

CORRESPONDENCE.

PRINCIPAL DAWSON ON EVOLUTION.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR :

SIR,—It is to be regretted that your reviewer, in noticing my views on Evolution, had not taken the trouble to consult some of my published writings on the subject, which are sufficiently accessible, instead of criticising a "brief report," of which I am not in a position to express any opinion, as I have not read it, and which, because of its brevity, was probably very imperfect. The lecture criticised was not on the subject of Evolution, which was merely referred to incidentally in connection with the probability that the writers of the Old Testament may have been acquainted with ideas of evolution not very dissimilar from some of those now held, but that they have nevertheless kept up the distinction between the rational and moral nature of man and the instinctive and automatic nature of the animal, even when pointing us to the lower animals for lessons of the highest wisdom.

I have not, in this lecture or elsewhere, objected to evolution on the authority of the Bible. I venture to dissent from many of the current theories known under that somewhat vague and comprehensive name, solely because they appear to me to be destitute of scientific proof and inconsistent with observed natural facts; and so long as this is the case I need not accept them, however insisted on by "eminent authorities." That such authorities are sometimes weak in reasoning on this subject, is well seen in the extracts you have given from Wallace, who, starting from the statement that it is "almost" demonstrable that specific changes are "produced"—they have not as yet been known to be actually produced—by variation, and admitting that the further changes necessary to give higher groups are "far less clear," ends with a triumphant affirmation of the evolution of the whole animal and vegetable kingdoms from "a few primeval types," the origin of which would of course still remain to be accounted for. But I have elsewhere sufficiently shown the weakness of this sort of reasoning, not on theological but on purely scientific grounds.

I would add that I entirely disclaim the bad taste of stigmatising those who may differ from me on scientific or philosophical questions as "infidels, atheists, sceptics, &c." I have not done so, and do not propose to do so. Further, as to what your reviewer calls "the impossibility of the heathen 'learning salvation' by the teachings of nature," I believe I am not responsible for the expression "learning salvation," whatever it may mean; but I know that the principal object of the lecture in question was to show how much of the highest spiritual teaching all men, whether heathen or otherwise, may derive from nature, and in how marked a manner the Bible directs attention to this source of instruction.

J. W. Dawson.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR.

DEAR SIR,—We have been good friends for so far, but this week you and I must disagree about the way "u" and "I" were treated in my last article. You make me say "for my wife and I," &c. Now did I not say "for my wife and me? If I did not it is very strange, for I never—well, hardly ever—make such mistakes, and I love to be an objective case. I know they say you are too fond of nominative cases, but that is no reason that you should make one of me. By the way, the *Gazette* says you have a "principle" in the use of the "capital I." I suppose you have, but I don't think you can accuse the *Gazette* of having any principles in the use of its "editorial we." I don't think it is to your "I" that people object so much as to its being a capital "I." Now, if you would use a small "i"—a wee "i" should please everybody, since the great trouble is that you are not we(e) as an editor.

But I shall say no more to you about the "I" if you will apologise to me about the "u." Is it not too bad that a "u" should be taken out of my name, and what Mrs. Shoddy would call a *hen* put in place of it? Know you not that I was named "Ninus" after the first King of Assyria, husband of Semiramis and founder of Nineveh? And yet you put me down "Ninns"! *Sic transit gloria mundi* in the last number of the SPECTATOR.

But I must warn you, Mr. Editor, that you will have Mr. Hugh Niven down upon you again about the "M. P.s." In one of your editorials you have "M. P.'s," singular, possessive, instead of "M. P.s," plural, objective; and it seems to me that "M. P.s" is not correct either, for they are not Member of Parliaments, but Members of Parliament. Why not write "M.s P."? Of course you may say that common usage has made "M. P.s" proper, (they say it takes uncommon usage to make some of them proper during the Sessions), but common usage has made it proper to put them always in the possessive case. Perhaps it is because they sometimes carry on like all possess that people think they must always be possessed.

My wife, who has been reading this over my shoulder, has just asked me a conundrum: "What is the difference between you and me, Ninny dear?" I suggested that I was much cleverer than she, but she says that is not the answer; it is that she is Phrosie and I am prosy. They say a clever man's wife never appreciates him; but lest you, Mr. Editor, and your readers should agree with Phrosie, I shall hasten to subscribe myself

Faithfully yours,

Ninus Clitheroe.

P.S.—Phrosie suggests that perhaps the reason we use "M.P.s" instead of "M.s P." is because so many of them are M.P. (emp'y) heads. I don't think Phrosie's puns are any better than mine, do you? N. C.

[NOTE.—Yes, Ninus Clitheroe did write it "for my wife and me"—which a new proof-reader changed, thinking it better grammar, and making a blunder of course.—Ed.]

TRADE—FINANCE—STATISTICS.

RAILWAY TRAFFIC RECEIPTS.

COMPANY.	1880.			1879.		Week's Traffic.		Aggregate.		
	Period.	Pass. Mails & Express	Freight	Total.	Total.	Incr'se	Decr'se	Period.	Incr'se	Decr'se
*Grand Trunk.....	Feb 14	\$ 41,466	\$ 149,201	\$ 190,667	\$ 171,545	\$ 19,122		7 w'ks	\$ 63,825	
Great Western.....	" 6	26,780	45,434	72,214	89,104	16,881		6 "	51,584	
Northern & H. & N.W.	" 8	5,857	10,583	16,440	16,522	82		5 "	3,704	
Toronto & Nipissing..	" 7	1,232	2,035	3,267	3,184	83		5 "	3,380	
Midland.....	" 7	1,573	1,933	3,512	3,365	147		5 "	2,746	
St. Lawrence & Ottawa	" 7	1,662	1,491	3,153	2,102	1,051		5 m Jan. 1	2,504	
Whitby, Pt Perry & Lindsay.....	" 7	474	945	1,419	1,735	316		"	1,647	
Canada Central.....	" 7	1,616	2,478	4,124	3,440	684		5 w'ks	4,334	
Toronto Grey & Bruce	" 7	2,043	2,011	4,054	6,204	2,150		5 "	2,907	
Q. M. O. & O.....	Jan. 31	3,395	2,004	6,059	5,156	903		4 "	1,499	
Intercolonial.....	Month							Month		
	Dec.	46,677	81,114	127,821	103,552	24,269		6 m'nths		29,695

*The River du Loup receipts are included in 1879, not in 1880; omitting them the week's increase is \$23,322, aggregate increase \$93,225 for 7 weeks.

BANKS.

BANK.	Shares par value.	Capital Subscribed.	Capital Paid up	Rest.	Price per \$100 Feb. 18, 1880.	Price per \$100 Feb. 18, 1879.	Two last 1/2-yearly Dividends.	Equivalent of Dividend based on price of Stock.
Montreal.....	\$200	\$12,000,000	\$11,999,200	\$5,000,000	\$138 1/2	\$132 1/2	10	7 1/2
Ontario.....	40	3,000,000	2,996,000	100,000	71	61 1/2	6	8 1/2
Molson's.....	50	2,000,000	1,999,095	100,000	77	81 1/2	6	7 1/2
Toronto.....	100	2,000,000	2,000,000	500,000	123	114 1/2	7	5 1/2
Jacques Cartier.....	25	500,000	500,000	55,000	60	28	5 1/2	9 1/2
Merchants.....	100	5,798,267	5,511,040	475,000	92 1/2	76 1/2	6	6 1/2
Eastern Townships.....	50	1,469,600	1,381,989	200,000	7	..
Quebec.....	100	2,500,000	2,500,000	425,000	6	..
Commerce.....	50	6,000,000	6,000,000	1,400,000	117	100 1/2	8	6 1/2
Exchange.....	100	1,000,000	1,000,000
MISCELLANEOUS.								
Montreal Telegraph Co.....	40	2,000,000	2,000,000	171,432	93	99	7	7 1/2
R. & O. N. Co.....	100	1,565,000	1,565,000	..	37 1/2	41	4 1/2	12
City Passenger Railway.....	50	..	600,000	163,000	88 1/2	117	5	5 1/2
New City Gas Co.....	40	2,000,000	1,880,000	..	117 1/2	117 1/2	10	8 1/2

*Contingent Fund. †Reconstruction Reserve Fund.

From April 1st to January 24th the Exchequer receipts of Great Britain amounted to £60,373,528, as compared with £61,578,835 in the corresponding period of the previous twelve months. The expenditure has been £68,610,352.

*THE FARMERS' DELIVERIES of home-grown Grain in the 150 towns in England and Wales for the week ended January 24th, 1880, and for the corresponding weeks of the previous nine years and the weekly average prices:—

	WHEAT.		BARLEY.		OATS.	
	Qrs.	Price.	Qrs.	Price.	Qrs.	Price.
1880.....	36,903	45 7d	64,080	37s 3d	4,713	20s 10d
1879.....	55,792	39s 1d	63,237	37s 5d	3,871	20s 1d
1878.....	44,186	51s 10d	71,119	44s 8d	4,599	21s 0d
1877.....	43,459	52s 3d	65,853	39s 11d	6,439	24s 10d
1876.....	52,316	44s 2d	75,066	35s 0d	4,329	25s 4d
1875.....	54,525	43s 0d	53,263	45s 0d	3,614	28s 9d
1874.....	52,652	63s 3d	61,143	47s 7d	4,664	28s 2d
1873.....	47,089	55s 9d	54,980	49s 3d	7,001	22s 1d
1872.....	59,369	55s 10d	72,839	37s 10d	5,832	22s 8d
1871.....	79,114	52s 6d	67,572	35s 5d	6,439	20s 4d
Average 10 years.....	52,342	50s 4d	65,215	40s 0d	5,150	23s 8d

And the deliveries from:—

	Wheat, qrs.	Barley, qrs.	Oats, qrs.
September 1, 1879, to January 24, 1880.....	643,036	1,080,826	84,313
September 1, 1878, to January 25, 1879.....	1,155,221	1,162,455	79,499
Decrease in 150 towns.....	512,185	88,622	*4,814
Decrease in the Kingdom.....	2,052,740	354,528	*19,256

*Increase.

*The receipts of Live Stock at New York for the last four weeks have been as follows:—

	Beeves.	Cows.	Calves.	Sheep.	Swine.
February 9.....	11,494	185	860	30,672	37,227
February 2.....	12,462	169	1,138	36,580	32,715
January 26.....	12,774	169	910	25,343	32,451
January 19.....	14,192	228	1,000	38,587	34,849
Total 4 weeks.....	50,922	751	3,908	131,182	137,242
Corresponding 4 weeks 1879.....	40,587	342	2,924	92,240	145,144
Corresponding week 1879.....	8,423	87	829	26,054	37,095
Weekly average, 1879.....	10,033	142	2,998	29,005	33,081
Corresponding week 1878.....	9,427	101	907	34,731	37,756

*Summary of exports for week ending February 7th, 1880:—

From —	Flour, brls.	Wheat, bush.	Corn, bush.	Oats, bush.	Rye, bush.	Pease, bush.
New York.....	59,226	656,601	253,056	1,594	16,369	7,799
Boston.....	13,049	37,751	2,0437
Portland.....	700	26,000	32,000
Montreal.....
Philadelphia.....	1,314	10,000	194,324	7.2
Baltimore.....	4,195	250,213	297,957
Total per week.....	78,475	990,573	974,876	1,236	16,369	30,299
Corresponding week of '79.....	135,263	1,251,476	1,599,347	2,885	80,592	37,279

*13,609 bushels Barley. †6,000 bushels Barley.

*From New York Produce Exchange.