

and with the exception of certain restrictions that are placed upon the use of fire and the cutting of very small wood, they exercise no direct control over them. The limit holders are absolute masters of the woods they lease. They are not bound either to cut in one section or in another, and provided they do not cut trees under 12 inches in diameter, they are not required to make any provision for maintaining the supply of wood. There is no provision made for a district that has been cut over, a period of rest that young trees or the soil may have time to attain a certain maturity. Another thing I might have said when you asked me about the control of Governments in foreign countries over their forests, is this: there they cannot cut more than a certain proportion of trees, even in districts where the forests are used for commercial purposes exclusively; they are not allowed to cut down more in a given district or than a certain proportion; they are not allowed to cut down entire blocks. Supposing a limit owner, finding that the timber market is good, would wish to cut down a whole district, he is not allowed to do it. The Governments decide upon the quantity of lumber to be cut every year. The Government foresters then visit the forest, and point out certain blocks or certain trees in those blocks which may be cut down. Of course it would be difficult to introduce an exactly similar system in this country, but some kind of a system should be introduced, under which the Government can exercise control over the lumber limits.

Q. Have you anything to say about the nature of the control foreign Governments exercise over the wood lands of their respective countries?—The tendency is to exercise a more rigorous control over them and to prevent any steps being taken under which the regular proportion of forest land, which should exist in every State for the advantage of agriculture, may be diminished. The wood lands of a country should not be less than 25 per cent. of the whole arable lands. That is considered a proper proportion, and when that proportion does not exist, it is maintained that the cause of agriculture suffers.

Q. Could the Government or Governments of Canada exercise a satisfactory control over the wood lands of this country, and in what manner?—In the older Provinces the question is one which would involve a great deal of debate and discussion. The Government have, by the present mode of leasing limits, lost much of their power to interfere in the matter, but they might regain it by taking up limits which are denuded of their large timber by the limit holders. They might take these back into their own hands without inflicting any serious loss upon the lessees, and they might also place limitations upon the size of trees to be cut down. There are two points at least upon which they might exercise very efficient control. But the principal point upon which they might take action would be this: they should set apart the lands which are known to be unprofitable for agriculture and retain them exclusively for forestry purposes, or to the production of timber. We have lands of that character here. Up the Ottawa, for instance, settlers have been induced to go in and settle on the pine lands. There, after one or two crops, it will take more than the original value of the land to make them produce again. After three or four crops at the outside, the thin covering of soil over the sand becomes utterly exhausted. These pine lands, and all the lands only fitted for the cultivation of pine and spruce, should be set apart exclusively for the cultivation of those trees. There are millions and millions of acres in Ontario and Quebec which could be made productive timber districts, but which will never be productive agricultural districts and will never pay for the labor, to say nothing of anything else that may be spent upon them for agricultural purposes. If these lands were set apart as timber lands they would be advantageously utilized. The Government could either take them into their own possession or lease them for a certain number of years in block, providing that no more than a certain number of trees should be cut down, and that when they were cut the land should remain undisturbed for five, ten or fifteen years, when it would be likely that a fresh crop of wood could be taken out advantageously. Of course there are lands in which the lumbermen possess a vested interest. It cannot be denied that they have opened up these lands and that they have spent enormous sums of money upon roads, in damming the rivers and so forth. It would not be just