

and the cossus; and the art of curing the ligneous consumption, which has hitherto been considered mortal, consists, according to him, in destroying these insatiable parasites, and fortifying the trunk against their future ravages. His first experiments were made on the large trees bordering the public walks of Paris, and with these he proceeded cautiously and gradually. He scored them in longitudinal sections, hoping in this way to quicken the circulation of sap in the bark between the incisions, at the same time that he laid bare and extirpated the tunnel-shaped nests of numberless tree-consuming insects. Encouraged by the results of this attempt, he ventured to try the effect of stripping trees thus affected of their whole bark—an operation not much less bold in its own way than that of slaying a human being. However, we are told that it succeeded to admiration, that “the scolytes and cossuses found themselves instantaneously annihilated,” and the grubs still in a state of unconsciousness, were buried alive in the process of cicatrization. The trees threw out new layers of “liber,” or inner bark, and even increased in bulk, as we learn from another source, more rapidly than their un mutilated contemporaries. Ever since the discovery was made, the more slashing practice has been universally adopted, and we are told that thousands of elms, already with one foot in the grave, are now convalescent patients or restored to perfect health by the benevolent exertions of M. Robert.

No English trees, so far as we are aware, have yet come under M. Robert's scalpel, and we should be the last to recommend a hasty application of so trenchant a system to the noble clumps and single trees of our public and private parks. But it is certainly worth a trial; for, if there is any truth in the theory, it goes to prove that the hostile scolytes and cossuses are not only responsible for the damage done by themselves, but serve as sappers and miners of other invading insects, besides opening cracks and channels in which the wet lodges and eats into the wood which they generally spare. It is not impossible that further researches will disclose some means of prevention which would be preferable to M. Robert's cure. Meanwhile, however, we have every motive for endeavouring to save the scanty remnant of those woods which once covered Great Britain. As far back as the beginning of this century the neglected state of the Royal forests, and the wastefulness of permitting great oaks to fall, without taking any account of their value or supplying their places with young saplings, were pointed out by Nelson. Since that time we fear that the growth of new plantations has not kept pace with the cutting down of old ones, and that we are becoming more and more dependent on foreign countries for our timber. On free trade principles we have no right to object to this, but so long as it continues to be our interest to grow timber at all, it is surely a dictate of prudence to make it as remunerative as possible by preserving it from

needless decay. Especially in the metropolis, where vegetable shade is so scarce and so grateful, the loss of a piece of foliage is a serious misfortune. How injurious the London atmosphere is to trees has long been known, and it has been remarked as a significant fact that the one which flourishes best in this smoky medium is the plane, which changes its outer bark annually. The elms have no such resource, and whether insect or impeded exhalation be the cause, these characteristic ornaments of our parks have a sickly look. It has been predicted by a prophet of dendrology that elms will be extinct in England before another century has elapsed. The bare idea of such a calamity should rouse the Woods and Forests—for the functions of that department have not expired with its name—from their lethargy on this subject. A generation must pass away before the place of a full-grown tree can be supplied, and the stately verdure of our parks testifies to a forethought which is still rarer now than in the days of our grandfathers. Men too often plant for themselves, and for themselves only, filling up with horse-chestnuts, and other trees of rapid growth, but short-lived beauty, the gaps in ancestral avenues of oak and elm. We lament this selfish short-sightedness when we see its effects on the country seats of individuals; but we have a right to exclaim against it when it affects the interest and pleasure of the nation. We cannot, indeed, blame Mr. Cowper and his predecessors for not having been the first to hail M. Robert's new invention. Nor, however, that it has been sanctioned by experience, we are warranted in hoping that no time will be lost in employing some new Evelyn to report upon its application to the forest tree which Englishmen, from the earliest times, have learned to love and almost to reverence.—*Times*

Care of Cows before Calving.

The following extract from a Prize Essay on the “Rearing of Calves,” by Thomas Bowick, published in the Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society, (Eng.), is applicable to all latitudes:

“The health and condition of the cow before calving, greatly influence subsequent results. A late milked, lean, raking, ill-cured for beef has oftentimes an easier parturition than that that is better furnished in these respects. But her after milking has a tale to tell of neglect somewhere; and the scraggy, ‘set’ condition of the calf throughout its after course, often arises more from this cause than from any other. Hence, we would say, dry the cow a *fair time* before calving, and so that she has something better than barley straw to live on, else the calf and its owner will assuredly lose by it. But what is regarded as a fair amount of time for being dry? If a cow brings her first calf when from ten