

primitive man, to the wonderful appliances of our day, are not invention, not the doing of genius. No: *Creation* is the word, it is creation prompted by the godlike nature within us. The telescope and the microscope are but new eyes, which our own creative faculty endowed us with, and in our days of Atheism our own godlike nature itself furnishes us fit and proper eyes to see Him, the source of all creation. Superficial science and learning may lead us to deny Him, but deep learning will unmistakably bring us back to Him, our All-wise Father. I myself had my eyes opened by the microscope."

Here we were interrupted, being called out to witness one of the sublime sunsets and the glowing of the Alps, and who could not, at such a sight, at such a grand exhibition of the splendour of His creation, but bow down in humility, acknowledging even in the pride of being the offspring of Him, the Creator of all, we are but an atom in His universe.

Wanderer.

### CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR:

SIR,—Allow me to agree with you as far as female physicians are concerned, for if I know anything at all about the matter, Toronto female physicians are becoming "numerous and notorious." I have desired to let you understand that your remarks are appreciated under that score, for the reason that I imagine a journalist does not always know when his comments and criticisms are in unison with the majority.

Permit me, Sir, to subscribe myself your obedient servant,

Toronto, 9th May, 1880.

Alfred Bengall.

### A CORRECTION.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR:

SIR,—The touching story of Shakespeare's "Measure for Measure" furnished a quotation in a letter of mine that appeared in your columns not long ago. The words will be found in the 2nd Scene of the 2nd Act. In the SPECTATOR, "perfect" was printed for "forfeit,"—sufficiently vexatious to a writer it must be admitted. In Vienna (if we accompany the dramatist) they had once a rather severe code for certain gross injuries to the social order. For the same offences against God and society Montreal has as yet scarcely found any better remedy than a violent one. They embody the especial sin of well-to-do youth of the stronger and impulsive sex, who in wounding thus their own purity of life and soul, and shutting themselves out from the peace of God, have also felt themselves free to destroy the Divine image in the happiness and the future of poor dependent ones, and the families that have loved and cherished them. The sin is actually excused and even encouraged by many amongst us who ought to know better. The true way to meet it is by paternal exhortations at the critical period of the life of the young men,—the time when they are said to be "going out into the world." I believe there are few domestic duties that are more neglected than this one. The world is always suffering grievously from the drawbacks imposed by timidity and false shame. The promotion of those early marriages, and that settlement of families which are possible in a new and progressive country, will offer elements of healing and preservation of the civic life. A word to the wise ought to be sufficient here. For further study of the New Testament view, following the strict monogamy of Christ's own preaching in the Gospels, see Rom. xiii., 12, 13; Gal. v., 24, 25; Eph. v., 3-14; I. Thes. iv., 3; I. Tim. v., 22; I. Tim. vi., 9-12; I. Cor. vi., 18-20; and other passages of the accepted Epistles.

Disciple.

### THE FUTURE OF THE DOMINION.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR:

SIR,—As there have been remarks lately made upon the supposed bad state of trade in the Dominion, with the constructive supposition that our Pacific ports can never be found rivalling or approaching San Francisco, Chicago, or Melbourne in their development, by our worthy pessimists, who fancy they have discovered that the taxation of Canada is greater per head of the population than that of the United States, and have not yet ascertained for themselves the notable decrease in the number and amount of business failures in Canada in the first quarter of 1880, will they, I would ask, account upon their theory for the fact that while all the railways of the country, so far as returns have been given, shew a large increase in traffic receipts in the four months of the present year, the Grand Trunk receipts for the week ended May 1st were no less than \$181,138, as against \$155,859 in the corresponding period last year,—an increase of \$25,279, which, excepting \$2,500, is altogether under the head of freight and live stock, and this increased, by the deduction of Riviere du Loup receipts of last year, to \$29,479,—the aggregate increase for eighteen weeks reaching the good round sum of \$520,421.

In view of such facts of the day that is passing, it would really seem to be no very bad plan to await the completion of this one season's operations, before drawing many final conclusions.

Setting aside the relation of the Grand Canada Through Line to the colonization of the North-West country, the idea of the great Spaniard, as

modified in the developments of these later times, will be crowned in the completion that our branch of the Empire may, in the fulness of time, give to it, in the opinion of many students of the age. Canada needs both progress and prestige, and it is in the Canadian Pacific Railway she will find them, without any expenditure that will not be covered by the fruits of progress.

Civis.

### EXHIBITION OF CANADIAN ART.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR:

SIR,—It is not necessary for me to write a line upon the merits and demerits of the pictures contributed by our Canadian artists, and exhibited at the Art Gallery, Phillip's Square, because it has been universally admitted that the recent exhibition of the Canadian Fine Arts Academy was not only very creditable, but, in comparison with previous exhibitions, manifested a marked advance in the representations of Nature, both in water colour and in oil.

While admitting that some of the pictures were meritorious, and characterized by considerable firmness and sincerity of treatment, vigorous handling, and skill in execution, yet there were others devoid of every quality necessary to the production of a good picture, showing neither invention, nor imagination, nor beauty of composition, nor faithful imitation of Nature.

The praise that I might have awarded to the good pictures, if given by the number in catalogue, name of artist, and subject, may have been galling to some who are engaged in the practice of art—for I cannot call them artists—had their names been omitted from my praiseworthy remarks. Again, had I written truthfully about many of the pictures I must have appeared unkind, which I have no desire to be to men who have been taken under the fostering care of His Excellency the Governor-General, and H. R. H. the Princess Louise, whose illustrious father, speaking at the Royal Academy dinner, on the 3rd of May, 1851, said in reference to artists and their productions:—

"The production of all works in art or poetry requires, in their conception and execution, not only an exercise of the intellect, skill and patience, but particularly a *concurrent warmth of feeling* and a free flow of imagination. This renders them most tender plants, which will thrive only in an atmosphere calculated to maintain that warmth, and that atmosphere is *kindness*—kindness towards the artist personally, as well as towards his production. An unkind word of criticism passes like a cold blast over their tender shoots and shrivels them up, checking the flow of the sap, which was rising to produce, perhaps, multitudes of flowers and fruit. But still criticism is *absolutely necessary to the development of art*, and the injudicious praise of an inferior work becomes an insult to superior genius."

No intelligent reader of the "Montreal Dailies" who has visited the recent Exhibition must be able to resist the truth of the opening paragraph of your contributor "Art," in your No. 18 Vol. III:

"Much has been written, and undue prominence has been given to some of the works, while others of greater merit have been passed by in silence by the daily papers which have criticised the paintings, and in such a manner have they performed the task that we are led to believe that if the arts in Canada require improvement so does that of "art criticism." (*sic*)

"Art," in his criticism has laid great stress upon the "Cattle" by Harrington Bird, "A Cow" by the late A. Vogt, and dwelt much upon the contributions of J. H. Fraser, H. Sandham, and Allen Edson, but has scrupulously avoided any notice of "A Summer's Afternoon (Essex)" in which is introduced a quadruped immortalized by Balaam, lamented by Sancho Panza, and sentimentalized by Lawrence Sterne, but no more like one of the genus *Equus Asinus* "than I am to Hercules."

If "Art" had said as much for the "Donkey picture," No. 69 in the catalogue, as he has for Bird's "immense bull," Vogt's cow, the pictures of Fraser, Sandham, and Edson, after this disparaging style:—"the ass is badly drawn, has an uncouth head and neck, such an animal would prove a novelty in a fair, had it been painted out, and the trees and the sky more carefully rendered, and more atmosphere imparted to the distance, it would be a better representative of nature, and more creditable to the artist's fame, and would have tended more to elevate the public taste, whereas now the less of such pictures seen by them (the public) the better;—the painting, for it cannot be called a picture, lacks breadth of effect, of colour, and of composition;—again it is affected in style, *un style maniere*—not a touch of nature in it." Mr. J. W. Gray would have thought such a sweeping criticism scarcely humane, and would, probably, have sought refuge from such a pitiless storm of defamation by declaring in the columns of the SPECTATOR that the writer had o'erstepped the modesty of criticism, and had, possibly been actuated by either malice, prejudice, or envy.

If "Art" had been taught the mysteries of his profession or vocation as an artist or critic, or his avocation as an amateur or connoisseur, I doubt whether he would have so mercilessly treated works which cost those who produced them the highest effort of their genius.

There were, doubtless, several pictures in the recent exhibition, which for its credit, and that of the artists who painted them, ought not to have been accepted by the gentlemen who composed the "Hanging Committee," who, nevertheless may for their kindness of heart be forgiven for not too strictly regarding the quality of the paintings, and who, for their refinement of feeling, may be commended for not "checking the flow of the sap," by sending "a cold blast over the tender shoots" of our young aspiring artists, which would have been done had their pictures been refused admission.

In conclusion, allow me to express the hope that at the next annual exhibition of the works of Canadian artists there may be more cause for congratulation.