



IMPROVED FARMING IN THE NORTHWEST.

and the grain laid low and gathered on a large and somewhat imposing scale.

The large number of homesteads taken up by people in the United States is significant. It shows that the limit of pioneer settling has been reached in that country; that the land not yet taken up is not of a sufficiently encouraging nature to induce immigration, and that people are, therefore, naturally turning their eyes towards the more productive territories of our own Northwest. "The Canadian Northwest," says the *Colonist*, "contains the only extensive tract of productive land on the North American continent which is open for free homesteading. Not only, therefore, may the stream of land-seekers from the United States be expected to grow, but the current of that class of immigrants from other countries who are looking for farming lands will be turned more distinctly towards this country." The same paper also states that the outlook for the future of Western Canada is quite as bright as it has been at any time since the opening up of the country to settlement. The country, of course, has felt the pinch of the hard times which have swept over all the world, but the people are in no wise cast down over the present necessity for practising a little more economy than they have been used to in the past.

It will be seen, then, that the anxiety of the bishops in the Northwest to be provided with means for strengthening the Church among the white settlers of the country is reasonable, and calls for the liberality of Churchmen in the east. It is true that the dioceses of the Northwest are assisted liberally by the missionary societies in

England, but it must be remembered that this support is gradually being withdrawn, and the fear lies before the bishops that the larger population will be on their hands at a time when the means placed at their disposal will be the smaller. Hence the necessity for increased contributions from the Churchmen of Eastern Canada.

THE recent eulogy on "Mohammedanism" by Prof. Max Muller in the *Nineteenth Century* is well and fully answered by Rev. Dr. Bruce in the April number of the *Church Missionary Intelligencer*. The shamefully licentious life and savage cruelty of Mahomet, the founder of the false system, renders it unseemly that he should be mentioned in the same breath with the pure and holy Jesus, the founder of Christianity; and as the stream cannot rise higher than its source, the Mohammedan has not much to boast of if he, as a devoted disciple, follows his master, whom, by his religion, he is bound to regard as the greatest of the prophets. But the Christian, rise he ever so high in purity and honesty, in virtue and self-denial for the benefit of others, in sobriety and every other quality which ennoble his mind and conduct, must feel himself immeasurably beneath Him who first taught the principles of his religion. Here is an important difference to begin with, and Dr. Bruce shows clearly that he who champions Mohammedanism, in its laws and practices, is the leader of a losing cause, and has set himself to an impossible task.