out with the active participation of the landowners. How fortunate we are in New Zealand that our National Parks are unalienated. How long will this position continue, for it is clear that they are certainly not inviolate?

We are less fortunate in our domestic settled areas. The first landowners in this country were heirs to the gentry of eighteenth century England and the first thing they did was to establish parks. However, they were quickly followed by the surveyor who proceeded to parcel out the country in rectangular chunks. Our forebears not only acquiesced in their meticulous work, which ignored every curvaceous nuance of the landscape; but also, out of the hundreds of comely trees they could have grown, all too frequently selected those two mournful conifers from the Monterey peninsula. It is time we did something about it. The cry for planning in Britain grew from the dreadful effects of urban sprawl and ugliness begun in the early stages of the Industrial Revolution. We too, could look first at our towns, with their festoons of wires like a dilapidated spider web; at the frequent cry that reserves do not pay rates and should be put to "better" use; at our standards of architecture and suspicion of trees. But we need to look also at our countryside, where scope for improvement in visual amenity is virtually unlimited, with a climate and soils that will grow almost anything we could wish for. Must we forever put up with topped and broken-down belts of radiata pine and macrocarpa? Must we have some of our finest distant views obstructed by marching pylons? Must our forest margins remain sombre pine, unrelieved by the brightness of fresh spring green or autumn colour?

If we do not take these matters seriously, what has happened in Britain could happen here. We will have those who want to retain a sort of graveyard — nothing to be touched — battling with those who want to get on with production and never mind the finer points. Let us be thankful that now we have been warned.

C. G. R. CHAVASSE

FORESTS OF AUSTRALIA, by Alexander Rule, 1967. Angus & Robertson, Sydney. Price $6.75.

The title of this book is misleading. It should read "A History of Forestry in Australia". There are 20 chapters each with historical, geographical and political facts covering a range of subjects such as Forest Regions and Types, Growth of Government Forest Services, Forestry Education and Research, Forest-based Industries, Multiple Land Use, National Parks, and a final chapter headed "Outlook".

While unsuitable as a reference or students' textbook, neither is it likely to be high on the list of "musts" for the general reader. It will be read with interest by all who have a nodding acquaintance with Australian forestry. For the Australian forester there are many interesting, intimate facts, and personal anecdotes to help liven the otherwise tedious accounts of the evolution of staff training and recruitment, development of research, methods of forest management, and administration of forest land in Australia.

The book has 70 black-and-white photographs of varying quality and odd juxtaposition. These are spread evenly through the book and do not necessarily relate to the adjacent narrative. More descriptive notes accompanying each plate would give more point to illustrations presented this way.

Although the author has drawn attention to past mistakes and errors, it is disappointing to find no criticism or challenge on current forest policy. This is particularly true of the final chapter where one might have expected some searching questions to stimulate future thought and research on planning Australian forestry. Instead, the current policy is outlined with future quantities and values of forest products that could be realized.

Is the target of 3,000,000 acres of exotic forest by 2000 A.D. realistic? If so, where should this future forest be established, and with what species? What policy and administrative problems must be overcome? Will "national" afforestation planning transcend State parochialism and rivalry?

A. K. FAMILTON