

PETROLEUM INDUSTRY ORAL HISTORY PROJECT
TRANSCRIPT

INTERVIEWEE: Ian McIlreath

INTERVIEWER: David Finch

DATE: January 2002

DF: Today is the 7th day of January in the year 2002 and we are with Dr. Ian McIlreath at his offices in the Pan Canadian building. Thank you for meeting with me.

IM: It's a pleasure.

DF: Could you give us a little bit of biographical information and some educational information before we get into your association with the CSPG?

IM: I guess the easiest thing to do is just talk about the educational side of my life. I got a Bachelor's, a BSc Engineering in Geological Engineering from Queens University, graduated in '69, did an MSc in Geological Engineering at Queens, graduated in '71. Came out to the University of Calgary and did a PhD program there which I ultimately graduated in. I say ultimately because before I graduated I actually moved on to move with Shell Canada at the time. So my PhD was 1977, I joined Shell in the fall of '74 and have been in the industry ever since. I've worked at all the sedimentary basins in Canada. I've done extensive field work, geological field work, one of the few who can claim this but extensive field work from the 49th Parallel right up to the equivalent front ranges, right into Alaska. I have done field work on every one of the Arctic Islands, except Baffin and Ellesmere, in other words the eastern Arctic. I have worked not only the western Canadian sedimentary basin but in various capacities, I've worked several stints in my career in the Mackenzie, Beaufort area and also off of the east coast of Canada. I worked several years internationally, primarily in Asia. And I've been an exploration geologist, I've been in management. I actually started, my first 3 years were as an explorationist with Shell Canada, in '77 I joined Petro Canada research, had a 3 year stint with them. Went consulting with Graham Davies and Agat, when it was a thing you could do by choice. Did that for 2 years, came back to Petro Canada Resources as an explorationist and very quickly went into the management circles. Then I moved from Petro Canada to Pan Canadian Petroleum in November of '92 and came over as Chief Geologist, which is my current position. And our company now has a name change, it's now called Pan Canadian Energy. So that's a very brief synopsis of what I've done.

#031 DF: Before we went on tape you started to tell me how you got associated with the CSPG, what was the attraction there?

IM: Actually it was probably one of just a fortuitous situation where one of my colleagues I was working at Shell was looking after the noon hour luncheon technical program and was at a position where he needed, he wanted to move on and was looking for a successor. He approached me which was kind of ironic because at the time, even though I was working with Shell I was still also a PhD student at the University of Calgary. So I

did take over the position of running the noon hour luncheon program and I took it from a, well, first of all, one of the first challenges was that we were running the luncheon program through Penley's Dance Hall, which I believe, currently the space is occupied by the Canadian Hunter Building. Anyway they were going to tear that building down so we had to move on and one of my first jobs was to find a suitable location for the CSPG. I ended up getting a competition between what I believe was either the Calgary Inn or the Westin Inn at the time, and the Calgary Convention facility. We ran an experiment, at least we tested both facilities and the Calgary Inn won the competition and that's how we ended up over in the Calgary Inn. The 2 or 3 years, I believe it was just over 2 years that I was the technical program chairman we saw the meetings go from several hundred to over 1,000 and I don't think those numbers have been approached since. In terms of the numbers attending the luncheons and we greatly expanded the breadth of the topics being discussed. So we went from strictly petroleum geology to, at that time, into astro-geology and just a whole, we pursued a whole line of other interesting areas of science and it seemed to be extremely well received by the membership.

DF: Was the Convention Centre just opening at that point?

IM: Yes, it had just opened, I believe, a year or two before. This was in the latter part of the 70's.

DF: Can you tell us the story about the competition over the meetings?

IM: Well, the competition, the way the Calgary Inn actually won the competition, both facilities had the size to look after our needs but the Convention Facility wanted to introduce French service during the serving of the meals which really meant that each component of the lunch, or each dish, was served individually, which added a lot of time to the meeting. So instead of taking the normal one hour, it took over an hour and a half. We tried it once, and found of course, as we predicted, it would take a longer period of time to serve. We did try to convince the management that we needed to be out within about an hour or so, once we got started and they simply didn't want to change this way of serving meals. They stuck with that for a number of years but it certainly cost them our business initially. I believe that we were very well served by the Calgary Inn, at least for the period of time I was associated and my immediate successors who ran that program. Then just shortly after that I was asked to serve on the CSPG executive so I went into the executive in the late 70's as a Director. It certainly gave me an insight into how the Society was run and more importantly it caused me to think where the opportunities, challenges and basically, I ended up, when I finished my time and learned how the Society ran, I was very well prepared then later, to actually accept a nomination to become the President of the Society. I did quite a large number of, served as various committee chairpersons and ran a number of committees and did a lot relative to some technical contributions, gave noon hour luncheon talks, led field trips. Kind of in fact, without trying to sound too boosterous I guess, but when they actually asked me to run for the Vice-President and at that time it was definitely becoming a 3 year commitment of a Vice-President, President, past President, when they asked me to run the Reservoir was in a smaller format and the editor of the Reservoir asked if he could editorialize and shorten my list of contributions to the Society so that it would fit the page. Anyway I did win that

competition and I went in, in '82, as the Vice-President and then in '83 became President. But because of my previous experience and my involvement with the committees, most of the major committees in the organization, I certainly had certain agendas that I wanted to follow right from day 1. And the Vice-Presidency was good in giving me the opportunity to take back some responsibilities and then to really firm a plan, which then we tried to execute through 1983. In '84 I really tried to play a supportive role to the incoming President who I believe was John Marr at the time. What I believed in. . . I wasn't particularly well served by my, either. . .well, let's put it this way, people who were Vice-President or past President didn't necessarily participate that strongly in the organization. I thought it was really crucial that I not only learn the game as Vice-President, be a good President but then really don't quit when I became past President but really help the incoming President. And that I always had a philosophy which was, you have your turn in the barrel and then you walk away from it. So I basically didn't want to be a hanger on but I have done some things subsequent, in the Society. I believe you asked me, why did I do it. There was a number of reasons probably, I hadn't thought about this at any great level of detail but I think what I really liked was I really did like the association of meeting new people. The Society also gave me an opportunity to manage and it was an outlet for my creativity. They certainly gave me free rein to do those sorts of things and as long as I was being responsible everybody was benefiting I think. But I really felt it was a very unique opportunity to learn everything from public speaking through giving talks to actually managing in a different environment, which was primarily the volunteer environment, where you have to convince people to follow and cooperate and try to achieve goals along the way. As opposed to the authoritarian or the dictatorial approach to management. So I thought it was really helping me in terms of broadening my horizons. But at the same time I really enjoyed the association and in reading the annual report, my annual report that you supplied me, one of the things I was really impressed with was the people who were at that time, the chair people and who participated in the various committees and who those people have grown up to be in the industry since. A lot of Vice-Presidents in there, a lot of very senior people who are well respected. It was just an underlying association or networking that. . .this was all before concepts like networking became part of the management lingo.

#125 DF: When you reviewed the report of activities that you wrote, what things stood out for you?

IM: I think it was the . . . to be really honest with you I'm glad I did reread it because in refreshing my memories about this, it was set in the context of the fact that we had been a national Society for 10 years, so it was an opportunity to look back over the 10 years and you have to put in context that 1983 was, at the time we perceived it to be a major downturn in the industry, in retrospect it was a minor downturn. So we were looking for, at least I was looking for efficiencies and streamlining the organization but most importantly what I was looking at was, 10 years prior to that we had become a national Society by name. We had adopted that we were going to be national with a lot of foresight and some good things had happened in that intervening 10 years but there was a

general sense that we were. . .the C stood for Calgary and that we really were not a national organization. We undertook a systematic review of how we could be more national in character and everything wasn't a major dedication or adapting to major new programs. Some of them were relatively minor but I think were significant. Such things as just simply changing. . .making the abstracts in the Bulletin bilingual. But from a national petroleum society point of view, we did step out and I'll come back to this later, but we did talk. . . first of all we affiliated ourselves with some of the other organizations in Canada, like the Atlantic Geo-Science Society. We put forward to the Societies, like the Geological Association of Canada, the GAC, the concept of holding joint meetings outside Calgary, which in fact came to fruition in the late 80's. We also though, looked at some concepts of, because of the downturn in the industry, a highlight for me was to, actually in retrospect, what we were doing was we were basically making ourselves more efficient. We greatly reduced the number of committees, which actually wasn't reported in that report. But I started the year with over 100 committees that I inherited and got it down to 60. I think we eliminated more than 40 because we actually did, in fact, create about a dozen committees. So through amalgamation or brand new committees, so I don't know the exact number we eliminated. But because of this downturn in the industry we realized that companies were making choices as to the memberships that they would support for their workers primarily. And what they would support from a corporate point of view. We began to realize this whole concept of value for the client, value for the customer or what you get for your dollar for being a member and I think we introduced that whole concept, which is what basically drove the Society through the rest of the 80's. But I think we initiated that so we were looking forward as well. One of the things I'm particularly proud of the executive of '83, the Society, I'm particularly proud of the whole Society was, we really tried to look out to making the Society important to students at all ages. We initiated support of. . . I've forgotten the name of the program right now but it's in the report but it's basically, at the high school level, it's the Science Fair. We instituted supporting the Gold Level, if I recollect properly, the Gold Medal Level here in Calgary. Actually that Gold Medal could have been at the national level now that I think of it, in fact it was. We instituted a whole number of awards for the various inter-collegiate, university conferences. We did one in the marine geo-science which has subsequently been abandoned. We basically, in effect, we started the initiative of public awareness of science really, but we didn't know at that time that that was the term or just what we were kind of getting involved in.

#184 DF: How about this moving the meeting up to Edmonton, what was the purpose of that, the Annual Convention?

IM: Again, that was the concept of trying to, through participation and meetings outside of Calgary, of making the CSPG more of a national Society, as opposed to strictly something that happened in Calgary. We made some efforts on the international front because my philosophy at the time was, if you are an international organization by default, more than anything else, you are a national organization. If you're only a national organization by default you come back to being only a Calgary organization. So we tried

to expand our efforts, in terms of liaison committees and various organizations like the World Petroleum Congress. We strengthened those liaisons if you like, with these national and international organizations. That was that concept of trying to get more international and trying to get more international participation in our technical programs. The one thing I probably did, in retrospect I could only have done it because I was young and stupid, was the fact that I'm probably the only President, when he was standing President was also the technical program chairman for the conference that year. That was the Mesozoic Conference which was one of the only conferences run in the 80's which was 100% CSPG. That was a huge technical but a really major financial success as well. I'd like to come back to a statement I made about contacting the other societies. We planted the idea of having a national meeting of the earth sciences. We planted that germ of an idea in 1983, and ultimately, I'd like to say that ultimately, although the CSPG lost that vision through the various, because of the ephemeral nature of executives, lost that concept, when I became President of the Geological Association of Canada, I brought that idea back to the CSPG. Ultimately, that was about 10 years later, when I was President of the GAC in the early 90's but it ultimately came back to become Geo-Science Canada 2000, which I ended up being the General Chair in 2000. Which sometimes, what goes around comes around or careful what you ask for. When you really come down to it.

#216 DF: Yes. It might happen.

IM: I guess it did. I guess one of the things I'd like you to check on when you're going all your statistics is, and I never thought of this until I get to be old like I am now, is I certainly probably was the youngest President up to that point, because I was born in '46. I wouldn't be surprised. . . I would be surprised if there's been somebody who was younger than me who has been President.

DF: Now the Convention your year made a significant pot of money didn't it?

IM: The Mesozoic Conference. Yes, it did. In fact there is a graph in the Annual Report that shows basically, the financial position relative to, more profit than anything else, of the organization over that 10 year period I was speaking of and you'll see a huge increase for the profits for our year. A lot of people dismissed that as being the fact that there was an accounting ledger item where the previous year, I believe the conference was with the AAPG and part of the profit didn't show up until 1983. Most people dismiss that huge increase in profit as being that. That is an element of why we had such a profit but we also had an extremely profitable convention ourselves, which was 100% CSPG, so we didn't have to split. And the other things is by this, if you like, part of our whole process of reviewing each committee and basically, eliminating those that were defunct or inoperative and at the same time scraping out monies that were squirrelled in bank accounts across the city and outside the city, we brought back a lot of money. So there's a lot of efficiencies that we gained as well. So I'd say there's like 3 major components. And then we had a very profitable year just relative to our luncheon programs, our field trips that year were sold out, so we made money. But we had a little bit of an emphasis on making money and I guess that's another one of my. . . I don't know if you watch any of the Star Trek or any of the spin off type programs but call it a Ferengi??? rule of

acquisition which is one of my rules and that is, my operating principle since day 1 with the CSPG is to always make money. It isn't to make money to support salaries or for administration. What I'm hoping is the money is reinvested into the technical objectives of the Society. Nowadays whether that's public awareness or whatever. And I did that as an operating principle with Geo-Canada 2000. Geo-Canada 2000 we were definitely going to be in the red 2 months before the conference. We had a projected debt of several hundred thousand dollars and we exited with an extremely high profit. That came about because basically, we got together with the organizing committee. We knew that our sponsoring societies wanted money, that's still an operating principle, they wanted a profit. We basically sat down and we did everything possible to make it into a profitable situation. And it turned out to be highly profitable. Damned near killed us to be honest with you, as volunteers, but anyway it turned out to be that way. So I have no idea, I've never kept track of how much money I've made for the Society but I know I've made a significant amount in my 20+ years, starting to come on to 30 years.

#268 DF: One of the problems with management of the CSPG has always been the big expenditures on big ticket items, like large publications because those aren't really amortized over the years. I don't think there were any memoirs or anything big published in your year were there?

IM: That's a good question. In fact, I think we'd both have to go back to the . . .

DF: According to your . . .

IM: To the report to . . . There is one inconsistency in the reporting there. In my column it says that we did publish an Arctic Memoir and yet in the summary of the publications it doesn't show up. So I'm not really sure on that, whether that was published in '83 or it was published in a subsequent year.

DF: Oh, I see. Just to quote you, you say, in short term ventures, there was a shift in focus from multi-year projects to short term ventures, which have relatively small manpower requirements but a resulting higher profile. So . . .

IM: I think that comment, while it's definitely tied to the economic side, that comment is a foreshadowing of what was to come in the 80's and through the 90's and currently, which is that it was the crunch on the volunteers.

DF: How did that come about?

IM: Well even at that point in '83, as I indicated to you, there was a bit of a downturn in the industry and companies were withdrawing their support and people felt threatened by . . . felt they had to focus more on their job and give less time as volunteers and rightfully so. We saw a lot of our long term projects, one of the reasons in investigating why they had not been brought to conclusion was, they were so long term that people were turning over, going company to company but there was also this negative impact of the economy at the time. So we really felt that when we did projects in the future we wanted to do less of a commitment to long term projects. Primarily the effect it was having on the volunteers for these various reasons. It would give us a higher degree of chance that the project would be brought to a conclusion, a successful conclusion. And I think that really was the driver in that. I think there's another graph in the annual report which shows the

membership for the particular year looking back over the previous 10 or 9. What you see is starting a levelling off and even though we had our share of new members joining that year we started, because of the economic downturn, we started to see people indicating that they couldn't renew their memberships or were not going to renew their memberships. And that did have an effect on us. I haven't done it with the CSPG but I had cause to do it with the other national society, the Geological Association of Canada. What you see of course, in the mid 80's, late 80's, is the downturn, either very flat or a real downturn starts to develop in terms of membership in these technical societies. So I think, although we didn't realize at the time, we were probably at the start of that.

#312 DF: What do you remember about the first computer that the CSPG got?

IM: Not a whole heck of a lot to be honest with you. Whatever it was it was antiquated and probably, I wouldn't be surprised was used primarily as a word processor, even though it was bought to handle, essentially, the books for the Society. One of the things I remember more than the computer was actually the office itself, because the previous year I'd been asked by the Society to get a group of volunteers together and to go in, because we were moving from, I think it was the Lougheed building over to the Herald building. I was involved evenings, as the chairman, with a group of volunteers, CSPG members, and we did all the major renovations, it was not contracted. We did the painting, we did the dry walling in the Herald building and then subsequently went out and bought the furniture and the new Board table, that was something I actually personally picked out. From RGO I think it was. There was a manufacturer here in Calgary. That was finally all brought together in '83, the Board room was opened up, we finally got our. . .we used the Board room for meetings beginning in '83. So it was with some . . .well, when we moved over to our current premise, or facilities, I had some regrets because there was somewhat of a personal attachment to the CSPG office, I had put my own blood in there, sweat and tears as well as a group of individuals, group of members of the CSPG. And we had a lot of fun, we did it over a number of evenings through a couple week period. That's some I'm not sure is generally known with the Society.

DF: When it gets larger these things become more commercialized don't they?

IM: Oh yes, in today's world we'd delegate that, we would certainly subcontract if you like.

DF: One thing you mentioned before we went on tape was that during the time when you were in charge of the technical luncheons you dropped the question period afterwards, why was that?

IM: Again, it was strictly for time. People had indicated that they wanted to leave by 1:00. The other thing that caused us to drop the question period was, when we moved to new facilities and there was this ramping up of more people attending the luncheons it just became unwieldy to try to coordinate a lunch, at least the question period after. What we basically did was invite people who had questions to informally come up afterwards and talk with the speaker and that's essentially what we do today as far as I can see. There's some good old memories of Penley's, in my first year, just as we were making that transition I can remember a talk being given by Dr. Lynton Land, who was talking about modern day carsh??? processes which is basically, he was talking about the neuroic???

ground table and water carting out, cavernous systems and limestones. At the same time it was in February and we'd had a big snowfall and at that particular luncheon date there was a chinook going on and the water was dripping and they had these pails set up because in Penley's you had long tables, that's the way the lunch seating arrangements were made, so there were these long tables and between the tables they had buckets and this thing was dripping at the same time he was talking about dripping water causing the formation of caves, it was pretty hilarious. He was a professor, he was an AAPG distinguished lecturer.

#377 DF: That's great.

IM: We got some good memories too.

DF: Any other stories from Penley's, it was a dance hall wasn't it?

IM: Yes, it was a dance hall. I didn't have any association with it before, I only went to a couple of the technical luncheons, maybe to about a year's worth of technical luncheons before it was coming up to be the transition and this other individual was leaving us. His name was John Harper, but John was leaving as the committee chairman and he asked me if I would consider being the chairperson.

DF: How many did Penley's seat?

IM: Just several hundred. I think, if I remember correctly, their maximum was about 350. And again, served on long tables and the meals actually came in by a catering truck and we did have things like the catering truck not making it or being delayed, so the lunches being delayed. It was a low tech operation. So it was kind of nice to go to a regular caterer when we went to the Calgary Inn.

DF: What do you remember about the CSPG's relationship with APEGGA when you were on the executive?

IM: I remember it was no more strained than it probably is all the time. But APEGGA was changing its qualification rules at the time, for becoming registered, and although they had a generous grandfather clause, which most people took advantage of, it still caused some problems. For example, even though, up to that point you could fairly easily become jointly registered if you had the qualifications as a geologist or a geologist engineer or a geologist geophysicist or whatever. That new system eliminated it. I know personally I was not at the time, a member of APEGGA, and I should have grandfathered myself when I had that opportunity. So when I was President I took it upon myself to write the exams because I had a little bet with the President of APEGGA that, under the new regulations you could not be jointly registered, so I wrote the exams and promptly got a letter back from the Review Board saying, you passed your exams, you're accredited, both as a geologist and an engineer but you practice as a geologist therefore we can only give you the geologist. I said, that proves my point but I left it. I haven't done anything particularly with APEGGA until now and I'm now running for council, as of about a week ago.

DF: So why has there been this tension between APEGGA and the geologists?

IM: That's a really good question. I'm not really 100% sure, I really haven't given a lot of thought to it. I think there's people who simply don't meet the accreditation requirements

and like anybody, you're always afraid to submit your credentials and you hear they can be really tough. So I think there's certainly the accreditation process has always been somewhat prohibitive. And especially those people who have joined our industry from other countries. I'm thinking even of the States or the UK as far as that goes, but anywhere outside of Canada. And then for a time the accreditation process was even pretty rough for people who had gone to universities in Canada. Because there were things like 3 year degrees, and the generation just before me, a lot of people had 3 year degrees and the way they got their registration was through the grandfathering because they had enough industry experience. But nowadays they probably wouldn't be able to do that, they just simply wouldn't. So that certainly is a big roadblock. And I think there is just a group of people, probably those who were educated in the 1960's or just didn't like the whole concept of having to be registered. Maybe it's a western Canadian trait, I don't know. Or you adapt it as a western Canadian trait.

#446 DF: It serves the purpose of western alienation.

IM: A lot of people point out too, what it simply comes down to is, why. Why do you have to be registered to protect the public from you and pay for it too. So what are the benefits. I think they have a lot of the registrants that are paid for by companies and I'm sure that when people are no longer associated with a company I think they look pretty closely at this. They may have to in order to be a consultant or whatever.

DF: What do you remember about the social activities the year you were, or when you were on the executive.

IM: I might just say something more about APEGGA. In 1983 there really wasn't much of a controversy between us. It was a quiet year on that front. Just to be fair to APEGGA, it was very quiet that year, other than this controversy that I just explained to you. Social programs. . . I think we had the usual highly successful events associated with things like the Mesozoic Conference, the social events with the Mesozoic Conference. In this examination of all committees, all responsibilities and what the membership got for their services, one of the things we deduced was that in general geologists are not particularly socially adept. Drinking beer, yes we're good at that. So we actually tried to find alternative ways to allow the geological community to get together. I believe if memory serves me right, the squash tournament came out in that year. We didn't know in that year whether it would be actually something that would be picked up and run in successive years or not. It was successful that year and it was nice to see that, yes, some people thought that it was good enough. It certainly had a long streak to it. So it was pretty funny, we certainly had sort of the tried and true methods of having some social fun. It's interesting, I don't know why we were focussing so much on the technical program but one of the original benefits of the noon hour luncheon programs, when they were small and in a place like Penley's was that, it really was quite the ritual to introduce yourself to new people and actually have conversations with people, and be able, because we were a small enough community, to recognize other people. We lost that actually, when we went to sort of the new, modern era of something like a Calgary Inn or sometimes the convention facility. Because the size of the meetings, we ended up with people saving

seats, they tended to stay with their own companies. Although some people, I know some people who purposely tried very hard to sort of follow one of the original intents of getting out and meeting new people. But it's very hard to then run into those people at another meeting even if you do and sort of establish a new relationship. So it's hard to network.

End of tape.

Side 2

DF: What other issues stand out for you in the time you were on the executive?

IM: Even though I stated very early in this interview that my method of operation, at least how I operate in these executive positions of various societies has been that when I do get to be past President I really try to act in a very supportive way of the new administration. I could see in the CSPG situation, again because of the economic environment and what was happening externally within the industry, that the trend was going to be to manage the Society as a business. That really is contrary to why the Society was created in the first place. The Society in my estimation and the way I read its bylaws, constitution is that, it was created to disseminate technical information, that was always #1, and that always has been for me, the most important aspect of the Society and the reason it exists. But I could see it was becoming a business and it was going to be run by Presidents who were much more business oriented, even though we had started the ball rolling along these lines. But to the point I thought, to the detriment of it being a technical society. For example, yes, it really takes a hit on your bottom line if you for example, publish a number of memoirs. So, although it didn't happen probably within the next year but it was definitely coming up on the drawing boards and it did happen over subsequent years, if a group of individuals wanted to make a significant publication they were forced to bring the money in as well as the idea, to the table. I don't think that was particularly working in a collaborative fashion with the volunteers. It was, you bring the money or don't come to the table, it even got that bad. So I think money was driving a lot of things that happened in the 1980's and probably well into the 90's as well. I certainly following my own principle, I did my bit, I walked away from the actual running of the Society but not my involvement in doing other things for the Society. As I said, I guess part of that is, not to be critical of the way other people want to think that they can do and help and put a lot of energy into it and I'm sure they have the right ideas or at least they have their beliefs and they think they're doing the right thing. But I think that's been probably my biggest concern for the Society since I've left. The other concern I have is this continuous concept of making this truly a national society and being recognized internationally. I think the CSPG is well recognized from some of the technical contributions that are made, primarily in print but also just the level of the conferences themselves, they have a good international participation level, even if they run a sole CSPG conference. But those are the 2 aspects. One is always remembering why we exist, according to the original constitution, bylaws, not my interpretation of them. But also this whole concept of being

a national, not a Calgary based. . . it is Calgary based but not a Calgary society. One of the reasons I had a chance to bring closure on something I thought got started in 1983 from the CSPG side, again, reactivated by the Geological Association of Canada with me being behind the scenes. Again, I didn't exactly plan on running the thing but ended up, through Geo Canada, of bringing together, for the first time ever, the major geo-technical societies in Canada for an event which maybe we'll run every 5 years, maybe we'll run every 10 years. Overall it was a positive experience. But it's our participation and public awareness of science, supporting the educational systems by awards, and at university conferences. The national liaison committee, at the time, I'd forgotten this but we had revamped it and we held 2 meetings a year, not just one, we put so much emphasis into it. We listened to what they had to say, we made a lot of changes that year. As I say, we had 2 meetings a year which just became too onerous for people obviously, later on. But to listen through them, what the students were needing. That's I guess, where I'm coming from. I did have the . . . I guess one of the distinctions which I didn't say in my CV or introduction was the fact that I'm the only person who's ever been President of the Canadian Society of Petroleum Geologists and the President of the Geological Association of Canada. So I've at one time or another, represented all earth scientists that are members of those societies, as well as I've been President of the Canadian Geological Foundation. And just to be allowed to sleep in my own house I turned down the Canadian Geo-Science Council Presidency.

#062 DF: Good, nice to know you're not out on the street. These past President's dinners, what happens at those, are they constructive do you . . . or do you attend them?

IM: First of all, I don't attend them and it's not because I choose not to, it just happens to be that almost invariably they host them the week I go hunting every year. They have an uncanny ability to pick the week that I'm hunting. The hunting is more important. But I have gone to a spotted number of them, those that have either been earlier or a little later.

DF: Was there one the year you were President?

IM: There definitely was.

DF: Was it helpful?

IM: It was probably one of the most testy meetings and it was nothing to do with the performance of our organization. It had nothing to do with the CSPG, well that's not quite true. There was a chap by the name of Gusso, who is well known and a very thought provoking individual. It was quite a highlight to have him at the dinner. But at the end of the day, my report, a few questions which were very straightforward, Gusso got up and asked a question which was entirely on his agenda. It was basically his concern was relative to the Geological Survey of Canada and of course, we always have been very strongly supported, at least our volunteers have been a very strong support base from what was the ISPG at that time, now GSCC and they took immediate offense to it. But it was not a CSPG related situation, it was Gusso's personal reservation about the work that the GSC was doing. It polarized the crowd and I found myself kind of standing at the podium watching something developing out there in the crowd.

DF: That had not much to do with the Society, directly.

IM: No. If it wasn't for the principals that were involved I probably would have forgotten about it not long after that, or I would have forgotten it that night probably.

DF: Any comments of the future of the CSPG, 75 years now since it was founded?

IM: Oh, undoubtedly, as long as there's a petroleum industry there will always be a CSPG. Undoubtedly. What I'm very encouraged by is to see, really quite honestly, is to see young people getting involved and having ideas, starting to put their energy into it. As long as that occurs we'll always have a Society. It's always been very reasonably priced. You get some people, 1 or 2% think otherwise but for what it offers, it still offers that same opportunity for people to network, to express themselves, to do really unique things, like organize a core conference, organize a special session on something, even a publication. And learn things like what it is to have your manuscript examined by peers instead of . . . of course, we don't do manuscripts in companies anymore, but to be technically challenged and go to a higher level. Learn how to express yourself. And I think really, working in a volunteer environment is so different sometimes, than working in a controlled organization that you normally are working in on a day to day basis. Even if you're working in a small company, still it's an organization and it has a hierarchy to it. I think all those things exist, all those opportunities. And there's lots of room because Canada is still very much in the petroleum game. With the developments on the east coast and I think we'll be doing another round in the Arctic again, just because of supply. There's lots of challenges to get us there but we will be back. There's all that to share, there's all that to learn, share once again. So no, I think it's very positive. And I think people have the opportunity to bit as much as they want and hopefully we can have people that are aggressive enough that they'll make that dedication to wanting to run the Society as well. But I still come back to, it's a whole concept of, I think what worked for me is that I really had some pretty good idea of how it was run, what the problems were, some of the opportunities and still had all my grey matter in those days so I had a few ideas and creativity and some things I wanted to accomplish. So I went at it hammer and tong, and even though I had a full day time job I still really enjoyed the whole situation. But at the end of the day, you know, you had your chance. If you didn't get it done well, don't try to influence other people. And why, I mean, it's their agenda. You're not doing anything particularly other than just putting a spoke in the wheel really. But no, I'm very proud of the CSPG.

DF: Great. On behalf of the Canadian Society of Petroleum Geologists and the Petroleum Industry Oral History Project I'd like to thank you so much for meeting with us today and we'll end the formal part of the interview at this time. Thank you very much.

IM: Well, thank you and it's certainly been a pleasure to finally meet you too.