

ing testimony—the strong unsupported averments—the broad assertion, and the feeble proof—the decision of the judge is often unexpected and seldom satisfactory. Each party feels intensely the wrongs he has been subjected to. He is apt to think that his earnest asseveration ought to be admitted as proof, but his witnesses, if he have any, saw nothing or heard nothing, or if they did, it was something very different from that about which they were called on to testify.

If the master fail in his action he merely pays the wages that have been earned, and wages till the servant get into employment. If the servant fail, he is liable in damages, and forfeits the whole amount of his wages. The during-pleasure engagement would put an end to these unseemly, unsatisfactory disputes. Rather than go to law, a month's notice or a month's wages would be given or received, and the utmost forfeiture or penalty would be a sum equal to that amount.

Assuming that the Feeing Market and half-yearly service are abolished, how would engagements during pleasure be effected? By parish or village registers. But if we are correct in our views, during pleasure engagements would be so permanent, that there would be little need of an extensive machinery for re-engagement. To render them permanent, however, the Bothie System must also be abolished. The servant must no longer be worse lodged, worse bedded, and worse fed than the horses, cattle, or pigs. He must be raised in the scale of public and private estimation. He must cease being reckoned a mere machine, and he must be regarded as one of the noblest works of God, made a little lower than the angels, and capable of being crowned with glory and honour. He must have his religious feelings respected and cherished, his moral nature trained and cultivated, and his physical nature nurtured and improved. When he enters his service he should be received as a member of the family, and every arrangement compatible with prudence and propriety should be made for promoting his comfort and rendering the engagement permanent.

It may be thought that there is something Utopian—something fanciful and imaginative in all this—that if servants were so treated they might forget their relative duties—they would walk out of their proper position—they would tread on the heels of their masters, and disown their authority. Were such the results, far be it from us to advocate the system; but we are satisfied that no such perversion of the laws of kindness and humanity would happen. On the contrary, we are of opinion, that a kind, fair, judicious master would more likely have obedient, faithful, respectful servants, than one who was unkind, facile, or indiscreet.

Let any one estimate the difference between a good servant and a bad. How much the former may save by care, attention, and watchfulness. How much the other may destroy by carelessness, inattention, or neglect. To get a good servant is the first thing, to keep him is the second. Previous inquiry into character is necessary in the first instance—Christian kindness is essential in the second. The married men should have comfortable cottages, and kitchen gardens attached. One single man should board in the kitchen, and if two or more, they should have a suitable lodging elsewhere, presided over by a respectable female domestic, and be provided with a clean and wholesome sleeping apartment. We think that married men in general, make better and steadier servants than unmarried men. They are less apt to be led astray, and less disposed to change. Their wives and children may occasionally be useful, and in consequence of the frequent intercourse between them and the farmer's family, kindly feelings are generated, which may be productive of much mutual advantage.

These arrangements will of necessity require to be modified according to the size and character of the farms; but in every modification it must ever be kept in view that the moral, religious, and physical well-being of the