my mind and enabled me to put off the season of mourning. I must offer an apology to him. I did not intend to quote him as distinctly claiming to have profoundly studied political economy. I thought, however, it might be inferred, and that only modesty prevented him stating it. He tells us that "Roswell Fisher" claims to have "thoroughly studied it (political economy)" and he claims to have studied as well as "Roswell Fisher," and that is as well as "any ordinary mortal can." As one does not expect now-a-days the "Gods immortal to mingle with the strifes of men," least of all when the subject contended about is political economy, nor hope to see an extraordinary genius occupy his time with the mere rudiments of the science in question. Mr. Stephens has claimed as much as would the late M. Léon Say or John Stuart Mill. What sort of thing Mr. Stephens means by "a Scotch joke in the abstract," I know not; it probably is the product of one of the protected industries of Canada, and may be very good, but the article is unknown here.

As an ordinary mortal can study political economy *profoundly*, and Mr. Stephens has studied it as thoroughly as any mortal can, he perhaps would kindly favour me with the reasons which lead him to deny that Adam Smith has exploded the doctrine that a man saves money by accumulating all the

processes of a manufacture under his own hand. In passing, I would remark that, as political economists are not the majority in any country, it is no argument against "Roswell Fisher's" statement that the majority of political economists favour Free Trade, to say that the policy of the majority of countries is for Protection. I am astonished that one who has studied political economy as well as "any ordinary mortal can," did not see this. Mr. Stephens asserts that British manufactures were established by means of protection; surely a man of his extensive reading must know that this is not the case with regard to what are usually regarded as the staples of British manufacture. It was not protection that taught Watt, Arkwright and Peel to invent; protection had no share in putting stores of iron and coal in juxtaposition; these are the causes of Britain's manufacturing superiority. He ought to know that the only prohibitory duties imposed during this century by the famous "Orders-in-Council" aimed not at protection, but at retaliation, and were strenuously opposed by the manufacturing interests, who might have been supposed to have been benefitted by them. The truth is that the commercial legislation of the world was vitiated by the old world fallacy of "Balance of Trade," which, exploded by David Hume, is espoused by Mr. Stephens, who has studied political economy as "thoroughly as any ordinary mortal can."

Mr. Stephens tells us that the object of production is to so multiply the inhabitants that all the grain grown in Canada may find mouths there to eat it. That principle extended would mean that every country should produce only for its own market, which again means that commerce should cease. That would seem to prove the principle false without further argument. But, again, this rapid importation or production of mouths is decidedly against the interest of labourers and mechanics, as their individual value will be lowered in the labour market. Hence protection, as thus expounded by him, is one-sided in its effects in the long run. But this process will and must take time, and during all that time the farmer is either obliged not to sell his grain at all or pay double freight for it. Further, he is obliged to pay, it may be, two prices for every article of consumpt. Let us suppose the case of a manufacture on which is laid a prohibitory duty of 50 per cent.; let us say the annual consumpt is \$1,000,000 worth of goods, untaxed. If we say that the consumers might have invested the money thus taken from them at only 5 per cent., that duty would have cost Canada, in 25 years, \$24,000,000 in round numbers. As the profit of a manufacture is usually reckoned at 10 per cent., all that is saved in that way is really about \$7,000,000; consequently \$17,000,000 have gone from the capital of the country. Indeed the loss is more than this, for the price of one thing being increased, everything else has a tendency ultimately to rise, consequently even to the manufacturer the money he seems to get is not worth all that it seems to be. Say the average increase of price all round is only 20 per cent., then the manufacturer has gained only in reality \$5,600,000.

Mr. Stephens states quite truly that the nominal value of money is of less importance than its purchasing power. Free Traders acknowledge that, and assert that Protection, by lessening the purchasing power of money, lessens its real as distinguished from its nominal value; consequently, if Mr. Stephens will only apply the principle he has laid down that the gain of every individual necessarily increases the gain of the community, to see that Protection must overhead impoverish, not enrich a country. He adds, to be sure, a clause, "but not always when it arises from trade and commerce, because in the latter case the gain is at the expense of the purchaser and consumer." Unless he means to include fraudulent transactions, Mr. Stephens, who has studied Political Economy "as thoroughly as any ordinary man can," must know that this is not the case. He must know that the profit of the butcher who buys an ox and sells it is the reward for the service he has rendered to those who could neither purchase a whole ox nor use it if they could. His wealth is really added to the wealth of the country, as is the wealth of the grower of the ox or the consumer of the same. In fact, Mr. Stephens has only to follow out the principle he has laid down to become a Free Trader. It may be remarked in passing that we do not, in considering the loss to national wealth, take into account the salaries of the revenue officers employed to keep out foreign goods. This, as will easily be seen, is a double loss—a loss in men who might be employed productively, and in money which might also be so employed.

Another fallacy that could be knocked on the head, if Mr. Stephens would only consistently reason out the principle laid down, would be: "That we cannot get trade benefits when separated by a political boundary." Does Mr. Stephens not see that the prosperity of Canada would be the same, the sum of the wealth of its inhabitants as great, were that wealth considered by itself or reckoned only as a thirteenth part of the United States?

This also, it seems to me, exposes the fallacy that lies at the root of the constantly repeated assertion that progress in manufacture means progress in civilization. There is a sense in which this is true. When any large community begins not only to grow grain but also to manufacture goods, it has advanced; but the other side of this is forgotten—that progress in civilization means really differentiation and extension of communities. If in the great community of nations one nation devotes itself to one sphere of industry and another takes up another sphere, then these nations form one community.