

On the whole, the text is well written, and the author is to be congratulated on a carefully documented, thorough report. Unfortunately, however, the book shows signs of hasty printing, and incomplete proof-reading. Although a few printing errors are almost inevitable, this book has too many for its length. Most of these are minor, although the gremlins of the type have added two new species to the literature ("Blackpool warbler" and Yellow-throated Flicker, on pp. 51 and 66, respectively). Several of the footnotes

are not cited in the text, and one (59) is missing from the Literature Cited. A few references are incomplete. One hopes that future publications of NPPAC will be more carefully checked before publishing, and that future works will not be double-spaced. Such excessive use of paper seems particularly inappropriate in a book published by a large conservation organization.

These criticisms are minor, and I unhesitatingly recommend this book to all concerned naturalists. — *Martin K. McNicholl*, Edmonton.

## LOOKING BACK

### At Our Questionnaire

We wish to thank the 215 people who took the trouble to reply to the questionnaire in the March 1973 issue. We analyzed the first 200, 192 of which were received by the July 2 deadline. There were only two replies from people not currently getting the *Blue Jay*.

**References:** The table presents a summary of what respondents want to read more about.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Total wanting subject</u>	<u>Percent of res- pondents</u>	<u>Indicated % of material *</u>	<u>Life history, ecology</u>	<u>Local lists</u>	<u>Iden- tifi- cation</u>
Birds	149	75	10	129	106	111
Flowers, trees	144	74	10	105	82	111
Conservation	140	70	10	—	—	—
Mammals	135	68	9	118	86	88
Environmental problems	113	57	8	—	—	—
Photography	85	43	6	—	—	—
Butterflies	83	42	6	61	46	60
Geology	77	39	5	—	—	—
Reptiles	74	37	5	56	53	50
Flower Plants	74	37	5	58	44	55
Amphibians	72	36	5	55	47	52
Fish	65	33	5	55	41	44
Paleontology	63	32	4	—	—	—
Other Insects	58	29	4	51	26	38
Other						
Invertebrates	45	23	3	39	20	32
Astronomy	26	13	2	—	—	—
Other	21	12	1	—	—	—

\* Obtained by totalling the first column and dividing that total into the number of respondents per subject. May be interpreted as number of pages per 100 pages or articles per 100 articles or pictures per 100 pictures on the subject.

It would seem from this voting that the average respondent is interested in many aspects of natural history and in preserving his environment, including its flora and fauna. Another indication of this wide range of interest is that 98% of those who wanted bird articles also wanted to read about other subjects.

**Favourite Articles:** Seventy-nine articles, notes and columns were listed among the best liked. Sixteen articles received more than 10 votes each. Their abbreviated titles, with the number of votes in parentheses, were: Coyote management in Saskatchewan (56), Whooping Crane in Saskatchewan (29), Common insect galls (29), Botanical investigation of the Drumheller area (20), Cougar kittens (20), Biological and chemical study of Qu'Appelle Lakes (19), Birdwatching indoors (18), Short-faced Bear (14), Captive Poor-will in Alberta (16), Letters and notes (15), Feeding the hungry (14), Goldeneyes at Emma Lake (13), Ste. Scholastique Airport (12), Animals of the Pinhorn Grazing Preserve (12), Then and now (Marion Nixon) (12), and Plea for protection of the Aiyansh lava flow (11).

Most of the reasons for liking articles are covered by "interesting", "informative", "educational", "well done", "readable" and "am familiar with the area".

**Occupation:** There were about 50 occupations listed by 182 people. The most frequent were: 31 housewives, 25 students, 22 active and 3 retired teachers and 23 farmers. Persons who were professionals in the subjects listed in the above table (biologists, veterinarians, conservation officers, archaeologists, etc. totalled 24.

**Age of Respondents:**

10-19 years: 14	20-29 years: 29	30-39 years: 25
40-49 years: 33	50-59 years: 40	60-69 years: 31
70-79 years: 11	80-89 years: 5	90-99 years: 1

This tabulation shows that only one-third of the respondents were under 40. Obviously we did not find out what would make the *Blue Jay* more attractive to younger readers, particularly high school students.

**Geographical Distribution:** Not everyone stated where they lived but of those who did, there were 127 from Saskatchewan, 29 from Alberta, 17 from Manitoba, 10 from elsewhere in Canada and 4 from the United States.

**Comments:** There was a great variety of comments on many subjects. Most commonly mentioned were: new format (21 for, 2 against), emphasis on common names (21 for, 9 against), March cover (7 for, 8 against).

**Summary:** It looks as though the *Blue Jay* must continue to cover a wide range of subjects, but with a better balance among them. This, in turn, means that our readers, particularly our respondents, will have to help themselves by writing and encouraging others to write letters, notes and articles on their experiences and ideas, and by sending in photographs and drawings of plants, mammals, conservation topics, etc. etc.

Thanks again for your cooperation. — J. B. Gollop.