

*By Mr. Heyd:*

Q. What suggested the idea to me is the fact that I remember during this summer a large lot of very valuable reports reached me. While I was in the House here, I would have had plenty of time and an opportunity of franking them, to my constituents, but in my particular case, they came up, 50 or 60 or 70 pounds of them, in the middle of summer without being wrapped in envelopes, and the amount of labour involved in sending them out is such that I left them without sending them out and will probably put them in the fire.

A. That is the report of this committee, I presume?

Q. Yes.

A. Not of the experimental farm?

Q. No, these things should come in envelopes so that a man has nothing to do but put names on. After you get them and write to Ottawa, and get Hansard envelopes, it is a little too much for a man who is a busy man. He might address the envelopes while he will not go through all this work.

A. All our experimental farm reports are sent in envelopes to every one on our mailing list; about 50,000 in all.

Q. I got 200 odd of the committee reports at the house and I just did not know what to do with them.

A. I should have been glad to get them for distribution at the experimental farm.

*By Mr. Cochrane:*

Q. Would you explain the effect of this planting of trees on the plots adjoining?

A. I shall be glad to do so.

Q. All right.

A. I was up at Indian Head in the summer of 1900, after they had had a series of very bad wind-storms. I went over the crops very carefully and I was surprised at the effect the shelter belts had had on the fields adjoining. I found by measurement that for every foot of tree growth, there was a protecting influence for from 50 to 60 feet on the crop in the adjoining field. Where we had a growth 12 feet in height, about 600 feet of the grain had been preserved quite green, and a little beyond that influence the ground was so wind-swept you could not see a green blade on the ground. It was a most convincing evidence of the value of the shelters.

Q. What stage was the grain in then?

A. It was about three or four inches high. Most of the unprotected parts of the fields had the grain so destroyed that it was found necessary to plough and resow the land. Some fields partly destroyed were left, and gave small crops of from 5 to 20 bushels of wheat per acre, whereas the protected area gave of wheat about 30 bushels to the acre.

Q. Does the grain grow well right close up to the tree?

A. We do not sow the grain close up to the trees, but generally have a roadway between the trees and the grain fields.

Q. I find in our section of the country and on our own farm that trees are very exhaustive, especially a row of maples or spruce, and I found in one instance that with a very shapely maple tree which any one of artistic taste would be glad to have about, the tree was in the corner of the fence, the field was planted in corn, and I counted thirty-four hills of corn in the shade of that tree almost useless?

A. That is very true, but there is not much lack of space or fertility in the west, and I think a roadway between the plantation and field, is sufficient and the fields that are not protected suffer so much from wind that trees pay well for the space they occupy. We do not get such winds here, strong enough to blow the grain out of the ground. Several years ago we had an instance where a plot of Banner oats in the partial protection of trees gave over 100 bushels to the acre, whereas one not far off but exposed gave little over 50 bushels. These instances might be multiplied, but I have perhaps said enough on that point to prove the great utility of trees as well as their beauty.