

nent barrens, and will not produce field crops profitably. On this sixty per cent no farmer desires an acre. At the same time it ought to be producing revenues for the nation. As much of it as possible should be kept under forest growth, producing wood crops regularly. This is the argument for "forest conservation" in a nutshell. No one asks to be

culture. Canada takes \$200,000,000 a year from the forests and a very great part of this amount goes to purchase farm products. Until every destructive forest fire is stopped and every timber-growing area restored to its productive condition, Canada's agricultural interests must suffer the chief loss. Of every hundred dollars that come out of



allowed to use agricultural lands for tree growing. And no farmer will object if the country maintains non-agricultural lands in their natural money-making conditions, giving timber harvests year by year.

The Forest Dollar, therefore, is not earned at the expense of agriculture, but is the ally and supporter of agri-

the forest, seventy-five dollars go for wages and supplies. The remaining twenty-five dollars pay interest on the lumbermen's investment and help make up the \$7,500,000 taken by the provincial and federal governments each year in taxes.

Canadian Forestry Association,
Ottawa.