

The reports of Professor H. S. Spence-Sales of McGill University, of Dr. R. L. Nicholson, Director of the Geographical Branch of the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys, Mr. G. A. Hills, of the Ontario Department of Lands and Forests, and Mr. F. L. MacKenzie, Chief of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration, and there are numerous others, such as Dr. Leahy, the urgent need for greater effort in the study of land capabilities and land use in Canada has been brought forward. Dr. Radforth especially brought back a wealth of information on the detailed site studies being carried on in the northern districts of the U.S.S.R. for planned development; and it has amazed me, the concentrated effort that is being made to analyze the various climatic, geological, biotic and cultural features of the land forms constituting the various districts.

Senator WALL: You are referring there to the U.S.S.R.?

Mr. BROWN: Yes, the U.S.S.R. No stone or peat hummock is left unturned as university faculties in co-operation with government agencies carry on an almost assembly-line attack on the various physical chemical and biotic properties of land, and this seems to be regardless of current economical value. Canada is fast lagging behind in the study of land use, as compared with other countries. I am not supporting their governments by any means, but I am just a little jealous of what they are doing in digging more holes in the soil than we are.

Canada is growing by leaps and bounds and our greatest period of expansion is yet to come, following the maximum growth period expected in the United States in the near future, which I imagine will not last too long.

Our northern areas (within the Boreal Forest and Forest-Tundra transition)—and I have a forest region map, if anyone would like to look at it—will, in all probability, be much more highly populated than at present. Aside from mining and hydro, the development required in these regions is not entirely one of agriculture.

In the Ontario-Quebec clay belt and in portions of the Prairie provinces and British Columbia, agricultural development should have a definite place in conjunction with multiple land use, including forest and wildlife management, on an individual or co-operative basis.

An excellent example of research and planning for a farm-forest-wildlife multiple development is just being completed by Mr. Hills of the Ontario Department of Lands and Forests, adjacent to the town of Cochrane. It is a masterpiece of work, I think. There are some 20 maps on a large and detailed scale, and there is a complete revision suggested as to the allotment of size of farms and as to the distribution of private and community woodlots, and also quite a lot of detail on the management of wildlife. I think his main idea is that in the past the area which was allowed to reach farmer or settler was not large enough, and that if you get a good man you should give him something that will support him, and I think actually he was behind a plan to bring Scandinavian people to Cochrane, which did not develop.

In general, the development of our northern areas is a one-shot type in each specific location, either mining, pulp and paper, national defence, or communication facilities. On the average, mining development is not permanent—and this is on the average of the number of starts that are made—and, in addition, may have an up-and-down prosperity; pulp and paper development has proven more stable, but in the north the agricultural development associated with it has generally not flourished. Now, I do not mean here that the multiple development of an area for a pulp and paper worker, say, a bushworker in the winter, and a farmer in the summer, is not desirable, but I think the method of distribution of land has been wrong. Mining, national defence and transportation developments have all been extremely expensive and little attempt has been made to develop local resources for mutual assistance and general development of the area.