

## 1B. MAJOR PLAYERS, MANY VIEWS

There are several distinct groups of stakeholders in the struggle to influence management policies and priorities for the future of Canada's forests. Not all share the same stake from an *investment perspective*, but each one of them is dedicated to specific interests and strongly held visions for the future of these resources. In most cases, such interests and visions are complementary and there is common ground, but in many cases there seems to be irreconcilable conflict.

In terms of substantive recommendations about shaping the future of forestry in Canada, and for the role of the new federal Department of Forestry, the Committee has heard many voices, sometimes sounding as a chorus of shared concern, but more frequently like a clamour of conflicting claims. Divergent opinions were expressed not only by different interest groups, but occasionally even by members of the same interest group. Some differences are only degrees of emphasis, rather than direction, but others originate from more deeply rooted conflicts about systems of value and methods of analysis. There are, for example, deep divisions between those who value the forests for environmental purposes and those who view them as a source of renewable commercial harvests to meet economic goals.

*Canada's naturalists are clearly concerned about the status of forest management in this country. There is a strong perception that forests are managed for timber and, to a lesser extent, game species. If we are to achieve sustainable development of our forests, forest management must be approached in an ecosystem context, with timber only one of the many values to be sustained.*

*The Canadian Nature Federation views forests as complex ecosystems, composed of many species of trees, shrubs and herbaceous plants, providing habitats for birds, mammals and a wide variety of other less visible forms of life. — Paul Griss, Executive Director, Canadian Nature Federation (Issue 19:10).*

*I think we should really disabuse anybody of any suggestion that you can withdraw land from the working forest land base without cost. Some figures we have developed at the council would indicate that for every 1% reduction in that working forest land base we referred to, you would look at something in the order of 2,400 jobs that would be lost; wages and profits per year of some \$80 million, government revenues of some \$15 million plus. It is not at all clear that you could completely replace that loss by intensive forest management, but if you could the cost would be something in excess of \$650*