

draw \$2.50 per acre a year for six consecutive years for not more than ten acres planted to trees. To be eligible, however, he is obliged to furnish adequate proof that the trees are not farther than eight feet apart, and that he replants in every instance where a tree dies. The law of 1881 provided for a maximum expenditure of \$20,000 in tree bounties, and to keep the amount within this sum a reduction was made last winter."

The results of this wise law in Minnesota are said to have already been such that, in the words of another contemporary, "the face of the country has been so changed in a few years that people knowing it as prairie only, would fail to recognize it." Mr. Joly's brief letter in our columns a few weeks since has attracted considerable attention to the subject. He and others whose scientific and practical knowledge gives special weight to their opinions can render a great service to the country by continuing to press the matter upon the attention of the Government and people.

CHURCH union, as discussed at the recent annual meeting of the Evangelical Alliance, in this city, is a question, not only of great interest in itself, but of weighty import from the far-reaching possibilities it involves. How formidable are the obstacles to be overcome before any general union of the great denominations can be brought about may be inferred from the differences of opinion which are met at the threshold, touching the kind of union it is desirable to seek. In the opinion of some, that which is chiefly desirable in the way of Union, namely, essential unity in thought and purpose, is already a fact accomplished, so far, at least, as the so-called Evangelical Churches are concerned. At the other extreme stands the view, which was evidently that of the Bishops of the Lambeth Conference, that there can be no union worth the having apart from some form of creed subscription, and agreement upon some common theory in regard to such ecclesiastical questions as that of the "historic episcopate." Intermediate between these are those in whose eyes the desired union takes the form of a federal organization, more or less compact, framed simply with a view to effective co-operation in carrying on the great aggressive warfare which is the chief mission of the visible church. The latter class again seems likely to be subdivided into those who would have the Protestant or Evangelical Churches united in order that they may combine their forces more effectively in the warfare against Romanism, and those who would seek union for its own sake and make its borders wide enough for the admission even of honest Roman Catholics. There can be little doubt, however, that the true, as well as the only practicable idea of Christian union, is that of unity in diversity, though this, too, leaves wide scope for differences of opinion touching the limits within which the unity is essential, or the diversity permissible. Even were a grand organic union of all the churches of Christendom possible by the discovery of some place of compromise on all matters of creed and policy, it would probably soon prove to be a very doubtful boon to humanity. Its edifice, built up with much nice word-juggling to-day, would begin to crumble to-morrow. The great temple of truth is many-sided, and there is no height accessible to the human mind from which all its parts can be viewed in their proper relations to each other and to the whole. Most of us have to be content with such glimpses as we can get from the low stand-point within our reach. The main thing, so far as the mere matter of belief is concerned, is to get the largest views, and to frame the most comprehensive and symmetrical conceptions possible. The success, however, of such subordinate unions as those which have been consummated between the various branches of the Presbyterian and the Methodist bodies in Canada teaches by contrast a useful lesson in regard to the folly of splitting hairs in theology and perpetuating distinctions without differences. There can be little doubt that progress in the same direction may be made by other bodies with similar results; there is still less room for doubt that some form of federal union for the accomplishment of the higher ends for which all churches exist is among the possibilities of the future, and that the practical power of the Christian religion may be wonderfully increased by such a concentration of its resources.

ONE of the most striking and suggestive papers read at the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance on the subject of "Christian Unity" was that of Rev. A. B. Cruchet, B.A., a French Protestant, of Montreal. In the heat of the present agitation on the subject of French aggression and the French language in the schools, every fair-minded, English-speaking Canadian will be glad to know how the matter strikes an intelligent and earnest French Protestant, who

has been for seventeen years working as an evangelist among the French-Canadians. There is much practical good sense in some of Mr. Cruchet's remarks, as when, for instance, referring to the need of constitutional reform, he reminds us, in effect, that Frenchmen are Frenchmen, and cannot, by any process, political or educational, be metamorphosed into Englishmen. We must "keep the substratum," says Mr. Cruchet, "it is good." The French ideas, tastes, methods, and manners are not to be discarded *en bloc*. Instead of looking upon the French-Canadian and his belongings with contempt or aversion, we should learn from him many things, and yield him many things. We must dismiss from our minds the notion that "the French-Canadians are an inferior, ignorant, degraded, and benighted people. They are not degraded, they are intelligent; and if they are not as well educated as their neighbours, it is because of their clergy, who educate the few to rule and govern the masses." The logic of the last clause rather militates, it must be confessed, against the preceding contention; still, the general argument is sound. Those who would really effect a change for the better in the views and ambitions of the French-Canadians must dismiss their contempt, born of prejudice and misconception, and approach them with the measure of respect due to their character as a people. "Cease to remind them," says Mr. Cruchet, "that they are a conquered people. They have been conquered by England, but not by the English-speaking inhabitants of Canada. In this land of ours we are all Canadians, all British subjects, all on a footing of equality." The thrust is keen, but merited. In another place the writer of the paper pointed out the necessity of emphasizing the difference between the "insatiable ambition of the clergy and the legitimate aspirations of the people." Again, he counsels that English-speaking Protestants cease to threaten French-Canadians with the loss of their language. "Why take away their dear and beautiful language? What harm is there to speak French, especially good French? The French, as far as I know, do not abuse their right. On the contrary, they learn English as fast as they can, and use it whenever they know that they will not be understood in French." The argument, however good in reference to Quebec with its million of French, to which, Mr. Cruchet, no doubt, means it to apply, would manifestly fail with reference to Manitoba and the North-West, with their small percentage of French settlers, if it includes the retention of the language for official purposes. A telling argument in favour of Christian union was made in the statement that it would enable the strong church that would result to wield with more efficiency the great power of the press. "The French-Canadians are rapidly becoming a reading population. A strong French Protestant press would more speedily than anything else evangelize the French, and yet their sole organ—*L'Aurore*—has for years eked out a miserable existence. None of the denominations would subsidise it, lest they should sow for some other denomination." We do not know whether the speaker is himself a member of one of the denominations so hard hit. His paper was certainly seasoned with a good sprinkling of French wit as well as wisdom.

THE Liberal Federation of England has wisely resolved to press forward at the coming session of Parliament a Bill embodying the "one man, one vote" principle. This is a reform so reasonable and just in its nature—provided, that is, that the fundamental Liberal principle of "government of the people, by the people, for the people," be accepted—that the question of its universal adoption, wherever representative institutions exist in their integrity, is but one of time. Now that the great Liberal party of England, with Gladstone at its head, has unequivocally and specifically embodied it as a plank in its platform, its acceptance by the Commons is pretty well assured, especially as the Liberal-Unionists can scarcely refuse to support it, and moderate Conservatives will not care to oppose it vigorously. This action of the English Liberals may suggest to those who claim to be their equivalents in Canadian politics the wisdom of pushing forward the same reform in Canada. Why not insist that the principle be embodied in the Franchise Act before the next general election? We see no good reason why the Government or the Conservative party should oppose it. The composition of parties in England is probably such that Conservatives will be likely to lose more than their opponents by the measure, but we see no reason to suppose that a similar result would follow in Canada. So far as we know the one party is as likely to receive the benefits of plural voting as the other. The chief value of the reform is that it would eliminate one temptation to imper-

sonation, and to the multiplying of spurious and otherwise fraudulent votes, and thus aid, to some extent, in purifying our politics.

THE death of Jefferson Davis has recalled to the world's memory the great struggle with which the ex-President of the Southern Confederacy was so closely connected. The responsibility which he with a few other leading Southerners incurred in precipitating the war of the Great Rebellion was a fearful one. Few men in the whole course of the world's history have been officially the means of causing so many of their fellowmen to bite the dust, as he who has just now himself obeyed the long-delayed but inevitable call. None the less, or perhaps we should say all the more, had his proved the winning instead of the lost cause, and the Southern Confederacy achieved the independent existence for which it fought so bravely, the name of Jefferson Davis might have gone down to future ages with something of the same lustre which glorifies that of Washington. Nor, after all, was there so very much difference in the specific ends for which the two men fought. Both aimed at freedom, the right of self-government for the people they represented. The misfortune—perhaps we should call it crime—in the case of the South was that the political independence for which it struggled was complicated and inextricably interwoven in the minds of the conquerors with the great moral question of slavery. As was apparent to outside observers in all the earlier stages of the contest, and as Lincoln himself frankly avowed, the issue on which war was waged and victory won was not the manumission of the slaves, but the preservation of the nation. Still it is likely that more Northern men fought to put down slavery than fought to save the nation. Probably more fought for money, or under compulsion, than from either a patriotic or a moral motive. Even at this date it is hard for the dispassionate reviewer of this eventful bit of history to see any valid reason, from either the political or the ethical point of view, for the distinction which makes the war of the Revolution a glorious struggle in the sacred cause of freedom—and the war of the Rebellion an iniquitous uprising against legitimate authority. Indeed, from one point of view, Washington was more emphatically the rebel, seeing that the Government against which he rose in arms made no pretensions to be based on the consent of the governed, while it might well seem that a Republic formed by the voluntary federation of States, and boasting the suffrages of a free people as its cornerstone, repudiated its own fundamental principle the moment it denied the right of secession to a number of the contracting States. So true it is that the event has after all most to do with determining the moral character of a movement in the eyes of history. But, passing by all such speculations, now bootless, nothing but a blind obstinacy could refuse to recognize the over-ruling Providence, which out of the evil has educes and is still educating good. The slaves are now freedmen, and are, we may hope, gradually becoming freemen. The nation is at peace and likely to remain so. The South has been reconstructed on a better foundation than that of unrighteous slavery, and is being regenerated by the infusion of the impulses and energies of a new and better life, industrial, political, and let us hope, moral.

THE original story of the abdication of the Emperor of Brazil seemed from the first somewhat apocryphal. It is not the manner of kings, even of the mild type of Dom Pedro, to resign the prerogative of royalty with a bow and a smile, at the first polite suggestion of their subordinates. The ex-Emperor's version of the affair, if that reported is genuine, gives it, as was to be expected, quite a different colour. Still it must not be forgotten that Dom Pedro himself is, in this case, an interested witness, and is scarcely in a position to give a dispassionate account of the transaction. Evidently the world will have to wait yet longer for a reliable version of this strange revolutionary movement. The character and motives of the chief actors must be read in the light of events yet to come. If the authority which, whatever the results, can hardly be described otherwise than as usurped, is wielded with moderation and transferred at the earliest possible moment into the hands of men constitutionally appointed to receive it, history may not only vindicate those who had the courage and genius to effect so great a change so quietly and peacefully, but may record their names amongst those of the benefactors whose memories future citizens of the Republic of Brazil may delight to honour. If, on the other hand, those who thus deftly but ruthlessly wrested the sceptre from the feeble hands of the aged monarch shall prove themselves military adventurers and self-seekers