

that some means are adopted for stocking them with the kind of timber trees best suited for the region.

Practical Forestry has now been conducted on professional and profit-producing lines for a long time in Europe; the statistics regarding forest production under rational management date back over a century. It is not suggested, however, that the time has come when in America, and (to bring the matter closer home) in Canada, we should put into force European methods. We shall probably never use these methods, certainly not in their entirety; conditions are different and so methods must necessarily be different.

On this continent forestry has been practiced long enough to give us the data to show what it costs and what profits it can be made to pay. There is no necessity for us in Canada to go to Europe in order to study forestry methods; much more useful would be found a tour of the United States National Forests, whose methods of management are being based to an ever increasing extent on the studies carried on by the Forest Service for years past, supplemented by whatever of European practice has been found serviceable under present American conditions.

Much more is already known of proper methods of managing Canadian forests than has ever been put into practice; what is needed is the chance to do what we know ought to be done. More money and more faith in the future are needed. The expense of organizing the immense forest areas of our country and of initiating the proper methods of management on them must necessarily be great. For years the forest reserves cannot reasonably be expected to return more than a fraction of the money spent on them. There can be no reasonable doubt that they will do so eventually, and the government can afford to wait

that time as no private individual could.

This fact is clear from the experience of all times and of all continents that in forestry, just as in agriculture and in everything else, in order to get profits an investment must first be made. If cut-over and burnt-over areas are left to themselves they will not produce any profits from wood-crops or afford any protection to agriculture and stream-flow. If they are given a little protection they will produce a small crop of inferior wood; and if the matter be taken up in a rational way as a man would take up farming, profits will be obtained in proportion to the judgment exercised and the money expended.

It pays and pays well, to spend money on the forests. The countries which deal most generously with their forests have the handsomest returns. Saxony, as mentioned elsewhere in this issue, spends an average of \$3.46 per acre on her forests every year, and gets, as return for this expenditure, a profit, over and above the expenditure, of \$5.32 per acre. Wurtemberg, spending approximately \$3.25 per acre per year on her forest land, makes a profit of approximately \$8.00 per year. France, in return for an expenditure of \$1.00 per acre on the forests, obtains, over and above this, a revenue of \$1.72 per acre. When we come to forests less intensively managed, Austria, spending some 72 cents per acre per annum on her woodlands, makes therefrom a net profit of 28 cents. Sweden, spending one cent per acre on the forests, gets a profit of 6 cents, (part of it, probably, paid out of capital) while Russia, with the same expenditure, gets three cents per acre. India spends six cents per acre per year, and gets a return of four cents above her expenditure.

To mention reforestation brings up in the minds of many people the