Professional Articles

Forestry's Future Frustrated or A Condensed History of Canadian Foresters' Concern for Forest Renewal¹

by

E.S. Fellows²

Abstract

A 40-year review of the concerns of Canadian foresters over the lack of a national forest policy in general and over failure to provide adequately for forest renewal in particular, as told chiefly in the words of contemporary writings and speeches.

Résumé

Une révision — d'une durée de 40 ans — viz-à-viz les inquiétudes qui touchent les forestiers en ce qui concerne le manque d'une politique forestière nationale en général et en particulier sur le manque d'approvisionnements adéquats pour nos forêts renouvelables, tels que racontés dans les discours et écritures actuels.

Introduction

Recent publicity, including an article in the June, 1983, issue of "The Forestry Chronicle" (1), give the impression that forest renewal and concern over not-satisfactorily-restocked forest lands are a latter-day revolution — perhaps paralleling the encounter of one Saul of Tarsus on his way to Damascus. Witness the report of the Science Council of Canada titled "Canada's Threatened Forests" published in March, 1983, which comments that:

"Recently, at all levels of government, as well as in industry and at universities, a great deal of thought, research and discussion has been devoted to the impediments barring the implementation of scientific forest management and forest resources research in Canada."

A little further on is the statement:

"Industry and governments are recognizing the need for better management of the renewable resource . . . The need for scientific silviculture, much like scientifically based agriculture, is beginning to be appreciated."

Or again, take the advertisement appearing in "The Globe and Mail" of July 25, 1983, under the authority of Hon. John Roberts, then Minister of Environment (Canada) which stated in part:

"In recent years however, it has become evidence that vigorous action on the part of governments, industry and the forestry work force is urgently required to ensure for future generations the same level of benefits Canadians have historically derived from the forest resource."

The advertisement goes on to say —

"Nationally there is a large backlog of insufficiently restocked forest land. Forestry is now (*sic*) in a critical transition stage where mining the virgin forest must give way to systematic forest renewal and management."

In responding to today's seers one is tempted to go back to the preachings and actions of the Father of Canadian Reforestation, the redoubtable Ellwood Wilson. Admittedly, he was about half a rotation ahead of his day. It is doubtful if, had his advice been followed in the 1920's, it would have done us much good in the 1980's. But assuredly if it had been consistently followed in succeeding decades, the timber-supply picture today would be vastly better. Be that as it may, his was a voice crying in the wilderness.

¹This manuscript was received several months before D. MacKay's book "Heritage Lost" was published and any citing of the same original sources is purely coincidental. Editor.

²Consulting Forester, P.O. Box 354, Fredericton, N.B. E3B 4Z9

Early Stirrings and Fact-finding Years

It was probably toward the close of World War II that grass-roots foresters began to see the writing on the wall and the public (and its governments) showed a quickening interest in forestry. A series of "rehabilitation" reports and Royal Commissions took a critical look at the condition of the country's forests and at the industries dependent upon them — the Dawson Commission in Nova Scotia, the MacKenzie "Reconstruction Committee" in New Brunswick, the Kennedy Royal Commission in Ontario, the Eliason Royal Commission in Saskatchewan, the first Sloan Royal Commission in British Columbia and the Kennedy Royal Commission in Newfoundland all dealt largely or exclusively with the forest and forestry during the decade from 1944 to 1954. In all these, professional foresters made their inputs. A 1944 submission to government by the Nova Scotia members of the Canadian Society of Forest Engineers (CSFE) (2) is perhaps representative of professional concern over forest renewal. It said:

"Although natural regeneration is often satisfactory many areas capable of supporting tree growth are lying idle. Little or no effort has been made at artificial regeneration."

The brief went on to make specific recommendations for forest renewal.

Possibly the first time a professional forester publicly expressed his concern over forest renewal in Canada in terms of the margin of time for achieving desired results was the key-note address given by Gordon Godwin at the 1948 annual general meeting of the CSFE in Fredericton (3). He said in part:

"The day of reckoning may be distant, but I don't think it is 80 years away. I think it would be wiser to plan on it being closer to being 50 years away. And that is a very short time in the life this nation should enjoy. It is far too short a time for the forests to reproduce themselves. By the end of this century under present methods, we may be scraping the bottom of the barrel — and it probably won't be a wooden barrel.

"Our timber supply situation is not desperate. But it is serious. The time to do something about it is now."

He went on to say:

"As we conduct our inventory, while we provide for protection, and while we develop new products, we must proceed with forest management and particularly with silviculture."

He continued —

"There are many instances where operators could increase rate of growth and enjoy increased allowable annual cuts within the next few years if they were to use even the meagre data on silvics that now exist. It should be possible for many limit holders to double the yield from their present holdings within 20 years. By the end of this century, it should be possible to apply forest management to the whole of the accessible forest area, and to double the annual cut . . ."

Godwin concluded his address with these words:

"This rosy picture won't be realized with our present haphazard approach to our forest problems. It can be

assured only when the provinces, the federal government and the industry agree jointly that the problems are national in scope, that their solution depends on cooperative effort, and that the sooner something is done the less will be the cost of doing it, and the greater and earlier will be the returns."

As we reread these words we could weep with frustration. They were uttered more than 36 years ago by a responsible and prescient industrial forester.

One year later, a major break-through occurred when Parliament passed the "Canada Forestry Act" in which for the first time the federal government by legislation recognized its joint responsibility for the welfare of the nation's forests. By this enabling Act, the federal government was empowered to enter into cost-sharing agreements with the provinces with the specific aims of improving forest protection, systematizing and improving provincial forest inventories and securing the renewal of forests. However, it was almost exactly two years before the first agreement under the Act was consummated. As was to be expected, most of the emphasis was placed on forest inventories and protection, since more comprehensive data were needed before the needs for forest renewal could be defined quantitatively and geographically. In the first year of activities under the Act, only 1200 acres were planted and 6000 acres were seeded. At its 1953 annual meeting, the Canadian Institute of Forestry (CIF) passed a resolution endorsing the need for emphasizing forest protection under joint federal-provincial agreements.

Nevertheless, the matter of forest renewal remained a major concern of foresters and their associates. At the same 1953 CIF meeting in Winnipeg, Prof. G.K. Goundrey had this to say (4):

"Sustained yield in a very broad sense is not only desirable, but essential for survival. At the present time the world in which we live is still too busy digging up ore and wasting oil to worry about shortages, but in the near future, perhaps sooner than many think, renewable resources will come back into their own and the forester will be vindicated."

In April, 1954, the CIF in cooperation with the Canadian Forestry Association, the Agricultural Institute of Canada, the Engineering Institute of Canada, and the Canadian Chamber of Commerce sponsored a Natural Resources Conference in Winnipeg which was attended by the Hon. Jean Lesage, then Minister of Northern Affairs and National (sic) Resources, and Hon. C.D. Howe, as well as representatives of the sponsoring organizations and other agencies interested in the conservation of forests, waters and soil. As a public relations exercise, the conference surely served a useful purpose, but if it had any concrete results, they are not now identifiable.

At its 1954 meeting, the CIF noted that no cooperative forest-protection activities had been undertaken under the Canada Forestry Act and passed a resolution enjoining its members to urge their members of parliament and legislative assemblies to give this matter the attention it deserved.

In April, 1955, the Manitoba Section passed a resolution intended for its own provincial government, but urged all sections to take similar actions in their respective provinces. The resolution contained 16 "Whereases" the last of which reads "monies made available under the present agreement are not

commensurate with the revenue derived (directly or indirectly) by the federal government from forest industry, nor with the need for better forestry in Canada;"

The body of the resolution went on to read as follows:

- "1. That the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources of Manitoba contact the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources, requesting that Federal-Provincial Forestry Conference be called prior to August 31st, 1955;
- "2. That the Province of Manitoba recommend that new agreements be drawn up whereby:
 - (a) The money made available to each province shall be calculated on a formula basis in which the factor of increased provincial expenditure shall not be a condition of federal assistance.
 - (b) The money made available shall be spent in the provinces on a dollar for dollar basis on such forestry programs as best meet the needs of the individual province.
 - (c) All agreements shall be for a five-year term and shall be subject to renewal by mutual agreement at the end of this period, with or without amendment.
- "3. That federal contributions under the Canada Forestry Act be substantially increased to the degree warranted by the importance of forestry in the Canadian economy."

Also in 1955, the federal government set up the Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Prospects (the "Gordon" Commission) and in February of the following year J.W.B. Sisam, then President of the CIF, appeared before the Commission in Ottawa to present the Institute's brief. This comprehensive, 53-page document (5) contained the following observations:

"A generation ago some of the most prominent exponents of forestry in this country were noted for their zeal in drawing public attention to the grave dangers lying in the casual neglect of our forest resources. Had it not been for their crusading spirit our position would have been poorer than it is today; and because of their efforts to arouse popular concern we can now face our problems with more objectivity and with a fuller knowledge of the forest itself. Today, therefore, our predictions may be less sensational than theirs, but the essence of our warnings is much the same, namely that decisive action must be taken now to avoid jeopardizing the supply of raw material for the forest industries. We do not wish to imply that Canada is facing an imminent timber famine, but we want to emphasize that the country is in danger of impoverishing its most economical sources of wood."

A few pages further on the brief stated: —

"A major problem in much of the Canadian forest is the matter of securing satisfactory regeneration after logging. This is largely a technical problem, but by no means wholly so. The usual practice on Crown lands is for the government to collect payment for timber on the basis of the volume cut. But it makes no difference whether the wood was grown by nature unaided or whether some limit holder voluntarily incurred expense

to secure better regeneration than would otherwise have resulted. Thus, if a limit holder makes a special effort to practice some elementary forms of forest management, he gets no credit for it. He will therefore do it only when he must. The net result is that, over large areas of cutover timberlands, there is a very unsatisfactory condition of re-stocking both as to quantity and quality."

The brief then went on to say —

"The quantity of raw forest products available to Canada in the future will depend partly on present investment in the forest. Considering the importance of wood to our economic welfare, it behooves us to determine as best we can our future needs, and to act now to provide for them by the most effective means at hand."

Elsewhere in its brief the Institute commented:

"Under present circumstances the investment in promoting future forest crops is likely to depend on current financial considerations. With heavy demands on provincial revenues for social services and on corporation profits for income tax and dividends, the expenditure on the forest is a residual sum not related to the actual requirements in any way whatsoever.

"Considering Canada's present and probable future need for wood as a raw material, there should be a deep interest in establishing a sound policy on wood production. Outlays for forestry operations determined by what is left over after all other demands on the profits from current forest operations have been met is a wholly inadequate policy of management. The alternative is to establish by the best possible methods the probable future requirements of the Canadian wood-using industries. It is fully appreciated that no exact statement of requirements is possible because of changing technology and markets. However, such an estimate would at least establish a goal for production, and would put the practice of forestry in a positive position in the economy with a positive demand on the existing factors of production."

To lend emphasis and urgency to its words, the brief pointed out that: "In the seven years following 1945, the primary production from Canadian forests increased by 40 per cent, whereas the increase in the 20 years prior to 1945 was only 12½ per cent."

In 1957, the Forestry Study Group of the "Gordon" Commission published a report on the timber demand projections it had developed (6). These projections were to become key data in later analyses of the relationship between the timber supplies and the anticipated needs of the Canadian forest industries.

At its 1958 annual general meeting, the CIF adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the Canadian Institute of Forestry submitted to the Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Prospects a brief which outlined the current forestry situation in Canada, and, whereas this aforesaid brief indicates specific major obstacles to the improvement of forest management practice and to development of Canadian forest lands, whereas the principal recom-

mentation of the aforesaid brief calls for the institution of an Advisory Committee on Forestry, said Committee to advise the Federal Government on problems pertaining to the development and management of Canada's forests, be it therefore resolved that the President of the Institute undertake to discuss with the appropriate responsible authorities in the Federal Government the feasibility of the implementation of this principal recommendation."

G.W.I. Creighton, then President of the CIF, and Major-General Howard Kennedy later appeared before the Standing Committee on Mines, Forests and Waters of the House of Commons to present the Institute's views.

One year later, under prompting from its Lake of the Woods Section, the CIF annual meeting adopted the following resolution which was preceded by three pertinent "whereases":

"Be it resolved that the Canadian Institute of Forestry urges its Sections to arrange meetings between administrators of Crown lands and representatives of the forest industries, the principal users of Crown timber, to discuss and formulate ways and means of restocking cut-over lands, formerly carrying healthy, vigorous stands, but not now adequately restocked; and in carrying on these discussions and formulating procedures therefrom, that all representatives give due consideration to tenure of the land, economics of financing restocking projects, and the necessity of maintaining a competitive and profitable forest industry in Canada."

A Bright Beginning

The next decade was ushered in with great promise. On June 28, 1960, Prime Minister Diefenbaker introduced a bill entitled "*The Department of Forestry Act*". This bill, which repealed the "*Canada Forestry Act*", received unanimous passage in the House of Commons on July 11 and gained Senate approval on July 20. Hon. Hugh John Flemming was appointed the first Minister of Forestry. At the CIF annual general meeting later that year, a resolution was passed which offered the Prime Minister all possible assistance in developing a program for the new department. All Sections on the Institute were asked to submit their ideas so that the national body could submit a comprehensive list of areas of interest which should be considered.

In June, 1961, CIF President Hugh Hodgins presented the Minister of Forestry with a list of 32 subject areas deserving attention. In this context, only four of these are relevant. These were:

- "11. There is a necessity for effective study of the more serious obstructions to better forest management in Canada."
- "14. Structure and development of forest stands and stand improvement require more attention."
- "16. Rehabilitation of brush lands and other productive forest sites unsatisfactorily restocked should be reviewed with a view of resolving this problem."
- "25. Comprehensive cost studies covering all aspects of the work of growing desirable forests, right through to harvesting, should be undertaken."

In 1961, a major conservation event took place in Montreal. It was the "Resources for Tomorrow Conference" sponsored by the federal and all provincial governments and which had been almost three years in planning and preparation. The Conference embraced all renewable resources. Each was discussed both separately and jointly with others. Discussions on forestry were founded on nine background papers authored by outstanding foresters in government, industry and education. Two of those papers dealt comprehensively with the subjects of demands for Canadian forest products and estimates of the long-term prospects for Canadian wood supplies. This was almost certainly the first time a representative group of Canadian foresters had an opportunity to look simultaneously at the sharply rising curve of the demands for wood and the still-imperfect, but increasingly refined, estimates of wood supplies. In one of the two concurrent workshops on forestry, one of the discussants, Ian Mahood, had this to say (7): —

"The obvious need is for intensive management on the most productive acreages, close to the centers of production, which are capable of growing low-cost wood on short rotations. Managers, both private and public, have expected timber in remote areas would become economically available due to rising prices for the products. The error has been that world competition for sales of forest products holds product prices down, and where prices have risen the domestic cost spiral has so eroded operating margins that Canada faces an actual and increasing deficit of economic timber. This neglect of the cutover lands close to industrial centers is likely to be one of the greatest forestry errors of the past two generations."

One of the conclusions of this workshop was (7):

Management

Since our ability to compete with other countries is affected by the cost of forest operations, our forest policies should be improved toward:

- (a) *High-intensity* management in easily accessible regions;
- (b) The orderly development of less accessible areas through construction of access roads and other necessary improvements."

The first conclusion of the second forestry workshop reads as follows (7):

Type and intensity of management of forest land

In order to establish the basis for decisions on the type and intensity of forest land management, it is agreed that for the country as a whole:

- (a) Criteria of economic productivity be defined, taking into consideration such factors as productive capacity of land and access to markets.
- (b) A forest land use classification be made in which criteria are taken into account.
- (c) A study be made of trends in social and economic pressures developing with regard to the use of forest land in Canada.
- (d) A study be made of areas outside Canada that are competitive on the forest product markets of the world, and of the factors affecting their competitiveness.

"It was agreed that the last item (d) should be given high priority in any economic study program, to be undertaken and completed as quickly as possible."

In the "wrap-up" statement prepared by the Research Coordinator (Forestry), the conclusions of the Conference on forest management were summarized thus (7):

Forest Management

"It was concluded that policies should be designed to stimulate high-intensity management on the most accessible productive areas, but, at the same time, the orderly development of more remote forest resources should be stepped up. However, in this connection, the group felt that carefully established criteria of economic productivity are needed before wise decisions on development can be reached in specific instances. It was also noted that we urgently require more detailed knowledge of those factors influencing the competitiveness of other leading countries in world trade in forest products. A forest-land-use classification and a study of trends developing in the social and economic pressures on the use of forest land were also advocated."

Before leaving the subject of the Resources for Tomorrow Conference, it is appropriate to repeat a statement made at the opening Plenary Session by Pierre-Elliott Trudeau, speaking "more as a lawyer than as an economist". He said in part (7):

"Whence then must progress come? It must come from a united front of all the experts on a scientific and technological basis. The experts must forego their vested interests and their political conflicts, and warn the Canadian public that there exist certain objective data which cannot be ignored without danger to everyone's health and welfare. If such were done, this Conference might mean the end of an era during which all the pressure groups tried to prevent the resource problem from being considered objectively, from the single viewpoint of the *general* interest.

"There are few sectors of public life in which the technocrat should have more to say than in the field of natural resources, because in this field objective research and scientific experience are highly possible. It has nevertheless been a field in which, until now, the voice of expert has not often been heard.

"At long last, this week, it appears that the experts have decided to speak loud and clear. They should be concerned with reaching the public and being understood, for it is mainly by influencing a majority of the people the technocrat may assert himself in a democratic form of government."

In his concluding statement Trudeau said:

"The expert must therefore direct his appeal to all levels of the electorate, for it is the voter who ultimately compels federal, provincial and municipal governments to take action. And must not the cause of natural resources be defended passionately at all levels of government?"

In due course, the Resources for Tomorrow Conference

led to the formation in 1963 of the Canadian Council of Resource Ministers (CCRM) — later expanded into the Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers (CCREM). At its first meeting in November of that year, it was unanimously agreed by the eleven ministers that "it is of the utmost urgency that Canadians be made fully aware of the social and economic values of the forest community, so crucial to Canada's continued development." According to a statement in "The Forestry Chronicle" 40(1) of March, 1964 —

"It was the opinion of the ministers that a renewable resource supporting our greatest free enterprise industry consistently accounting for almost one-third of the total value of all Canada's exports, should receive, within the Constitutional division of responsibilities, a much greater degree of sound attention and development at all levels of Government.

"It was agreed that the existing Federal-Provincial Forestry Agreements, covering inventory, reforestation, access roads, stand-improvement and forest fire protection, have been more or less satisfactory up to the present time. However, there is an urgent need for — (a) greater flexibility in the terms of the Agreement to permit wider provincial planning; — (b) an increase in the federal funds to be made available to the Provinces."

It should be noted that *eleven* ministers were in unanimous agreement, that is to say, the federal minister concurred.

Relapse and Paralysis

At the same time, the federal government was in the process of abolishing its Department of Forestry and incorporating its functions in yet another of the interminable series of shot-gun weddings and divorces that have plagued federal forestry activities. This time the short-lived union was to be known as the Department of Forestry and Rural Development.

The CIF strongly protested this move in a letter from its President, R.G. McKee, to Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson. The Prime Minister replied on February 20, 1964, as follows:

"Thank you for your letter expressing the views of your Institute on the government's plans for reorganization of the departments of forestry and agriculture.

"The government's plans for integration of the departments of forestry and agriculture will in no way lessen our concern for the success of the forest industry or our attention to its interests or problems.

"On the contrary, I am confident that the result of the reorganization will be not merely to continue the progress which was being made but to strengthen still further federal action of value to the industry.

"As you are aware, however, the range of federal action relating to forestry is limited by constitutional considerations. As a result, the department has since its inception remained relatively small in size and the workload involved has been much lighter than that of most departments. These facts have limited the role which could be played by even the most able and dedicated Minister of Forestry.

"The reorganization is intended to product a better

balancing of the work-load among departments. It will therefore, I believe, improve efficiency.

"That is the reason why forestry is being associated with the important work of rural development. The change does not mean that forestry will take a lesser place in government interest. On the contrary, by receiving attention within a broader and busier operation, more interest will be taken; it will be possible to make departmental actions more effective; and the industry will have even better reason than before to feel its viewpoint and interests are known in a way that assures them full attention at the highest level.

"In short, I appreciate the importance of the forest industry to Canada and I assure you that this appreciation will be in no way diminished."

The Prime Minister's response begged the question of who was responsible for the fact that the Minister of Forestry and his Department did not have a great deal more to do.

Not long after this, R.G. McKee, British Columbia's Deputy Minister of Forests, speaking to the members of the Interior Lumber Manufacturers' Association, had this to say (8):

"As President of the Canadian Institute of Forestry, I have been in contact with a considerable number of the two thousand professional foresters across the country in the last two years. I can assure you that they are far from satisfied with the national progress of intensive forestry."

He went on —

"My reason for washing all this dirty linen in public is to show that professional foresters across the land are powerless to right the situation. Unlike other professions, the opportunity to put into effect the skills of the forestry profession is not controlled by foresters, but by the people who own the public working circles, or by the company directors in some of the older provinces who have been miserly in expenditure for intensive forestry."

Speaking specifically about British Columbia, McKee went on —

"The only way to prevent these future 10-year reductions in allowable cut is by the practice of more intensive forestry, which means ploughing back more of these forestry-earned dollars. The appended table for the year 1962-63 indicates that the combined provincial and federal forest-based revenues from this province were of the order of \$256,500,000.00 whereas the forest expenditures of both governments was \$21,700,000.00 or a mere 8.5 percent of the revenue collected."

"To foresters, this is a niggardly replacement of forest capital, and is unfair to the industry which has contributed so much to the regulation of cut, unfair to the foresters in government employ who are charged with the task of trying to make sustained-yield forestry work; and particularly unfair to our children's children."

At almost the same time, Prof. T.G. Wright, then Dean of Forestry at the University of British Columbia, told the 1964

annual meeting of the Woodlands Section of the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association that (9):

"There is no higher forestry priority in Canada than to accelerate all phases of reforestation practice. We must chart a broad, imaginative and aggressive program of planting, seeding, site preparation, and extension of nursery facilities. We must throw away the compound interest tables, roll up our sleeves and tackle the job."

He concluded his paper by saying:

"Canada cannot maintain her superior position in world forest products trade in the long run if she fails to carry out a dynamic reforestation program. Effective reforestation today will provide the cheapest wood and the largest harvest for tomorrow."

In 1962, the CIF had set up its Silviculture Committee under the energetic perceptive chairmanship of D.I. Crossley. In its report a year later, the Committee emphasized the need for innovative approaches to the requirements and activities associated with timber harvesting. It pointed out that some regulations could well be dispensed with and the money saved by abandoning procedures that were purely defensive fire-protection could, and should, be put to much more constructive use in fostering forest renewal while simultaneously reducing the risk of fire.

In the editorial in "The Forestry Chronicle" 41(3) of September, 1965, K.W. Hearnden, then President of the CIF, quoted several leading figures as follows (10):

(Hon. E.D. Haliburton, Nova Scotia's Minister of Lands and Forests)

"'Far too much of our forest land is unproductive, even apart from the burned-over and barren areas'. Of the 500,000 acres of barren Crown land in western Nova Scotia, he suggested that 136,000 acres could be reforested."

(Major-General B.M. Hoffmeister, President of the Council of Forest Industries of British Columbia)

"There can be no question that an adequate reforestation program is one of the major responsibilities now facing public management of the forest resources."

(Mr. A.F. Buell, Chairman of the Woodlands Section of the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association)

"We are now going to become even more dependent on our more accessible forest areas, both licensed limits and private woodlots, for our raw materials. Here is where efforts must be concentrated to increase production of fibre per acre."

Hearnden continued in his own words: —

"In contrast to the open-handed spending of our federal government in every other field, reforestation, in 1963, was assisted to the extent of only one-half of one percent of the tax revenues taken from the forest industries. Our provinces, too, have been drawing on forest capital to finance other activities and in 1963 spent less than 8 percent of stumpage revenues on reforestation. Compare these outlays with the 200 million dollars in federal-provincial grants being provided to enable Canadian municipalities to mark the 1967 Centennial,

and with the island-in-the-St. Lawrence-building, "Expo-67" venture which, we are told, will cost the Canadian taxpayer nearly half a billion dollars, and the measure of Canadian forestry is taken."

Meanwhile, the federal Department of Forestry had been updating projections of the supply of, and demands for, Canadian timber in the coming decade. Largely as a result of these studies, the 1966 annual meeting of the Woodlands Section of the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association was told (11):

"These conclusions can be summed up by saying that, if the Gordon Commission's projection of total demand for wood materializes (and I have no persuasive evidence that it will not), we shall not be facing an imminent shortage even if economic conditions should prevent us from going further for our supplies than we now do. On the other hand, if Canadian industries intend to keep pace with the rate of increase in the world demand for forest products expected during the last 20 years of this century, the margin for further expansion of the wood-using industries remaining after 1980 will be narrow enough for serious concern. Perhaps it is none too soon to be manoeuvring towards the position which they will want to occupy by the year 2000, because 35 years is not a long time in relation to the effective development of our forest resources."

One year later, a similar message, but one with particular emphasis on the diminishing supplies of sawtimber, was delivered to the Canadian Lumbermen's Association (12).

In February, 1966, the Department of Forestry sponsored what was hoped to be a major milestone in the country's sluggish progress along the road towards more intensive practice of forestry — the National Forestry Conference, sometimes known as the "Montebello Conference".

This Conference brought together foresters and associated professionals from provincial and federal governments, the forest industries and the universities — all under the Chairman of the Minister of Forestry, Hon. Maurice Sauvé. The Conference addressed three main questions, namely,

1. What are the present demands for Canada's forest resources? What will they be in 1975? In 2000?
2. What is the present state of Canada's forest resources?
3. What must be done to ensure that these resources meet 1975 and 2000 demands effectively?

Several important background papers were presented and the delegates then dispersed into a number of "workshop" sessions which considered not only the commercial uses of the forest but also wildlife and environmental concerns, although the emphasis was placed on timber availability and forest renewal.

Each province presented a short statement on its forestry situation. With the exception of Prince Edward Island, all provinces stressed the need for intensified forestry practice to ensure adequate future supplies, although one or two had strong reservations about providing the funds to do the job. Probably the comment of F.S. McKinnon, on behalf of British Columbia, most succinctly summed up the views of many when he said (13):

"The answer to the question of what must be done to ensure that this renewable resource meets future

needs is relatively simple — allot adequate funds to forest management."

At the concluding session of the Conference, R.M. Fowler, President of the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association, minced no words in expressing his concerns. In part he said (14):

"We can say now, as we could not say on Tuesday, that a major effort is going to be needed to obtain these possible levels of demand. The subsequent sessions reported that total wood resources would be sufficient in 1975 to meet the prospective demands, but even here the situation is not an easy or automatic one; there are areas and species where the allowable cut on an economic basis will not permit growth at the national average. When we look to 2000 A.D., it is quite clear that with present methods and arrangements we will *not* have enough wood to meet the estimated demands.

"The need of doing something now, to meet the demands of 2000 A.D. is clear. The question we have to face — and haven't really faced yet, is what we should do and how we should go about it. A conference such as this can be useful in defining the need and bringing it to the attention of all interested parties. But no conference — this one or any future one — is going to grow trees."

"You can go on as you are — live on in the happy assumption of the past that we have unlimited forest assets to draw on and close your eyes to the fact that assumption is no longer or will no longer be valid — continue with a lot of individual and rather half-hearted efforts to improve silviculture, and do a bit of research and train a few scientists, and build some roads, and tinker with forestry laws, and so on. If this is done, most of the people in this room will probably get by — they can work on and take their pensions (though it may become a little doubtful if their pensions will be as valuable as they now think). But sometime, your sons or successors — perhaps 15 or 25 years from now will feel the bite of wood shortages — and they may wonder why we were so blind and inefficient and unimaginative today.

"The other choice is to decide to do something about the problem we have exposed in this conference and that — let us be honest about it — is a choice of great complexity. It involves difficult political decisions — difficult because they are long-range decisions and — if the Minister will excuse me — the fact is that a politician is not good at making long-range decisions. He thinks in terms of two or three or at most four years — and he wants his results now. You don't get quick results in growing trees or applying a forestry policy.

"The first think is to convince political leaders and the public that a problem exists — that the old, happy, easy affluent days of unlimited forest resources are nearly over. This is not going to be easy . . ."

Mr. Fowler's closing statement reads as follows: —

"Mr. Minister, as head of the Department of Forestry, you have a difficult task but I think beyond any doubt the responsibility for this essential co-ordination rests

with your Department. You have one great factor working in your favour. The figures which this conference has indicated are very great — the opportunities are enormous and this is one game in which all the players can get a prize. I think that people will make the effort if they can be gained. I think that the essential co-ordination of forestry policy needed to meet the opportunities that have been held out at this conference can be achieved, but someone had better get down soon to detailed and specific plans."

Later in the final Plenary Session, F.S. McKinnon, BC Deputy Minister of Forests, summed up the conclusions reached with regard to forest regeneration thus (13):

"This topic was divided into two parts: first the rehabilitation of lands cut-over in the past and not regenerated for commercial tree species or only partly so; and secondly, the lands being cut-over currently. It was apparent that the allowable cut for our managed forests would be increased significantly if we were to follow the sustained-yield principle of prompt and complete regeneration of all productive forest land. The extent of the problem was not clear nor was the cost calculated but it is very evident that if Canada is to meet the goals of future wood requirement, every productive acre must be working to full capacity. It is also noted that in general, these lands needing rehabilitation were made up of the better sites and were more accessible than many of the lands being logged currently. The acreage involved is such that substantial appropriations are indicated and existing cost-sharing arrangements between the two senior governments should be extended or modified to the extent necessary to introduce an effective program. The *Canada Forestry Act* was considered to be a suitable medium for this necessary co-operation."

In closing the Conference, the Minister said (14):

"It seems to me that we have an extraordinary future in this country in the field of forestry. At the same time, if we want to have the people of Canada benefit to the maximum, we have to have some sort of co-ordination. I think that, as the Minister of Forestry and responsible for the Department of Forestry, we have given an indication that we believe in co-ordination, we believe in some sort of planning, and we have assumed some responsibility. As long as I remain the Minister of Forestry, I want, on your behalf, to continue this approach and I am quite ready — I think the Department also is quite ready — to assume more leadership in the forestry field, bearing in mind that, as Mr. Fowler said, we have to meet some constitutional difficulties. However, my conviction is that all the various provincial authorities are aware that we can go nowhere unless we have a national approach to this problem. One thing struck me during the entire Conference — that we are not pre-occupied by provincialism or regionalism; it was always the common good of Canada as a whole and this is a very good sign at a time when there is so much talk of regionalism in our country."

In the eight-month interval between the National Forestry Conference and the 1966 annual general meeting of the CIF/IFC in Banff, the enthusiasm generated by the Conference rapidly evaporated. The reason was not far to seek. In his annual report to the meeting, President D.I. Crossley had this

to say (15):

"I was greatly encouraged by the action taken by the Federal Ministry of Forestry and Rural Development in convening the National Forestry Conference last February and the call for his leadership that was one of the results of that Conference. It was particularly gratifying that the participants should emphasize the need for extending and increasing the shared-cost provisions of The Canada Forestry Act. Consequently I was shaken when I examined the Federal Forestry Department's estimated expenses at the end of the last fiscal year and learned that, when compared to the previous year's expenses, the estimated amount to be spent in ARDA was up 59%, on Maritime Marshland Rehabilitation was up 66%, the amounts to be spent on freight assistance and grain storage costs on western feed grain was up 10%, the amount to be spent on Forest Research and Administration was up 14%, at the same time the contributions to the provinces in the way of Shared-Cost agreements were down 7%. Because I am convinced that these Shared-Cost agreements are the result of some of the best forest legislation to be enacted for many years I am chagrined over Finance Minister Sharp's recent announcement that the government will terminate all financial assistance to the provisional forestry programmes. I am in no position to argue against the necessity for the introduction of brakes on inflation but I do recognize that if our general and long-range economy is not to suffer and we are to meet the goals that have been forecast then we must get on with the fundamentals of resource management. One deplores the lack of statesmanship that results in our government initiating and servicing vote-getting social-welfare legislation at the expense of the development of a fundamental, revenue-producing basic resource so vital to the welfare of our country."

In an effort to rekindle the spirit of the Conference, the Institute at its 1966 meeting adopted the following lengthy resolution ("58th Annual Report of the Canadian Institute of Forestry").

"Whereas:

1. Canada's forests, in addition to other uses and values, support an industrial complex which earns over 2 billion dollars in foreign exchange and amounts to 25 per cent of Canada's total exports. These industries account for 9 per cent of the net value of production of all commodity industries and more than 5 per cent of the gross domestic production;
2. Forestry investments needed to sustain and intensify production are long-term, large and continuing, and therefore deserve sound planning, effective co-ordination and adequate financial support at the National level;
3. The proceedings of the National Forestry Conference of February 1966 demonstrate conclusively that, if projected demands are to be met, funds must be forthcoming to provide for more adequate forest inventory data, reforestation, forest protection, forest access and stand improvement — programs to which the Government of Canada has contributed more than 56 million dollars since 1951 through cost-sharing agreements, and which in turn have resulted in the establishment of many new forest industries, in the

improvement of forest management practices and, in general, have made a very significant contribution to Canadian forestry;

4. Because of the inter-dependence of forest research and practice, the research program which the Government of Canada is building through its Department of Forestry and Rural Development has been and will continue to be greatly enhanced by the implementation of a number of the non-mandatory elements of the Forestry Development and Research Act, including the Federal-Provincial Agreements;

5. The 7.9 million-dollar appropriation provided in 1966-67 for the Composite Forestry Agreements, which is deemed to be inadequate in relation to the present need and the potential benefits which would accrue to all Canadians, may not be renewed on April 1st, 1967.

Therefore, be it resolved that:

1. The principle of composite forestry agreements be reaffirmed because of their contribution to sustained economic development;

2. The money for forest operations under composite agreements be reinstated at a level of not less than that for the year 1966-67;

3. The Government of Canada be asked to convene an early meeting of all federal and provincial ministers responsible for the management and utilization of Canada's forests, and that they be empowered by their representative governments to investigate and recommend on the amount of funds urgently needed and the means whereby these funds may be provided on a continuing basis from the large revenues which the forest resources contribute to the federal and provincial governments;

4. The Executive of the Canadian Institute of Forestry be instructed to take immediate action to bring this resolution to the attention of those concerned and to work towards its full implementation by all practical means, including personal representation to the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premiers of each of the provinces where forestry is of significance."

However, the blow had already fallen during the summer of 1966 when the federal government indicated its intention of abandoning shared-cost forestry programs. On September 16, the Acting-President of the CIF/IFC, D.I. Crossley, entered into correspondence with Prime Minister Lester Pearson on this subject — a correspondence that was to continue until the following June³ — in which he reminded Mr. Pearson of the findings of the National Forestry Conference and of the commitment his Minister had made at that time.

In his reply, the Prime Minister confirmed the government's intention to terminate the composite forestry agreements, but said that this did not preclude "special agreements dealing with specific forestry problems which arise from time to time, and which are dealt with by the federal government and the provincial governments concerned, on an *ad hoc* basis." (16) He went on to say that the government had plans to double the research capability of the Department of

Forestry and Rural Development during the next five years. To this Crossley responded on October 18 in part as follows:

"Throughout those entire proceedings (i.e., of the National Forestry Conference, ESF) the need for increased research at the federal level was de-emphasized and the need for the fundamentals of wild-land resource management, e.g. access, protection, inventory and reforestation of wasted lands was expounded. While we recognize the inter-dependence of forest research and practice there is absolutely no justification in doubling the department's research capability until such time as these basic requirements have been satisfied. In his concluding remarks at the National Forestry Conference last February the Minister of Forestry stated 'I am quite ready . . . to assume more leadership in the forestry field'. This leadership we are calling for today."

The Prime Minister's secretary replied very promptly, and this encouraged Crossley to write to the Prime Minister again on October 28, in part as follows:

"... our professional group is acutely conscious of its responsibility to assist in meeting demand projections for wood and feels itself to be in a unique position to advise you and your government of the implications of various courses of action. A concerted attempt must be made to meet demand projections. Every sector of our future national economy will be influenced by the degree of success obtained and lack of direct federal involvement cannot be contemplated."

Four months later, Crossley again wrote to Mr. Pearson as follows:

"It is our Institute's opinion, unanimously expressed at our Annual Convention, that this abrupt change in policy is not in the best interest of our country, and will, within the next generation, cost us thousands of jobs, tens of millions of dollars in forfeited export trade, millions of dollars in corporation income taxes, numerous indirect financial losses, as well as many intangible but important subsidiary benefits. This reversal in policy has also shattered the image of a progressive co-operative-federalism so recently created at the National Forestry Conference in 1966.

"Seen from the perspective of the year 1987, it will be cold comfort to realize that the introduction of this new policy did, in the opinion of the Minister of Finance, slightly ease inflationary tendencies in 1967. We therefore respectfully but urgently request that you and your colleagues reconsider this decision, and, in the light of the recommendations made at the National Forestry Conference and those contained in the detailed presentation which I have attached, reappraise the federal forest policy and formulate a new forestry programme of increasing rather than decreasing effectiveness."

To that letter was attached a four-page memorandum expanding on the Institute's position on the subject of advancing specific suggestions.

The final letter in the series, dated June 6th, 1967, expressed appreciation for the cordial reception given by the Minister of Forestry and Rural Development, Hon. Maurice Sauvé, to a delegation from the CIF/IFC which presented its

³None of this correspondence has been published in full.

views on the urgent need for continued coordination of forestry development throughout Canada under the leadership of the federal government. Following the meeting with the Minister, President Crossley sent the following message for publication in "The Inner Bark" 3(2) of June, 1967:

"Audience with Minister Sauvé today's date confirmed that shared-cost forestry agreements are a dead issue. In an atmosphere of cooperation the Minister advised of the early re-convening of the National Forestry Conference Steering Committee to explore in depth the problem of a National Forest Policy and a cooperative approach to increasing yields from Canada's forest lands to meet forecasted demand projections for wood."

In fairness it should be explained that the provincial governments — with the possible exceptions of ministries which benefitted directly — were not unhappy with the discontinuance of shared-cost programs tied to specific applications.

By that time it was becoming increasingly clear that the consumption of wood by Canadians was fast rising towards the ceiling imposed by annual allowable cuts. (Indeed the actual increase in the use of wood for industrial purposes in Canada increased by 78% between 1955 and 1980 — exceeding by a significant margin the estimate of the "Gordon" Commission.) (16) But a more important aspect in the long-run was the fact that 'the ceiling' of allowable annual cuts was steadily descending because many cut-over lands were not being satisfactorily regenerated; thus the commercial forest base was continuously shrinking. In an attempt to form a reliable estimate of the extent of this shrinkage, the CIF/IFC assigned this task to its Forest Management Committee under the successive chairmanships of D.I. Crossley, A.F. Moss and M. Anderson. Data on forest management practices and results were collected by means of questionnaires with increasing success in 1966 and 1967, and in the latter year the Committee produced a 77-page report based on the replies it had received (17). This was the first authoritative — though still imperfect — estimate of the extent to which future supplies of timber for Canada's fast growing forest industries were dwindling.

A meeting of the Steering Committee of the National Forestry Conference — the first since the Conference — was called in June, 1967, but had to be postponed until September. Although at least some of the participants probably did not realize it at the time, the meeting took on the characteristics of a wake at which decisions were made as to how some of the estate of the deceased would be distributed amongst various federal legatees. Thus the exciting and pregnant National Forestry Conference of February, 1966, was quietly laid to rest with its fetus intact in September, 1967.

A month later, in an unusually long valedictory speech at the CIF/IFC's annual general meeting, retiring President Crossley devoted about 2500 words to a hard-hitting account of the events described above. It is tempting to quote his remarks at great length, but the following will give a representative sample ("59th Annual Report of the Canadian Institute of Forestry". December, 1967.):

"First, and most important, is the federal government's proclivity to hide behind the skirts of its constitutional responsibilities. It conveniently but inconsistently confines itself within the framework of federal jurisdiction and responsibility and, as Mr. Sauvé explained to the

Standing Committee on Agriculture, Forestry and Rural Development as recently as June, 1967 'our jurisdiction is limited exclusively to research'. Before this same Committee Mr. Sauvé stated 'The Department heads and I decided that the best way of providing assistance to industry in the field of forestry was to call A National Forestry Conference in which all representatives of the provinces, industry, the universities and organizations interested in forestry could at least meet to discuss amongst themselves the problems of forestry. *We cannot take any further action*'. This remark (the italics are mine) was made 16 months after the Conference at the conclusion of which the Minister, in his closing address, had accepted the mantle of leadership in advancing forestry toward the intensity of management necessary to satisfy the demand projections made. He recognized certain constitutional difficulties would have to be overcome and surely was aware of jurisdictional sensitivities that would have to be considered."

In an effort to pick up some fragments of the shattered dream, the CIF/IFC at its 1967 annual general meeting made the following its No. 1 resolution ("59th Annual Report of the Canadian Institute of Forestry". December, 1967.):

"Whereas:

The Federal Government has cancelled all provincial cost-sharing agreements in forestry and thereby removed the basis for a well-established commitment of public funds on a national basis and whereas all Crown funds for forest management purposes are now under the complete jurisdiction of the Provincial Governments, which could result in a lowering of the level of forestry practice in the provinces.

Therefore, be it resolved:

The National Executive urge the sections to promote the continued advancement of sound economic forest management practices in their regions."

As an ironic aside, in February, 1968, the inside of the front cover of "The Forestry Chronicle" carried an advertisement of the Department of Forestry and Rural Development. The "ad" showed a young girl gazing intently at a pine seedling and under the picture were the words:

"Because she is Canadian, this child's future is also bound to a tree in terms she does not understand — terms like massive capital investment, sustained-yield management, standing merchantable timber, most important export. These are key words in the language of Canada's largest industry".

Under the foregoing words was a statement emphasizing research as the main function of the Department following which were the names of the Minister and his Deputy.

But more shocks were soon to follow. In 1968, the federal forestry entity was dragged through yet another matrimonial dissolution and remarriage, the union this time to be known as the Department of Fisheries and Forestry (note the order of precedence) under the political direction of Hon. Jack Davis. "The Forestry Chronicle" 44(5) describing a speech delivered to the 60th Annual General Meeting of the CIF/IFC by the new Minister, had this to say:

"In closing, Dr. Davis said that as a new minister it is his

intention to listen very carefully to suggestions made by the Canadian forest industry and that he will do everything in his power to insure that it will receive true value for its tax dollar."

Shortly thereafter, the Institute's retiring President, V.J. Nordin, delivered these words in his presidential address of 1968:

"There were many other agencies that participated at Montebello including Provincial Governments, the Industries, and Universities. In the interval of 2½ years, what have these agencies contributed with reference to the major Conference recommendations to meet the anticipated demand projections for timber by the year 2000? As far as we are aware, NOTHING! This Fabian policy on the part of the Canadian forestry community is very disappointing and your Institute, as Devil's Advocate in the most constructive sense, must energetically pursue its role to encourage and ensure responsible action."

One year later, "The Forestry Chronicle" 45(5) contained this quotation under the heading 'Fisheries and Forestry Cuts':

"Fisheries and Forestry staff will be cut back by 200 full-time employees and 350 seasonal employees . . . Every effort will be made to find other jobs for those who are laid off.

"'This is an important economy', Mr. Davis said. 'It will help us to streamline our operations for a longer term future. I hope it can also be realized without seriously affecting the quality of the services which our national Fisheries and Forestry people have been providing to the Canadian public over the years.' he said."

(Shades of Prime Minister Pearson's 5-year plan to double the Department's forestry research capability!)

Immediately upon assuming office at the Institute's annual general meeting in the fall of 1969, CIF/IFC President François Matte sent a telegram to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry containing the following ("For. Chron." 45(6)): —

"The Canadian Institute of Forestry assembled in annual meeting strongly protests damaging reductions in staff announced for the Canadian Forestry Service. . . . We consider that present plans for staff reductions are inconsistent with conclusions of National Forestry Conference of 1966 sponsored by Department of Forestry and Rural Development relating to vital importance of managing Canada's forests to meet staggering demands which are expected to be made upon them within a generation."

Mr. Davis replied by letter stating that the staff cuts were "inevitable". Whereupon President Matte responded with a letter reading in part ("For. Chron." 45(6)):

"The members of this Institute are very concerned because serious problems such as future wood supply, would need to be studied with all possible dispatch. The forest industry should get right now all the help that can be mustered to accelerate its normal development. So it is rather disturbing to hear that some important research projects will be slowed down or even shelved as a consequence of future restriction on funds and manpower.

"We hope that all possible courses will be explored thoroughly before a revision of the research program is implemented as it could cause serious damage which will have lasting effect for years to come."

Just prior to this exchange with the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry, the outgoing President of the CIF/IFC, E.S. Fellows, had this to say in his year-end report:

"We still face pretty much the same forest management situation as we did at the time of the National Forestry Conference of 1966, but one-tenth of the hours between that date and the end of the century have already ticked away and much new wood-consuming capacity has been built or is being built in all parts of the country. I think we could well spend the next year getting into position to make another assault on the seeming lack of concern in government circles in particular, but also within industry, over the way we are drifting into a position of timber shortage. Some of our economist friends are prepared to debate whether or not massive investment put into increasing the national allowable annual cut is justified. They may have a point, but surely nobody can justify our getting into a position of scarcity in relation to the potential world demand merely by default. We should know where we are going and consciously and intelligently plot our course."

And so a decade in which the need for greatly intensified forest management was persuasively documented and in which high hopes of major advances in that direction were raised ended in retreat.

The 70's: "Plus ça change, plus . . ."

Early in the 1970's, the public in the industrialized world set out on a bewildering orgy of environmental concerns; from this Canada was by no means immune. Fundamentals and common sense were often the principal casualties, one of the former being the need for sustained interest in forest renewal and protection. The CIF/IFC reconciled itself to the fact that shared-cost forest-renewal schemes were a politically dead issue. It therefore embarked on an attempt to convince the senior levels of government to introduce incentive elements into the management of forest lands. The Forest Management Committee of the Institute drafted and received approval of a resolution to this effect for transmission to the Canadian Council of Resource Ministers and, through it, to all provincial and federal governments.

"The Forestry Chronicle" 46(6) (December, 1970) was devoted largely to papers on reforestation. In the closing paragraph of the editorial of that issue, Editor G.F. Weetman said:

"What are lacking are the policy decisions by governments, and the cooperative agreements with industry, to initiate or expand this technical forestry work — work which must be undertaken now to supply the predicted demand for wood products in 1985 and 2000."

How ineffectual foresters had been in getting their message through to the public is illustrated by this national radio commentary reported in the April, 1971, issue of "The Forestry Chronicle" 47(2) referring to a brief by the Nova Scotia section of the CIF/IFC to its provincial government in which the commentator says: "And they recommend that we don't have any more National Parks here — unless of course the Canadian government changes their ideas and allows logging in the

parks. One would think they were running out of wood". So much for 20 years of warning of impending timber shortage! But then, our national radio network has consistently shown itself to be abysmally ignorant of the basics of the Canadian forestry situation and interested only in sensationalizing its self-generated misconceptions.

At its 1972 annual general meeting, the CIF/IFC continued to urge governments to come to grips with the fast-approaching crisis in wood supplies. This time it pleaded for the development of standardized forest inventory data as a step towards more reliability in establishing allowable cuts. This was accomplished by Resolution No. 72.1 as follows:

"Whereas Canada is lacking guidelines on forest policy acceptable on a nation-wide basis by the several provinces and the federal government; and whereas there is an increasing demand for forest products throughout the world and particularly in North America; and whereas the available fibre supply in Canada is limited by economic constraint in the first place and by physical constraints in the second place; and whereas the forest-land base is being subjected to many withdrawals in both single- and multiple-use contexts; and whereas the present forest inventory data available for Canada are not standardized and are inadequate for long-range forecasting; and whereas the Canadian Forestry Service, through its Forest Economics Research Institute, has accepted a responsibility for coordinating a nation-wide compilation and interpretation of inventory data; be it resolved that the Canadian Institute of Forestry, through its Executive Committee, press for concerted action in support of the expressed desire of the Canadian Forestry Service to standardize and improve basic forest inventory information suitable for allowable-cut calculations; and be it further resolved that an Advisory Task Force consisting of federal, provincial and industrial experts be set up to carry out the above objective so that the federal and provincial governments may establish appropriate forest policies".

The 1973 annual general meeting of the CIF/IFC saw the passage of two resolutions aimed especially at getting its message through to the public; they read as follows:

Resolution 73.2 "Whereas Canada is a forest country and is highly dependent on its forests for industry and other benefits; and whereas a future timber supply must be guaranteed and that more intensive silviculture is required to provide this timber; be it therefore resolved that the President of the CIF/IFC make a strong positive statement at the forthcoming Man and Resources Conference in Toronto, drawing attention to these needs and deficiencies. And that he endeavour to ensure maximum publicity through all available media on this important topic."

Resolution 73.3 "Whereas one responsibility of the forestry profession is the growing and managing of forest to meet adequately the current and future needs for wood and other products; and whereas the profession has a related responsibility of ensuring that the public is informed factually as to the current condition, deficiencies and needs of the forest and of forestry practice; and whereas there is a lack of comprehensive and comprehensible information as to the extent and efficiency of current provincial forest regeneration pro-

grams, therefore, be it resolved that a special, ad-hoc committee of the Institute be appointed by the Executive Committee at the earliest possible date to report to the members on or before April 30, 1973, on the following matters: 1. The direct and indirect revenues derived by the federal and provincial governments from the forest industry in each of the years 1968 to 1972 inclusive. 2. The actual amounts of money expended by each of the 10 provinces on silvicultural activities in each of the years 1968 to 1972, inclusive. 3. The quantitative relationship between the extent of areas cut-over, burned or otherwise denuded and portions thereof which are deemed to be regenerated satisfactorily by natural and artificial means respectively by provinces in each of the years 1968 to 1972 inclusive. 4. In each of the 10 provinces and territories an objective and, where possible, factual assessment of the effectiveness of current artificial regeneration programs, particularly in respect of seedling survival, and stocking percentages achieved in treated areas."

At the next annual general meeting of the CIF/IFC in October, 1974, the retiring president, G.F. Weetman, had this to say in his year-end report ("The Forestry Chronicle" 50(6): Annual Meeting Supplement):

"... it is *with regret* that I note a further administrative reorganization within Environment Canada, a reorganization and amalgamation which apparently may further weaken the Canadian Forestry Service. This service could have done much more to tackle some of the problems I have referred to, if it had not undergone so many reorganizations in recent years. There is a major lack of recognition and support at the federal level for forestry, a situation which Canada as a forested nation can ill-afford because federal taxation and incentive powers could do so much more to promote sound forest management".

Later at the same meeting, the Institute passed the following resolution:

Resolution 74.1 "Be it resolved that the CIF/IFC strongly endorse the recent establishment by the Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers of a Task Force on Forestry to analyze forest management policies and practices throughout Canada, including tenure, utilization, reforestation, productivity, public revenue, and forest protection. Further, the CIF/IFC believing that an informed public will support necessary investments in forestry, urges that the findings of the Task Force be made public".

In 1975, the CIF/IFC began to gather some allies in its ceaseless efforts to warn Canadian leaders of the dire straits into which the country's forests were being allowed to drift. In September of that year, the third annual report of the Canadian Forestry Advisory Committee to the Minister of Environment (18) contained these comments:

"The apathy of governments in Canada towards formulating forest policy in the *national* interest is greater than in any other sector of our economy. . . ."

"Not only is there no clearly defined national forest policy, but no institutional arrangements exist to permit consultation in developing consistent policies by federal and provincial governments, by the forest industry

and by other forest users. If this situation persists a national forest policy may emerge 'by default' after policies for other major national issues have been defined and their objectives given priority".

"The need for a *national* forest policy statement is all the more urgent because most provinces are now giving priority to provincial forest policy development. Divided jurisdiction will, however, make the formulation of a meaningful national policy difficult".

"The federal government should take the initiative in negotiating joint federal, provincial and industrial reforestation and tree-improvement agreements for the immense task of restoring and maintaining the productivity of depleted forest lands. An urgent related need is the acceleration of forest access road construction".

In February, 1977, CIF/IFC President A.B. Anderson wrote to the then-Minister of Environment, Hon. Roméo Leblanc, outlining the chief concerns of the Institute. These formed the basis for a one-and-one-half-hour meeting between the Minister and the Executive Committee of the Institute. In his account of this meeting in "The Forestry Chronicle" 53(3), Anderson said that the Minister:

"suggested that government departments expand only in response to crises. Is there a crisis developing in forestry which would demand a reversal of the present growth pattern of the fast dwindling CFS? Is federal participation relevant? The answers to these questions were under study."

Later that year, Hon. Roméo Leblanc told the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry on the House of Commons that:

"Canada does need a national focus for ongoing analysis and development to ensure that provincial and federal actions and policies affecting the use and management of the forest resource are consistent and in accord with long term needs." ("The Forestry Chronicle" 53(5)).

By this time planning was well under way for the National Conference on forest renewal sponsored by the Canadian Forestry Association. "The Forestry Chronicle" 53(3) took the occasion to wish the sponsors well and to pledge full support of the CIF/IFC. But, at the same time, the Institute was fighting a rear-guard action against the federal government's deeds — in contrast to its protestations. President P.E. Boucher's report to the Institute for that year contains the following comment:

"Most important in our dialogue with Honourable Roméo Leblanc has been our very serious concern over the withering Canadian Forestry Service. It has dropped from 2178 man-years in 1968/69 to 1407 man-years in 1977/78, a fall of 35 per cent in 9 years. During the past 5 years it has virtually had an unchanged budget in a period of 58% inflation. I doubt if we have made any effective impression but we must keep trying. The Minister's comments this past April before the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry were encouraging, and in my view, point towards the advisability of pursuing this matter energetically". ("The Forestry Chronicle" 54(6): (Annual Meeting Supplement)).

At the same annual meeting, the Institute passed a veritable barrage of resolutions related to forest renewal, giving employment in forest renewal projects, re-asserting its increasing concern over the continuing deterioration of the Canadian forest resources and drawing attention to the rich rewards to be gained from a vigorous program of forest renewal. Most of these resolutions were directed to the federal government and the ten provincial ones. The only exception was a congratulatory resolution of support for the Canadian Forestry Association for its efforts to stimulate apathetic governments to urgently needed action on forest renewal.

After assuming office, CIF/IFC President Paul Boucher lost little time in writing to the new Minister of Environment, Hon. Len Marchand. A meeting between the Minister and the Executive Committee was arranged in January, 1978, at which five major areas of CIF/IFC interest were outlined, including the immediate necessity of placing high priority on forest renewal, maintenance, and protection; incentives for intensified forest management; and the need for a national forest policy. The Committee received a sympathetic hearing, but following the meeting, the Executive Committee decided that the President should write to Prime Minister Trudeau to complain about the government's attitude towards its forestry obligations. Boucher's letter to the Prime Minister contained the following statements (The Forestry Chronicle 54(1)):

"Since 1969, there have been many serious losses in the Canadian Forestry Service establishment; a total of 2,200 man-years has been reduced to less than 1,400, a loss of 35% in a period when needs have grown rapidly. The regional impact has been particularly severe because of regional freedom to shift staff resources with insufficient attention to the needs of forestry. We are deeply disturbed by the effects of cutbacks made in Forestry to help Fisheries 'defend' Canada's 200 mile limit.

"In these critical times when the Canadian forest-based industries are not able to maintain their share of world markets, greatly improved capacity for statistical and economic evaluation is essential. Since the Forest Economics Institute was abandoned, the Canadian Forestry Service no longer provides even a basic level of support in forestry economics. Because we believe that more attention to forestry economics and re-establishment of an Institute are essential, we urge that you take the necessary steps to strengthen the capability of the Canadian Forestry Service in this area.

"The severe imbalance in resources devoted to fisheries in comparison with forestry alarms us."

Some months later, in his reply to Boucher's letter, Prime Minister Trudeau said: "I can assure you that we shall continue our efforts to strengthen the effectiveness of the government's forestry program" (The Forestry Chronicle 54(5)).

On May 9, 1978, a delegation from the CIF/IFC appeared before the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry of the House of Commons to present its concerns. It was invited to make another appearance before the Committee on May 23 — which it did.

Not long after that came the news that the federal government proposed to make further cuts in the Canadian Forestry Service and to close the Petawawa Forest Experi-

ment Station. For the first time in its long campaign for firmer and more effective federal leadership in forestry the CIF/IFC took off its kid gloves. In "The Forestry Chronicle" 54(5) of October, 1978, its Editor, J.A. MacArthur, had this to say:

"This incredible proposal suggests that either the federal government is not in the least interested in the future of the Canadian forest resource or that there is a frightening lack of intelligence somewhere in high places for such action to be even mentioned".

"... As false economies go this proposal must be in a class by itself. Incidentally its implementation would negate solid commitments made by major figures in the federal government.

"These results are not acceptable to Canadians, particularly at almost the exact moment when they are beginning to take the forest resource seriously. This latest mindless cut-back in resource conservation is one more piece of evidence that the federal governments do not take the forest resource seriously. Federal governments, we are forced to conclude, prefer to take the \$1,000,000,000⁴ and run."

The threatened closure of the Petawawa Forest Experiment Station generated united opposition to the move. Spontaneous grass-roots meetings, radio programs, 'Letters to the Editor' and petitions were the order of the day. Concerns were no longer couched in diplomatic terms. The government was accused of lacking the political will to care and to plan for the future of Canada. Prof. Paul Aird of Toronto's forestry school is quoted as saying that what this nation needs is someone "to take the Government, to take the Cabinet, and shake it until the beast thinks green". (The Forestry Chronicle 54(6)). As a result of the united protests the Petawawa Station remained open, but not without severe injury.⁵

On September 18, 1978, President Boucher wrote identical letters to Hon. Jean Chrétien (Finance) and Hon. Robert Andras (Treasury Board) in similarly blunt terms in part as follows:

"The drastic cuts now proposed for federal forestry research are completely inconsistent with these assurances and with the government's concern for measures to strengthen the economy. They cannot fail to weaken Mr. Marchand's credibility as the federal spokesman for forestry or to create the impression that the federal government has no serious interest in one of Canada's most important industrial sectors".

The October, 1978, annual general meeting of the CIF/IFC commended the Executive Committee for its presentation to the Commons' Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry and it then passed the following resolutions:

Resolution 78.5. "Whereas a healthy Canadian economy is partly dependent upon the forest resource because it provides 18 per cent of the nation's exports; over one billion dollars alone in tax revenue to the federal government; and employment for 1,000,000 Canadians and, whereas the Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers is presently con-

sidering policy needs and expanded forestry programs, including forestry research, while simultaneously the Government of Canada has announced reduction in its forestry capability prior to policy development and contrary to initiatives taken by DREE and EMR to expand forest management and use of forest biomass for energy.

"Be it therefore resolved that the Canadian Institute of Forestry recommend to the Prime Minister of Canada, and all provincial premiers and leaders of opposition parties that the proposed reduction in the Canadian Forestry Service be suspended until the current review of national forest policies and federal-provincial responsibilities being developed by the CCREM has been carried out and policy decisions have been made.

"It is further recommended that advice of industrial, academic and other agencies be included in defining federal and provincial roles and policies in forestry."

Resolution No. 78.7 "Whereas the CIF/IFC supports and encourages the implementation of intensive forest management across Canada and recognizes that this program will require expanded activities in forestry research, particularly in the field of forest genetics, regeneration, and utilization; therefore be it resolved that the CIF/IFC recommend to governments the development of the necessary incentives and tenures which will encourage intensive forestry practices and forest research by the private sector".

Another resolution instructed that copies of Resolution No. 78.5 be sent to all other agencies concerned with the future of Canada's forests. The Institute also urged its own members to bring the essentials of Resolutions 78.5 and 78.7 to the attention of their MP's, MLA's, provincial premiers, leaders of opposition parties and the public at large.

Soon after assuming the office of President of the CIF/IFC in October, 1978, D.R. Redmond wrote to the Prime Minister reminding him (amongst other things) of the need for "rehabilitating Canada's huge 'backlog' of unsatisfactorily restocked forest land" and decrying the further cut-backs in the Canadian Forestry Service "announced in spite of assurances to the contrary made to this Institute by the Minister of Environment and yourself" (The Forestry Chronicle 54(6)). Copies of his letter were sent to the leaders of the two opposition parties. The Deputy Prime Minister, Hon. Allan MacEachen, replied by explaining the dire need for economies and pointing out that some of the savings would be redirected into joint federal-provincial forestry projects. The leaders of the opposition parties responded in a more positive vein (The Forestry Chronicle 55(2)).

At about the same time, the President wrote to the Chairman of the Commons Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry suggesting the convening of "special hearings and an emergency review of budget requirements to establish and maintain an adequate national capability in forest resources research, support of forest-based industry, and development and maintenance of a high quality forest environment" (The Forestry Chronicle 54(6)).

The spring of 1979 brought a federal general election the result of which was a change of government. At the time the President of the CIF/IFC was in the midst of an exchange of correspondence with Hon. Joe Clark, the Leader of the Oppo-

⁴That is, one billion dollars of tax revenues from the forest industries (E.S.F.)

⁵The federal government still made the same total cut in dollars and staff to the CFS that it originally proposed, but merely distributed it differently [Editor].

sition, — an exchange which culminated in a letter to the Rt. Hon. Joe Clark, Prime Minister of Canada. Although the Prime-Minister-to-be made no firm promises, he did outline his party's general approach to forestry problems, including closer and more cooperative relations with the provinces (The Forestry Chronicle 55(4)).

It is not surprising that during its first few months in office, the new federal government had not implemented any new forestry initiatives. However, the CIF/IFC was not content to 'wait and see'. At its annual general meeting in October, 1979, it adopted four resolutions relating to Canada-wide forest policy. The first (Resolution 79.4) urged the Government of Canada to:

- "1. Establish a more orderly and coordinated long-term forestry program.
- "2. Increase its commitments in both amount and duration to the Forestry Sector,
- "3. Provide increased support to its own and other institutions engaged in forest management research".

The second (Resolution No. 79.6) noted that "Canada's economic future is imperilled by inadequate investment in forest renewal" and went on to endorse a proposal of the Canadian Forestry Association and the National Forestry Forum that federal tax credits be extended for provincially approved management practices performed to standards set by the Provinces.

The third (Resolution No. 79.7) supported the concept of a Canadian forest policy for Canada, encouraged the Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers to develop such a policy and offered the help of the Institute's Canada-wide membership in assessing the technical and social implications of policy alternatives.

And finally, Resolution No. 79.8 "resolved that the CIF-/IFC demand that the Government of Canada take immediate steps to establish a full department of forestry with its own Minister to ensure that the Canadian forest resource will receive the attention that it so obviously deserves and so sadly lacks".

Another federal general election in February, 1980, again brought a change of government and yet another minister responsible for federal interests (or lack thereof) in forestry. The CIF/IFC's new President, J. Harry G. Smith, joined many of his predecessors in writing to the Prime Minister of Canada drawing attention to the ever-deteriorating forestry situation across the country. Dr. Smith hoped that Mr. Trudeau would "be able to use this new opportunity to stimulate effective action on the many serious problems that influence Canadian forestry". He went on to say that the Institute "would like to see Forestry as a Department of your Government. Failing that, we hope you will ensure that it is ably represented by a strong Assistant Deputy Minister reporting to one of your Senior Ministers. We sincerely hope that you will do your best to implement fully the Federal Policy on the Canadian Forestry Sector that was approved as a discussion paper by the Cabinet Committee on Economic Development in December, 1979." Smith sent a copy of this letter, along with his congratulations, to the new Minister of Environment, Hon. John Roberts (The Forestry Chronicle 56(2)). In due course, Mr. F.L.C. Reed was appointed Assistant Deputy Minister (Forestry) of the Department of Environment.

In the ensuing months, the Institute allowed events on

the federal scene to unfold without comment. However, the 1980 annual general meeting had no intention of letting the profession's concerns go unnoticed. It passed two resolutions aimed at furthering its objectives. The first urged the Institute and each of its sections to lobby federal and provincial politicians in an effort "to make elected representatives familiar with the importance of the forest, and progress and problems in its management and the political significance of these". The second one resolved that "the CIF/IFC prevail upon politicians and the public to obtain legislative protection for the forest land base" (The Forestry Chronicle 56(6): Annual Meeting Supplement).

The early parts of this review of our profession's efforts to promote public interest in forestry and repeatedly to warn the responsible politicians of impending problems may be "news" to many of our members. However, even the latest additions to our ranks should be familiar with what has transpired so far in the decade of the 80's. There is therefore no need to recount the more recent events.

Epilogue.

The unanswered question remains: Why did foresters' warnings fall on deaf ears for more than a generation? The record shows conclusively that the leaders of government and industry were well aware of the problems; they heard but they did not listen. The attitude of the media, which consistently and quite rightly aver that the public is not interested in distant crises, has contributed to this problem; they failed to inform the public. As a result there has been no public pressure to forestall the problems we continually predicted. There were no votes to be gained by spending money on activities for which the public perceived no need. There was public apathy to be sure, but not, in this instance, public *disapproval* of forestry activities. It is said that one difference between the statesman and the politician is that the former aspires to lead while the latter insists on being pushed or dragged. If that is so, it is easy to argue that what forestry has lacked most was statesmanship. Statesman would have resolved problems; politicians waited until the problems mushroomed into publicly acknowledged crises.

Here a repetition may be forgiven. In 1959 it was resolved "that the Canadian Institute of Forestry urges its sections to arrange meetings between representatives of the administrators of Crown lands and representatives of the forest industries, the principal users of Crown timber, to discuss and formulate ways and means of restocking cut-over lands, formerly carrying healthy, vigorous timber stands, but not now adequately restocked; and in carrying on the discussions and formulating procedures desired therefrom that all representatives give due consideration to tenure of the land, economics of financing restocking projects, and the necessity of maintaining a competitive and profitable forest industry in Canada". At the same meeting at which the foregoing resolution was passed, that sage forester, C.D. (Dick) Orchard, had this to say: "Of this much I am sure. In 1979 you will have the twenty year answers, and no one of that day will care one jot or tittle about what we may forecast today". Well, Dick, *almost* "no one".

One might say the same of almost everything professional foresters, their Institute and their associates have been saying for the past 35 years about the dire need for an aggressive and sustained program of forest renewal. Some foresters — especially some of the younger ones — tend to be apologetic about the present state of affairs as though the profes-

sion was in some way responsible for it. It is to be hoped that the foregoing account of events will dispel that misconception. Canadian foresters should be shouting from the rooftops: "We have been telling you so in the strongest possible terms for more than a quarter of a century and now it has come to pass." They should be saying that to the public, not in a spirit of self-approbation, but in the hope — faint though it may be — that, next time Canadian foresters have an important warning, politicians and the public will not only hear but may even listen and take heed.

Final Footnote

The list of references which follows does *not* include an entry "FENSOM, K.G. 'Expanding Forestry Horizons; a History of the Canadian Institute of Forestry/Institut Forestier du Canada'". Yet, without this invaluable reference, the preparation of this article would have been far more difficult and time-consuming; it might not even have been attempted. The author is most grateful for the help he got from this painstaking digest of Canadian forestry facts and events.

References

1. **Lortie, Marcel. 1983.** Development of a federal policy on forest renewal. *For. Chron.* 59: 124-127.
2. **N.S. Section, Canadian Society of Forest Engineers. 1944.** Forestry, economy, and post-war reconstruction in Nova Scotia. Liverpool, N.S. 61 pp.
3. **Godwin, Gordon. 1949.** Forests and forestry in the Canadian economy. *For. Chron.* 24: 245-251.
4. **Goundrey, G.K. 1954.** Economics of forestry. *For. Chron.* 30: 148-153.
5. **Canadian Institute of Forestry. 1956.** A brief presented to the Royal Commission on Canada's economic prospects. *For. Chron.* 32: 141-166.
6. **Davis, J., A.L. Best, P.E. Lachance, S.L. Pringle, J.M. Smith and D.A. Wilson. 1957.** The outlook for the Canadian forest industries. Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Prospects. xi & 261 pp.
7. **Resources for Tomorrow Conference, Proc. Vol. 3. 1962.** Queen's Printer, Ottawa, Cat. No. R29-5261/3. xiv & 519 pp.
8. **McKee, R.G. 1964.** Canadian forestry and the shared-cost program. *For. Chron.* 40: 262-266.
9. **Wright, T.G. 1964.** An approach to reforestation policy. CPPA Woodlands Section Index No. 2285(F-2).
10. **Hearnden, K.W. 1965.** A case for better Canadian forestry practice. *For. Chron.* 41: 285-289.
11. **Fellows, E.S. 1965.** Canadian forest resources in relation to projected demands on them. CPPA Woodlands Section Index No. 2335(G).
12. **Fellows, E.S. 1967.** Raw materials — quantity and quality. *Proc. Canadian Lumberman's Association*, Montreal, February, 1967.
13. **National Forestry Conference. 1966.** Background papers and general information. Montebello, February 1966.
14. ———. **1966.** Summaries and conclusions. Ottawa, June 1966. 43 pp.
15. **Crossley, D.I. 1966.** Canadian forestry and the Canadian forester. *For. Chron.* 42: 333-336.
- 16.(a) **Dominion Bureau of Statistics. 1969.** Canadian forest statistics (Revised 1959). *Occas. Bulletin* 25-502.
- 16.(b) **Statistics Canada. 1982.** Canadian forestry statistics (1980). *Ann. Report* 25-202.
17. **Canadian Institute of Forestry. 1967.** Forest management statistics for Canada's questionnaire survey. 77 pp.
18. **Canadian Forestry Advisory Council. 1975.** The forestry situation in Canada — Major concerns and proposed remedies. Ottawa, September 1975.

**EDWARD
S.
FELLOWS**

MEMBER:
Canadian Institute of Forestry
Forest Products Research Society
etc.

FORESTRY & FOREST PRODUCTS CONSULTANT

Mail address:
P.O. Box 354,
FREDERICTON, N.B.
E3B 4Z9

Office location:
404 Queen Street,
FREDERICTON, N.B.
Phone: (506) 455-3232

INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT — FOREST PRODUCTS —
FOREST ECONOMICS, POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION