

# APPENDIX VI

Investigation of record Douglas-fir in the Seymour Valley, British Columbia (After Tiemann, 1935).

"I have investigated the basis of this information and am convinced that the data is well substantiated from a number of different sources, although it has been much questioned.

The available information gives the height as 417 feet; diameter at the butt 25 feet (this diameter is substantiated by a photograph of the felled butt in which there are a number of people); thickness of bark, 16 inches. At a height of 207 feet the diameter was 9 feet. The trunk was free from limbs for a height of 300 feet! This was a remarkable tree if the information is correct, and it establishes the Douglas fir in former times as one of the tallest trees in the world!

"Unfortunately, direct information about this tree has been peculiarly difficult to obtain. Mr. Carey, who felled the tree, and who was apparently a long time resident of Vancouver, from whom the data was obtained, is no longer living, and a Mr. Mullett, formerly a scaler in the British Columbia Forestry Service, who was present at the felling, cannot be located. The alleged photograph of the stump was published in the British Columbia Lumberman, March, 1927.

Mr. H. Steere-Clark, Safety Director of the B.C. Loggers Association, in a letter to Mr. Newton B. Drury dated June 17, 1931, after quoting the dimensions stated above, continues: "These dimensions are in no way exaggerated, but were taken by the head feller and his crew at the time of felling. Mr. Carey, who actually felled the tree, has been dead for some years, but the record left behind him is authentic." And in a letter to me of March 3, 1931, he says: "This is also confirmed by Mr. O.L. Mullett, who was employed in the Forest Service at that time, as a scaler. The photograph which I exhibited at the National Safety Congress would not actually give the true perspective as

to the size of the butt, owing to the position from which the picture was taken, but that it was actually 25 feet through is confirmed by several residents of that district. I am very sure that the statement that I made is based on fact, for this particular tree was quite historical in the annals of British Columbia logging. The statement made by the B.C. Lumberman was obtained from the same source as my own."

Mr. R.M. Essie, Editor of the British Columbia Lumberman, writes (Sept. 30, 1930): "At the time this picture was given to me I also was very doubtful as to its authenticity, but Mr. O.L. Mullett, late of the B.C. Forest Service, who lent me the picture, assured me that the photograph was absolutely genuine, and that he had heard several people talking about this wonder tree." . . . In another letter from Mr. R.M. Essie to Mr. Donald Bruce, dated Oct. 23, 1930, he says: "There is not the slightest doubt that the tree was felled in the vicinity of Vancouver. Several of the people in the picture can be identified as residents of this district." And finally, in a letter to Prof. Emanuel Fritz, Mr. Essie, November 19, 1934, states: "Some years ago the picture was brought to us (with the dimensions) by a member of the Forest Service of B.C. (Mr. Mullett). We cannot vouch for the measurements of the log, but as you will see from the picture it is an exceptionally large one. The only clue we have of the size of the tree is the evidence of Mr. M. Lavell, since deceased, who in a letter dated February 24, 1926, states that he was one of the people who were taken in the picture and that the tree was felled in the Lynn Creek Valley on the north shore of Barrard Inlet, Vancouver. I have no reason to doubt the statement of Mr. Mullett regarding the size of this tree, but we have no actual signed affidavit or anything like that concerning the matter."

"The evidence of the letter from Mr. Lavell is important, since if true it establishes the photograph as authentic and not that of a California redwood as some have inferred. And if the photograph is really that of the butt of a Douglas fir, there seems no reason to doubt the di-

mensions given, for it was indeed a huge tree, larger than any now living (Tiemann, 1935).”