

The WITNESS.—It is one and one half cents per acre for privately-owned land.

Mr. CHARLTON.—They charge the lumber owners one cent and a half per acre, and the Government pays another cent and a half, making three cents for fire protection. In the province of Ontario the lumber owners pay for the protection themselves, and the Government undertakes fire protection on the Government lands that are not yet disposed of. Last year the Government of Ontario paid out \$234,000 and the lumber holders \$91,000, making \$325,000 in all. There were 925 men employed in fire protection in the province of Ontario. In the province of Quebec the Government does very little, but the lumber owners engage their own men. There is, as you know, Mr. MacMillan, an organization similar to that in the northwestern states, which has an oversight of about six million acres. In New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, the expense, so far as the Government is concerned, is very little. The expense to the Dominion Government for fire protection in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta last year was \$1.61 per mile. This year it will be \$1.92 per mile. In the Railway Belt of British Columbia the figures for this year are 93-100ths of one cent per mile.

In regard to what Mr. MacMillan said about clearing the timber land quickly, I have always held that was a short-sighted policy for this reason: It is the policy of nearly every Government to conserve its timber, and to sell the timber and require it to be cleared in two or three years is the very opposite of conservation. As long as lumbermen pay, especially in British Columbia, the ground rent which the Government requires, it seems to me it would be a very wise thing for the Government to let him keep it always. The Government charges \$140 a square mile each year for all the timber west of the Cascades, and \$115 for timber east of the Cascades, although I believe under the new law the charge is now \$100.

The WITNESS.—Yes, \$100.

Mr. CHARLTON.—I think it is a wrong policy to require the lumbermen to cut his timber as quickly as possible. The policy of the Government should be to conserve it. Mr. MacMillan has spoken of a royalty in the United States. I was not aware they had any royalty there; my information is that they sell the lands outright.

The WITNESS.—I was referring to the national forests in the western states where they have sales of timber. They sell the timber there and keep the land. They have adopted a similar principle of increasing the stumpage rates every two or three years in proportion to the increase in the average price of lumber.

Mr. CHARLTON.—There is one matter I would like to ask you about. I have seen a great deal of this western timber—in fact last summer I was through a very large tract on Vancouver island, and in my report I stated that the western hemlock is nothing at all like the eastern hemlock. It has been suggested, in fact, that it should be called Alaska pine. It is a beautiful lumber and in my judgement will be worth more than the Douglas fir. Have you ever had that matter taken up?

The WITNESS.—The western hemlock is really a very superior wood to the eastern hemlock. It is an entirely different kind of wood, does not check and does not warp, and is much more suitable for construction purposes, and can be used to advantage for interior furnishing. At the present time it sells for \$1 a thousand higher on the prairie than does the Douglas fir.

Mr. CHARLTON.—I think it is more like our white pine than any other wood grown in the West.

The WITNESS.—Yes, it is.

Mr. CHARLTON.—Mr. MacMillan touched on one thing quite important, as to whether the land should be entirely cleared by the lumbermen, or a certain number of