

soon spring into being over the face of our beautiful Canadian landscape to replace the sites of those old primeval forests so rapidly disappearing from the scene. The objections to this kind of tree planting may be stated in brief to be: 1st. Your teaching would depreciate and ultimately destroy private enterprise. This objection misinterprets the force of our teaching altogether. We do not mean to assert that the State should do all the work and the citizens nothing. No, no! We rather mean simply that it is the duty of the State to *encourage private enterprise*, and in every possible way to help the citizen. 2nd. Life is too short for such extended operations, and we should never see the results of our labor and care. In part we acknowledge the force of this objection, and in a larger part we do not, for though life is short, as we all sadly feel, yet many fine results have been seen by the operators in this direction. Besides, the objection has much of its point from a well known selfish principle influencing very many to leave as little as possible to those who shall come after us for fear our children will never thank us for it. 3rd. Our farm is too small to spare land for tree planting, as we want all our soil for grain raising and grazing. This objection is positively absurd on the very face of it, as any one traversing this country over hill and dale will readily see. How many thousands of such acres of Canadian soil are now lying in a state of comparative uselessness that might advantageously be used for purposes of tree growing? I stop not to answer; we all know they are immense. 4th. Our nursery men have not turned their attention to the matter of extensive forest tree growing, and consequently trees are difficult to obtain, and beyond our limited means. The force and

pungency of this objection can be readily dispelled, like the morning cloud that passeth away. Only let the want be felt, or gently hint that the demand is likely to occur, and the stock can be supplied by the million, and on the most liberal terms; and we have every confidence in the supply if there is only likely to be a good demand. 5th. Trees planted by the roadside have a tendency to impede traffic and to harbor wet, fungus, &c. This objection, though pretty well rooted over this entire country, is mainly resting on misrepresentation, and is contrary to our experience. If proper kinds of trees are properly planted by the roadside, and moderately proper attention can be given to them, they will grow up to be the beauty and adornment of our country, and a source of everlasting blessing, and consequently cannot be charged with the detriments objected to. But 6th, and lastly. Trees in blocks exhaust the soil, and by their shade exhaust neighboring fields. In answer we would ask, "Exhaust what soil?" for they cannot exhaust the neighboring fields to any perceptible extent, and they positively enrich the soil on which they are now standing by their gaseous and vegetable deposits. As for the shade complained of, this is so meagre that it is scarcely worthy of a passing consideration. With these objections and their answers, we shall now close our paper, and confidently leave the resultant consequences to the mature judgments of your mind. We only regret that it was not in our power to bring better and more thorough ability to bear on a question at once so interesting and so important. We hope yet to see the day when the measures here recommended shall be recognized by the authorities of this country.

January 18th, 1882.