In his annual address for 1962 the President enjoined us to face certain responsibilities as members of this Institute; and incidentally resurrected the implications of an old question: "Do we aim at a professional society or one devoted primarily to narrower vocational interests?" Are we to attempt to achieve... "general recognition as the authoritative body where forestry matters are concerned... rendering good service not only to its members and to the cause of forestry, but also to the general well-being of the country as a whole?" Have we, even yet... "come out into the light of day to lead, as we should lead, lay thought in matters pertaining to forest management?"

Before it can achieve acceptance in this leadership, the Institute will however need clearly to define the meaning of forestry for New Zealand - to widen its horizons before it is too late, and in terms less stilted and noncommittal than those used by our Constitution. Some progress has been made recently by introducing the grade of affiliate membership, whereby those people influential in spheres allied to forestry may establish a recognized and mutually beneficial contact with the Institute. But more active measures are needed to redeem the popular identification of forestry with the history and practice of a government department charged with administering the later stages of what has been in effect the dissolution of New Zealand's indigenous forest estate: a dissolution which is apparently inevitable because dictated by all the pressures of economic and political expediency that such a department must suffer. Nevertheless, there is no such handicap attaching to this Institute, and it is time that we came... "out from behind the shadow of the civil service... to take the lead in moulding popular opinion." This leadership is most needed in those matters about which individual members who are public servants (and they form 75 percent of the total membership) must be most circumspect, because they are in one way or another politically weighted. It is in precisely these issues that sound forestry has suffered because of the lack of a vocal and technically competent counterpoise.

However if we adopt a narrow or equivocal definition, or revert to an inflexible professional posture, it will only trammel our ability to recognize and guide changing trends in forest use, and will generate repetitions of that same impasse of ineffectuality which

faced the Institute over the Waipoua Forest controversy, the National Parks movement, and over Nature Conservation. Only in the case of the Parliamentary Select Committee on Soil Conservation and Rivers Control was specific action taken. Over Forest Sanctuaries positive leadership was stultified by a semantic interpretation — simply ignoring a collective plea which was real enough, however unscientifically phrased.

If in the name of forestry we persistently refuse to champion these causes or, at least, wisely to support those who do, we abandon that one interest which above all others is fundamental for the forester. On it are founded his concepts of sustained yield; the rotation; multiple use; soil, water or wildlife conservation; and resource management. It is indeed so axiomatic that it is rarely stated, but without it his stewardship would itself ultimately become redundant — i.e. not to express a basic concern for the welfare of the forest, whatever its objects of management, is self-destructive. Moreover by allowing other organisations, however worthy their motives, to pre-empt the position vacated through our default, puts New Zealand forestry in an entirely false position. As early as 1945 one of our members drew attention, in a letter to the Editor, to the unnecessary hiatus between forestry and conservationist propaganda, which . . . "invariably has its origin in a genuine and deepfelt goodwill towards the forests. It is not only illogical that this general feeling of goodwill should be working against the forester instead of for him — it is also prejudicial to good forestry and, hence, to the nation as a whole".

It is therefore incumbent on each member not only, in the words of our President, to sell the productive and protective benefits of forestry — but also personally to demonstrate that efficient utilisation is only one aspect of sustained yield, precluding waste and decay; that management can create harmony and not monotony; that fruitfulness is more beautiful than senescence; that wildlife habitats are not static but cyclic; that the ugly measures often necessitated by short-term expediency should be visualized within the time-scale of the rotation; and that when the Institute speaks of forest management it does not mean “planned exploitation”.

Finally, we may individually cogitate on the theme that while forests should be permanent, their objects of management are not.

The Authority for Professional Criticism — Inside or Outside?

The late Owen Jones, in his presidential address for 1948, commented that at the Institute's inception the proposed additional words . . . "by encouraging achievement in the science of forestry, by creating opportunity for an interchange of views upon forestry and allied subjects, and by fostering a spirit of comradeship among
foresters” were omitted from the final draft of our Constitution — and he regretted the omission. It is interesting to note that a paraphrase of the excluded words is still included under paragraph 24, dealing with the formation of Local Sections; and in some Local Sections at least there is animated and mutually fruitful discussion. Can the same be truly said of our Institute’s annual meeting?

The mental dichotomy evident in many Institute members, who are employed by one or other of the few large forestry organisations, tends to cause undue restraint in our debates. This same dichotomy places on the senior members of the Institute a heavy responsibility to see that conflicting loyalties do not detract from the Institute’s effectiveness. We must all remember the warning words of Professor H. H. Chapman of Yale and this Institute: “No profession can survive as such when its ideas are regimented by the authority of any organisation, and no society, representing a profession, can hold the respect of its members when freedom of discussion or criticism is banished.”

It is no doubt difficult for those who are aware of the underlying policy decisions influencing management to listen to uninformed or only partly relevant comment from their juniors. However, if the annual conference is to fulfil its functions, all members must be free to present their ideas as they see fit; and must in turn respect that freedom of discussion which is necessary for the very justification of an Institute.

The very blunt words of Professor Chapman are most relevant today; they should be read and taken to heart by all who are dedicated to their profession. There is much to do and much to put right. Only through the free interchange of ideas in open discussion, and by the one form of worthwhile censorship — the discipline of criticism by informed colleagues in open debate — can we forge truly a science of New Zealand forestry. Without such a science, forestry could become a subordinate industry and remain an insignificant profession. Its evolution depends upon our foresight.

Our Contribution to International Forestry

A few years ago there was a feeling that New Zealand was outside the main current of events and developments in forestry at the international level and that the contributions it could make to the activities of the Forestry and Forest Products Division of the Food and Agricultural Organisation were limited. Reports were made to F.A.O. about what was going on here and information about progress elsewhere was received, but these were regarded as the normal obligations and benefits consequent on membership of the Organisation. Representatives also attended conferences of varying importance and interest but of limited direct benefit.

More recently, there has been a marked change of attitude, dating perhaps from the attendance of a strong delegation at the Asia
Pacific Forestry Commission meeting in New Delhi in 1960. The report of this meeting took the unusual course of recording a direct recommendation to New Zealand to make land available to increase its afforestation programme and hence its contribution to the wood supplies of the Asia-Pacific region. At the same meeting, interest was aroused in countries of South East Asia in what has been achieved here. As a consequence, there has since been a steady flow of visitors, under the sponsorship of various international assistance schemes, seeking to benefit from our experience.

At the same time New Zealand personnel have obtained a firmer footing in the forestry projects of the Expanded Technical Assistance Programme of F.A.O. — one officer having recently completed an assignment and another just begun a three year deputation. Their services are not easily spared but it is felt that they not only give good value in the international field but will also bring back to New Zealand experience which will be to our ultimate gain; a fact that is to be taken into account when further technical help is sought by other member countries. Requests for it are likely to arise as a result of the meeting, scheduled for 1964, of the Asia-Pacific Commission in New Zealand, an event to which foresters will look forward with much interest.

The Tenth Pacific Science Congress, Honolulu, Hawaii, 1961

This mammoth conference attracted well over 2,000 delegates to its 18 sections, in which about 900 papers were presented, many of them at the 142 symposia.

The accent was on the natural sciences, and foresters could not complain of inadequate representation. The forestry sections were forest biology, forest management and forest products. Symposia were held on the organisation and development of research in forestry in the Pacific region, animal-forest relationships, study of forest regeneration, tree improvement, forest fire research, forest growth studies, forest inventories and ligno-cellulose chemistry. Most of the 62 forestry papers were presented at these symposia. There were also sections allied to forestry: soil science, botany, conservation, zoology and entomology.

Many of the forestry papers were valuable. A few were stimulating and thought provoking. Among the latter was Cromer’s “Developments in the Study of Initial Spacing and Growth” in which he described “correlated curve trend experiments” and the use of equal numbers of trees instead of equal areas for unit plots. Fon’s “Use of Models to Study Forest-Fire Behaviour” was also impressive and revealed the fabulous resources which some of these workers possess. But many papers were only dull chronicles of progress made and some of the symposia were mental marathons. There was too little time for discussion and argument. Delegates
would have been served better if there had been fewer papers and if the papers had been distributed some weeks before the Congress.

The symposium on animal-forest relationships enlivened proceedings with two jousts between conservationists and sportsmen: representatives of the N.Z. Deerstalkers Association and the N.Z. Forest Service in one, and Hawaiian botanists and Hawaiian game managers in another. The latter controversy arose over the destruction of native Hawaiian forest by wild sheep, which are regarded as game animals. The argument of the game manager was revealing. He invoked the almost inviolable concept of multiple use, and emphasized the political impossibility of suddenly destroying a game resource on which thousands of hunters were dependent.

The post Congress tours were, by all accounts, magnificent but expensive. The few shorter expeditions were full of interest and provided vivid impressions of the sprawling luxuriance of the Metrosideros-dominant indigenous forest, rather similar in appearance to mixed-hardwood montane forest in New Zealand. Impressive too was the growth rate of recently planted exotic species on skeletal basaltic soils — among them Eucalyptus botryoides growing one foot in height per month and Cedrela three to five inches in diameter at three years of age.

There was a commendable political motive at Honolulu. Among the delegates were many from under-developed countries and they received attentive hearing. More important, they received considerable benefit from countries more advanced in science through both formal papers and informal discussion. It was especially noticeable that those under-developed countries which had received American aid were much more advanced than those which had not been so fortunate.

Attendance at the Congress was a stimulating experience: compelling our delegates to lose their preoccupation with forestry problems in New Zealand and to think about forestry on an international plane. In the Pacific region there are many countries less advanced than New Zealand, and in many aspects of forestry New Zealand ranks amongst the leaders. There is obligation for New Zealand foresters to become more aware of and more involved in Pacific forestry and to strive to assist those countries where forestry is at an early stage of development. Our motives need not be wholly altruistic, for many potential markets lie to the north.

Farm Forestry Loans

At the annual meeting of the N.Z. Farm Forestry Association at Timaru in April, the Minister of Forests announced a scheme of Government loans to promote forestry on farms. It is apparent that the national objective of a second million acres of exotic forest by the year 2000 and a third million by 2025 cannot be achieved within
the pattern of large State and company forests which make up the
bulk of the first million acres. These forests were established on
land that was sub-marginal by the farming standards of the nineteen-
twenties and -thirties. But, since World War II, farming and forestry
have come into increasing competition for land previously incapable
of development, and much of the additional forest will have to be
found by fuller utilization of land within regions already devoted
to farming. It has been suggested that farm and other private forestry
might contribute 400,000 acres of the million needed by the end of
the century.

Most foresters will already know the details of the scheme, which
will be reviewed after 5 years. In brief:

* Maximum loans £25 per acre for establishment
  £15 per acre for tending.

* Simple interest at 5 percent per annum.

* Repayment, under a 20-year table mortgage, after 20 years or
  the first year of realization, whichever is the sooner.

* Subject to satisfactory establishment and treatment, half of the
  loan may be remitted before repayment commences.

* Minimum area to qualify 5 acres; maximum area 20 acres, or
  100 acres over a five-year period.

In the financial year 1962/63 tending loans only will be available,
to a limit of 2000 acres or £30,000; thereafter the sum available
for planting and tending will increase progressively to £250,000 in
1966/67. Locality in relation to existing or potential markets is
stated to be the main consideration in determining priorities for
loans, but provision of secondary benefits such as noxious weed
control, soil stabilization, water regulation and (provided it is not
part of normal farm management) the provision of shade and
shelter will be taken into account.

The broadening of the base of our exotic forest economy is
desirable, indeed inevitable; but, in the process, there will be many
difficulties to be surmounted. Notwithstanding the good work of the
farm forestry associations there is still a lack of understanding
among farmers of the principles of growing and marketing a forest
crop. New Zealand forestry is already suffering a serious shortage
of trained personnel and it will be necessary to spread the available
men dangerously thin to ensure that farm forestry is soundly
planned and efficiently executed. Merely to prescribe the routine
procedures of large scale forestry will not suffice for the much more
varied circumstances of farm forestry. Ultimately this field will no
doubt be covered by consultants and foresters employed by farm
forestry associations, but meanwhile a heavy burden will be placed
on Forest Service officers who traditionally are more at home practic­
ing forestry than in the passive role of advising, inspecting, and
certifying.
Few will gainsay the need to get forestry on to the farms; but are there not other landowners also warranting Government assistance? An increasing number of sawmillers are seeking to provide their own forests near their markets; many local authorities hold land near centres of consumption and might be encouraged to contribute to the national requirements while building up an asset for their local community.

More "Negative Stumpage"?

Commendable as may be the objective of the recently announced farm forestry loans, there is one important aspect of forestry in the farm economy which it does not solve, which it considers only obliquely, and which it may even aggravate.

The anomaly is involved in the fact that for every farmer who is at present able to sell his standing timber at a profit there must be at least three who cannot. Rationalize this as we may, in terms of neglected silviculture, it is recognized by all — farmers as well as foresters — and for the latter to persist with their appeal to “plant more trees”, in face of the fact, invites comment upon our sincerity or our sense of economic realities. It is particularly unfortunate when, as frequently happens, the interpreted judgement is allied with the small timber-owner’s bitter experience to destroy sound plans for large-scale afforestation. The forester’s valid defence that the cases are not comparable will fall on deaf ears.

Fundamentally, many farmers who have grown timber are today faced with a problem of “negative stumpage”: caused by limited local outlets for unprocessed produce, the fixed charges of moving logging equipment to small parcels of timber, and the increasing burden of cartage as distance from conversion plant increases. The latter charges are variously computed as ranging from twopence per cubic foot for the first five miles, plus a penny for each ten miles thereafter on large-scale logging operations, or approximately 1½d for regular cartage contracts (e.g. the Japanese log trade), to as much as 3d per cu.ft for every ten miles by casual contractors. The latter is the rate the small timber-owner normally has to pay, so that outside a range of 50 miles from the sawmill his timber is a liability — he can neither sell it nor does it pay him to have it milled for his own use.

It is sometimes argued that this state of things is a temporary phenomenon, and will improve as the projected timber deficit forces merchants and millers to pay higher stumpages. The dangers for the small timber-grower that are inherent in this assumption were discussed in an editorial last year. Our immediate concern is that the farm forestry loans do not solve the problem of negative stumpage: in fact they could very easily magnify it by encouraging the planting of farmlands beyond the limit of zero stumpage, while
at the same time obscuring the real problem behind a smoke-screen of rebates.

What then is the solution? Clearly it must lie in turning the handicaps of isolation to positive advantage, by on-site conversion; thus eliminating cartage on all local timber-needs. This is already becoming common practice for small round-produce; but several farmers have already looked beyond this, by attempting to develop their own units for converting logs into sawn battens, boards and scantling. However, such local attempts are clearly beyond individual resource and a solid case can be put forward for the State to allocate the necessary engineering and technical skills to develop, or adapt from the several portable sawmills available overseas, a unit to meet the specifications for farm forestry in New Zealand. Once the initial development is completed there would obviously be great opportunities for promotion and for co-operative ownership by individual farm forestry associations.

New Zealand Hydrological Society

The recent formation of a New Zealand Hydrological Society is welcomed. Various organisations have shown for some time an increasing and vital concern for the water resources of this country. Public awareness of their value, and of their menace if uncontrolled, is developing. Forestry and hydrology are inevitably associated. It is therefore not surprising that several of our own members are also members of the new Society. These include the editor of the Journal of Hydrology, the first issue of which appeared in June of this year.

We wish the New Zealand Hydrological Society and its Journal every success.