

was much more rapid than where the trees were left to fight out the natural struggle for existence. At the rate the lightly thinned plot is growing its volume will be equal to that of the check plot in another ten years, and as was pointed out in the case of the Castor plots the material taken out in the thinning will have been a clear gain, quite aside from the improvement in the quality and value of what was left. There has also been a slight gain in the heavily thinned plot over the unthinned plot, following the same basis of comparison, and this gain will undoubtedly show much more plainly at the end of another five years. The response of trees twenty-years old to a thinning can hardly be expected to equal that in younger stands, and furthermore the record shows that the heavily thinned plot in 1915 had been suffering from the presence of too large over-topping hardwoods which were of course removed in the thinning. Another oddity of the figures as given, namely the fact that although the average tree on the unthinned plot grew faster both in height and diameter than on the thinned plots, the volume growth of the stand was less, is explained by the very large number of trees which died on the unthinned plot in five years. This number was 188, as opposed to eight and sixteen on the lightly and heavily thinned plots, respectively.