species for amenity plantings in communities. However, during the mid to late 1960's we had a very intensive afforestation program in recreation areas in the southern part of our province. Trees were planted in highway picnic sites, Trans Canada Campgrounds, Provincial Parks and Regional Parks. The purpose of the planting was to provide shade and a pleasant visual effect on our open wind swept environment. Some planting locations were very tough and we had our successes and failures. Both native and exotic trees were used and from those early plantings we now have a sound basis on which to select hardy species.

I realize that our experience does not relate directly to your concern about plants for communities, however I feel we have contributed something to the knowledge of amenity plantings.

Thank you again for bringing this matter to my attention.

Adolph S. Matsalla

Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources
Saskatchewan

Dear Mr. Anderson:

I have received your letter of January 3rd recommending a program to develop suitable tree species for amenity planting in northern towns and cities.

The Alberta Forest Service has recently established a modest tree improvement program. One of its objectives is to develop hardy planting stock suitable for northern locations. Some work is also underway to test introduced tree species for hardiness under northern conditions.

I believe that this work will contribute directly towards the development of suitable stock for the very important purpose of municipal beautification.

Thank you for advising me of your views on this matter.

Don R. Getty

Minister of Energy and Natural Resources
Alberta

Policemen, Planners and Managers, in New Brunswick Crown Forests¹

G. F. Weetman

New Brunswick, like Ontario, Quebec and Manitoba, has chosen to attempt to fill, simultaneously, the roles of policeman, planner and manager of forested Crown lands. The wisdom of assuming the third role — the manager — is questionable. It is indeed doubtful whether the Province is either financially or physically capable of doing the job effectively on all Crown lands. It is worth noting that, while Ontario opted for this approach in 1962, in spite of the opposition of some dedicated government foresters, the Armson study of 1975 recommended that responsibility for forest management be handed back to industry (1).

Superficially, the arguments for government management appear logical. The forests belong to the public and the public interest must be protected. The environment must be preserved or enhanced, and wood resources rationed on the basis of allowable-cut calculations and socio-economic factors. Moreover, the continued productivity of Crown forest land must be assured and, when cut, the land must be promptly and adequately regenerated (2). Large industrial corporations do not necessarily share the same priorities and, therefore, all of these roles should be played by government. It sounds reasonable, particularly

when the forest-management track record of large pulp and paper companies, operating on leased Crown lands in eastern Canada, is examined.

However, the situation is not simple and the apparent solution — government management — is not necessarily the best.

Historically, Crown forests were regarded as unused resources waiting to be exploited to create jobs and wealth. Assignment of timber leases was generous — so generous, in fact, that wood supplies were in general, more than adequate for industrial needs. The logical roles of the Crown as policeman and planner were largely unfulfilled as there was little to police or plan for in an era when the objectives were to cut the forest and create jobs. Environmental and social issues were not yet recognized. It was an era marked by a lack of both on-the-ground management and forest-management objectives. If any forest management was needed — and apparently little was — it was left up to the industry.

We are now in another era in New Brunswick. The budworm crisis has forced the Government into the decision-making role in forest protection. It has also forced an appraisal of long-term timber supply: there are prospects of roundwood shortages, especially of softwoods, even to maintain current employment and cutting levels. Regenera-

¹Reprinted from UNB Forestry Focus, a quarterly publication of the Faculty of Forestry, University of New Brunswick.

tion surveys show inadequate and very slow stocking on many cutovers. The environmental sensitivity that has arisen recently has forced a reappraisal of the effects of woods operations. Continuing high levels of rural unemployment make more urgent the need for the creation and maintenance of forest-based employment. Management and silvicultural activities have now been rationalized and subsidized by temporary federal-provincial DREE Agreement funding.

In this new era the need for a strong Provincial role as a policeman, planner and policy-maker is obvious. Without responsible leadership the aimless path of economic expediency and short-term politically-based decision-making will be perpetuated.

Less obvious is the need for Provincial management. Examples of the capability for competent and efficient on-the-ground forest management by industry are to be found nearby. J. D. Irving's efficient plantations and nursery operations are well known. Nova Scotia Forest Industries' silviculture program is widely admired. Elsewhere in Canada, in Alberta and British Columbia where the industry has assumed responsibility for management through Forest Management Agreements or Tree Farm Licences on Crown Lands, there is an efficient level of intensive forest management (3). The administrative, bureaucratic and financial problems incurred by government in trying to run efficient silviculture operations, in spite of the best of will by the foresters involved, are apparent in all Provinces. The problems are institutional (4) and probably insurmountable.

On the few large freehold forested acreages in Canada (Irving, Georgia Pacific, Fraser, Abitibi, CPR, Crown Zellerbach, MacMillan Bloedel), intensive forest management operations have been initiated or have been operating for many years. In the United States the most intensive forestry practices are to be seen on large corporate forest holdings. Even Weyerhaeuser's high-yield forest program has gained some measure of tolerance, if not approval, from environmentalists (6). Across the border, in Maine, the tempo of development of intensive forest management programs has been stepped up greatly during recent months. The Seven Islands Land Co., Brown, Scott and other managers or landowners are involved and supporting jointly financed research in this area. However, there are some very real social and environmental problems associated with their operations (7).

The case for industrial management of Crown forested lands in Canada was ably made by Crossley in 1975 (8). The opportunities for it in New Brunswick are presently almost non-existent because of lack of policy in this area. While there is a policy on industrial forest development (9), there is none for forest management in New Brunswick; there are no objectives, no guidelines and no incentives.

The public interest must be protected on public forests. Experience elsewhere has shown that this interest can be protected while having the management planning and the silvicultural work done

on the ground by the same organization that does the logging. There is a merging of corporate and government interests in this area. It tends to be an efficient arrangement; the costs are charged to the timber and are not dependent on the vagaries of the Provincial Treasury Board or federal DREE. The work is done by people operating under corporate discipline.

In order for this arrangement to work, tenure does not have to be guaranteed in perpetuity, nor does equity in the land or the timber have to be ceded by government to industry. But there does have to be a system for either allowing approved "forestry costs" to be charged against stumpage, or a licensing agreement which makes it possible for industry to charge off forestry costs as an operating expense. The additional future growth generated by more advanced silvicultural practices will result in increased harvests at shorter rotation ages. Moreover, industry stands to benefit immediately, because prompt and efficient regeneration increases the annual allowable cut. Above all, arrangements and incentives must be embodied in the clear-cut Provincial policies, forest-management laws and regulations.

It is clear that there is a mutuality of interest shared by both government and industry in intensifying forest management on Crown lands, with benefits accruing to the people of the Province in terms of greater and more stable employment and better-quality forests. The time is ripe for the Provincial planners and policy-makers to sit down with industrial forest managers and work out a new provincial policy and guidelines for implementation. The present path being trod by the New Brunswick government, based largely on precarious DREE financing, is fraught with unforeseen uncertainties and future financial difficulties. There are some lessons to be learned from experience elsewhere — or must they be, in New Brunswick, learned the hard way, and too late?

References

- (1). **Armson, K. A. 1976.** Forest management in Ontario. Ont. Gov. Bookstore, 880 Bay St., Toronto.
- (2). **Lussier, L. J. 1976.** The forest management plan operation in Quebec. *Pulp and Paper Canada* 77 (7): 42-51.
- (3). **Weetman, G. F. 1976.** Expenditures and decision making in Canadian silviculture. *Pulp and Paper Canada* (In Press).
- (4). **Wolpin, C. 1977.** Institutional constraints to forest management in Nova Scotia. Draft M.Sc.F. thesis, University of New Brunswick.
- (5). **Zobel, B. 1975.** Increasing timber production from forest lands. Burgess Lane Lecture, Univ. of B.C. Nov. 19, 1975.
- (6). **Mitchell, J. G. 1974.** Best of the S.O.B.'s. *Audubon*, Sept. 49-62.
- (7). **Osborn, W. C. 1974.** The paper plantation. Ralph Nader's study group report on the pulp and paper industry in Maine. Grossman Publ. Viking Press, N.Y.
- (8). **Crossley, D. I. 1976.** The case for industrial management of Canada's forested lands. H. R. MacMillan Lecture, Faculty of Forestry, Univ. of B.C.
- (9). **Province of New Brunswick. 1976.** Statement of policy on industrial forest development. Dept. of Natural Resources.