We have heard during the past few days that great progress has been made in our profession, but I don't think the public yet knows what forestry really is. Yesterday there were three business men in the elevator with me. I happened to be the only person wearing a Conference badge, and one of these men who looked to be quite competent and well educated, possibly well informed on most subjects, asked: "What is this conference that is going on in the hotel?" I replied: "It is a foresters' conference." He then enquired: "What do you fellows do—cut down trees?" Now I used to hear that thirty years ago, and I had imagined that stage had been passed, but there is at least one man in Winnipeg who still doesn't know that professional foresters do more than cut down trees—we still have a job to do in public education.

This Institute as a unit has not done much for the welfare of the nation—individually yes, collectively no. I realize you have written and published a Statement of Forest Policy. Well and good as far as it went, but how far did it go? The translation of that Policy Statement into action must be done by the individual members of the Institute. The Institute as a body can do little, but it should be a function of the Institute to encourage its members to act. In the final analysis, the value of this Institute to Canada will be the cumulative effort expended by its individual members, specifically you, you and you.

DISCUSSION OF PAPER PREPARED BY J. B. MILLAR

Dr. G. S. Allen, Dean, Faculty of Forestry, University of British Columbia.

In this paper Mr. Millar has expressed satisfaction with the technical phases of forestry education and with the professional attitude and adaptability of the graduate forester, but he has also expressed some dissatisfaction with the cultural and fundamental training of forestry students, having in mind particularly the question as to whether the graduate forester is prepared to take an executive or administrative position in industry or in government or to take his proper place in the affairs of the nation.

As far as the administrative and executive abilities of a graduate forester are concerned, I can't quite agree with Mr. Millar's viewpoint. I feel that a university cannot be expected to train an executive as such. We all know that there are people who show a natural ability for leadership, some at a very early age, and others at rather a later stage in their development. I would say that all the University can hope to do is to help a person develop his natural ability along these lines.

The principle aim of the forest schools is to train professional men. In forestry we need a great many professional men and only a relatively few executives and administrators. Cultural training as such, providing as it does a broad background in the humanities, languages, history and so on, will not necessarily produce an administrator. Therefore, I would argue against the thought that a simple increase of cultural subjects in the forestry curriculum will necessarily lead in that particular direction. Such a

change may make the forestry student a better rounded person, and that, I think, is all to the good—that is what most of the forestry schools are trying to get into the curriculum today—a better rounded education.

Also I would say that universities should not attempt to indoctrinate. That may simply be the use of a word by Mr. Millar, but I don't think that it is a good one. We shouldn't try to indoctrinate a person to any line of thinking; but rather to teach our students to think, to approach problems with an open mind, to be self reliant, to be proud of an answer that is based upon fact, and to present it where it will do the most good. They should be free of dogma, and that I think is becoming more and more important in the world today; they should know how to work and play with others, as Dr. Truman said last year. I believe the universities are doing their job, if they turn out people, regardless of their profession, who have these abilities developed in part, or who have been encouraged along these lines by the training they have received.

Here I think we come to the final small, but important point—that it is a really wise man who knows which rung of the ladder he should attempt to reach. There are many people with ulcers and various other sad afflictions, who have passed the right rung on the ladder and who are unhappy even though they are executives and administrators.

J. L. Van Camp, Manager, Canadian Forestry Association Inc., Montreal.

I would like to speak briefly on two points, which I think are either given or implied in Mr. Millar's paper. First, in some of the forest schools the school administration takes very great pains to assess the qualities and abilities of the student and to make this information available to the prospective employers. I am not certain that we have gone as far as we should in many Canadian schools in keeping almost punched-card type records of the student's training and ability, so that we can give a good well-rounded advisory analysis of the man when someone asks—"Do you have a forestry graduate who would be suitable for my particular company or government department?" Many times we have had to rely somewhat on personal judgment, which can be biased. In one institution with which I was connected, this method was carried to a highly effective degree, and usually those employers who visited the school appreciated the fact that a great volume of information regarding the students was available. However to simplify this procedure somewhat, we found that employers usually asked questions in three general categories:

(1) "To what organizations did the undergraduate belong while on the campus and what part did he play in organizational work and student activities?"

(2) "How does the student get along with other people?"

(3) "What are his interests and how self-sufficient is he?" I think that these are some of the things that might be studied and possibly made available in our analysis of the students when we are talking to prospective employers.

My second point is that the way in which the forestry profession makes itself known favorably to the public is very important to every member of the profession and certainly to the cause of forestry as a whole. I think that we are weak in this respect and possibly do not get as much training as we should in public presentation either during our schooling or after graduation. One of our greatest difficulties in connection with the *Forest and Outdoors* magazine is to get clearly and intelligently written stories that are of sufficient interest for the public to read them. Many people will present us with technical papers, and they go straight into the wastebasket, as usually the first paragraph would not pass as being effective to stimulate our readers' interest. Public-speaking, I think, comes in something the same category.