

ments," and this seems to cover the question completely. Forestry is a business just the same as agriculture or mining are businesses and in order to exist in this country where the "almighty dollar" rules it must be run on a paying basis.

Roughly speaking there are three classes of soil. (1.) agricultural soil, (2.) forest soil, (3.) unproductive or barren soil. The first two are the ones we are especially interested in at present. Agricultural land comprises the richest and most fertile soils sufficiently close to market to make the raising of cereals and the general practice of farming financially successful. All land other than this, not absolutely barren, is properly forest soil and should be used for the growing of forest crops. The ideal state of things is, of course, to have every foot of ground worked in such a way that the maximum amount of profit may be realized with as small an expenditure of labor as possible, and accordingly all true agricultural land should be devoted to farming and all true forest land should be relegated to the production of forest crops. Unfortunately this is not the case in Canada. The nearest approach to the ideal is to be found probably in Germany or Denmark, where, for over one hundred and fifty years the governments have exercised their authority in the management of forest lands both belonging to the States and to private individuals.

During the early settlement of this country the chief feeling entertained in regard to the forest was, that it was an enemy and a hindrance to progress, and at that time one cannot blame the pioneers for regarding it in this light. Now, however, we are in a better position to realize what the blind destruction of the forests means to us, and to succeeding generations. We are at present suffering to a certain extent from the

lack of foresight during the early days, which induced the settlers to clear the forest wholesale without special regard to the after utility of the soil under agricultural management, and we ought as much as possible to try and prevent the continuation of such a short sighted policy as at present allows of the destruction of the forest on large areas of land every year without making provision for the protection of a second growth on the cut-over districts. Also where practicable means should be taken for the reforesting of areas now lying barren and unproductive, and there are many such, which would, if properly managed return a good interest on capital invested.

From the very nature of a tree it stands to reason that any forestry work must necessarily extend over long periods of time. If a man plants trees now he cannot hope to derive any return from them within say fifteen or twenty years at the least, and in the meantime the growing of forest crops, under existing conditions, is at any time subject to destruction from fire. (This does not refer to small undertakings in thickly settled districts.) Fire is the main enemy to the forest, not only directly but also in an indirect way, in that it weakens and damages the forest to such an extent that any trees not wholly burned up, are so much injured and weakened that they soon succumb to the ravages of insects and fungi. If fires can only be kept down, the chief obstacle to general forestry in Canada will largely be done away with, and forestry investments will become practically safe. Under present conditions a lumberman cannot be blamed for cutting his property absolutely clean of all merchantable timber, leaving no old trees to reseed the cut-over areas and taking no care, during lumbering operations, to prevent the younger growth being damaged by the careless feeling and logging of