earliest extensive forest planting in New Zealand, and the first centre of utilisation of the exotic timbers.

The State Forest Service, in the face of a most depressing curtailment of all investigative work, has still managed to continue the establishment and remeasurement of sample plots in most of its exotic plantations.

Finally, arrangements were made to establish a number of sample plots in the extensive stands of the Perpetual Forests Ltd., the first, so far as we know, to be arranged for by any of the private forestry companies. This development is perhaps the most important of all, as indicating in the company a bona fide interest in the possible returns to bondholders, for signs of which foresters have been rather critically watching and waiting, so far as commercial forestry in general has developed in this country.

It is therefore a matter for satisfaction that a start has been made along co-ordinated lines. It remains now to amplify and extend the work as fast as possible.

LOCAL BODY SHARES

The recently published Report of the National Economy Commission, in its section dealing with the State Forests Account, contains among other passages giving food for thought to all interested in forestry in New Zealand, a most welcome statement on an important matter of policy. That is the definite recommendation that the payments of timber royalty shares to local bodies out of the State Forests Account should be abolished.

Few people know of these financial servitudes operating over our State Forests, and fewer still realize the extent of their burden, and the magnitude of the hindrance they represent to the development of a sound and stable forest policy. The present position is decidedly complex, and an adequate treatment of its development is impossible here. It may be put briefly, however, that the State Forest Account is now not receiving the full royalty from sales of indigenous timber through various forms of local body subventions operating in two ways.

The first is the diversion of 90 per cent. of the royalties on the "Warden's areas," where but 10 per cent. goes to the Forests Account for administration. This is, on its face, a temporary matter in that it applies to areas now Provisional State Forest over which the mining wardens had granted sawmilling licenses prior to the transfer of administration to the Forest Service. With the extinction of these licenses,
this diversion would naturally cease. However, in the West­
land Region alone, a very large area is under such reservation,
—enough to provide for normal cutting for a decade, and
comprising, naturally, the most accessible stands. It may
be accepted, too, that the 10 per cent. of gross royalty retained
by the Forest Service is hardly adequate to cover the barest
of supervision, let alone any outlay designed to make the
areas reproductive.

The second diversion, while less drastic in appearance is
really more sinister in effect, in that it is of a permanent
nature applying to all indigenous State Forest. This diver­
sion is embodied in the “fifths and tenths” provision, whereby
fifths or tenths of the gross royalties received from the forests
are payable to the local body within whose boundaries the
forests are located. The justification for such payments lies
in the fact that local bodies cannot rate the Crown. Yet no
system of rating or taxation has ever been known which
would extort 10 per cent. or 20 per cent. of the gross income
of any business concern. Taxation and rating of freehold
timberlands in New Zealand are on a basis most fair to the
timber grower, and there is no visible reason why the State
in its timber growing activities should not be on as equitable
a basis as the private forestry concern.

Government policy in New Zealand has jealously upheld
the privilege of the Crown against the local authorities in
all cases, including the many trading activities of the various
Departments. The suggestion that the State’s trading ven­
ture in forestry be rated as a private forestry venture raises
a very large issue. But if the system of subventions is to
continue, it is obviously essential to devise a system of grants
more or less equivalent to the true rating value the forests
would have in private hands.

The fifths and tenths provision does not apply to the plan­
tations of exotics, but only to the indigenous forest areas. It is a
relic of the administrative viewpoint that timber was a mine,
not a crop. It is therefore working to discriminate unfairly
as between local bodies having native bush areas, and those
in which exotic plantations are established. From the latter
the counties get no return whatever.

The most important aspect, however, is the impediment
which these extortions put in the way of organization of the
native forests along the lines of continuous production. The
greatest task in New Zealand forestry for the next decade is
the economical conversion to sustained production of the
native forests of Westland, Southland, and Nelson.

Sufficient progress has been made in silvicultural research
to indicate prospects distinctly hopeful of success, yet such
silvicultural knowledge is of no avail when the hope of financial success is clouded by a perpetual tax as excessive as these local body subventions.

The problem of the native bush is not, as is usually accepted, a silvicultural problem. It is much more an administrative problem, and these local body payments form a part of this administrative problem which must be solved before any progress toward true forestry can be made.

It is hoped, therefore, that legislative effect may be speedily given to this recommendation.

KAHIKATEA

Perusing the Annual Report of the State Forest Service for the past year, the Editor notices that the term “White-pine” has displaced that of “Kahikatea” as the standard common name of Podocarpus dacrydioides. It has for many years been the policy of Government in New Zealand to encourage and perpetuate as the standard common names the Maori names of plants, trees, etc., in addition to Maori place names, wherever possible. Consequently since the time of Kirk our Government reports have always used the Maori names in all cases except the native beeches, where the Maori term is generic, and specific names were essential. The result of this policy has been definitely to enrich the language, while it has had an impression even on that carelessly spoken individual, the New Zealand bush sawmiller, who long ago accepted kauri and totara as matters of course, and has of late years in the North Island at least, given over the misleading and erroneous “red pine” and “black pine” for rimu and matai. He has so far boggled, however, at “kahikatea” and now it seems Government is capitulating to slovenly speech and careless mind. We are told that it hurts our export trade—that an unpronounceable outlandish word such as “kahikatea” frightens prospective buyers. It is difficult to credit. Our Australian purchasers are many of them secretly proud of their ability to handle Maori names. Besides, their own place names seem rather worse than anything New Zealand can produce. Foreigners who attempt Maori pronunciation usually do better, in fact, than do most New Zealanders, giving the vowels their standard Italian value.

In any case, most business is done in writing, and every buyer knows the word in print and knows that it refers to one definite timber which he wants for a special purpose. Even if an English word might be handier than a Maori one, in general, there are serious objections to “white pine,” in that there are many commercial white pines, and in that the New Zealand