REPORTS

CONTROL OF NOXIOUS ANIMALS

A Select Committee of the House of Representatives was appointed at the end of 1963 by the Prime Minister, with the following order of reference:

To consider:

(1) The provisions of the Noxious Animals Act 1956 with particular reference to the control of all species of deer;

(2) The question of keeping deer in captivity for the purpose of establishing an export industry in venison, or for game management;

(3) The development of private hunting in the control of deer and other animals covered by the Noxious Animals Act;

(4) The expressed provisions of the National Parks Act 1952 and the Noxious Animals Act 1956 in relation to control of noxious animals in National Parks.

There follows an account of the evidence submitted to date by appointed representatives of the Institute of Foresters.

2 March 1964
Wellington

The Chairman,
Land & Agriculture Select Committee,
Parliament House,
Wellington.

Dear Sir,

The N.Z. Institute of Foresters is an incorporated society whose 400 members include most professional and sub-professional foresters in New Zealand, whether they are in the employ of Government departments, local bodies, afforestation companies or forest-based industries. It is an independent body having no constitutional connection with the New Zealand Forest Service or with any other Department of State.

The brief evidence which the Institute wishes to submit on each item of the terms of reference of this Committee will be prefaced by a few comments on general principles.

The practice of forestry involves the administration not only of forests but also of the land on which the forests grow. Forests are more than trees; they are complicated and interwoven mixtures of soil, water, trees, other types of vegetation, and animal life. It is a basic principle of forestry that the inter-relationships between these constituent parts of a forest must be studied and understood and that their complexities must be recognized. Man's impact on any one of the factors which go to make up or influence a forest will in one way or another inevitably react on some or all of the other factors. Foresters therefore have learnt that policy and administration decisions cannot be taken without looking at the forest as a
whole. Unless this is done, forest deterioration or forest destruction will result, as was almost universally the case before the lesson was learnt. If the lesson is forgotten today, or ignored, the result can only be another era of forest degradation. The relevance to the present inquiry is the fact that the control of animals in forests is only one aspect of the complex business of forest management. In New Zealand it is a particularly important one by reason of the extreme vulnerability of the forests and the great potential for damage presented by introduced grazing and browsing animals.

Forests are managed to create and perpetuate certain values, of which the main ones are the production of timber and other forest products; the protection of soil and the regulation of water flow—both leading to amelioration of flooding and of soil erosion; and the provision of scenic and recreational amenities. In some countries, other important values are the maintenance of habitat for sporting or for fur-bearing animals, and the provision of grazing for domestic stock. It is another basic principle of forestry that forests should be managed so that these values can be sustained in perpetuity; and this is as much true for the protection and amenity values as it is for those of timber production. The forester's mission in life is to so administer the forests under his control that they can be passed on to future generations with their important values unimpaired. His ideal goes even further—to leave the forests in a better and healthier and more productive condition than they were when he first assumed control. He cannot do this if any action is taken, or permitted, which jeopardizes future as well as present values. Specifically, a forester in New Zealand cannot ensure that the benefits of protection forests are sustained in perpetuity unless he has it in his power to counteract any process which would nullify these benefits. The grazing and browsing of noxious animals constitutes just such a process.

The third principle to be mentioned is that concerned with the philosophy of multiple use. Multiple use may be defined as that type of management which seeks to obtain the maximum volume and range of values that the land is capable of producing, provided always these values are compatible in combination and can be permanently sustained. It will generally be found that each forest area serves a particular purpose while at the same time it may fulfill one or more ancillary functions. Examples are protection forests—their primary purpose soil and water conservation but widely used for recreation. Or again, production forests managed primarily for their timber yield can also provide shelter and grazing for domestic stock. But the cardinal principle of multiple use is that the major object of management must be considered paramount, and other uses permitted only if they do not conflict with the major one. The relevance of this principle to the present context needs little elaboration; animals can be permitted or encouraged in forests only to the extent that they do not affect protection or production values when these values are the higher and more important ones.

The Institute does not intend to submit detailed evidence of the damage which introduced animals are doing, or have the potential to do, to protection and production forests in New Zealand. The extent of this damage is generally recognized by all knowledgeable people throughout the country and is probably well enough known
to the members of this Committee. The Institute does, however, suggest that the above principles are all relevant and should be taken into account when the Committee considers the four items of its terms of reference.

The Institute's specific comments on these items are as follows:

1. The Institute sees no reason to amend any of the major provisions of the Noxious Animals Act 1956. The most important operative provision is that the Minister of Forests is given discretionary power to control and eradicate deer and other prescribed noxious animals. His is the responsibility to decide when and where control measures are necessary and then to have them carried out. The vesting of this responsibility in the Minister of Forests and through him to trained forest officers is an indication that the Act implicitly recognizes the principles which have been enunciated above. The Institute is not concerned with the details of the Act or its administration; its only concern is that the legislation should make it possible for foresters to manage the lands under their control for the greatest long-term good of the nation as a whole and on a sustained yield basis. Read in conjunction with other legislation, the Noxious Animals Act achieves this. The Institute would oppose any suggestion that the Minister's powers should be curtailed in such a way that one sector of the community, or one particular group of forest users, would be able to further its own narrow or sectional interest at the expense of the general good.

2. There is no objection to keeping non-breeding animals in captivity for display purposes and some will doubtless have to be kept for reasons of research. At this stage the Institute would strongly oppose allowing animals to be bred in captivity for game management as this pre-supposes that there will be game management of wild herds. In the future, it may be possible to select some areas in New Zealand which have no other important uses or values (whether on-site or off-site), and to allocate these areas specifically to the management of game. But before this can be done we must know much more than we do now about the dynamics of animal populations, about desired levels of control and how to recognize them, about how these levels can then be maintained, and above all about the natural or induced spread of animals from one area to another. We do not have this information today and it will take many years of patient research to gain it. Until we know these things it would be unwise to encourage the deliberate maintenance of herds in "safe" areas, whilst at the same time having to face up to the expenditure of an unknown sum of money to prevent the spread of animals into areas where damage is or could be serious. The concept of game management is thus premature in New Zealand; even more so, then, is the suggestion to breed animals in captivity for this specific purpose.

The idea of farming deer in enclosures for meat production would appear to be so impractical as not to merit any comment at all.

3. The Institute believes that private hunters should be encouraged to the maximum extent possible. In some countries with larger populations than New Zealand and in which deer and other animals are more in balance with their environment, the manipulation of
private hunting pressure has been successful in achieving the desired measure of control. As yet, this has happened only to an insignificant extent in New Zealand. Most private hunting is confined to relatively accessible areas; private hunters just do not operate in sufficient numbers throughout remote back-country areas to exercise any real influence on animal numbers. The situation will change as better access is provided; the Institute understands that it is accepted Government policy to provide such access. The important point once again is that the administration of animal control measures must be in the hands of those responsible for the management of the land and the implementation of the relevant legislation. Private hunters are interested in shooting either for sport or for profit and are not interested in exercising control per se. They can still do a useful and increasingly important job; provided that their activities are guided and directed by the appropriate administering authorities, they should be given all possible encouragement and assistance.

4. The principles of animal control apply as much to National Parks as to land in other tenures but there is one important difference. The National Parks Act states that as far as possible indigenous vegetation will be preserved in its natural state and exotic vegetation eliminated, and as far as possible all introduced animals will be exterminated. It is quite impossible to maintain indigenous vegetation completely in its natural state in the presence of introduced animals and therefore if the Act is to be fully implemented, there is no alternative to the extermination of noxious animals within National Parks and their surroundings. As complete extermination is generally held to be impracticable, the National Parks Act is a particularly difficult one to administer.

The Institute does not wish here to submit its views on National Parks policy as such. It is concerned merely with stressing the point that as long as the National Parks Act is worded as it is then a policy directed towards complete extermination of noxious animals within Parks is quite logical. Since organized sportsmen are naturally completely antagonistic to extermination, it would be at variance with this policy for them to exert any influence on animal control measures. Considering the wording of the Act, of all types of land tenure, National Parks are the last on which the responsibility for noxious animal control should pass from the properly constituted authority. The Institute understands that, in practice, and despite the rigid provisions of the Act, it is found desirable from the national point of view to concentrate animal control measures on other areas where much greater damage is being done and where more tangible values have to be protected. New Zealand has not got the manpower nor could it afford the money to control noxious animals in the critically important river catchments and at the same time exterminate them in National Parks. National priorities override the provisions of the National Parks Act. This situation gives even further point to the desirability of using private hunting pressure to the utmost; there is so much to be done that all those ready and able to help should be given full encouragement.

If it is ever decided that, on a given piece of National Park land, National Park values to the country as a whole are less than those
which would accrue to deerstalkers as a result of a policy of permissive game management, then the logical solution would be to change the tenure of the land. For various reasons, the Institute could not at present recommend such a course, the most pertinent "animal" reason being the fact (already mentioned) that we do not at present know whether it will ever be possible or practicable to control the spread of animals from areas where they are allowed to areas where they are not.

Finally, the Institute would like to quote two excerpts from its own publication the *N.Z. Journal of Forestry*. Both appeared in the 1959 number, and both were commenting on the 1958 Noxious Animal Conference. The first, from a Presidential address, is as follows:

During the past year much publicity was aroused over the question of noxious animals and their impact on the New Zealand way of life. This culminated in a meeting, convened by the Minister of Forests, whereat all organizations having any interest in noxious animals and allied wildlife matters were invited to express their views. It is a curious manifestation of our times that despite an official policy which aims uncompromisingly—perhaps unrealistically—at total extermination, and about which, it is said to the credit of our legislators, there has never been the slightest political cleavage, no latter-day subject is more fruitful of controversy than noxious animals. Their great sporting and economic potential, their utter harmlessness, or even benefit to protection forest and mountain vegetation, the barbarity of poisoning and its dire implications for avian and human life, the futility and ineptitude of official control measures—these and similar matters have been dilated upon in word, print, and colour slide by an articulate and sophisticated minority composed almost wholly of organized deerstalkers. Objective evidence, based on investigation by trained ecologists, and rarely confirming the asseverations of the sporting interests, has naturally been slower in filtering out to the public. By providing a venue for assembling and disseminating the known facts, and, no less important, for debunking many widely publicized fallacies, the Minister of Forests has assisted materially in giving the taxpayer at large an opportunity to view New Zealand's noxious-animals problem in its correct perspective.

The second excerpt took the form of an Editorial Note. It reads:

Since the early days of settlement in New Zealand some sporting bodies have had a large voice in the importation and subsequent management of wild animals. And the same sporting bodies have always been to the fore in expressing their views on the complex situation created by many of these introduced animal species increasing to the pest stage. Public opinion was undoubtedly influenced by many seemingly authoritative pronouncements on the subject by sporting bodies, one result being that the very real problem of wild animals out of control has been consistently underestimated. This was reflected in a marked reluctance on the part of governments to get down to earth, to study the situation objectively, or to institute adequate control measures.

From the time that responsibility for those animals labelled "noxious" was transferred to the Forest Service, some deerstalkers have conducted a harrying campaign. This reached a crescendo following an announcement that compound 1080 would be used in the experimental control of fallow deer in the Caples Valley at the head of Lake Wakatipu. Deliberately misleading statements were a feature of this campaign, which was remarkably successful in confusing the public and throwing the whole question of noxious animals and their control into the melting pot.

The Minister of Forests, the Hon. E. T. Tirikatene, did the country a good service when he retrieved the situation by calling a meeting of all
interested parties. Prepared statements were read and circulated, and a
day was spent discussing the main matters at issue. For the first time a
summary was given of all the evidence accumulated by the National
Forest Survey and the Forest and Range Survey of the Forest Service
on the effects of browsing animals on protective vegetation. Under the
expert chairmanship of the Minister all had a fair hearing, and it was
noteworthy that no loose statement went unchallenged.

It speaks volumes for the common sense of New Zealanders that the
results of the meeting were decisive. Ample evidence supported the belief
that there is a problem, and one of great magnitude and complexity.
Whatever part sport may ultimately play, it has little or no effect in con-
trolling animals now. Government hunting has dealt with some animals
only. It has made a real contribution towards clearing animal pests from
pastoral country but not from the mountain forests so vital to the welfare
of the lowlands. It is apparent that impetus must be given to control
measures, but above all there is need for greatly expanded investigations.
Compound 1080 was recognized to be a legitimate tool for use in control
of noxious animals; this was admitted even by some to whom its use
was abhorrent.

... It would be a matter for concern should any sporting body, by
virtue of its interest in a few animal species, be permitted to dictate
Government policy in respect to animal pests.

A. P. THOMSON,
President, N.Z. Institute of Foresters Inc.

* * *

Thursday, 23 April 1964

The Committee resumed at 9 a.m.
Evidence was taken during the day from:

Mr A. P. Thomson and Mr J. G. Groome (New Zealand Institute
of Foresters).

Mr J. G. Groome (Taupo Ski Club Incorporated).

Mr E. A. Batson and Mr J. L. Porter (Hawke's Bay Catchment
Board).

Mr G. H. Blundell and Mr M. King (Wairarapa Catchment
Board).

Mr D. A. Campbell (Soil Conservation and Rivers Control
Council).

New Zealand Institute of Foresters and Taupo Ski Club

The evidence from these two organizations was taken together.
Submission No. 4 was read by Mr J. G. Groome, on behalf of the
New Zealand Institute of Foresters, with the following interpolation
at the end of section 2 on page 2, after the sentence, "The idea of
farming deer in enclosures for meat production would appear to be
so impractical as not to merit any comment at all."

"This remark is made on the assumption that farmable and easily
fenceable land will not be transferred from sheep or cattle produc-
tion. If it is, or if areas could be found which were unsuitable for
sheep or cattle farming and did not constitute a danger to water-
holding capacity, the Institute would consider those areas might be
suitable for deer farming. However, the costs and difficulties of
fencing and maintaining the fences on the only sort of land that is likely to be available—steep remote country with no agricultural potential—would probably be so great as to render the proposition hopelessly uneconomic. There would also be very great difficulties in selecting areas of land which could be grazed by deer without detrimental effects on protection and water regulation values.”

Submission No. 43 was read by Mr J. G. Groome, on behalf of the Taupo Ski Club Incorporated.

Hon. R. G. GERARD asked whether the Committee was to take the written submission on page 2 regarding the impracticability of deer farming or the verbal interpolation.

Mr GROOME said if areas could be found which were useless for sheep or cattle farming and which were not a danger to erosion, the Institute would change its policy, but it knew of no such areas at the moment.

Mr DICK asked if the Institute was opposed to browsing animals, including domestic stock, in forests.

Mr GROOME said, No, not completely opposed. He understood that overseas animals in range conditions were used to a large extent, both to the benefit of forests and to extend range grazing.

Mr DICK asked if Mr Groome thought it would be possible to find areas in New Zealand which were not suitable for grazing sheep and cattle but which would be suitable for grazing deer without detriment to the country.

Mr GROOME said that as yet the case for higher returns from grazing deer than from cattle had not been proved, and therefore if cattle could be grazed it was better policy from the national point of view.

Hon. Sir ERUERA TIRIKATENE asked whether local body and private industry foresters were part of the Institute.

Mr GROOME said, Yes, at least a third of the membership. He thought there were two affiliate members who were millers and also forest owners. There were also members of the Forest Service in a private capacity.

Hon. Sir ERUERA TIRIKATENE asked if the Institute wanted an acceleration along the lines of its submissions.

Mr GROOME said, Yes. The Institute’s main criticism of the Forest Service was that it did not publicize its work enough. The general public should be made aware of the problem and of its effects.

Hon. Sir ERUERA TIRIKATENE, referring to the statement, “In some countries other important values are the maintenance of habitat for sporting or for fur-bearing animals, and the provision of grazing for domestic stock”, asked if that point might be arrived at in New Zealand.

Mr GROOME said it might be possible in some production forests, but on the steeper country the effect of soil compaction by hooves would probably preclude it.

Hon. Sir ERUERA TIRIKATENE said the grazing and browsing of noxious animals was referred to as a process which could nullify the benefits of protection forests. Did the Institute believe in their reduction or perhaps removal?

Mr GROOME said, No. The Institute was not bound to follow Government policy. It believed there should be some tolerance of
animals in forests, but they had to be at a level which allowed the vegetation to be maintained.

Hon. Sir ERUERA TIRIKATENE asked if Mr Groome could elaborate the thinking of the Institute on the statement, "animals can be permitted or encouraged in forests only to the extent that they do not affect protection or production values when these values are the higher and more important ones."

Mr GROOME said there were some areas where the mountain topography was not so steep and the erosion problems not so severe, and if those areas could be separated in some way from the critical areas, although he could not suggest how it could be done, the Institute would tolerate animal herds to a certain extent in those safer areas.

Hon. Sir ERUERA TIRIKATENE asked if Mr Groome considered the relations of the Institute with the Deerstalkers Association were reasonable. Was the liaison good?

Mr GROOME said, Yes.

Hon. Sir ERUERA TIRIKATENE asked if any members of the Association were in the Institute.

Mr GROOME said be believed there was one.

Hon. Sir ERUERA TIRIKATENE asked if the Institute had had any discussions with any commercial enterprise.

Mr GROOME said, No. He had had discussions with the hunters supplying the meat, but not with the operators themselves.

Mr GRIEVE asked if Mr Groome considered deer caused more erosion than rainfall or frosts.

Mr GROOME said the introduced animals added to the effects of frost and rainfall which had always been present, and in many parts of New Zealand they caused more.

Mr GRIEVE asked if the interpolation in the submission was the result of what Mr Groome had heard at the hearing yesterday.

Mr GROOME said, No. He felt he should explain how the submission had been drawn up. The council of the Institute had started work on it before Christmas, when Mr Thomson had asked for the opinions of council members. He had then compiled a statement and called a meeting, about five weeks ago, at which the wording had been thrashed out. Since then great stress had been laid on the farming of deer for meat production, and the Institute felt it should say something about it.

Mr GRIEVE asked if the Institute had had anything to do with the proposed eradication of the Virginia deer in the Wakatipu area.

Mr GROOME said, No, that had never been discussed at Institute meetings.

Mr GRIEVE asked if the Institute would be in favour of not exterminating those deer.

Mr GROOME said, as an Institute, No; individually they would be.

Mr GRIEVE asked if the Institute would still not agree even if the Deerstalkers Association proved it could adequately control them at no cost to the country.

Mr GROOME said the Deerstalkers Association had not proved to his satisfaction or the Institute's that it could exercise adequate control in any area.

Mr THOMSON said the Institute as such had not considered any one individual herd and whether or not its control could be carried
out by any constituted authority. The Institute had endeavoured to confine its remarks to the principles, and he could not answer on its behalf regarding the Virginia deer.

Mr GRIEVE, referring to the submission by the Taupo Ski Club, suggested that ski clubs operated on slopes covered with snow and so would not be interested in the flora and fauna.

Mr GROOME said many ski clubs comprised among their members trampers. He had been up the mountain last weekend and there had been no snow.

Mr PICKERING, referring to the submission regarding game management on page 2, section 2, asked if the Institute had been aware of Mr Holloway's opinion when that submission had been drawn up.

Mr THOMSON said, No, at the time of making that statement he had not seen Mr Holloway's statement nor discussed it with him.

Mr PICKERING, referring to the statement on page 4 that deliberately misleading statements had been a feature of the campaign following the introduction of 1080, asked, what kind of misleading statements?

Mr THOMSON said all the evidence was in the proceedings of that conference. Going on memory, the statements had been of the sort that even a modest application of 1080 for a specific narrow control purpose would completely pollute all the water running out of that catchment, despite the evidence from Mr McIntosh and the toxicologists to the contrary. There had been statements that the vegetation would be poisoned and future generations of animals would die, despite all scientific evidence to the contrary. At the time it had been considered fair to say that statements of that sort had been deliberately misleading.

Mr PICKERING asked if the Institute agreed with the findings of the meeting which had been called by the then Minister of Forests.

Mr THOMSON said he did not think the Institute, as a body, had ever gone through the findings one by one, but the fact that the President in his presidential address had made those remarks and the editor of the Journal of Forestry, which generally but not necessarily reflected Institute policy, had made those comments indicated that by and large the rank and file of the Institute did agree with those findings.

Mr PICKERING asked if the Institute considered those findings were still valid.

Mr THOMSON said he knew of nothing which altered any one of them.

Mr McCREADY asked what was the overall membership of the Federated Mountain Clubs.

Mr GROOME said the last annual report had shown approximately 11,000, with 3,000 in branches of the Deerstalkers Association, making a total of 14,000.

Mr McCREADY said the Deerstalkers Association had claimed to have a membership of nearly 10,000.

Mr GROOME said all the branches might not be affiliated to the Federated Mountain Clubs.

Mr McCREADY suggested that the ski clubs might be more interested in their sport than in the overall interests of New Zealand.
Mr GROOME said they were vitally interested in the parks in which they skied as well as in the actual sport.

Mr McCREADY asked Mr Thomson to comment on the statement in the submission by the Institute of Foresters, "The idea of farming deer in enclosures for meat production would appear to be so impractical as not to merit any comment at all."

Mr THOMSON said that when that had been written the Institute had had no knowledge of the detailed proposals which would be put forward. In view of those, it was considered that the statement was too blunt. The statement had been made on the assumption that no farmable and easily fenceable country would be allowed to go out of sheep or cattle production and that the intention was to farm bush country. However, it would still be the view of the Institute that the cost of fencing and maintaining those fences on that type of country would be prohibitive, and therefore the Institute had considered it was so impracticable as not to merit any comment at all.

Mr McCREADY said one witness had given evidence that his organization had built up an export trade worth some £500,000. One could assume they were men of business who would not have gone into it lightly.

Mr THOMSON said he did not think they had produced any evidence that they had had any experience of the costs and difficulties of erecting deer-proof fences.

Mr McCREADY said it was their money.

Mr THOMSON said that, in the opinion of the Institute, they would be investing their money unwisely.

Mr McCREADY asked if the Institute had gone into any details.

Mr THOMSON said, No.

Mr McCREADY suggested that the Institute's opinion was an uninformed one.

Mr THOMSON said, No. The Institute had available to it the details of one of the deer-proof fences which had been erected in forest country in New Zealand, and it knew something of the costs and difficulties. He could not accept that it was an uninformed opinion.

Mr WHITEHEAD asked if the 400 members of the Institute had had a say in the drafting of the submission.

Mr THOMSON said, No. The Institute usually appointed a committee to deal with matters such as that, but, as it had not been known when the hearing would be held, they had not thought there would be time to form a committee, and so the council had done it and sent it to some members for comments.

Mr WHITEHEAD asked how many were on the council.

Mr THOMSON said there were the President, the Vice-President, a council of four, and a secretary and treasurer.

Mr WHITEHEAD asked if he could take it from the submission that the Institute believed the noxious animal population could not be controlled.

Mr THOMSON said he did not think there was anything in the submission that would suggest it could not be controlled. There had been no intention to make that suggestion. The Institute considered it could be controlled with proper measures.
Mr WHITEHEAD asked if there was sufficient liaison between organized private hunters and the Forest Service to ensure control.

Mr GROOME said he believed every assistance was given by the Forest Service in particular, and other Government departments, to organized bodies, especially the Deerstalkers Association, which had rules to guide it.

Mr WHITEHEAD asked if the Institute was definite in its opinion that the native flora and fauna should be preserved.

Mr GROOME said, Yes, because of erosion and for the perpetuation of the forests themselves.

Mr WHITEHEAD asked if the Institute had considered the introduction of other types of trees to help to combat the erosion problem.

Mr GROOME said it would be very expensive, and in many areas there would be a public reaction against such introduction.

Mr WHITEHEAD asked if gorse would help with the problem of erosion.

Mr GROOME said any plant which had been proved to be a weed would have to be carefully looked at. The forest and range experiment people were looking at every possible plant, and one of their main worries would be that it might endanger other land.

Mr WHITEHEAD asked if the Institute preferred the natural forest to the exotic, even where the latter could assist with the erosion problem and also provide a useful crop.

Mr THOMSON said that, as foresters, their view was that, whether exotic or indigenous, if it could be grown it should be used.

Mr WHITEHEAD asked if, in view of the evidence which had been given about compaction, the Institute would limit the number of people going into the natural forests.

Mr THOMSON said that, except for a few places such as around kauri trees where that had happened, he would say, No.

Mr GROOME said the pressure of a tramping boot was not the same as that of a cloven hoof.

Mr WHITEHEAD said reference was made in the submission to man's impact on the forests and how he had spoilt them. In some cases man had improved the forest. The Forest Service said the beech forests were improved by taking some of the trees out. It was not just a matter of leaving them as they were.

Mr THOMSON said there was no suggestion implicit in the submission that forests should be left as they were. Forest management was not necessarily passive.

Mr WHITEHEAD asked if the Institute would want to control millers completely.

Mr THOMSON said, Yes. The control of the axe in forests was a fundamental principle of forestry the world over.

Mr WHITEHEAD asked if the Institute would like to see the Forest Service take out all the trees and sell them to the millers.

Mr THOMSON said he did not know the majority view of the Institute, but there were good arguments in favour of that course.

Mr WHITEHEAD said he took it the Institute could have changed its views since the 1958 conference.

Mr GROOME said different views applied in different areas, and the results of research should indicate how each area should be treated.
Mr WHITEHEAD asked if the Institute was definite that the Minister should face his responsibility through his own trained forest officers.

Mr GROOME said, Yes. It was through the Minister's authority that the foresters themselves had some authority in their forests.

Mr WHITEHEAD asked if that could be given to anyone else.

Mr GROOME said, No, and the Institute would strongly oppose it.

Mr WHITEHEAD asked if any areas could be given to private people to operate.

Mr GROOME said, No, they should have no authority, particularly in National Parks.

Mr WHITEHEAD asked whether there could not be more co-ordination of private hunters instead of envisaging that it would all be done by the State.

Mr GROOME said the interests of the two parties were different. One wanted control and the other wanted a continuation of good shooting. Nevertheless, there was a good deal of co-operation, much of which was not publicized.

Mr WHITEHEAD asked if £5 to get rid of one deer was expensive.

Mr GROOME said that when the deer were numerous shooting was not expensive. It was when the numbers got to a low level that the private shooter might not be interested.

Mr ROWLING said he took it from the submission that the Institute would be happy to see a revision of the National Parks Act.

Mr GROOME said, No. The Institute felt that any revision at the present stage would be dangerous. However, it did consider that the expenditure of money on eliminating animals completely from National Parks was secondary to the attack on the critical catchment areas.

Mr ROWLING asked what the editor of the Journal had had in mind when he had written, "It would be a matter for concern should any sporting body, by virtue of its interest in a few animal species, be permitted to dictate Government policy in respect to animal pests."

Mr THOMSON said that went back to the previous conference, when it had been understood that the Deerstalkers Association had been attempting to dictate Government policy by endeavouring to bring public opinion to the point of forbidding the use of particular poisons.

Mr ROWLING suggested that the phrase "dictate Government policy" was rather extravagant.

Mr THOMSON said he thought the sporting bodies themselves would be forced to admit that their actions had been attempts to dictate Government policy. That had been exactly what they had wanted.

Mr ROWLING, referring to the statement that the Taupo Ski Club strongly opposed the allocation of preferential rights in National Parks, suggested that the provision of ski tows was along those lines.

Mr GROOME said, No, because they did not exclude other people from using valleys or snow fields. The submission referred to preferential rights to the exclusion of other people.

Mr ROWLING asked if the Taupo Ski Club would like to see some revision of the National Parks Act.
Mr GROOME said he doubted whether it would support a revision, although not necessarily for the same reasons as the foresters.

The CHAIRMAN asked if the Institute would agree that the Government was taking a realistic view of the situation and doing the best it could.

Mr GROOME said, Yes, within the limits of the finance available. The CHAIRMAN asked if the Institute really believed that private shooters, in killing over 100,000 head a year, were having no effect. Mr GROOME said, no lasting effect. The effort would be better directed to critical areas where it would have greater results.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that, therefore, the Institute would prefer control to any suggestion of extermination.

Mr GROOME said, Yes, if control could be exercised effectively.

The CHAIRMAN said evidence was accumulating that 1080 or other poisons were having an effect on indigenous fauna, including birds. What were the Institute’s views?

Mr GROOME said the view of the Institute would be that a decision would have to be taken on the greater good. It had no evidence of the effects of 1080 on native birds, but it would be true to say that the habitat of birds was improved by removing noxious animals, and, although a few birds might be lost in the process, it would be better in the long run.

Mr PICKERING, referring to the paragraph at the bottom of page 1 and the top of page 2, said the Committee had to evaluate the various multiple uses, some of which were in conflict. For instance, it had been told that the venison trade could rise to £1 million a year. Could Mr Thomson list some of the protection and productive values, especially those in jeopardy from the deer?

Mr THOMSON said there could be no suggestion that the value of venison for export would justify the use of Kaingaroa Forest for deer. The Kaingaroa Forest supported an industry with a total capital of £40 million, and the future of that industry was dependent entirely on future crops of trees. There was ample and compelling evidence that a large deer population in Kaingaroa would make it impossible for a second crop to support the Tasman Pulp and Paper Company. That would be putting the values and priorities completely out of perspective. It would be a ridiculous suggestion that the value of venison could be compared with the value of tree crops which supported the whole newspaper industry of New Zealand — an industry which was one of the biggest earners of overseas exchange and one of the highest earners per acre of any area in New Zealand. That covered production forests. As for protection forests, it was far from easy to put it in pounds, shillings, and pence. He could only refer to the weight of evidence, particularly that by Mr Holloway, of New Zealand’s potential for deterioration of mountain lands, leading to flooding, to the endangering of cities, and to costly engineering works such as those on the Waimakariri. The action of introduced animals in causing that accelerated erosion was such that everything possible should be done to get the mountains into better shape and so reduce the low-down problems and the expenditure of money on flood control. Therefore, the balance was between the few thousands of pounds, or even hundreds of thousands of pounds, which might be earned from venison on the mountain country and many times that amount which would have
to be paid for bigger floods, bigger runoff, and more protection and engineering works. It was difficult to get facts or figures, but the Institute would be certain that the values being protected in protection forests would far outweigh the value of the venison which might be taken from them in the critical catchments.

Mr DICK, referring to the submission by the Taupo Ski Club, asked how many clubs within the federation would have the same feelings towards the two Acts under review as the Deerstalkers Association had.

Mr GROOME said he could not answer that. The ski clubs had been prompted to make submissions by one of the major clubs, not in the federation, circularizing them and saying that the deerstalkers had put in a submission which could be taken as the opinion of the whole federation.

Mr THOMSON, speaking as an ex-president of the Federated Mountain Clubs, said that, to his knowledge, most of the tramping, ski, and climbing clubs were of one mind on the subject. The administration of the federation had deliberately refrained from submitting any evidence because it had felt, with deerstalkers branches as constituent members, it would be unfair to put in a submission to which all its members could not agree.