D. R. Redmond
President

President's Report

This is the last message that I, as president, will submit to this column. My annual report will appear in the annual meeting supplement that you will receive in December, and will convey a summary of the year's activities of the Executive Committee.

In previous messages I attempted to keep you posted on how we implemented last year's resolutions and presented for your study some of the follow-up correspondence between the Institute and government leaders of opposition parties. I invite you to read in this issue our brief to the Canadian Council of Resource and Environmental Ministers. Several members had a hand in its preparation and I gratefully acknowledge their contributions, but I don't ask them to share in any responsibility for my omissions or errors in judgement.

I believe firmly that the Executive Committee should speak out on problems facing forest managers in Canada and that it must keep the membership informed on what it is doing. This Committee can be effective only if the membership supports the arguments it advances and its actions will be greatly strengthened if the individual members also speak out. During the past year we have had exceptionally active participation by individuals, groups of members and Sections on many topics and I thank every one for the role he played.

The Executive intends to continue its dialogue with governments, labour unions and any other organization that plays a part in formulating forest policy. It was to get a sounding on what direction we should move that the Secretary Manager, in March 1979, distributed a questionnaire to determine the degree to which the members are satisfied with CIF activities and to get suggestions for future programs. To date we have 467 replies and, in addition to answers to the questions asked, many useful suggestions.

It is rewarding to the Executive Committee to have well over 20% of the members respond. It is even more gratifying that 74% expressed satisfaction with the program and the remainder were dissatisfied mainly because they thought we had not done enough or gone far enough.

Your new Executive interprets your replies as loud and clear instructions to maintain contacts at the political level, to develop an effective public awareness program, to strengthen our recruiting drive, and to keep the Forestry Chronicle topical. There is a wide range of opinions on what the Chronicle should cover and what it should contain but on the whole it should report for all Canada on current forestry practices, operations, changes in policy and legislation at the Sectional or Provincial level. The Editor will have to exercise considerable wisdom, as he has in the past, to satisfy the majority.

A lot of the suggestions dealt with need for more activity by Sections and Working Groups, especially in preparation of briefs, newsletters, and information on services available to members. Many would like their Sections to hold meetings more frequently. I interpret this to mean that many members are looking for opportunities to get more involved in CIF activities.

Some suggested that fees should be reduced or held at their present level. Others would like to see a greater proportion of their fee spent in their Section and many cautioned that we should watch our finances carefully. There is the rub. The members are pleased with what we have done. We have kept the Institute in the black with an annual increase in dues of less than 6% when inflation has been nearer 10%. We have intensified the program in the areas thought most desirable by the members. We are asked to do more and spend even less. We will see what we can do.

There is much to be done. Often officers of other professional groups, the public, or industry ask about the CIF's position on a particular topic. The only statements we have to fall back on are our Forest Land Policy Statement and a report on forest taxation prepared by Working Group No. 9 in 1977. These are useful documents to guide us in debate on these subjects, but we should have material on many more topics. For instance, I was asked recently by one of Canada's leading scientists to outline the Institute's position on the subject of "acid rain". I had to confess that we had none and that at the moment we had given it no consideration. Another questioned me respecting use of chemicals in forestry. I had no position to fall back on for herbicides and was very little better off respecting insecticides.

These instances demonstrate that we are expected to have professional positions on many topics, if we want to be considered spokesmen for forestry across Canada. Other topics that have been raised are forestry research (our Research Priorities Committee is looking into this); forestry education (our latest is in Dean Garrett's book); natural areas (the Natural Areas Committee is reviewing this); intensive forest management etc. The lack of up-to-date answers on these questions demonstrates that there is room for every member to get involved in developing a segment of the Institute's policy and program. The challenge will be even greater in the 80's and we will meet it, if we support future presidents the way you rallied behind me.

Thank-you for making my year as your President the rewarding experience it has been.

D. R. Redmond