

could be collected as follows:

- Latitude
- Longitude
- Description of location, e.g. one mile north of . . .
- Altitude
- Habitat, including associated species
- Soil type
- Any particular feature of the plant
- Date of collection
- Collector's number.

Such information would be used to help future researchers.

Seed could be sent directly to: Andrew Jackson, Royal Botanic Gardens, Wakehurst Place, Ardingly, West Sussex RH17 6JN, England; or to myself at 218 Otupua Road, Timaru, and I would be happy to forward it to him.

**Mike Bunckenburg**

## Silvicultural diversity

Sir,

Your editorial in the February issue of the journal makes some interesting if not totally accurate claims about the conservative approach of foresters in the past and compares this with the more dynamic approach now being adopted by some of the new owners of forests previously controlled by the Forest Service.

You are critical of the lack of species diversity in our exotic forests with management restricted predominantly to low final stockings with pruning, and you further claim that foresters in the past have always been subject to a straight jacket of conformity. It appears that this straight jacket was strapped on by some faceless individual or individuals from "higher up" and I presume I fall into this category.

The earliest plantings of exotic production forests were characterised by intensive site definition and an attempt to match species with each site change. Parts of Conical Hill and Dusky Forests are or were good examples of this type of development. The result was a mix of hardwoods and softwoods which created all sorts of problems in management and final harvesting. At the other end of the spectrum were the plantings almost totally dominated by *P. radiata* particularly in the period from 1960 to the present day. The reason for this domination was simple. From the far north to the far south and from sea level to about 600 metres a.s.l. radiata gives the best return to the forest grower and can be utilised for a full range of forest products. Nothing else matches it. I guess there will always be reservations raised by the monoculture bogey but this problem may be more perceived than

real, particularly now that we have a full range of radiata genetic material available.

How plantation forests should be managed has of course been subject to intense scrutiny for years. I think it was generally conceded that to improve timber quality and maximise returns, pruning and thinning were essential when growing radiata. However, within this general prescription there was considerable variation. In fact the variation was so great that FRI was given the job of checking out radiata management region by region within the Forest Service. This was the genesis of the Radiata Task Force which then proceeded to go well beyond its original terms of reference. I recall that there were about 150 different management regimes being used at that time. In addition in some forests where the site index was low or where weeds such as gorse were a problem tending consisted of one thinning and no pruning. What you see as something new, you will probably find has already been tried and rejected or if it makes sense is still being used.

If you intended to be provocative in your editorial then I think you have succeeded but you appear to be basing your comments on personal perceptions rather than solid facts.

**G.M. O'Neill**

### Editor's reply

Mr O'Neill misunderstands the point I was trying to make. Criticism of the old foresters (including Mr O'Neill) or the Forest Service was not my intention, and I apologise to Mr O'Neill for giving him that impression. Nor was I saying that the radiata pine direct sawlog regime was "wrong" and we should all jump on an alternative species bandwagon. I have no doubt that radiata pine, managed in its many and various ways, will continue to dominate plantation forestry for the foreseeable future. An anarchy of impractical silvicultural options, without reason, is no-one's idea of good management. Mr O'Neill's comments in this regard are not in dispute.

The "target", for want of a better word, was our decision-making process. A narrow focus on financial criteria alone, without considering a broad decision-making environment, particularly the market, is a production-driven approach that does not always provide the best solution. Different companies and individuals have different objectives and resources, and no one solution is necessarily correct – there are horses for courses. I gave the example of the farmer with the different needs to highlight that point.

On that note, I would suggest there is no universally "correct" silvicultural regime. A forester can justify any number of options by simply changing the decision-making criteria and adopted strategy. Here I take issue with Mr O'Neill. Radiata pine does not necessarily give the "best return to the forest grower". That depends on how you assess "return". Even on a purely financial basis it is not given; and I have yet to hear conclusive evidence that the discount rate we use to give us that answer is appropriate, nor that we can compare that answer adequately with an, on the face of it, inferior NPV for a longer rotation species such as Douglas fir. As an example of a broader decision-making approach, Tasman have recently stated an intention to review their rotation lengths to ensure log quality matches their customer requirements.

It may be my personal perception, but the increasing diversity in decision-making approaches we are beginning to see as the wood-flows increase, and the ownership base broadens, is good news, and was worth pointing out.

**Editor**

## Forest Accord and mission statement

Sir

Council of the New Zealand Institute of Forestry is currently reviewing the mission statement, and also considering whether the Institute should adhere to the Forest Accord signal in 1991 between the NZ Forest Owners' Association and a majority of the environmental organisations. This Accord is intended to provide a mutually agreed discipline of action for environmentally-friendly treatment of New Zealand's remaining indigenous forests.

Within New Zealand, the goals of sustainability in respect of natural resources were considerably strengthened in 1991 with the adoption of the Resource Management Act. Whilst overseas, in November 1992, New Zealand became a member of the International Tropical Timber Organisation. The ITTO was set up under the United Nations in 1985. Although principally a timber trade organisation, one of its aims is to encourage moves towards the sustainable production of tropical rainforest by the year 2000. Clearly, this aim stands in stark contrast to the present reality of continuing tropical forest destruction.

As a member of the ITTO, New Zealand is now committed none the less to furthering the goal, not only in tropical timber trade and in support for sustainable

management of the forest in these countries, but also in the treatment of its own natural forest.

President Peter Olsen, in reviewing the question as to whether the Institute should sign the Forest Accord, has drawn attention to perceived problems arising from the East Coast afforestation scheme. Yet, surely, these problems are overstated.

The East Coast project, as a government-funded scheme, has three separate purposes. They are: the political (to massage the Government's ego), the economic and social (to provide employment and regional development benefits from planting new protection/production forests); and the environmental (to control and repair a catastrophic erosion problem that has acquired world-wide notoriety). It is the proposal to achieve the last aim partly by clearfelling and converting to production species much of the existing kanuka forests and manuka shrublands, which is supposedly straining the Forest Accord.

Yet the NZ Forest Research Institute, in its submission on the project, noted that kanuka/manuka communities of eight years old or greater are as effective as fully-stocked radiata stands in stabilising erodable landscapes. Moreover, for at least six years after cutting and burning such kanuka/manuka, the land will be highly susceptible to erosion. The NZFRI report concludes: "It makes little sense, and certainly not conservation sense, to follow this course of action where other better options are available".

Vice-President Jolyon Manning, referring to Council's current review of the Institute's mission statement, has reiterated that the primary goals of the professional foresters are the promotion of excellence in forestry management in terms of both the care and stewardship of the inherited indigenous forests with their vital role in soil and water conservation, and the practice of good silvicultural principles in the pursuit of sustainable and productive commercial plantations.

If the forestry profession is to improve its still badly tarnished image with the general public, and I would also suggest its own self-image as a responsible professional body, it is essential that it does not compromise its principles. Surely, there is no way that the primary goals stated above can be regarded as incompatible with the undertakings accepted in the Forest Accord.

Multipurpose forestry, as first understood in parts of Europe, was probably the world's oldest environmental science. For too long politicians and others have tried to subvert it into an exploitative concept for achieving short-term and narrow objectives.

The Institute should sign the Forest Accord.

**Eric Bennett**

## The Forest Accord

Sir,

Ket Smith's note in the February issue on why the Institute should sign the Forest Accord is little more than a wimpish grovel to parlour-green soul salving.

The Accord is an agreement between parties whose members, on both sides, have clearcut objectives; they have agreed to stay off each other's turf and to get out of each other's hair in areas where they are most likely to fight. Fair enough; most of us would agree with that.

But the key factor is that the signatories on both sides are all large and prosperous, and both sides can sit back and bask in mutual admiration of their sensitivity without any great real cost to anyone.

We are now getting another view of the Accord, a view aptly described by the saying that when elephants fight small people get squashed; the Accord that we are asked to support is now being used as a hammer to bash down people who have no resources other than their land and who have so far been left on the fringes of society, bypassed by the benefits that the rest of us take for granted.

We have just, in the past few days, seen Tasman Forestry pull out of their reforestation agreement with Ngati Porou because of an inability to reach a compromise, in terms of the Accord, over what is kanuka and what is not. Ngati Porou have set aside 30% of their land as reserve, but a section of the conservationist movement, led by the Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society, say it must be 50%.

In justification, their official, Kevin Smith, said on national radio that there is plenty of other land outside tribal land which needs planting, and if they want work, Ngati Porou can go there. He also said that the Forest and Bird campaign would continue if they found some "foreign ratbag" as a partner in place of Tasman Forestry.

Now the Ngati Porou can of course carry on being hewers of wood and drawers of water for other people, as Mr Smith suggests, and of course they can continue as clients of the Department of Social Welfare and the Justice Department, but I gather that they would rather make more of their lives and stand on their own feet.

I support their efforts to do just that and I do not agree that this Institute (or

indeed any other organisation to which I belong) should be a party in any way to any agreement which leads to such arrogant, not to say racist behaviour.

As an individual I support the philosophy behind the Accord, as I imagine most members of the Institute do, and I see it as an excellent basis on which issues of conflict may be resolved.

Unfortunately it is clear that this is not the view of an influential group within the conservation movement, who seem to have a Serbian attitude that talk and agreement is merely a way of gaining time to bully.

Individuals are of course free to do as they think best, but the Institute itself should not be a party to the Forest Accord until there is more evidence than at present of the sense of community and social responsibility of some on the conservation side.

The decision to sign must be decided by a referendum of all members, not by Council or by a vote at the AGM.

**John Purey-Cust**

## Should the Institute sign the Forest Accord?

Sir,

Ket Bradshaw (Smith) referred in her article to "regenerating shrubland". This prompts two comments.

Firstly the "regenerating scrubland" mostly occurs on Conserved Land, conserved under Acts usually initiated by the (increasingly fondly remembered) NZ Forest Service.

Secondly much "regenerating scrubland" at present contains no individuals of New Zealand timber species that grow for a long time. If there are no individuals now, how will there ever be any "in the fullness of time"? That is unless such species are deliberately planted (the Conservation Lobby would hold "with malice aforethought"!).

**K.D. Marten**

## A call for legal redress

Sir,

By publishing that disgusting photo on page 6 of the last issue you have allowed the journal to descend to a new low.

It is bad enough when HRHs the