HARRY SMITH'S viewpoint is that:

Statistics Canada's definition of forestry should be improved

In our concern for better management of forest land we need new, broad, and effective working definitions to describe the real importance to Canadians of forest resources use. For much too long many Canadians have equated timber production and forestry (Canada Yearbook 1970-71, p. 609-38). Although many foresters espouse a broadly based concept of forest resources, some government planners remain skeptical. A few even have questioned the dependance on wood of the pulp and paper industry. With the widespread concern for input/output analyses and planning programming and budgeting systems in Government has come a need for better ways of defining financial and social importance of each sector.

There is a good example and several lessons are to be learned from the fact that the Canada Yearbook 1970-71 (p. 1187-9) recorded growth of the forestry industry as averaging only 2.5% annually, from 1946 to 1969. Compared with the average of 4.8% for all industry in this period, growth in 'forestry' like that in agriculture, fisheries, and trapping, was below average. 'Forestry' was subject to pronounced irregular fluctuations in output "because of the nature of its production processes and also, to some extent, because of its sensitivity to changes in world demand and price."

The census value added by 'forestry' in 1968 as reported by Statistics Canada is tabulated below by Provinces and percentage of all goods-producing industries. "Census value added is derived by deducting the cost of materials from the gross value (exclusive of excise and other sales taxes) of shipments (adjusted for change in inventory of finished goods and goods-in-process) or revenue." We would have to study the appendix of the 1968 issue of DBS Catalogue No.

61-202 to learn the census value added in forestry on an all-activities basis. This would include the wood-based manufacturing industries but we still would not know the contributions made by forest land and forest-based resources to values generated by recreation, tourism, grazing of domestic livestock, water yield and quality, beauty in the landscape, open space, and so on.

The summary of values added by 'forestry' in 1968 are:

Region	\$M	p.c. ^a
Newfoundland.....	18,325	4.0
Prince Edw. Isl.	—	—
Nova Scotia.....	8,307	1.4
New Brunswick.....	36,264	7.1
Quebec.....	166,327	2.2
Ontario.....	111,414	0.8
Manitoba.....	2,111	0.2
Saskatchewan.....	5,097	0.3
Alberta.....	6,348	0.2
British Columbia....	370,525	11.4
Yukon and NWT....	44	0.1
Canada-Forestry....	724,761	2.3
All industry.....	31,818,888	100.0

^aPercentage of total goods producing industry in region.

Since the above values are so much lower than those considered by many foresters as representative of the role of wood-based industries, it is important that efforts be made to change the name and the definitions used by Statistics Canada. Perhaps 'forestry' should be replaced by 'timber production' if it must stand alone in summaries. The definition of forestry should be changed to reflect all aspects of forest resources use, perhaps along the lines used in the Special Study No. 14 of Science Council and re-defined by Jorgensen as:

"Forestry has as its objective the growing of trees and the management of forest resources for their present and potential contributions to the economic, social and physiological well-being of society. These contributions include wood, water, and forage for domestic and wild animals, as well as non-consumptive amenity values and environmental, recreational, and scientific benefits."

PROD TO ACTION

I read with great interest the article entitled "Forest Technician's Associations in Canada" by H. W. Blenis and P. J. Murphy (August 1971, page 189). Manitoba has not formed a Resource Technicians Association to date but informal discussion has been carried out for the past year. This article has prodded me to action.

Don Forrester
Resource Technician
Winnipeg, Manitoba

A BURNING QUESTION

It always bothers me that "ecologists", when they talk about the role of fire in natural areas (cf Forest Chron. 47:138-140) always want to exclude or "protect" the natural area from fire. Is it because they can't see the fire for the flames?

A. J. Kayll
Fredericton

AN E FOR A Y

I certainly regret reading in your October issue the tiresome item, ascribed to Worrall, concerning dendrology. That was supposed to read geneecology, not gynecology. Dendrology could never be that much fun.

Yours freudian slippedly,
J. Worrall
Vancouver

A CHOICE OF WORDS

Not too long ago, When "computer" was THE word, "Fortran IV" and "simulate" Were sayings often heard. But now "environment" and "ecology" Are phrases of the day, And we've learned to say the same old things In a new "aesthetic" way. After all, is not that how Researchers earn their pay? Fred Federal

BULLSHIT

BULLSHIT

July 27, 1971

BULLSHIT

BULLSHIT

Dear Professor Day,

Reading Dave Fayle's editorial on the civil servant with the BULLSHIT rubber stamp prompted me to go out and order one. My only regret is that it didn't arrive in time to stamp your paper (no offense, now).

At any rate I am leaving N.B.C. to go and work for Booth Lumber Ltd. at Tee Lake, Quebec, starting next Monday and now I need a French MERDE DE CHEVAL stamp, so I am writing to you a fiendish heritage of mad stamping. You may find it at the Lakehead.

All the best to you, I hope to run across you someday (soon).

P.P.

P.S. You better return your proofs soon, they're overdue.

BULLSHIT

BULLSHIT