

into hemlock
 the land, and
 small returns.
 s, and plant
 and gives a
 north.
 and I believe
 believe it has
 the summer
 to Algoma,
 and the crops
 valley of the
 of miles, we
 and if the
 is very well
 climate by
 their effect as
 not necessary
 able timber,
 all as other
 ing walnut
 six inches in
 have about
 en inches in
 t two and a
 denuded of
 memorialized.
 as it is sold
 the country.
 rs' growth,
 . Mr. Joly,
 ere, sent to
 ntal plot of
 g lengths of
 es of trees
 I would
 me will go
 occupy all
 much more
 d in a very
 raged. He
 op of black
 some years
 n 12 to 16
 hes, taking
 y would be

merchantable. About 18 years since I planted some black walnut, butternut, and hickory, and the last time I saw them the walnut and butternut had made fully twice the growth in the same time that the hickory had. It took three or four years before the hickory seemed to do anything at all, and then the advancement was not at all rapid. They have a very long tap root, and they are exceedingly difficult to transplant and made to grow, even if you take them two years from seed. Last year in Ottawa we put out some 300 or 400 trees of that age, and I expect in the spring to find that at least two-thirds of them are dead. They were in a very doubtful state in the autumn. Yet the timber is very valuable, and we should not be easily discouraged, and if we could arrange to plant the nuts where the trees are to grow we could do a great deal better than by buying young seedlings and planting them out. The same remark would apply to the black walnut and butternut. Both of them we know to be valuable for timber, and also for the shelter they afford. We have had only two season's experience at Ottawa, but there are nuts that we planted the first season; I noticed quite a difference between those that were transplanted on the new plantation and those that were planted in the original plot. They are nearly double the size where they were left, not transplanted; and I feel certain that the trees that make so strong a start as they at the outset would make a much greater growth afterwards than we should anticipate when we see them at the end of two years. With regard to pines, the Scotch pine has impressed me more favorably as a tree likely to be useful as a timber tree for planting in this country than the white pine, for the reason that it seems to be a very rapid grower. I have had some Scotch pine out for 15 or 16 years, and they have certainly made a larger growth than the Norway spruce in the same time, and I think if I were planting a plantation, looking forward to the wood principally, I should expect to get better results from the Norway pine than from the spruce—better, probably, than the white pine. I think there is no doubt that forests have a great influence on rainfall, and also that they have a considerable influence in inducing local showers; and yet it is a point that is very difficult to prove, and such circumstances as Mr. Morden advances show that there is no rule without an exception, and there are a great many exceptions in regard to this question of forests inducing rainfall. However, I think we may take it as a well-established fact that land that is not influenced by trees—supposing the climate to be the same—does not, as a rule, get the same amount of rainfall that land will where it is adjacent to large bodies of wood. It is not fair to compare Ontario with the maritime provinces; for instance, on the Atlantic seaboard, where they have a large amount of evaporation from the ocean right at hand to give them an abundance of rainfall there. I would imagine they would have plenty of rainfall where they had trees around. The same is the case on the Pacific coast. There they have too much rain—almost every year too much rain, although they have their dry periods occasionally in the summer time, notwithstanding the enormous wood growth there is there. It shows it is a question it is not well to be too dogmatic about; and there is another aspect of that question of evaporation which Mr. Phipps did not touch, and that is the enormous evaporation that goes on from a field of growing crop. It would be a difficult question to answer how far the evaporation from growing crops should be held to counterbalance the evaporation from trees; but the question of shelter is a very important one, and I think that was very fairly put. Mr. Phipps said not to plant soft maples on high lands, but I have seen soft maples growing as fine on high, dry soils as in the wet soils. [A delegate—"Correct."] And although we commonly find the tree growing in wet lands, yet it stands transplanting on dry soil, and does very well. (Hear, hear.) And as a tree being particularly valuable for shelter I think we should not hesitate to plant it on high land. Indeed, for shelter, I think it would make better shelter in summer, and more of it than the sugar maples, because it is a more rapid grower, and especially as it would attract the winds more fully on account of its growing of a more bushy form, and not generally growing so high. At Ottawa we have accumulated about 100,000 forest trees, and these have been planted out, some in sheltered belts and some in plots. I was glad to hear that remark from Mr. Morris about planting mixed clumps rather than undertaking to grow any one particular kind of tree. That is the way with nature; you find ten or twelve different trees in one clump. Those who have tested forestry in different parts of the world find