

in the country by reason of Protection instead of more. The farmer, the day-labourer, and the consumer generally, has to pay for all these vagaries. When any farmer passes a fine house occupied by any manufacturer of protected goods, he can say to himself, "All that splendour has been wrung out of me. I have paid for it in the sweat of my brow, in the weariness of my bones." I wonder, too, that the manufacturer does not feel that he is really a pauper living on poor rates as really as any pauper in the Old Country, when his whole profit is due to protective duties. If, on the other hand, he were to employ his capital in what Canada really can supply the world with, then (by getting back goods in return for this) there would be a vastly greater increase, at once, of wealth and comfort, than there can be with protective tariffs.

"Marib" may say, if he pleases, that merchants understand their own interests better than such theorists as Adam Smith, and though we doubt whether he is right or not, we shall regard him as correct; but this is not the question, but rather: Is the interest of the manufacturer the interest of the country at large? and *that* all Free Traders most emphatically deny.

This leads me to consider another fallacy, or at least what seems to me a fallacy, in the arguments of the Protectionists. It is taken for granted all through the discussion of this question that the protected industry is the better for it. Now here it may open to such able and courteous writers as *Marib* to say, as we have already quoted from him, that merchants know what is most for their own interests. That we doubt. We know that land owners in Britain furiously opposed railroads that doubled their incomes; that postal authorities declared the penny postage an impossibility; that practical men, who boast in being so and look down upon theorists, are as a rule a full generation behind the thinkers of the age, and are angry at these thinkers for being ahead of them, and therefore are as likely as not *not* to know what is best for them. Has American shipping been the better for the constant and growing protection that has been afforded it? In the year 1830, when the protection afforded the shipbuilder was slight, 89 per cent. of the American goods imported into Britain was carried in American bottoms, in 1850 it had sunk to 72 per cent., while in 1878 it had fallen as low as 26½ per cent. This last fall may perhaps to some extent be due to the Alabama depredations, yet the country ought to have got beyond that before this time. It is also true that this fall is more apparent than real—it is the case that a goodly number of vessels flying foreign flags are really owned by American capital, but as they have not been built in the States the Stars and Stripes are not, or were not very recently, allowed to float over them. This falling off rigidly represents the result of Protection. If, however, anyone else meets me with the assertion that the actual amount carried may be greater although the per centage be so much smaller, I have another set of figures for him. In 1860 the amount of goods imported into Britain and conveyed by American bottoms was \$507,000,000, while in 1878 it had sunk to \$313,000,000. These figures may be left to speak for themselves. We may mention one other thing in this connection. Notwithstanding the great ad valorem duty on wrought iron and steel, a British house is supplying an American railway with steel rails, and competing with it for the contract were some of the Pennsylvanian iron works. That this is the natural result of Protection, Free Traders aver. Let manufacture A be protected, that increases the cost of producing B, so that has to be protected also; that affects C, which in turn has to be protected, and so on with the whole alphabet of manufactures. Then when the circle is completed, or perhaps long before, it is found that A needs further protection, as the protection of the rest of the alphabet has increased the cost of production, and so begins another turn of the screw, only to be found in its turn insufficient. Then when the process is stopped, as stopped it must be ere long, it is black ruin to the poor unfortunate who has his capital invested in any of these protected industries. The case of the French sugar refiners and their bounty is quite different; that method of fostering native industries does not heighten prices, and hence, though foolish, it is not absolutely self-contradictory, as is the ordinary form of Protection.

One more fallacy must be considered and then I have done. I have been amused to find it taken for granted that progress in manufacture meant progress in civilization and culture. We in Scotland do not regard the manufacturing districts as more cultured than the non-manufacturing. We do not, as a rule, regard Glasgow and Paisley as being more civilized and cultured places than Edinburgh and Saint Andrews, nor do we usually reckon Dundee above Aberdeen in these matters. If, however, it should be urged that in one country the actual culture is practically equal, though in this country we are apt to put the manufacturing districts lower in the scale than the non-manufacturing, still let it be. But in Holland and Belgium we have two adjacent countries, and everybody knows that there are vastly more and more varied manufacture in the latter than in the former, and yet Holland, with a very much smaller population, has a much higher place in Europe, and is really a much more highly cultured country than Belgium. If progress in civilization is progress in differentiation, then that differentiation may be carried to greater minuteness the greater the number of those who, near each other, pursue one given manufacture as they may each do one part of the process and pass it on to the next. And this applies to farming as to everything else, though perhaps in a less

obvious way than some other manufactures. Yet there are differences of soil and of situation, not to speak of agricultural implements and methods that might easily lead to an amount of differentiation not dreamed of now.

J. E. H. T.

Stirling, Scotland.

THE "OLD MASTERS" AGAIN.

Nearly three columns of prose and poetry from Mr. T. D. King appear in the last number of this paper, in reply to our article, on the Old Masters, of the week previous. After Mr. King's paper had received our careful perusal, it reminded us of the old Scotch preceptor's criticism of two Ministers who had been on probation. One, he said, was "na soun," and the other was "a' soun"!

It is a recognized principle in law and logic, "that the onus of proof rests on him who alleges the affirmative." Mr. Barton Hill, the owner of these productions, and his champion, Mr. King, allege the pictures in question to be originals. We have yet to see a tittle of proof of this pretension. Mere assertion, however glibly uttered, is not proof. Declamation is not argument. The most frenzied eloquence cannot make black white.

Mr. King states that the owner did not submit the genuineness of his pictures to the Art Association. We have authority for stating that they were all submitted for exhibition; that the Council had several meetings before it could decide upon the propriety of granting it; that, finally, a few of the best were selected, with an intimation to the owner, that if any catalogue should be published, it should be prefaced with a notice, prepared by the Council, informing the public that the Council expressed no opinion on their genuineness; and that the others were refused, for reasons expressed to the owner,—*verb. sap.*

We should not be surprised if the Council finds it has thus established a troublesome precedent. However meritorious these may be as copies, the Council may find it very unpleasant in the future to draw the line between the good and bad which may be hereafter tendered for exhibition. It might have been better to have offered, once and for all, to exhibit along with these, all other Old Masters in the city which the owners may decide to submit to the public. And by so doing, who knows but that, in this age of wonderful discoveries, the long-lost "Triumph of Poverty," by Holbein, may be found in one of the classic lanes of the Quebec suburbs; and the long-sought-for "Birth of Christ," by Raphael, in one of the fashionable avenues of Griffintown!

Mr. King says the question of their genuineness had "been already determined in London, Paris and Antwerp by experts"!! He omits, however, to furnish the opinion of these experts. If they did pass any opinion, the nature of it needs no prophet to tell.

He reiterates his conviction that Rubens painted this example of *Ahasuerus and Esther*, and that Palma il Vecchio painted this so-called *Jupiter in Judgment*. He says the Jacob Ruysdael belonged to Queen Isabella of Spain, and the Raphael to Baron Rothschild of Paris! But we notice he very significantly has omitted, in his last paper, any further mention of the so-called Rembrandt—*Isaac blessing Jacob*, whose beauty he so much admired, and of whose genuineness he expressed undoubting belief, in his previous epistles. Was our reference to the catalogue of Rembrandt's works the cause of this omission?

With regard to this Rubens and Palma il Vecchio, we are entitled to demand the proof of originality alleged on their behalf. We repeat that no seals or documentary proof of this claim have yet been produced to the public or, we believe, to the Art Council. Waiving the claim on this occasion, we will offer a few more remarks about them.

In our previous paper it is stated we had seen a similar picture attributed to Rubens in Europe; but which was, or whether either were, genuine, we avoided expressing an opinion, as certain of our books, which could settle that that point, were not then accessible. We are now in a position to supply the necessary information. Both these pictures are copies. The original, with thirty-six other works of this master, were destroyed by fire in the Jesuits' Church at Antwerp, in 1718! Vide Catalogue Raisonné of Dutch and Flemish Masters, by John Smith, London, 1830.

"So much for Buckingham."

Now, for the alleged Palma il Vecchio. It is almost a pity to damp the ardor which may have been aroused about this work by the eloquence of Mr. King. But, cruel as it may be, the truth should be told. Mr. King says that "Judging by the style of *Jupiter in Judgment*, there is positive external evidence that it is an original." This, Mr. King utters as his opinion; and it may not therefore be improper to ask how many of Palma il Vecchio he may have seen ere we should be called upon to accept his *ipse dixit*. But whether he has studied or no, all or any this master produced, we have now to deal with his three assertions; 1st, that the picture represents *Jupiter in Judgment*; 2nd, that the painter was Palma il Vecchio; and 3rd, that it is original.

It appears, in the first place, surprising, that one so familiar with classics and heathen mythology, as Mr. King is known to be, could possibly commi