

## A BIG DREAM.

A very amusing anecdote is told of Sir William Johnson, Superintendent of Indian Affairs in the Mohawk Valley, in 1755, and as it throws some light upon the easy manner in which fortunes were made in those days, may not be uninteresting to your readers. Sir William, by his usual courteous and kindly manner to the Indians, had gained an ascendancy over them generally, and particularly over a chief, named Hendrick. On one occasion Sir William was unpacking a large box of clothing which had just arrived from England, Hendrick happening to be in the room. He was particularly attracted by a richly embroidered coat which was brought forth and shaken out in all its glittering splendour of gold and lace, and gilded buttons and bright silk trimmings. The Indian's eyes sparkled, and he could scarcely keep his hands from the coveted prize, but he held back and kept his peace for the time. On the following morning, however, the chieftain waited upon Sir William for a purpose, as was evident from the intensity of his looks. "Sir William," he said, "I have a great dream last night; I dream that you say to me, 'Good Hendrick, you have been my friend, and now I will reward you,' and you gave me the new coat, with the bright gold on it that came in the box." The baronet reflected for a few moments, and finally said: "It is true, Hendrick, you have been my friend; the coat is yours. The chief went away fairly beside himself with joy. A few days after Sir William said to him, "Hendrick, I had a dream last night." "Ah! what did my white brother dream?" "I dreamt that you took me by the hand and said, 'Sir William Johnson, you have been my true friend, and I will give you a proof of my love,' and you gave me the tract of land on the great river and Canada Creek," describing a square territory embracing nearly one hundred thousand acres of choice land. The chief was for a little time confounded. This was the fairest part of his domain. But he was not to be outdone in generosity. "My pale-faced brother," he said, "the land is yours." After a pause he added with a nod, "Sir William, we won't dream any more. You dream one too big dream for me." I..

## AGRI-HORTICULTURAL DEPARTMENT.

## DEARBORATION OF CANADA.

The first effort of the settler is to clear his land, to destroy the forest, using what portions of timber and wood are required for his own wants, and leaving the remainder, which is often of great value. He often uses the ashes to prepare potash, thus depriving the land of a valuable fertilizer. But the great portion of the forest is destroyed without reason. By mere accident a few trees may be left, affording shade and grateful shelter for years. No sooner does the settler reach that condition when his utmost efforts are not required for supplying his daily wants and he gathers around him the comforts and conveniences of life, than he begins to perceive the want of trees for shade and for ornament. Along the road on the border of his land he plants young trees, and just as he reaches the allotted age of man his trees are in their prime. He has provided for the generation following him a few trees for ornament and shade. When drawing fuel from the distant forest, how often do the farmer's sons regret the wanton destruction of wood on the first settlement of the land? How often, if the farm is to be sold, does the lack of trees for shelter and ornament detract from its value? This is not the only loss by denuding the land of trees. The climatic effect is still more serious. Deprived of shelter from the cold winds of winter and the burning sun of summer, the soil becomes dry and the springs dried up. The farmer, often discouraged, buys new land to go through the same process of burning and destroying forests.

What the improvident farmer is doing on a small scale, is going on in the lumber regions of Canada on a large scale. Our magnificent forests are gradually being destroyed, a minimum portion being utilized as timber. With the management of private property the Government cannot interfere; but certain regulations can be insisted upon in the timber limits under its control to prevent the complete dearboration of Canada. Not a tree can be cut down in the Old Country without the consent of a Government inspector or the forester of the landlord. In the iron districts of the north of France, the wanton destruction of the forest for charcoal annihilated one of the greatest industries of France, and where once was a thriving population of artisans is now a poverty-stricken district. In the iron districts of Connecticut, the prudent forethought of the Government in enacting that wood for charcoal should be cut once in twenty-five years has preserved the iron industry, which has been a source of wealth to thousands. What will be the condition of Canada in a few years if the wanton destruction of forest trees goes on at the present rate it is fearful to contemplate. In the Baltic Islands, formerly abounding in forests of pines for shipbuilding, are now sand wastes, uninhabited, annually yielding to the encroachments of the sea, owing to the cupidity of the people of a former generation.

The vast forests of Canada, which serve as stores of water to supply the rivers and protection from the northern blast, are fast disappearing, and will render adjacent districts uninhabitable.

At the present rate, not many years will suffice to denude the forest lands of Canada in all districts accessible to navigation or railways. What is the remedy? First: Government should enact laws that all trees cut down, whether for timber or the convenience of lumbermen, should be paid for; that every lumber district should have an Inspector, to prevent the wanton destruction of trees not required for lumber. Second: Municipal authorities should insist on the planting of trees on the public highways. Third: The charter of every railway should contain a clause providing that trees be planted at certain distances along the line on both sides.

The Pacific Railway Company are now planting trees along their line for their own interests. It is a provision, we believe, in grants for lands in Manitoba, that the settler is required to plant a certain number of trees before he can obtain his title.

This subject is well worthy the attention of our Provincial as well as our Federal Legislature.

## DOMESTIC ECONOMY.

**ANILINE STAINS.**—A solution of sulphide of sodium will remove immediately the stains of aniline dyes from the hands.

**WATER TANKS.**—It is a great mistake to suppose that because the tank water is supplied from rain, it is therefore purer than that from river or well. The rain carries from the roof a portion of organic matter, which causes fermentation and the development of acetic acid; this acts upon the lead and produces a poison not easily detected without tests. There is comparatively no danger of river or well water being contaminated by lead, as the mineral salt contained in river water forms an insoluble compound with the lead of the pipes or tanks. All tanks near water closets should be covered to prevent dust from falling. They should be carefully and frequently cleaned; indeed, every kind of tank requires constant care and looking after, even if the water is only employed for external application.

Tanks and cisterns should be carefully cleaned, and all droppings of solder and lime should be removed. They should be well cleaned once a month and well covered up.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

## THE "REFORMED" EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR:

MR. EDITOR,—As an apology to the readers of the SPECTATOR for the appearance of this article in its columns, I will merely state that my sole object is to correct certain historical errors concerning the nature and object of the English Reformation which were recently advanced in this paper by the Rev. Dr. Ussher, and that I have no desire whatever to provoke a controversy.

The elimination of Papal errors, the emancipation of the Anglo-Catholic Church from the usurpation of the Bishop of Rome, and the return to the faith and practice of the primitive church, were the *real* and *only* objects of our martyred forefathers.

The first Prayer Book of Edward VI., fully accepted by the Church (A. D. 1549), was the result arrived at by the Reformers before the encroachments of Continental influences. In A.D. 1552, this book was revised, in order to satisfy some objections raised against it by parties who had imbibed the principles of those of the Foreign Reformers, who had fled to England to escape persecution. By making a few apparently unimportant concessions, our Reformers sought to unite all the Reformed Churches in one body, without surrendering the *all-important* principles. But the work of conciliation failed, and an enemy in disguise was permitted to enter the Church, which in after years proved to be as deadly a foe to truth as the Papacy had ever been.

After the Marian persecution, Queen Elizabeth with her advisers, Cecil and Parker, desired to adopt the Reformation, as the Reformers had left it, but the Puritans clamoured loudly for concessions, and the Prayer-book of A.D. 1552, was proposed as a compromise. But the Book had never been generally accepted by the Church since it contained things, which had a tendency to teach doctrines contrary to the spirit of the Reformation; and, while it was adopted, several additions were made to it from the original Book, so as to not only prevent the dissemination of false doctrine, but at the same time, to endeavour to conciliate the Puritans, who were in sympathy with the teachings of the Prayer-book of A.D. 1552.

It will not be necessary, in this article, to trace the progress of the English Church during the reigns of James I. and Charles I., and the nine years of persecution under Cromwell, when nearly 8,000 of her clergy perished either by violence or starvation, when it was a penal offence to even use in private the Prayer-book, and the Church pulpits were filled by the most ignorant and depraved of the masses; when Laud, who with all his faults, was sincerely devoted to the *true* principles of the Reformation, endured a martyr's death at the hands of a howling rabble, who called themselves law-makers; who reached the *acme* of their ambition, when Charles I., lay headless at their feet, and Communism and its twin sister, Infidelity, reigned supreme. All those facts are matters of history, and need not be further entered into in this article, and we will go on to the last revision of the Prayer-book, A.D. 1662. The alterations then made indicated a strong inclination to return to the first principles of the Reformation, as laid down in the first Prayer-book of Edward VI., and the result was, the Prayer-book, as we have it to-day. It is true, a few objectional things were retained, but this was the result of Puritan machinations, and all true Churchmen are anxiously looking forward and longing for the time when the ancient Liturgy shall be restored, and the Anglican Church, freed from all Puritan innovations, will be as she was in the "glorious morn" of the Reformation.

Bearing these facts in mind, it is difficult to see how our Prayer-book can be said to contain doctrines tending towards Romanism and at variance with *true* Evangelical doctrines, as held by the Apostles and the Primitive Church.

Instead of the followers of the late Bishop Cummings, taking, as they assert for their model, the true Protestant Church of England, they have in reality adopted as their principal articles of faith the following doctrines, unknown alike to the New Testament, and to the Church Catholic for nearly seventeen centuries, viz.:—

Firstly, the doctrine of Instantaneous and Sensible Conversion, being the Holy Spirit's unvarying method of dealing with the soul, calling it the "New Birth," which latter terms the Holy Scriptures *invariably* applies to the grace of Baptism.

Secondly, the doctrine of Human Perfection, teaching that he that is "born of God" in this sensible conversion, *sins not ever after*. The ultimate tendency of these doctrines, when fully developed, is to set up an *individual infallibility*, equally as arrogant as that assumed by the Bishop of Rome; and the doctrine of *salvation, by works of merit*, both utterly repugnant to, and at variance with Holy Scripture.

If these "Reformers" do not attribute any efficacy to the Apostolic Succession, why have their leaders taken such careful precautions to obtain and perpetuate it?