

The one question for this Society, at present, is the commercial relations the Dominion holds, and ought to hold to the United States. We are just commencing housekeeping, and everything has to bend to the stern law of ways and means. The Political Economy Society is pledged to discuss this as the main item on its programme, and it is to be hoped that it will be considered in a calm, fair, dispassionate, and conclusive manner. One thing let me say with authority: membership will compromise no one. A member may hold to his opinions and to his party, and yet attend the debates. The society aims at the free discussion of all questions which can come within the very broad limits of political economy. Every man who has a concern for the future of the Dominion should join the society, and it is to be hoped that other cities and towns will follow the good example set by the City of Montreal. Whatever may be of interest ought to be discussed, and no important question should be shirked or shelved without examination. We have tried to exist on sentiment and party, but it is high time that we put away all childish things.

CUI BONO?

Advent sermons have been preached in great abundance during the last four weeks, and I should like to put a question or two to those who are so constantly talking of the second coming of Christ. First of all; What is the real and practical value of this new gospel? How is it going to influence men's thoughts and lives? What will it do for us in the approaching fiercer conflict between theology and science?

Second: Suppose the coming of Christ shall not be after the preconceived ideas of the Second Adventists, will they recognise the Lord? Because it is on record that the men among the Jews who had studied the sacred writings profoundly, and had formulated their theories as to the kind of man the Messiah should be, and looked every day for his coming, said of Christ—"This fellow, we know not whence He is." As Canon Baldwin puts it:—

"It was prophesied that He should be born of the seed of the woman. In Bethlehem He was born, of the Virgin Mary. It was prophesied that He should come of the seed of Abraham, and that prophecy was literal in its fulfilment. He was to be born of the House of David, and He was the root and offspring of David. He was to be the Lion of the tribe of Judah, and He became the Lion of the Tribe of Judah. He was to be the despised and rejected of men, and He was spit upon, and buffeted, and when His people were asked whether they would have Him or Barrabbas, the murderer, they preferred Barrabbas. It was prophesied that He should speak unto them in parables, and He spoke unto them in parables. It was prophesied that He should heal the sick, and He went about healing the sick. It was prophesied that He should ride into Jerusalem in meek triumph, riding upon an ass, and that too was fulfilled. It was prophesied that He should be betrayed for thirty pieces of silver, and for thirty pieces of silver He was sold. It was prophesied that the money should go for the purchase of the potter's field, and it was literally fulfilled. It was prophesied that the soldiers should cast lots for His raiment, and they cast lots for His raiment. It was prophesied that He should be crucified and rise on the third day, and on the third day He rose. It was prophesied that the Spirit should descend on the day of Pentecost, and on the day of Pentecost was witnessed the descent of the Holy Spirit."

But it must have occurred to the Canon that the Jews had all those evidences before their eyes, and yet they rejected the Christ. He did not answer to all, not even to most of their notions. And suppose our Second Adventists should be misreading prophecy; and suppose the second coming shall not be after the notions they have formed, will they be likely to acknowledge the blunder and accept the truth as it shall be revealed? In all probability a great revolution is at hand—new forces are breaking in upon life everywhere—but it is more than probable—judging from history—that our earnest Second Adventists, and their successors, will be looking up for a thousand years to come.

THE COTEAU BRIDGE AGAIN.

SIR,—In last Saturday's issue I see that you have invited a gentleman to give you a fair judicial opinion, uninfluenced by any local consideration, on this Bridge and Railroad. Now, Sir, I have taken a very lively interest in this railway from its inception to the present time, and I might allow your correspondent's remarks to pass unnoticed were it not for one sentence in his closing remarks—namely, "Would not Canada lose more than Glengarry

would gain?" I cannot see how Canada would lose more than Glengarry. The County of Glengarry is in Ontario, and Ontario is in the Dominion, and after the road was built they would be still part of the Dominion; but, let me tell your correspondent that the Railway Charter was not granted to Glengarry, neither was it ever intended to be built merely to accommodate that county, and that county never was or could be so selfish as to ask a charter to accommodate itself, but the charter was obtained for a larger and greater scheme than merely being built for one county. This road, when completed, will accommodate the County of Huntingdon on the south side of the St. Lawrence, and on the north, the Counties of Soulanges, Glengarry, Russell, and part of the County Carleton and the city of Ottawa. I really cannot understand why the Province of Quebec generally have taken such a lively interest in stopping the construction of a railway which costs them nothing, and costs the Dominion nothing. Has not Ontario as much right to build and maintain her own railways as the Province of Quebec? Yet Ontario never interfered with that Province in the management of its railways; yet the Province of Quebec wants the Dominion to relieve her of the burden of her railways. If so, the Province of Ontario will have something to say on this question. Why does the North Shore Railway seek connection with the city of Ottawa? It is to increase its traffic. Has Ontario objected to this? She has not; for when the Toronto & Ottawa Railway is completed it will be an important feeder to the North Shore Railway, also an important feeder to the Canada & Atlantic Railway, and will be a shorter route to the sea-shore than any now in existence. Why should the Province of Quebec (Montreal especially) ask the people of this section of Ontario to carry them somewhere round by Montreal instead of a straight line, saving a distance of nearly fifty miles? It is said this road and bridge will injure Montreal; if so, is that a reason that the people of the Ottawa Valley should not build a road to accommodate the trade of this section of the country? I contend that what benefits the Ottawa Valley benefits Montreal; for nine-tenths of the traders of the Ottawa Valley buy their goods in Montreal; and when our staple article, the lumber trade, can save money by a direct communication with the American market, then every one connected with them saves money. On the same principle of enterprise, the people of Ottawa might object to Brockville tapping our trade at Arnprior. The same might be said of the people of Kingston tapping the trade at Pembroke; also of the people of Toronto for tapping our trade at Nipissing. Those people had a perfect right to build those railways without outside interference, and so will the Canada & Atlantic Railway be built, notwithstanding the opposition of a large portion of Quebec against it. One reason why Montreal objected to this bridge was, that it would interfere with the navigation of the St. Lawrence. It had been shown in evidence before the Railway Committee that there was only at the rate of one and a half boat per day passing downwards—none upwards—and that the bridge could be opened by steam-power in one minute, and by hand-power in two minutes, and that no boat passes downwards except in daylight and clear weather. If this can be called obstruction, compare it with the Mississippi River, with its eleven bridges, and a boat passing every hour in the day, yet no accident; and I am satisfied that when Col. Gzowski makes his report on the bridge question, you will find that he will state that no objection can be raised against a proper low-level swing bridge. His report will be made, I expect, at a very early date, and it is the opinion of all engineers who have given an opinion on the bridge, that there is no difficulty in building a bridge that will not interfere with the navigation of the St. Lawrence.

I remain yours, &c.

Ottawa.

"Ottawa" has fallen into several blunders. First of all, he fails to distinguish between the remarks of my correspondent in last week's issue of this journal and the comment I made on them. The letter was put within inverted commas, and my remarks in answer followed. Then "Ottawa" argues that as Glengarry is in Ontario, and Ontario is in the Dominion, no harm can come to the Dominion or any part of it by the building of the bridge at Coteau. "Ottawa" is not very nice as to logic.

SIR,—I have just read in your paper of to-day, Dec. 20th, an anecdote which you credit to Edmund Yates of the *World*, and I do not know which inspires me with greater disgust, the story itself, or your introduction of it. I fear I am inclined to give Mr. Yates the benefit of the doubt; for you, living so much nearer to *America*, know its people better. And you say, "Edmund Yates, of the *World*, is responsible for the following general remarks and particular story, which deal with the manners of a certain and numerous class of Americans who still persist in carrying their natural blunders into civilized society."

Now, I ask you, Mr. Editor, as a believer in truthfulness, in and out of journalism, to retract what is thus evidently a blunder of yours.

You know that persons of the kind described in the *World's* story are not only not numerous, but so scarce that I doubt if you should search through the great nation on your border, if you would find a native-born citizen who would