

opinion, could act more energetically and more quickly, without being troubled by the meddling of the ignorant or interested parties.

How shall we reach this end, and teach our people the rudiments of silviculture? Will it be, for instance, by introducing some knowledge of forestry in the curriculum of our elementary schools, and by forcing the little Canadians to discuss economical questions of forestry? To this question I answer emphatically, no. Let the teaching in these schools consist of reading, writing, counting, a little of local history and geography and the principles of religion, and it will cover all that can be reasonably expected. At the most, I would advise that the teacher, from time to time, during little outings in the neighbouring woods, should give to his pupils sound and general data on forestry matters; what has been called, *Leçons de choses*. Any more than this would be out of the way and would lead to a piteous failure.

In the high schools and academies, normal schools and colleges, I would go a step farther. It is there, indeed, that the teachers are made; it is from there that come those who will constitute the ruling classes. Consequently it is only right that these students should know well the importance of the forestry question. Therefore I would advise some kind of forestry training, but on the express condition that it be organized with much tact and judgment; for our aim cannot be to make professional foresters out of those pupils, but rather to teach them general principles, so that, when leaving the college, they carry home with them the conviction that we Canadians have a forestry question to be solved, and that if we wish to solve it without compromising the future, we should look for this solution to come from competent persons following closely scientific data and principles.

It is again along these lines that I would like to see the clergy, the professional men, the manufacturers, the lumbermen, contribute to spread sound ideas in forestry matters among the people with whom they live. This personal action would require very little effort, and could often be realized simply by a good advice, given in due time, or a simple remark made *en passant*.

This is one way of understanding the manner in which we should get a popular and practical forestry education; but there is another means which cannot be neglected: it is reading newspapers, reviews, books, etc.

The people read more than ever; therefore let us distribute, on all sides, tracts concerning our forests—but on one condition, that these papers be well done. In preparing them, the authors will leave out all pretention to exhibit a great science, and adopt, as much as possible, the *point de vue* in talking to their future readers. Moreover, they should treat only essentially practical points.

In the United States the Federal government sends free of charge, at the request of interested parties, expert foresters who furnish all the information wanted on the manner of treating wood lots, according to the use which the proprietor wishes to make of them. Why should not our governments do likewise? Why should we not have something to say to the proprietors about the general and particular care of their forests? For instance, why should not the colonist be advised never to lay bare the surface of steep slopes, whether for fear of disastrous landslides or of denuding what the centuries to come might be unable to recover with a valuable crop of wood?