

\*

^^^^^^^^^^

/ ..... \

=====

+ +

The 1993  
CANADIAN UFO SURVEY

~~~~~

Five Years of UFOs

Compiled by  
Chris A. Rutkowski

Contributors:

|                             |                            |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Paul Anderson, UFO BC       | Roy Bauer, UFOROM          |
| Steve Bucek, UFO BC         | Charles Burchil            |
| Grant Cameron, UFOROM       | Daniel Clairmont, MUFON SK |
| Graham Conway, UFO BC       | Tony Cowling, UFO BC       |
| Michel Deschamps, MUFON ON  | Frances Ellis, UFO BC      |
| Lorne Goldfader, UFORIC     | Jeff Harland, UFOROM       |
| Gordon Kijek, AUFOSG        |                            |
| George Kriger, UFOROM       | Victor Lourenco, MUFON ON  |
| Mike McCarty, MUFON ON      | Rob Nowatschka, UFO BC     |
| Christian Page, UFO PQ      | Stephen Parsons, MUFON NF  |
| Vladimir Simosko, UFOROM    | Michael Strainic, UFO BC   |
| David Thacker, AUFOSG       | Tom Theophanous, MUFON ON  |
| Donald Vanden Hoorn, UFO BC | Ruth Walde, MUFON SK       |
| Bonnie Wheeler, CUFORG      | Drew Williamson, MUFON ON  |

Published by

Ufology Research of Manitoba  
Box 1918  
Winnipeg, Manitoba  
Canada R3C 3R2

May 5, 1994

# The 1993 Canadian UFO Survey

## Introduction

Since 1989, UFO case data has been solicited from all known and active investigators and researchers in Canada for analyses and comparison with other compilations. Before that time, individual researchers would normally maintain their own files, with little or no communication with others. Even today, representatives of major UFO organizations often do not regularly submit case data, and the parent organizations themselves tend not to do much analyses with the data they do receive, although this is changing.

After favourable responses from the publication of previous Canadian UFO Surveys, UFOROM decided to continue the systematic collection of raw UFO report data in Canada and prepare yearly reports for general circulation. It always has been felt that the dissemination of such data would be of great advantage to researchers, so it is presented here once again as data with some analysis.

This is not to suggest that statistical studies of UFO data are without their limitations and problems. Allan Hendry, in his landmark book *The UFO Handbook*, pointed out flaws in such studies and asked:

... do UFO statistics represent a valid pursuit for more knowledge about

this elusive phenomenon, or do they merely reflect frustration that none of the individual reports are capable of standing on their own two feet?  
(1979, p. 269)

Hendry offered six questions to ask of statistical ufology:

- 1) Does the report collection reflect truly random sampling?
- 2) Have the individual cases been adequately validated?
- 3) Are apples and oranges being compared? Are NLs necessarily the same kind of UFO as DDs?
- 4) Are differing details among cases obscured through simplification for the purpose of comparisons?
- 5) Does the study imply the question: "Surely this mass of data proves UFOs exist?"

and 6) Do the correlations really show causality?

The Canadian UFO Survey was undertaken with these and other critical comments in mind. Readers are left to judge for themselves the value of these statistical analyses.

## Canadian UFO Data

The response from Canadian researchers to requests for 1993 data was less prompt than in previous years; there was some difficulty in receiving cases from the "active" researchers and there are still some researchers who, for whatever reasons, do not submit cases for the annual survey. In addition, some researchers do not maintain useable case files and do not retain quantitative criteria in their investigations (for example, contactee groups).

It is now known that only a small fraction of "active" ufologists and self-proclaimed "researchers" actually investigate cases and maintain useable records. However, despite these problems, more than twice the number of reports were obtained for 1993 than the previous year. The 1993 report may be much more comprehensive because of its broader database.

In 1989, 141 UFO reports were obtained for analysis. In 1990, 194 reports were recorded. In 1991, 165 reports were received and in 1992, 223 cases were examined. In 1993, 489 reports were obtained, an increase of more than 200% over the previous year.

In 1993, reports were obtained from contributing investigators' files, press clippings, the files of the National Research Council of Canada (NRC) and fireball reports from geophysicists and astronomers associated with the Royal Astronomical Society of Canada and the Meteor and Impacts Advisory Committee (MIAC) affiliated with the Canadian Space Agency. The NRC

routinely

receives UFO reports from private citizens and from RCMP, civic police and military personnel. Included among the NRC reports are many observations of meteors and fireballs, and these have been added into the UFO report database since 1989.

There are several reasons for including such IFOs in the UFO report database. First, previous studies of UFO data have included meteor and fireball reports. For this study, the working definition of a UFO is: "an object seen in the sky which its observer cannot identify." In many instances, observers fail to recognize stars, aircraft and bolides, and report them as UFOs. That is why some UFO investigators often spend many hours sorting IFOs from UFOs. Historically, analyses of UFO data such as American projects like Grudge, Sign and Blue Book all included raw UFO data which later resolved into categories of UFOs and IFOs. Second, observed objects are sometimes quickly assigned a particular IFO explanation even though later investigation suggests such an explanation was unwarranted. One 1993 case can serve as an example: Case NRC 93-030, on 26 February 1993, in Cambellton, New Brunswick. It involved a triangular formation of 11 lights in which moved slowly through a fog layer and was observed for 45 seconds by a witness. The label assigned the report was "possible meteorite." Given the information on the case, it is probable that the object was not a "meteorite," but it is impossible to give

a

definitive explanation at this time.

Fireballs have always been reported in Canada. The tremendous increase in fireball reports for 1993 suggests that people have become more comfortable with reporting observations of unusual objects in the sky. Another factor is that organizations such the Canadian Space Agency appear to be more visible to the general public and are requesting and receiving fireball information.

This easier access to information has accelerated by the blossoming of the so-called "Information Highway" and the Internet. Indeed, many of the reports in the 1993 survey came via electronic mail and newsgroups.

Until 1993, the number of Canadian UFO reports appeared to remain constant at an average of 180 cases per year, even allowing for the influx of cases from new contributors to the database. However, the number of reports received in 1993 represents a significant increase over previous years. The largest contributor to this increase was a single fireball event on October 30, 1993. That evening, a spectacular object and a sonic boom was reported by literally hundreds of people throughout Canada. More than 120 individual reports were filed with astronomers, RCMP, police, the NRC and other agencies.

(This event will be discussed later in this report.) The implication of this case is that statistical tabulations of UFO characteristics in 1993 will be

skewed by a significant amount.

#### Note on Missing Data:

Several problems were encountered in acquiring and using data submitted by Canadian ufologists:

1) In some provinces, localized flaps prevented investigators from following

up individual reports, and instead only noted that several dozen reports were received from a certain area during a particular month. In these situations, the meagre report data (often just a note that an anonymous person had left a message on an answering machine saying that an object had been seen, but no other details) could not be satisfactorily added to

the database. (The number of such "lost" sightings is not insignificant; more than 200 reports may fall into this category, thus raising the true number of reported UFOs in 1993 in Canada to about 700!)

2) Only one Close Encounter of the Fourth Kind (CE4) was included in the database. It should probably have been eliminated. CE4s are the sensational "abduction" cases which are currently receiving wide attention. Some researchers have speculated that thousands of such abductions occur each year, based on various surveys and the number of witnesses ("experiencers") coming forward. Since abductions are often

reported long after the fact, exact times and dates may be meaningless as UFO data. Similarly, since witnesses' memories are clouded or obscured, other data such as colour, duration and even location may be impossible to ascertain. Indeed, if, as some sceptics would suggest, that abductions are a psychological rather than a "real" phenomenon, then CE4s may not be appropriate for inclusion in UFO databases. And, if they really are true close encounters, their complexity decrees that their inclusion in a raw data listing might be inappropriate as well. For these and other reasons,

all other CE4 cases were not included in this study. From information received through conversations and interviews with abductee therapists and other researchers, it is possible to speculate that at least 25 relatively-documented abductee cases occurred in Canada in 1993.

3) Approximately 30 reports were received after statistical analyses had been run. This is unfortunate, but emphasizes the need for ufologists to respond promptly to requests for data. Although it is widely known that data collection for this annual study begins in January of each year, many ufologists delay sending their data or ignore repeated requests for data submissions.

Method

Data for each case was received by UFOROM from participating researchers across Canada. The information then was coded and entered into a WordPerfect file, separated by tabs. The file was then converted into ASCII DOS text and uploaded into a UNIX environment where it was read into a SAS statistical package and analyzed.

The coding key is as follows:

Example: 993 10 23 2108 CALGARY AB NL 600 BLUE 1 TRI RUMBLE 6 DND P

Field: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

Field 1 is a default YEAR for the report (UFOROM is now coding to allow for the next millennium).

Field 2 is the MONTH of the incident.

Field 3 is the DATE of the sighting.

Field 4 is the local TIME, on the 24-hour clock.

Field 5 is the geographical LOCATION of the incident.

Field 6 is the PROVINCE where the sighting occurred.

Field 7 is TYPE of report.

Field 8 is the DURATION of the sighting, in seconds (a value of 600 thus represents 10 minutes).

Field 9 is the primary COLOUR of the object(s) seen.

Field 10 is the number of WITNESSES.

Field 11 is the SHAPE of the primary object.

Field 12 indicates whether or not a SOUND was heard.

Field 13 is the assessed QUALITY of the report.

Field 14 is the SOURCE of the report.

Field 15 is the EVALUATION of the case.

## Analyses of the Data

In 1993, there were apparent significant increases in the number of reports in Manitoba, while there was an apparent decrease in reports in Alberta and Quebec. As usual, British Columbia represents the largest fraction of UFO reports of all the provinces. Since 1990, BC has garnered

between 30% and 40% of the total number of cases per year. As mentioned in previous annual reports, this is partly due to the highly efficient UFO reporting system in that province, and the comparatively large number of active investigators. The rest of the Provinces appear to have had average numbers of reports in 1993.

If we look at only the NRC as a source for UFO reports, the geographical distribution of cases is more related to population. The most reports then come from Ontario, followed by Manitoba and Quebec. As mentioned earlier, there was a major fireball over the prairies in 1993, raising the number of cases from Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and this caused the higher proportion of reports from those two provinces. Taking that factor into account, the distribution of cases agrees somewhat better with population, although there is still an overabundance of reports from Western Canada. It is not clear why this would be so.

TABLE 1

Distribution of UFO Reports by Province

|    | 1989 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 |
|----|------|------|------|------|------|
| BC | 15   | 76   | 59   | 90   | 157  |
| AB | 16   | 9    | 22   | 8    | 56   |

|     |    |    |    |    |    |
|-----|----|----|----|----|----|
| SK  | 18 | 10 | 7  | 9  | 93 |
| MB  | 22 | 20 | 6  | 23 | 74 |
| ON  | 34 | 21 | 30 | 56 | 51 |
| PQ  | 28 | 36 | 16 | 10 | 32 |
| NB  | 1  | 7  | 9  | 9  | 3  |
| PEI | -  | 3  | 1  | -  | 1  |
| NS  | 3  | 5  | 7  | 3  | 3  |
| NF  | 3  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 7  |
| YK  | -  | 1  | 1  | 3  | -  |
| NWT | 1  | 2  | -  | 1  | 5  |

The monthly breakdowns of reports during each year show slightly different patterns from those of previous years. In 1989, there was a significant increase in UFO reports in the late fall, with other months maintaining what appeared to be a fairly constant "normal" level of reports. But 1990 saw two major increases in report numbers in two months: April and August. The "normal" level of monthly report numbers appeared to be constant in other months, with minor fluctuations. In 1991, reports peaked in August, but there was no single obvious trough. The 1992 breakdown again shows no clear peaks in monthly report numbers. This is most curious, because UFO reports often are thought to peak in summer and trough in winter. This has never been the case with Canadian UFO reports throughout this five-year period

of study. In 1993, the opposite of what is usually imagined was true: there were peaks in winter, and troughs in summer. The October peak is easily explained as due to the fireball. Even taking this into account, there are more cases in fall than in summer, and more in winter than spring and early fall. Again, there is no immediately obvious reason for this.

However, in an historical analysis of 480 Manitoba UFO cases in UFOROM's MANUFOCAT, a distinct June peak and December trough was found. Analyses of 13,000 cases in Project Blue Book found a similar June peak and December trough, though Hendry (1979) suggested that this was a statistical artefact. Further studies are needed to understand the monthly distribution of UFO data.

TABLE 2  
Monthly Report Numbers

|     | 1989 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|
| Jan | 13   | 17   | 13   | 15   | 59   |
| Feb | 9    | 7    | 7    | 16   | 15   |
| Mar | 6    | 6    | 17   | 27   | 20   |
| Apr | 9    | 47   | 12   | 16   | 22   |
| May | 5    | 10   | 7    | 22   | 14   |

|     |    |    |    |    |     |
|-----|----|----|----|----|-----|
| Jun | 9  | 10 | 12 | 16 | 38  |
| Jul | 5  | 9  | 16 | 23 | 27  |
| Aug | 5  | 47 | 25 | 19 | 49  |
| Sep | 12 | 15 | 16 | 11 | 41  |
| Oct | 32 | 16 | 12 | 16 | 152 |
| Nov | 27 | 10 | 11 | 21 | 24  |
| Dec | 9  | -  | 17 | 21 | 21  |

An analysis by report type shows a similar breakdown to that found in previous years. The percentage of cases of a particular type remains roughly constant from year to year, with minor variations. Nocturnal lights (NLs), for example, comprised 60% of all reports in 1989, 73% in 1990, 67% in 1991, 61% in 1992 and up to a high of 76% in 1993. The average of these is 69%, which agrees well with the meta-analysis conducted by Hendry (1979), which found that NLs comprised 70% of the cases studied. But, because he was using the original standard Hynek classification system, he did not have the present category of Nocturnal Discs (NDs). These were probably distributed between NLs and DDs in his study.

TABLE 3

Report Types (Modified Hynek Classifications)

|     | 1989 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|
| NL  | 84   | 141  | 110  | 136  | 372  |
| ND  | 20   | 24   | 26   | 44   | 77   |
| DD  | 16   | 15   | 13   | 20   | 26   |
| CE1 | 10   | 2    | 7    | 15   | 8    |
| CE2 | 7    | 1    | 4    | 5    | 2    |
| CE3 | -    | -    | 1    | 2    | 1    |
| CE4 | 2    | 4    | 2    | 3    | 1    |
| EV  | 2    | 3    |      | 1    |      |
| RD  |      | 1    |      |      |      |
| PH  |      | 1    | 1    |      |      |

For those unfamiliar with the classifications, a summary follows:

NL (Nocturnal Light) - light source in night sky

ND (Nocturnal Disc) - light source in night sky that appears to have a

definite shape

DD (Daylight Disc) - unknown object observed during daytime hours

CE1 (Close Encounter of the First Kind) - ND or DD occurring within 200 metres of a witness

CE2 (Close Encounter of the Second Kind) - CE1 where physical effects left or noted

CE3 (Close Encounter of the Third Kind) - CE1 where figures/entities are encountered

CE4 (Close Encounter of the Fourth Kind) - an alleged "abduction" or "contact" experience

EV (Evidence) - a case where physical traces left by an event are the primary claim

RD (Radar) - UFOs observed on radar

PH (Photograph) - photographs of a UFO, but no actual sighting

The category of Nocturnal Disc was created by UFOROM for differentiation within its own report files. Similarly, Evidence is also an ad hoc creation, and may not be applicable by other researchers. Normally, Evidence would

include such physical traces as "crop circles", "landing rings" and "saucer nests". However, in 1990 there was a great increase in the numbers of such traces discovered in North America, and it was decided to treat these as separate from UFO reports in these Surveys.

The breakdown by Evaluation for 1993 cases was similar to results from previous years. There were four operative categories: Explained, Insufficient Information, Possible or Probable Explanation, and Unknown (or Unexplained). Readers are warned that a classification of Unknown does not imply that an alien spacecraft was observed; no such interpretation can be made with certainty, based on the given data (though the probability of this scenario is admittedly never zero). In most cases, Evaluations are made subjectively by both the contributing investigators and the compiler of this report. The category of Unknown is adopted if the contributed data or case report contains enough information such that a conventional explanation cannot be satisfactorily proposed. This does not mean that the case will never be explained, but only that a viable explanation is not immediately obvious.

TABLE 4

Evaluation of Canadian UFO Data

| 1989 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 |
|------|------|------|------|------|
|------|------|------|------|------|

|           | #  | %    | #  | %    | #  | %    | #   | %    | #   | %    |
|-----------|----|------|----|------|----|------|-----|------|-----|------|
| Explained |    |      | 2  | 1.2  | 17 | 8    | 154 | 31.5 |     |      |
| Insuf.    | 74 | 52.5 | 90 | 46.4 | 80 | 48.5 | 83  | 37   | 170 | 34.8 |
| Poss.     | 47 | 33.3 | 78 | 40.2 | 69 | 41.8 | 74  | 33   | 115 | 23.5 |
| Unknown   | 20 | 14.2 | 26 | 13.4 | 14 | 8.5  | 49  | 22   | 50  | 10.2 |

The average proportion of Unknowns throughout the 5-year study was about 14.5%, a high figure considering that this would imply that more than one in ten UFOs cannot be explained. However, there are several factors which affect this value. The level and quality of UFO report investigation varies because there are no explicit standards for ufologists. Some "believers" might be biased to consider most UFO sightings as mysterious, whereas those with more of a sceptical predisposition might tend to subconsciously (or consciously!) reduce the Unknowns in their files. Furthermore, since there are no absolutes, the subjective nature of assigning Evaluations is actually an interpretation of the facts by individual researchers.

If we look only at those Unknowns with a Quality rating of eight or

greater, we then are left with only 26 high-quality Unknowns in 1993 (5.3%). This value is comparable with other years: 4.9% in 1989, 4.6% in 1990, 7.3% in 1991 and 7.6% in 1992. And, if we eliminate the category of NLs from the 1993 Unknowns in an attempt to focus on detailed, close observations of UFOs, we get only 16 cases out of the original 489, or 3.3%. This last value is in accordance with the USAF Blue Book studies which found three to four percent of their cases were "excellent" Unknowns.

The average Quality rating of reports was 6.36, indicating that there was a significant amount of useful information available through investigations for the majority of cases. A breakdown of Quality versus Evaluation shows that both the Explained and Unknown reports carried with them a substantial amount of information. Obviously, in those cases, either the investigators found enough evidence to explain the observations as of conventional objects, or found that their investigations could not find an explanation with the same quality and level of information. The cases with Possible explanations or Insufficient Information were of much lower Quality and, hence, less information for evaluation.

The Quality of Nocturnal Lights varied considerably, while NDs, DDs and CEs had an average Quality Rating near 7 on the scale.

Finally, it should be emphasized that even these high-quality Unknowns

do

not imply alien visitation. Each case may still have an explanation following further investigation. And of those that remain unexplained, they remain unexplained, but still are not incontrovertible proof of extraterrestrial intervention.

The hourly distribution of cases follows a similar pattern for 1993 as in previous years. There appears to be a continuous curve, with a peak at 2200 hours local and a trough around 1100 hours local. Most sightings occur between 9:00 p.m. and midnight. Since most UFOs are nocturnal lights, this is not unexpected. The number of possible observers drops off sharply near midnight, and we would expect that the hourly rate of UFO reports would vary with two factors: potential observers and darkness.

The average number of witnesses per case went down from a value of 2.12/case in 1989 to 1.40/case in 1990, then up again to 1.91/case in 1991. In 1992, this value was up slightly to 2.36/case. The average number of witnesses in 1993 was 2.07/case. The five-year average was 1.97 witnesses per case. These figures indicate that a typical UFO experience has more than one witness, and support the contention that UFO sightings represent observations of physical phenomena.

The category of Duration is interesting in that it represents the subjective length of time the UFO experience lasted. Naturally, these times are greatly suspect because it is known that people tend to misjudge the flow of time. However, some people can be good at estimating time, so this value has some meaning. Although an estimate of "one hour" may be in error by several minutes, it is unlikely that the correct value would be, for example, one minute (disregarding the claims of "missing time" during the abduction category of experiences). Furthermore, there have been cases when a UFO was observed and clocked accurately, so that we can be reasonably certain that UFO

events can last considerable periods of time. The average duration of a sighting can be calculated as a summation of all given durations then divided by the number of cases with a stated duration. The resulting value for 1991 is about 12 minutes, down from 19 minutes in 1990. In 1992 and 1993, the average duration was again about 12 minutes. This surprisingly long duration is due likely to the large number of sightings lasting only a few seconds contrasted with the comparative few that lasted several hours.

An interesting result of the analyses is that long-duration sightings tend to occur in the early morning hours, from about midnight until 6:00 a.m. It is probable that the majority of observations at this time are those of astronomical objects, moving slowly with the rotation of the Earth.

Duration data by itself is not wholly useful in analyzing UFO behaviour. Hendry describes Duration data this way:

Duration is a powerful feature of identity when it refers to extremely short and long events, but is otherwise mostly a reflection of the witness's behaviour during the event, coupled with the fluctuating behaviour of the objects watched. (1979, p. 249)

Extremely short duration events are usually fireballs or bolides, while very long duration events of an hour or more are very probably astronomical objects. In between, there can be no way to distinguish conventional objects from UFOs solely with Duration data. (Hendry also cites a Canadian study by an Ontario UFO group which timed aircraft observations and found that the duration of such sightings varied between 15 seconds to more than 8 minutes.)

The Duration of sightings decreased with the number of reports. The majority of sightings had Durations of only a few seconds, while those with longer Duration were less in number.

In cases where a colour of an object was reported in 1993, the most common colour was white (36.3%), followed distantly by red (15.7%). Other colours were also represented, although there is a noticeable change from previous years, when green and orange were the dominant colours. Since most UFOs are nocturnal starlike objects, the abundance of white objects is not surprising. Other colours such as red, blue and green often are associated with bolides (fireballs).

Shape was a good predictor of UFO type, as was expected. Fireballs and

point sources were usually Nocturnal Lights, whereas cigars, discs and triangles were either Nocturnal Discs or Daylight Discs.

## Summary of Results

As with previous annual Surveys, the 1993 Survey does not offer any positive proof of the physical reality of UFOs. However, it does show that some phenomenon which is called a UFO is continually being observed by witnesses. The typical UFO sighting is that of two people observing a moving, distant white or red light for several minutes. In most cases, the UFO is likely to be eventually identified as a conventional object such as an aircraft or astronomical object. However, in a small percentage of cases, some UFOs do not appear to have an easy explanation and they may be given the label of "unknown".

What are these "unknowns"? An additional classification is useful to try and better understand this kind of report. In the gathering of data for the study, contributors were asked to give a value for their personal Evaluation of the reliability of the report. This value is noted as "E" in the case listing. This value gives the likelihood that the UFO experience "really" occurred as described by the witness. Granted, it is impossible for any investigator to judge this absolute value; often, a subjective value for two categories of "strangeness" and "probability" is assigned. The Evaluation

value is another subjective value imposed by the investigator or compiler (or both) with a scale such that the low values represent cases with little information content and observers of limited observing abilities and the higher values represent those cases with excellent witnesses (pilots, police, etc.) and also are well-investigated. Naturally, cases with higher values are preferred.

The 1993 high-quality unexplained cases were the following:

9930130 1900 Quidi Vidi,NF ND 3600s blue ball, 20 witnesses, STRA  
9930226 1805 Arthur,ON DD 720s black cigar, 2 witnesses, CAM  
9930402 1715 Prince George,BC DD 900s black object, 2 witnesses, STRA  
9930514 2200 Penticton,BC ND 10s cigar-shaped object, 2 witnesses,  
STRA  
9930725 2130 Brocklehurst,BC ND 300s 1 witness, STRA  
9930726 0100 Brocklehurst,BC ND 3600s round object, 4 witnesses, STRA  
9930802 2230 Mission,BC DD 15s red triangle, 3 witnesses, RCMP  
9930804 0436 Glenella,MB ND 120s yellow object, 1 witness, URM  
9930812 0030 Lethbridge,AB ND 5s black triangle, 3 witnesses, ASG  
9930820 2245 Winnipeg,MB DD 90s yellow triangle, 1 witness, URM  
9930821 2045 Vernon,BC ND 150s polygon, 12 witnesses, STRA  
9930822 1930 Kamloops,BC ND 3s white trapezoid, 1 witness, STRA  
9930901 0330 Dorothy Lake,MB C3 60s blue light & entity, 1 witness, URM  
9930912 1800 Surrey,BC ND 20s silver triangle, 3 witnesses, STRA

9930912 2030 New Westminster,BC ND 20s red oval object, 2 witnesses, STRA

9931219 2340 Cold Lake,AB C1 1200s 2 witnesses, ASG

The interpretation of this list is that these cases were among the most challenging of all the reports received in 1993. It should be noted that most

UFO cases go unreported, and that there may be ten times as many UFO sightings

that go unreported as those which get reported to public, private or military agencies. Furthermore, it should be noted that some cases with lower reliability ratings suffer only from incomplete investigations, and that they may well be more mysterious than those on the above list.

UFOs were reported at a rate of about 40 per month across all of Canada in 1993, although throughout the 5-year span of this study, the rate drops to 20 per month. Witnesses range from farmhands to airline pilots and from teachers to police. Witnesses represent all age groups and racial origin.

What is being observed? In most cases, only ordinary objects. However, this begs a question. If people are reporting things that can be explained, then the objects they observed were "really" there. Were the objects we can't identify "really" there as well? If so, what were they?

These are questions only continued and rational research can answer, and only if researchers have the support and encouragement of both scientists and the public.

## Comparisons with Other Analyses of UFO Data

It is most instructive to compare the UFOROM analyses with those of other organizations, particularly the National Sighting Research Center of New Jersey, headed by Paul Ferrughelli. The NSRC results have been reported in a series of publications, a recent one being the National Sighting Yearbook 1992. The NSRC collected UFO reports from newspaper clippings, UFO publications and MUFON case files and analyzed the raw UFO data. Because of the difference in data sources, a comparison with the UFOROM results will not be true. However, it is still interesting to compare the two studies.

The NSRC found a total of 197 UFO reports in 1992. This number was slightly less than that of Canada for the same year. Because of its larger population, it is likely that the USA had many, many more sightings that were never accessed through the NSRC's sampling technique.

The NSRC study revealed that there was no clear trend in the monthly distribution of UFO reports in the USA. Peaks were found in June and December.

Grouping the American and Canadian studies together yields a monthly distribution with troughs in mid-summer and mid-winter, with slight variations month-to-month. It is possible to speculate that with adequate report

sampling, there would be no monthly variation in the number of sightings, except for major flaps which would be more noticeable in an international survey. This is somewhat counter-intuitive and suggests that UFO reporting is independent of climate and seasonal variations. That is, people do not see more UFOs in summer because they spend more time outdoors during that season.

Like the Canadian study, the American data was unevenly distributed throughout the country. Most reports came from just two states, Florida and Indiana. The Florida flap is likely due to the Gulf Breeze reports which receive a great deal of media attention. The distribution of sighting duration was nearly identical to the Canadian study. The average duration of a typical American UFO sighting is between 3 and 9 minutes.

For the hourly distribution of UFO cases, the American study found a symmetrical distribution with a pronounced peak at 9 PM local time and a trough at around 9 AM local time. This is in complete agreement with UFOCAT studies by Hendry (1979) and others cited by him. Canadian distributions are normally about one hour later in each peak, but are otherwise identical in distribution. It is possible that there is a "Daylight Savings" effect within the time data. Breakdown by Hynek classification yields identical distributions within both American and Canadian studies, with NLS being overwhelmingly predominant.

A major difference between the Canadian UFO Survey and other studies of UFO data is that Close Encounter cases appear to be under-represented in the

former database. CEs comprise an incredible 30% of the NSRC data and nearly 50% (!) of the cases in David Spencer's MUFON UFO Report Database. There is no question that some screening and/or selection is occurring in the studies with high proportions of CEs. Hendry (1979) noted that CEs comprised 13% of the Blue Book unknowns and 14% of his own unexplained cases. (There were four unexplained CEs in the 1993 Canadian study.) In each of these studies, CEs represent slightly less than one percent of the total cases.

In summary, Ferrughelli's analyses of American UFO data yield results remarkably similar to the UFOROM Canadian studies, despite the differences in collection procedures. The two studies are complementary, and will aid further research into the UFO phenomenon.

Addendum:

#### The Anomalous Event of October 30, 1993

At 9:39 PM CST on October 30, 1993 (0339 UT on October 31, 1993), a brilliant object was seen streaking through the night sky over the Canadian prairie provinces. Literally hundreds of people witnessed the event, which lasted less than 10 seconds. Most observers thought the object was greenish-blue in colour, though some thought it was orange-red. Reports were received from

witnesses in Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Ontario, with some outliers in North Dakota and as far away as Indiana. Because of its trajectory and appearance, the object was assumed by scientists to be have been a fireball or very large meteor. It appears that the burn started over eastern Alberta, headed east across Saskatchewan and terminated somewhere over Manitoba.

Dozens

of people near Dauphin were jarred by a tremendous "sonic boom" that some compared to "a car hitting the house." The noise followed the passage of the object by approximately two minutes. Witnesses in eastern Manitoba generally saw the object somewhere to their west, so it may have fallen over Lake Manitoba.

A complication of the investigation is that a check with NORAD revealed that a

booster rocket from a Russian space mission had apparently re-entered the Earth's atmosphere over Canada at precisely the time of the observation. It was thus postulated that the observations were consistent with that of the space hardware re-entry, and that there had not been a meteoric event.

However, one researcher was told by another military spokesperson that an orbiting camera directed at Canada had recorded two separate events occurring within a few minutes of each other. It was possible, then, that some

witnesses

had seen the re-entry, while others had seen the fireball. A problem was that the predicted impact point or the rocket booster was near Nova Scotia, and there were no reports farther east than northwestern Ontario. In addition, if

the booster was low enough to create a sonic boom over Manitoba, it could not, under any circumstances, survive to the Atlantic Ocean. And what could be made of the outlier reports in the United States? Finally, it is most curious that no observer saw two events. It would seem logical that at least one person would have seen two objects, given the large number of witnesses and recorded observations.

Is it possible that a rocket booster re-entered the Earth's atmosphere at the same point and the time as a meteoroid? Although the statistical probability of such a unique tandem event is not zero, it is very unlikely. Something very remarkable and still not completely explained was seen by hundreds of people that night.

#### References:

Ferrughelli, P. (1992). National Sighting Yearbook 1992. National Sighting Research Center, 60 Allen Drive, Wayne, NJ 07470.

Hendry, Allan. (1979). The UFO Handbook. Doubleday, NY.

Rutkowski, C. A. (1986). The UFOROM Datafile: MANUFOCAT. Ufology Research of Manitoba, Box 1918, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada R3C

3R2.

Spencer, T. David. (1993). Initial results from the UFO report database. MUFON UFO Journal, number 305, pp. 13-15.

The 1993 Canadian  
UFO Survey: Five Years of UFOs

Summary of Findings

1. The number of UFO reports in Canada has been increasing since 1989. Reasons for this include increased public awareness of where to report UFOs and the increasing participation by UFO researchers in the annual studies. There were 141 UFO cases reported in Canada in 1989, but by 1993, the number of UFO cases rose to 489.
2. More UFOs are reported in Western Canada than in Eastern Canada.
3. More UFOs are reported in the fall and winter than in the spring and summer.
4. Two-thirds of all UFOs are classed as Nocturnal Lights; that is, they

are

simply lights moving about in the night sky. Most of these can be explained as aircraft or astronomical objects.

5. 31.5% of all UFOs reported in 1993 were explainable as misidentified ordinary objects.

34.8% of the cases had insufficient information to find an explanation.

23.5% had possible explanations.

50 cases (10.2%) could not be explained.

6. Of the unexplained reports, only about half were of high quality (26 cases, or 5.3%). That is, these cases were relatively well-investigated and well-witnessed and were judged as reliable cases by at least one investigator.

7. Most UFOs are seen around 10:00 p.m.

8. UFOs usually have more than one witness. Normally, two or more people see

a UFO at the same time.

9. UFO sightings last an average of about 12 minutes.

10. Most UFOs are white in colour.

These findings show that UFOs represent a continuing phenomenon that refuses to go away. More and more people are reporting UFOs each year, from all provinces. If UFOs do not represent alien visitation as is popularly conceived, the numbers of reports demand that the phenomenon deserves scientific study, if not as a physical phenomenon, then a sociological or psychological one.