

EDITORIAL NOTES.

There has probably never before been such a strong effort on the part of maple sugar makers to protect their pure product. The Chief Analyst for Canada recently analysed 128 samples of maple syrup and found 55 adulterated. It is reported that the adulterated samples were wholesome and palatable and a controversy has arisen. Some hold that as these adulterated samples are cheaper than real syrup and yet wholesome there is no reason why they should not be sold so that the poor man might get his 'maple' syrup and sugar as well as the rich man. The Pure Maple Syrup and Sugar Association of Quebec does not object to the sale of wholesome syrup made from cane or beet sugar, flavored with coal tar products, but what it does object to is the use of the word 'maple.' The controversy is going on warmly just now and the maple sugar men will undoubtedly make an effort to have a change made in the law and regulations to restrict the word 'maple' to products wholly of the maple tree.



The interest of the Canadian Forestry Association comes in to this controversy in this way: Maple sugar making is carried on in Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces and its centre is the Eastern Townships. Much of the land devoted to maple groves is fit for nothing but tree growth. A good maple grove properly worked and cared for is the most profitable use to which this land can be put provided a fair price can be got for the product. The claim is made that owing to the ease of making up substitutes for maple sugar and syrup, substitutes that contain nothing whatever of maple, the real product has been saleable with great difficulty. Many farmers have cut down and sold their groves for cordwood and the land is totally unpro-

ductive. This is a state of affairs to which conservationists are opposed. They want to see such land put to the best use, and the best use at the present time is a profitable maple grove. Maple syrup is a luxury and the people who buy it want to get 'maple' not syrup. They pay for 'maple' and they ought not to be humbugged with sugar cane or beets, no matter how life sustaining a combination of beet sugar and coal tar may be. The friends of forest conservation want to see the land devoted to its best use and will do what they can to keep rocky and non agricultural lands covered with trees instead of becoming barren wastes.



Readers of Canadian publications of all kinds and particularly readers of agricultural journals, have had dinned into them the dangers in the decline of population in rural Ontario—Ontario being the province in which the tendency is most marked. Rev. John MacDougall, Spencerville, Ont., has issued a book '*Rural Life in Canada*,' on this subject. He estimates that in the decade 1901-11 rural Ontario lost 373,567 people. One of the chief causes of this decline in population noted by Mr. MacDougall is the farming of soil unfit for cultivation. The invariable rule is found to be that rural depopulation is greater from those localities with the less fertile soils. Many of these soils are splendidly adapted to forestry, and Mr. MacDougall regards it as a duty of the nation to see that such soils are reforested and that further denudation of such soils be prevented. This is not a new story to the forest conservationist but evidently other people are arriving at this conclusion from another starting point. Some of the counties that have lost most heavily have large areas of abandoned sand lands and it would be interesting to follow this out county by county.