



HUGH'S OBVIOUS LEANING.

(APROPÓS OF THE GREAT DOMESTIC CONTROVERSY IN MONTREAL.)

SIR.—The animus of the *Star* is not difficult to discover. We are told that both sides of the question would be given, but what do we find? Is there one letter giving the faults and shortcomings of servants? Not one! Is there one letter bearing evidence of coming from a mistress who knows anything of the real troubles and trials of housekeepers? Not one!—*Correspondent Montreal News*.—From *Grip*.

“MISTRESS AND MAID.

“THE AMUSING EXPERIENCES AND OPINIONS OF A MONTREAL PEDLAR—A TRAINING INSTITUTION FOR YOUNG HOUSEKEEPERS.

“An ‘Old Country Pedlar,’ (Mr. N. Murray) has published a sixteen-page pamphlet giving his views on the much vexed mistress and maid question. Mr. Murray speaks from his experience, and says what he has to say in a racy, straightforward manner. Mr. Murray is happy to say that the Montreal ladies will compare favorably with those of any other place he has lived in, but the whiter the general flock the more conspicuous will the black sheep appear. On the suggestion of a public training institution Mr. Murray says: ‘What I think is needed is a training institution for young housekeepers, who have never been taught by their mothers in the mysteries of housekeeping.’ He has a good deal to say on the average young lady of the business houses. ‘Last winter I saw some girls shivering with cold, with plenty of coal and kindling wood beside them, and they were too proud to make a fire for themselves in the absence of a male attendant. The Lord keep the young men of our city from joining in wedlock with such stylish young ladies!’

“A number of very pleasing experiences with ‘ladies in the true sense of the word’ are recorded, and the ‘old country pedlar’ stays to observe that ‘in the houses of the leading business men of Montreal there is no noise about the servant question.’ One of the fundamental points of this question is that of ‘followers,’ one from which arise, directly or indirectly, many of the misunderstandings. Mr. Murray records the story of a fellow-boarder of his in Glasgow, who, out on his morning business, had smiled at a servant girl he knew. ‘The mistress came down to the store to lodge a complaint against him for having the “impertinence to smile at her servant girl through the window.” Perhaps she was at a ball the night before, and had the arms of another woman’s husband round her waist.’

“Mr. Murray also says that he could point out several ladies in Montreal that, seeing mistress and servant engaged together on some household affair, one would not know but the servant was the daughter. Instances of the other extreme are also given, but the decision is arrived at, that ‘servants and mistresses in Montreal at present are just on as good terms as they used to be.’ In Mr. Murray’s opinion, forned *a posteriori*, impertinence is contagious; when he met a rude, unkind mistress, he generally found her manner reflected in the daughter of the house, and even communicated to the pet-dog of the establishment.

“In an appendix, Mr. Murray emphasizes the evil consequences that must attend mistresses deliberately teaching their girls to tell lies in saying they are ‘not in’ when they are. Another side thought more worthy of consideration than almost any other is the Sabbath question. “A great many of the servants, both male and female, have to do a great deal of work on Sunday that is neither the work of necessity nor mercy.” Several apposite quotations from the Pauline epistles and the Pentateuch bring a very sensible and entertaining booklet to a close.”—*Witness*, Nov. 14.