

meanness of our trees. Of course, if he leaves the beaten tracks of travellers, and goes far enough into the wilderness, up the Ottawa and St. Maurice, he will see fine timber, but, in our settlements, we can only show him, here and there, at long intervals, one solitary elm, a model of grace and beauty, and the traveller will feel, as we do, grateful to the man who spared that tree.

On a warm summer's day, the Desert of Sahara, with its lovely oases, would be suggestive of coolness, compared with our country. No trees to shade the dusty roads, shelter the panting cattle, to set off the neat white-washed houses, only far away, hidden nearly out of sight, the patch of small neglected timber which the farmer is compelled by our stern winters, to spare from the general slaughter, as he dies, without fuel.

If every acre of ground were covered with valuable crops, one would try and get reconciled to the absence of trees, and bow to the iron rule of our age which converts everything into cash. But what a small proportion of all that ground is used profitably! We can find plenty of spare room for growing forest trees, they are not only the most beautiful ornaments to a country and the most useful product of nature, giving fuel, timber, shade, shelter, retaining moisture, and a protection against droughts, &c., &c., but, considering the question from a *strictly money-making* point of view, the culture of forest trees is perhaps the *best and safest investment* that can be made.

It is rather difficult, I admit, to induce people to plant forest trees in this Province, where, for generations, they have been brought up to look upon the forest tree as their natural enemy, to be got rid of at any cost, hacked down, burnt out of the way (for want of a better mode of disposing of it), and still troubling the settler for years with its everlasting stump, an obstacle to thorough cultivation. The children and grandchildren of the old settlers remember too well; they cannot be expected to love the forest tree, but self-interest ought to conquer instinct and prejudice. With us, land is not too valuable for forest tree culture. In Europe, where land is scarcer and more valuable than here, they plant, every year, thousands and thousands of acres in forest trees.

To those who say that our country is *too new* to think of that, I will answer that New Zealand, the Australian Colonies, India (so far as the settlement of the land by Europeans is concerned), are newer countries than ours, and they are all taking active steps towards the planting of forest trees on a large scale. In the United States, the Federal as well as the States' Governments encourage the culture of forest trees by grants of land and money, and exemption from taxation, and powerful societies are co-operating with energy and liberality. The Government of Canada has begun by offering free grants to those who undertake the planting of a certain number of trees on the Western prairies, but I will here observe that it will require more active measures to set the people in motion, and especially the establishment of nurseries, where the people can buy young trees and seed, and the beginning of some large plantations, as an example, to show to the people, by practical results, that the culture of forest trees is within the reach of every one.

We see in the papers that the Western railways have started the culture of trees on their own account, the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway is reported as having appointed a superintendent of tree culture, who has just contracted for three hundred thousand trees, and most of the roads west of the Mississippi and Missouri rivers have also begun to raise trees, in order to insure a supply of ties, and for other purposes.

How many give as their reason for not planting forest trees, that they will not live long enough to get any profit out of

them. You do not hear that in Europe. Are people more selfish in America than they are in Europe? Or is the feeling of self-reliance so much more developed in America, that the people here expect the next generation to take care of itself as they have taken care of themselves? Then leave them some timber, if you wish them to have the same chance that you had. It was but a heathen who wrote, more than eighteen hundred years ago: "*Arbores serit diligens agricola quorum fructus numquam videbit*" "The good husbandman plants trees whose fruits he will never see." But I must not drift away from my subject into philosophical considerations, it will be more to the point to show that the profits of forest tree culture are not only enormous, but that their realization is far from being delayed to an indefinite future.

I do not pretend that the whole of our farms should be planted in forest trees; that would be too absurd. Our farms are generally too large for the small number of hands we employ, there are always some odd corners, idle strips, stony or damp patches which it does not pay to cultivate; begin and plant forest trees there, suiting the tree to the nature of the soil—you will find some for every kind of soil. Once planted and fairly started, they will take care of themselves, give no trouble and increase yearly in value, in a wonderful ratio, so well expressed by the Honorable F. B. Hough, chief of the Forestry Division of the United States Agricultural Department, in the address lately delivered by him at Columbus, Ohio.

For years past, I have sought the best and cheapest mode of re-wooding our denuded lands, and have made some experiments, they have not yet been carried over a great many years, and are, so far, most encouraging, notwithstanding my numerous mistakes and enforced absence at the best seasons, and they satisfy me as to the correctness of the statements made by the leading advocates of forest tree culture. I trust not to be charged with egotism if I now give the results of some of these personal experiments, rather than copy or coo-dence what has been written by others, and it will be a great satisfaction if I can induce a few to try for themselves.

In selecting forest trees for planting, the first consideration ought to be the nature of the soil where they are to be planted, if the soil is not favorable to one kind of trees, do not waste your time in planting it there, you will find another tree that will suit the soil. After paying all due deference to soil and climate, you must be guided in your selection of a particular kind of tree: 1st. By the value of the timber. 2nd. The greater or lesser ease and certainty with which the tree can be grown. 3rd. The rate of growth.

I have tried, principally, black walnut, oak, elm, maple, ash, tamarack, Russian pine, and fir and poplar, and will now give some of the results:

BLACK WALNUT.—The value of that wood is so considerable (a dollar a cubic foot at the present time), and it is getting so scarce that it struck me as the most worthy of being introduced and cultivated here. True it did not grow spontaneously any where in the Province of Quebec, but this appeared to me no conclusive reason why it should not grow and flourish here. The lilac comes all the way from Persia, and it spreads out its leaves earlier and keeps them unchanged later than our typical tree, the maple. I did not fear our great colds, for in the West, the natural home of the black walnut, the thermometer often ranges as low as here, though for a shorter period at a time. It was well worth trying.

I procured a bag of black walnut nuts from the West in the fall of 1874, and sowed them at once, it was late in November, we had to remove the snow and break the frozen ground, but I thought the earth the safest place to winter them. They began to come up about the tenth of June following, not five per cent failed, and they have never been artificially sheltered