

Very unfortunately the Castor plot which had been left in its natural condition as a check upon the growth of the other two plots was destroyed by fire in 1917, so that it is impossible to compare the growth of thinned and unthinned stands/ <sup>in this case.</sup> The only comparison which it is possible to make is that between the second plot, which was lightly thinned, and the third, which was heavily thinned. 37% of the trees on plot 2 were removed in the 1915 thinning, and 58% of the trees in plot 3. At the end of five years the average tree on the heavily thinned plot had grown .8 of an inch in diameter and seven feet in height, as against .6 of an inch and five feet for the average tree on the lightly thinned plot. <sup>(Contrast these increases with those on the thinned Holly plot, where thinning began earlier.)</sup> The volume growth on both these plots was tremendous, being 3.9 cords per acre per year for the five year period on the lightly thinned plot, and 3.3 cords on the heavily thinned. The volume growth on the lightly thinned plot was greater than on the heavily thinned because of the greater number of trees, although as above pointed out the growth of the individual trees was not so great.

In order that comparisons with unthinned stands may be carried on, a new plot was established by Mr. Tillotson in 1920 to take the place of that which the fire destroyed. In another five years we hope to have results <sup>more plainly</sup> which will bring out the comparatively small response to thinning which may be expected/ <sup>in five years</sup> from a stand of this