inch square, the size of the former, bore 330 pounds, being 201 pounds more than those of Duhamel we must indeed believe that his timber grew in a different clime and soil, and was of a far superior texture to either of the former.

But, however, these strange differences, (and many more, the reader may notice) in the ascertaining of the product of the strength of different pieces of timber by the foregoing experiments may be accounted for, the great diversity of opinion that exists between these wise men as to the part of a tree wherein the strongest timber is to be found, as also the clime, appears more irreconcilable than the former, and is not so easily palliated; for there can exist but one conclusion with the man of information and practical experience, which is, that from a small distance from the face of the ground, every foot in the length of the shaft, upwards, decreases in its firmness, strength, and weight; likewise, as one of the authors referred to admits, the branches are inferior to the whole, also, if the tree divides as a fork, both the prongs, or stems thereof, are inferior in strength to what a single shaft would be. But, as to the real strength of timber, much depends on the age of the tree when cut down, the season of the year, and the mode of treatment it receives after it is cut down, in seasoning.

But the first or best plan to preserve the vital strength of the timber is, first, to girdle the tree nearly level with the ground, cut off its head, lop off its branches, strip off its bark, and let it stand, two, four, or six months before it is cut down, and the timber thereof will endure beyond that of the adjoining tree of equal goodness cut down and seasoned any other way. But this last article is somewhat adigression from our main object, though valuable to be known.