

read Sir Joshua Reynold's opinion of Michael Angelo, and then turn to John Ruskin's writings what a difference there is between these two eminent writers regarding the man.

For the opinion of some men amongst us, "Art" entertains great respect. They may not have studied it professionally, yet we think they have a clear conception of what is true or false in art. The paths of study leading to the history and causations which have governed art in the past are open to all. But the objection we have to the writer in your last number of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR, is that on all occasions he arrogates to himself too much of the art knowledge of the Dominion, and by doing so often insults the intelligence of the people. He is apt to be dogmatic in writing and intolerant of speech: wherever you meet him, he only must be heard upon the subject of art. He has been absent for some time from the columns of the SPECTATOR, but all at once he bursts forth in the full majesty of his power, uttering sentences which have become from repetition so familiar to the readers of your paper. We must confess, that we rejoice to see the great change which appears to be taking place in his mind, if we may judge by his last effusion. It appears since Royalty has smiled upon art, he too is willing to bestow a kind word upon Canadian artists. We trust it will last. Hitherto abuse from him has been their portion; henceforth they are to receive only kind words and encouraging smiles, with one solitary exception. In consequence of this change the artist who painted that clever water colour sketch of him, the other day, may now destroy it, for peace is declared. Nor will another of our talented citizens have occasion to immortalize him again, as he did in the past when he represented him in one of his pictures with a portfolio under his arm, and carrying a brass candlestick in his hand, as if in the act of searching for antiquities among the huckster's stalls at the Bonsecours market. I am at a loss to conceive why he changed so suddenly the full force of his wrath from Mr. Sandham who had incurred his displeasure, and upon whose head he heaped denunciations. Now it is Mr. Gray who has provoked his ire, and who previous to the advent of his letter was aware that utter annihilation awaited him through that power which only a King can wield. Well, the letter heralded forth by Mr. King's advanced puffing has appeared, and strange to say, Mr. Gray still survives.

No one of intelligence expects any original art-thoughts, but can depend upon a copious supply of extracts from books, which are always the best reading in Mr. King's letters, but I am at a loss to conceive why he did not give us some argument to refute "Art's" criticisms in a late number of the SPECTATOR. Instead of reasoning, we find nothing but abuse. Twice those notes have been assailed, but both writers avoid the task of proving them incorrect, and until they do so the intelligent portion of the public will be inclined to agree with "Art."

Mr. King appears to have been prompted by certain persons who wish to stay in the background. Would it not have shown more courage if they themselves had come forward and attacked J. W. Gray. The opinions of Mr. King, as far as the intelligent readers of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR in Montreal are concerned, require no comment. He is too well known here as a prejudiced critic, but as the circulation of the SPECTATOR extends all over the Dominion, its readers in other cities may not know Mr. King and his "playful eccentricities," as he is pleased to term them. He may think himself clever, but the days have passed, however Mr. King may regret it, when he can hold up a small panel picture and declare it "exceedingly fine," "full of sentiment and feeling," "of invention and imagination," "true to nature," "and of great antiquity," or hope to dazzle a spectator's eyes by the exhibition of a modern Wedgwood plate, which is of "immense value," "a perfect gem," "a priceless treasure," and before concluding I may as well point out where I may have aroused Mr. King's animosity. By injudiciously pointing out the name of a modern American painter "Coleman" in the corner of the picture, also failing to go into raptures over it. Or by informing, when and where, he purchased the "priceless treasure" of Wedgwood's production, and the price he paid for it.

J. W. Gray.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR:

SIR,—Would you kindly give publicity to the accompanying letter, the third of a series addressed to the *Star*, which he either neglects or refuses to publish. The two preceding letters enter into detailed proof of the correctness of my original assertion, and will be forthcoming in due time if needed:

TO THE EDITOR OF THE STAR.

SIR,—The non-insertion in your columns of my letter regarding the Bruce memorial erected at Lochmaben, County of Dumfries, Scotland, transmitted to you some time since, would appear to point to the desirableness on your part of concealing something, which, if brought to the light of day, would result in disquietude of spirit to some parties concerned.

Impartiality, so far as I am concerned, is at a discount.

My first letter on the subject you did not publish, but freely commented on, and these comments placed me in a false position. I am unwilling to remain in this position.

I, therefore, now respectfully request you to give publicity to said letter or letters (whose contents are corroborated by the Provost (Anglice, Mayor) of Lochmaben and the Rev. Wm. Graham, of Trinity, Edinburgh) during the present week, or to announce to me in any way you choose your refusal to do so. In the event of refusal, I shall in that case be at liberty to ventilate the subject in some other direction, with a view to vindicate my original assertion,—namely, that the Bruce memorial statue was *absolutely free of debt at the time the Rev. Mr. Muckie, assistant minister of St. Paul's, requested, through your columns, the Scotchmen of Montreal to hand over to him subscriptions for the purpose of liquidating a debt which did not exist.*

Hugh Niven.

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
	Week	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$	\$
*Grand Trunk.....	May 15	73,373	125,270	198,643	149,484	49,159		20 w'ks	504,674	
Great Western.....	" 7	35,522	51,890	87,412	74,716	12,696		19 "	206,990	
Northern & H. & N.W.	" 8	7,617	21,701	29,318	18,138	11,180		18 "	71,607	
Toronto & Nipissing..	" 7	1,201	1,676	2,877	2,958		61	18 "	7,511	
Midland.....	" 7	1,690	5,391	7,081	3,489	3,592		18 "	24,958	
St. Lawrence & Ottawa	" 8	1,546	1,276	2,822	3,142		320	fm Jan. 1	1,563	
Whitby, Pt Perry & Lindsay.....	" 14	530	1,245	1,775	1,096	679		"	8,131	
Canada Central.....	" 7	2,492	4,491	6,981	5,971	1,010		18 w'ks	12,417	
Toronto, Grey & Bruce	" 8	1,843	4,555	6,398	3,777			18 "	16,386	
†Q., M., O. & O.....	April 30	6,488	3,242	9,730	4,671	5,059		17 "	44,269	
	Month					(Month)	Month			
Intercolonial.....	April.	52,278	116,844	169,122	109,137	59,985		4 m'ths	152,943	

*NOTE TO GRAND TRUNK.—The River du Loup receipts are included in 1879, not in 1880; omitting them the week's increase is \$53,359, aggregate increase \$587,874 for 20 weeks.

†NOTE TO Q., M., O. & O. Rv.—Eastern Division receipts not included in returns for 1879.

BANKS.

BANK.	Shares par value.	Capital Subscribed.	Capital Paid up.	Rest.	Price per \$100 May 13, 1880.	Price per \$100 May 13, 1879.	Last half-yearly Dividend.	Per cent. per annum of last dividend on present price.
Montreal.....	\$200	\$12,000,000	\$11,999,200	\$5,000,000	\$135 78½	\$133 60	4	5.93
Ontario.....	40	3,000,000	2,996,756	100,000	78½	60	3	7.34
Molson's.....	50	2,000,000	1,999,095	100,000	82¾	77 3	3	7.25
Toronto.....	100	2,000,000	2,000,000	500,000	125	100¼	3½	5.60
Jacques Cartier.....	25	500,000	500,000	55,000	71	34	2½	7.04
Merchants.....	100	5,798,267	5,518,933	475,000	93¾	76½	3	6.40
Eastern Townships.....	50	1,469,600	1,382,937	200,000	99½	95	3½	7.04
Quebec.....	100	2,500,000	2,300,000	425,000				
Commerce.....	50	6,000,000	6,000,000	1,400,000	121½	103¾	4	6.58
Exchange.....	100	1,000,000	1,000,000					
MISCELLANEOUS.								
Montreal Telegraph Co.....	40	2,000,000	2,000,000	171,432	95	103	4	8.42
R. & O. N. Co.....	100	1,565,000	1,565,000		39	40¾		
City Passenger Railway.....	50		600,000	163,000	93½	80	15	5.35
New City Gas Co.....	40	2,000,000	1,880,000		121½	110¾	5	8.23

*Contingent Fund. †Reconstruction Reserve Fund. ‡Per annum.

*THE FARMERS' DELIVERIES of home-grown Grain in the 150 towns in England and Wales for the week ended April 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.....	29,333	48s 1d	7,628	32s 8d	2,388	21s 11d
1879.....	53,483	40s 11d	7,996	31s 0d	2,344	20s 11d
1878.....	38,355	51s 8d	5,198	42s 6d	2,557	25s 10d
1877.....	33,550	55s 10d	6,540	40s 6d	4,005	25s 8d
1876.....	41,916	44s 11d	11,737	34s 1d	2,300	26s 3d
1875.....	58,799	42s 10d	5,171	38s 10d	1,558	30s 0d
1874.....	43,620	62s 1d	5,258	46s 6d	1,578	29s 1d
1873.....	40,610	54s 10d	9,839	39s 4d	1,849	23s 10d
1872.....	52,931	54s 6d	8,771	36s 4d	2,719	22s 8d
1871.....	77,067	59s 7d	8,616	36s 9d	2,653	27s 9d

Average 10 years.....	46,876	51s 6d	7,675	37s 19d	2,601	25s 8d
And the deliveries from—						
September 1, 1879, to April 24, 1880.....	1,027,681		1,469,178		140,121	
September 1, 1873, to April 26, 1879.....	1,825,472		1,591,507		134,727	
Decrease in 150 towns.....	797,791		122,329		*5,394	
Decrease in the Kingdom.....	3,191,164		489,316		*21,576	

*Increase.

*Summary of exports for week ending May 14th, 1880:—

From—	Flour, bbls.	Wheat, bush.	Corn, bush.	Oats, bush.	Rye, bush.	Pease, bush.
New York.....	86,352	644,157	449,563	3,863		9,809
Boston.....	28,839	99,51	183,281	240		
Portland.....			47,930			
Montreal.....	4,138	13				1511
Philadelphia.....	10,909	134,379	315,480	372		
Baltimore.....	19,269	545,873	223,567	1,000		
Total per week.....	148,907	1,334,376	1,162,891	5,475		11,320
Corresponding week of '79.....	93,983	1,399,288	1,865,567	43,663	192,362	48,361

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

	Beeves.	Cows.	Calves.	Sheep.	Swine.
May 10.....	11,504	27	5,286	25,162	35,781
May 3.....	17,035	122	5,749	29,379	33,362
April 26.....	13,611	88	4,800	27,723	34,973
April 19.....	13,575	79	3,850	24,703	39,180
Total 4 weeks.....	55,725	313	19,676	105,958	143,296
Corresponding 4 weeks 1879.....	39,652	205	17,719	90,206	137,400
Corresponding week 1879.....	9,224	53	4,799	23,904	39,112
Weekly average, 1879.....	10,933	142	2,998	29,095	33,089
Corresponding week 1878.....	11,373	64	3,950	21,065	27,961

*From New York Produce Exchange.