The following is an abridged transcription of discussions following the papers on 5 and 6 May 1966. The Press was present throughout these discussions.

Following delivery of papers by Messrs Hutchinson and Poole—Olsen asked Mr Poole about the distinction between professional and sub-professional training and under whose aegis sub-professional training should fall.

Poole—“Sub-professional training is directed principally at day-to-day management. The Forest Service and larger organizations should continue and develop their own schemes.”

Wendelken—“Would there not be scope for a diploma at a lower level, rather than have several organizations running their own schemes?”

Poole—“A diploma course would meet neither requirement, particularly not that for close daily supervision and management of forests.”

Henry—“If Mr Poole considers that the State and the larger organizations should train their own—where does he think that the small organizations should get their people from?”

Poole—“Pinch them from the State.”

Henry—“To take that further: does Mr Poole not think that the Forest Service should train them for the whole country?”

Poole—“I was being a bit facetious. The Forest Service does now do this to a considerable extent. We would have to look very closely at this matter.”

Wendelken—“If I understood Mr Poole correctly—the forestry curriculum should include only a general broad introduction to protection forestry problems. The problems of protection forestry are best solved by people with a broad base of scientific disciplines. . . . Does Mr Poole agree with the implications of the advertisement for the professor of the proposed school, on page 3, that the Council of the University ‘envisages the study of timber from its beginnings as a seed in the soil through to its use in the building, furniture, pulp and paper, and associated wood product industries in New Zealand’—in other words a truly production forestry course?”

Poole—“I would like notice of motion on this, but I can state that I would not like to see any forestry course confined to just production. The protection forests of this country are every bit as important as the production forests—but how you deal with them is another matter.”

Following delivery of paper by Mr Henry—

Cunningham—“Over the past 10 or 15 years we have tended to think in terms of protection and production forests as two water-
tight compartments, perhaps as a matter of administrative convenience. But in future we will have to think very much more about the protection value of production forests and the productive value of protection forests."

Wardrop asked Mr Henry to explain his remarks on "early advanced training" and conversion of generalists into specialists.

Henry — "I regard a forester as a specialist when he comes out of forestry school. He becomes a generalist when he goes on to more administration, or administration only. Whether on utilization, protection forestry or production forestry makes little difference—as an administrator he ceases to be a specialist."

Groome — "Does Mr Henry envisage that the School will have a fair number of postgraduate students, perhaps coming back for refresher courses?"

Henry — "Yes, and I think that forestry graduates coming back could virtually do their higher degrees in another school. This would be very good."

McKinnon — "One question I should like to ask Mr Ernander is what qualifications are required for entry into the Royal College of Forestry?"

Ernander — "The same qualifications as into other universities."

McKinnon — "Any prior work in forestry?"

Ernander replied that it had previously been compulsory, but in the 1958 revision of the syllabus the pertinent regulation was cancelled. However, competition between students to secure places at the College was so great that prior experience of forestry conferred some preference. Hence most potential students still tried to secure some experience—usually about six to eight months.

Groome asked Mr Ernander about the proportions of general and specialist foresters.

Ernander considered it a big disadvantage for students to specialize, particularly in a small country, as it limited them to certain posts and provided fewer opportunities for transfer and advancement.

Following delivery of paper by Mr Pollard —

Thomson asked Mr Pollard whether, if he had a son whom he wished to train to take over his business, he would put him through a good forestry school rather than through an engineering or chemistry course.

Pollard — "Definitely through the forestry school. I believe this would be the finest training to qualify him for the higher roles of management in our industry. Our future leaders... will come from the forestry school."

Following delivery of paper by Mr McCaskill —

Poole asked Mr McCaskill if he would clarify what he had said about education for protection forestry coming "not so much in the fourth year as in the postgraduate year".

McCaskill — "No, the fourth year."

Poole — "As a specialist in the fourth year?"

McCaskill — "When I suggested that the fourth year be devoted to a major field, perhaps I should have defined them into produc-
tion forestry, forest products, forest protection — and that was the fourth year that I was defining.”

Franklin — “Could I ask Mr McCaskill to clarify what he meant by the diploma not being sub-professional? I believe there are two diplomas in agriculture: one is sub-professional, and the other is for the benefit of those who do not have an agricultural degree, but want to have a degree with agriculture attached to it.”

McCaskill — “I would call it a diploma of forestry science. ... It is quite possible that you would have someone who has a very good degree in biology or Stage III in botany, zoology, or even a masterate in it — he feels that he wants to work in animal ecology in the high country, and yet he is only a scientist, a pure scientist — without a clue how the world goes on. The same applies in forest products: a scientist may have an advanced degree in chemistry, but he is no use as he is to Mr Pollard. Even one year of forest products, in the four-year degree course, working alongside and in daily contact with other forestry students and with the forestry staff could possibly fill that gap. Forestry cannot possibly hope to service its field just with people from the School of Forestry — the diploma of forestry would enable these other specialists to come in ... provided they attain a higher professional standard, not just a sub-professional qualification.”

Cameron — “The most important aspect of establishing any school of forestry is concerned with obtaining a competent teaching staff. Competence is concerned with number — and my question is therefore how Mr McCaskill can reconcile his remarks about competence with the staff numbers proposed by the University for the school, i.e., a professor and three lecturers?”

McCaskill — “I cannot reconcile it. That was why I was so glad to see in Dr Dils’ note to me that the minimum number must be six. I have worked and taught in departments that were too small and I know just what these difficulties are: this absence of the clash of opinion, of daily stimulation. Quite apart from covering the major fields, particularly in the fourth year, I cannot see how you could get, anywhere in the world today, competent enough people, unless each group was shared between at least two men. Remember all the time that you are going to use for occasional lectures, demonstrations and trips the best men that you can get in any of the other fields.”

Henry — “To what degree does Mr McCaskill think people from outside the University should be brought in to give lectures?”

McCaskill — “Wherever you can get somebody who can make some special contribution, he should be used. A big school tends to live within itself. One of the advantages of a small school, only six or seven in number, is that it can constantly be looking outwards.”

Poole — “This advocacy of the excellence of teacher is of course extremely important, but how does it tie up with the Oxford system, where teaching does not play all that big a part? It is more a system of stimulation among the students themselves.”

McCaskill — “I consider that is the highest quality of teaching.”

Poole — “But it is a very different type of teaching, isn’t it?”

McCaskill — “I know it is. But this is the advantage we are going to have if we can only get a minimum of six staff and a small
number of students. This has not been properly tried in New Zealand. The formal lecture can certainly play a very big part; but the seminar system, the tutorial system, the individual contact system, would work to perfection in a school of the proposed type—or what I hope is the proposed type for Canterbury."

Jackson—"I was delighted to hear Mr McCaskill’s support for a minimum staff of six for the forestry school. As he may be aware, this is one of the things that has been of particular concern to the Institute’s subcommittee... it would be illuminating if he could indicate the extent to which he thinks the teaching of protection forestry and watershed management could be covered by existing disciplines and existing lecturers—or the extent to which it would be necessary to have specialists in these fields. If he considers such specialists are necessary what would be the minimum number required to cover protection forestry and watershed management?"

McCaskill—"Taking a minimum of six (and I still do not know whether that includes the dean, or not), I would be bitterly disappointed unless there was one specialist on watershed management available from the time the first students came into their third year."

Bunn expressed his pleasure over Mr McCaskill’s emphasis that forestry should be brought into the course at a very early stage, even during the first year. However if this were to be done, surely it would imply that virtually the whole course would have to be done at Canterbury?

McCaskill—"I thought hard about this... but, if we are going to get the benefits that will accrue from treating these men as potential foresters right from their first year, it will all have to be done here. I would not like to be too restrictive, for men who were quite definite about a career in forestry but had taken their two years of basic science elsewhere."

Following delivery of papers by Messrs Kennedy and Holloway—

Holloway—"One other point I would like to comment upon is this idea that the protection forestry side of it can be handled by graduates in the natural sciences without forestry training. As such a graduate in the natural sciences, without forestry training, I would give the lie direct to that. The graduate in natural sciences will certainly have a very large part to play, but the only one who can interpret his findings and put them into practice, on a practical scale, is the trained forester."

Hinds—"I understood Mr Holloway to say that among the graduates from the course there will be men with a flair for research. Does he think they should be sifted out early and deflected into pure science?"

Holloway—"To cater for this type of individual there must be provision for postgraduate research at the Ph.D. level. There will be cases where advanced silvicultural research should be done within the School itself, perhaps jointly with staff of the F.R.I. stationed on the campus, under joint supervision. ... [However] the basic conception of the School should not be research oriented."
Grayburn — “One of the things that has been worrying me has been the ability of this School to attract the best staff possible. . . . One is led to believe that the only way you can get good staff today is to offer them the very best of research facilities. I would like to know how Mr Holloway reconciles that with his idea that these people will be so busy that they will not have time for research?”

Holloway — “I will admit this does introduce difficulties. But the type of man who insists on abundant research facilities is not the kind of man you want, at least to start the School. If he is not prepared to devote himself to staffing and planning the curriculum he should not be the foundation professor of forestry.”

Cameron — “Does not Mr Holloway’s statement . . . that the staff need not be concerned with research, imply that they will, because of their small numbers, be so busy lecturing, so busy teaching and coping with a broad syllabus that they will have no time for research?”

Holloway — “That is going to be inevitable anyway. I would insist that they all have research experience, so that they could give research supervision.”

Cameron — “In effect, you are saying that this staff that has been proposed cannot adequately cover both teaching and research?”

Holloway — “I am not too sure what staff has been suggested. Dr Pownall did say four, but this was just a snap remark of Dr Pownall’s—a vague figure. . . . I cannot see it going much above six. As it grows you can build a research group into it. But over the first ten years, I cannot see it.”

Cameron — “This is where I think the Institute could take a positive approach to the problem, and give the professor full support in securing sufficient staff to cover teaching and research.”

Wilkinson — “I understood Mr Holloway to say that there would be Ph.D. facilities. I think there is a fairly strong body of scientific opinion in favour of taking Ph.D. studies away from the school at which they graduated.”

Holloway — “That would work two ways— with students coming in from outside as well.”

Hinds — “If you have your research outfit in watershed management and protection forestry on the campus with the School, and your other two major branches elsewhere, does Mr Holloway not expect some bias toward protection forestry because protection forestry research is on the spot—the others are not?”

Holloway — “This, Mr Chairman, is exactly the point I am trying to sell; I am trying to be open-minded on this. If we are on the campus and the others are not, we will get the pick of all the undergraduates. They will be left with the dregs.”

Hinds — “That is what I meant.”

McKinnon — “Well, I think that is fairly clear.” (Laughter)

Henry — “I’d like to comment on the possibility that we are likely to end up with two research establishments—one here and the other at Rotorua. . . . I consider that would be a very good thing: we might get a little competition to spend some of the money that is available for research.”
Hutchinson — "Mr Henry's point is extremely cogent: we want more research, and we want it better distributed. It is up to the country to move in that direction, and for this Institute to point the way for the electorate to follow. With your permission, Mr Chairman, I would like to convey my appreciation to Mr Holloway for his paper, but also my regret that his closing quotation I did not hear. Will he please give us either the quotation or the reference."

Holloway — "Ecclesiastes 11, verse one. 'Cast thy bread upon the waters: for thou shalt find it after many days.'"

Following delivery of paper by Dr Pownall —

McKinnon — "After hearing Dr Pownall's paper and reading the brochure calling for an incumbent to the Chair of Forestry, I still have the same misgivings as I had earlier on. It may be perhaps not deliberate, but there is certainly an emphasis given in the brochure, and also in Dr Pownall's remarks, to timber production and production forestry. I do feel that any individual considering applying for this position . . . might feel that his opportunities to teach his subject in the breadth that he considers it should be taught would be too circumscribed by the apparent thinking of the University. Dr Pownall might care to comment on that particular point."

Thomson — "Mr Chairman, I think that the Subcommittee has done an extremely thorough, competent and conscientious job in this. They have canvassed a wide spectrum of opinion, and they have recorded honestly what is a majority view; but I merely at this stage would like to make this remark that it is only a majority view. It does not necessarily represent the opinions of every Member of the Institute. Now I am one who happens to be in a minority in this and I disassociate myself from all the findings of that Subcommittee's report. I also have misgivings, and I think that is the right word to use, but I certainly do not view 'with dismay', as the wording of the letter is. . . . All I want to say at this stage is that Dr Pownall's task is not quite as difficult as it might appear: he doesn't have to remove dismay from everybody in this room — he might have to remove some misgivings from some of us."

Olsen — "... Dr Pownall, I would like to ask you, as a man of considerable experience in university administration . . . how you felt that four lecturers would be the maximum that you felt justified in asking for in view of the experience and opinions canvassed by the Subcommittee in reaching a minimum requirement of six. I know a good deal of your reply already, but I would like you to display your footwork once more."

Pownall — "Sir, if that is all you are seeking, I'll give you a display of footwork, by saying that I am ruled out from answering this. . . ."

Franklin — "I'd like to ask Dr Pownall how he reconciles his statement, that the setting up of the Forestry School was decided in the national interest and that of the forest industries of New Zealand, with the setting up of a school that can only afford a salary of £4,000 for its professor and so limited a number of lecturers to support him . . . If Canterbury is the ideal place for the School, as Dr Pownall so confidently asserts, why was there
not more open discussion. It was the secrecy of the decision that impelled us, as 'dirt foresters', to feel that the choice was determined by all the background work that went into it."

Pownall — "Thank you, sir, for that comment from a 'dirt forester'. . . . The decision on this was not made by the University of Canterbury but by those people who are paid by you and me to make it—it was made by Government. Let's be quite clear: the University of Canterbury is an interested party; it made its representations to . . . the University Grants Committee; what the University Grants Committee did with it, is its business—it's not our business. It's not our business either to take the business we have with the Government, before the public. . . . The University of Canterbury made a case for the introduction of forestry as part of its overall view that here at Canterbury we will interrelate, for the first time in New Zealand and Australia, a whole complex involving engineering, with chemical engineering, into pulp and paper technology; that will integrate with industrial design and furniture design; that will integrate with our strength of materials and testing laboratories; that will integrate with our school of architecture; where the people who have been trained in all these things—in building science, architecture, forestry, the whole complex—will have an opportunity of listening to specialists from other departments. . . . We envisage that this School of Forestry fits into this type of development. . . . Is it reasonable to infer that a decision reached by Government was reached on any other than a national interest basis? It's illogical. Moreover, if it were, then criticize Government. We're paid to run our University—we're not paid, although we're admirably equipped, to run the economy of New Zealand."

Poole — "The point has been raised as to the decision made by Government to set up a school of forestry, and where it is to be located. As one who has had a finger in both of these pies, I would be prepared to make a background statement about the moves, as far as the Forest Service was concerned, that led up to the decision. I have a prepared statement here."

Pownall — "Quite a coincidence, I presume?" (Laughter)

Delivery of statement by Mr Poole: "Negotiations Leading to the Setting up of a School of Forestry in New Zealand"

"In March, 1963, the Secretary of the State Services Commission, when replying to a Forest Service proposal to increase the annual intake of graduate foresters to the Forest Service, said that the Commission would like to see the need for overseas training reduced by the re-establishment of a forestry school in New Zealand. This suggestion coincided with a Treasury report on the Forest Service submission for increased recruitment, in which Treasury recommended that the Minister of Forests arrange for discussions with the university authorities on the economics and feasibility of re-establishing a forestry school in New Zealand as soon as practicable."

There had obviously been collusion between Treasury and the State Services Commission on this matter. Before these recommendations were brought forward, the setting up of a school
of forestry had been suggested from time to time in various quarters. You will recall the Wadham report which favoured the setting up of a school in Auckland. In 1961 the Principal of Lincoln College proposed the introduction of a course there. My own attitude was that the Service was well satisfied with the system of training it had, and provided the number of graduates could be increased, we did not wish to change it.

However, the Service was obliged to report to the Minister of Forests in compliance with Treasury’s report of March, 1963. In getting together background material, the Head Office Training Committee was asked to analyse the pros and cons of setting up a school. This committee came forward with a recommendation that a school be re-established in New Zealand and advanced the following reasons for this recommendation.

(1) Greater attention would be paid to local forestry problems.

(2) There would be a reduction in the training period.

(3) Research co-operation could be instituted with the school.

(4) Enhanced importance would be attached to forestry.

(5) There would be a saving of overseas funds.

(6) There would be a reduction in total costs of training.

While these deliberations about the re-establishment of a school were proceeding, the Forest Service was seeking approval to locate a forest research laboratory for the South Island on the Ilam campus of the University of Canterbury. The Service obtained approval from Government to discuss the possibility with the University of Canterbury and in December, 1962, the University approved the Forest Service’s request. This agreement, to my mind, significantly affected considerations about the school. It presented a unique opportunity to combine research, which will grow to substantial levels, with teaching on a campus with many interests related to forestry. After considering this in relation to the report of the Training Committee, my own attitude, therefore, changed in favour of a school.

Before the Service reported to the Minister on the case for the re-establishment of a school, the University of Canterbury had become aware of the fact that the Service had been asked to investigate such a proposition. In April, 1963, Dr Pownall, Vice-Chancellor of the University, invited me to meet some members of the University staff who were interested in the proposal to set up a forestry school. It seemed to me that, at this meeting, the University Council had already decided to submit a proposal to the University Grants Committee and what they were seeking from me were the details of such a scheme.

Once Canterbury University commenced to take an interest, pressure began to come from various directions. It appeared to me, therefore, that the best course to take was now to try and give direction to the pressures. They were obviously so strong that action would be taken on the setting up of a school before long. If all the pressures were allowed to mount without direction, New Zealand might have had a repetition of the position in the 1920s when two schools were set up.
I therefore analysed the position as best I was able and considered that, for many reasons, the Canterbury school offered by far the best site and associations for the establishment of a school of high calibre. Dr Pownall will be giving you these reasons at this meeting.

In April of 1964, I reported happenings to the Service's Training Advisory Committee and finally asked for a submission to the Minister in fulfilment of Treasury's instruction. Meantime, discussions took place with the University Grants Committee on the preliminary details of what a forestry course would contain. These were very much preliminary in order that the University Grants Committee could estimate, should it be decided that a school be set up. These discussions were also in compliance with Treasury's report that the Minister of Forests 'arrange for discussions with the university authorities, etc.'

At one stage, Dr Richardson, Director of Research, was drawn in to the discussions concerning the details of the proposed course and school. Finally, a very tentative course was laid down for the purposes of estimating. The details of this course seem to be the ones that got into the hands of the N.Z. Institute of Foresters and to which exception has been taken. You will know now, from the terms of the proposed appointment of professor of forestry, that details meant little at that stage beyond providing a basis for planning.

Before submitting a report to the Minister on the discussions with the University Grants Committee and on the Forest Service's findings, I discussed the question of location of the school with him. I said that if one was to be set up, my choice would be the Ilam campus and I set out my reasons. The Minister fully agreed with this choice. At no time during discussions did the University Grants Committee think it necessary to look beyond the University of Canterbury for the site for the school.

In 1964, the Forest Service submission was placed before the Minister and he in turn placed it before Cabinet in August, 1964. At the Cabinet Meeting of 31 August, 1964, Cabinet approved that the recommendations submitted by the Minister were approved for presenting to Caucus. This course was taken so that any other interests, at a political level, on the re-establishment or the location of the proposed school could be voiced. In fact, objections to the location came from both Sir Leslie Munro and the Member in whose Electorate the University of Waikato lay. The Minister therefore held a meeting of those interested and explained fully his reasons for his choice. At that meeting, the Ilam campus was finally chosen as the location and the Government made an announcement accordingly.

At no stage during these protracted discussions did the Institute approach me officially.

McKinnon — “Thank you, Mr Poole. I think that has been a very helpful statement.”

Usmar asked Dr Pownall what would happen if the professor, having convinced himself that he needed a staff of six or eight men, should be unable to convince the Professorial Board that this was necessary? He considered that this was the crucial issue, and was what the Institute feared might happen.
Pownall — “I should make it clear that the Professorial Board is concerned only with academic matters — only with the courses, regulations, design and prescriptions. It is the University Council that's concerned with staffing and with money. My experience has been that the University Council can do nothing other than transmit opinion on this matter, after investigation by the Vice-Chancellor, to the University Grants Committee. . . . What happens if the Grants Committee says ‘No, you cannot have this money’? Then the professor will have the same recourse as every other professor in the New Zealand system, who is not getting the staff or finance to do the job he was set up to do. . . .”

Jackson — “May I follow up your own question, Mr Chairman? . . . because I would very much like more clarification on how the University Council envisages the scope of this new School. I note that both in Dr Pownall’s address, and also in this brochure, there is a great deal of emphasis on forest industry. There are only two points at which forest protection, or protection forestry, are mentioned in this brochure — and they are when the other teaching departments of the University are mentioned. If I also try to envisage the scope of the School, I find that it is not going to be concerned, at least as defined here . . ., with protection forestry and with those aspects of soil and water conservation with which we as foresters have been accustomed to deal. This, to me, contains the crux of the matter, because upon this depends whether or not that initial establishment of four men will be sufficient. I think the Institute Subcommittee would view the matter in very different light if the scope of the School is to be concerned solely with production forestry — and not with protection forestry.”

Pownall — “It's no problem at all. I can give you the clearest of assurances. I'll reiterate them again, and I think I've written them four or five times into my published paper — it is in the hands of the foundation professor to recommend to Council what courses shall be taken and what staffing will be needed. . . . The University of Canterbury Council has no firm fixed opinion, stated anywhere in its document, or recorded as the result of any discussion by the Council, on fixing any limits whatsoever to the policy of the School of Forestry — of the Faculty of Forestry. The University Council has laid down nowhere, nor has ever discussed, putting any limits whatsoever on the policy of the Faculty of Forestry at the University of Canterbury. . . .”

Henry — “I also welcome Mr Poole's statement. . . . The whole situation would have been much clearer, for us anyway, had we known a little bit more about the background of Government thinking, and had there been clearer statements rather than the two or three lines that appeared in the Press, of the Minister's statements at the particular time decisions were made.”

Poole — “Going back to Dr Jackson's last question of Dr Pownall, in which he expressed concern that the specifications for the course lean too heavily on forest industries in a restricted sense and did not include protection forestry; I think that it's quite unrealistic to imagine any school of forestry being established in New Zealand that did not pay a great deal of attention to protection forestry. If there was any threat of this at all, the Forest
Service would have a great deal to say about it. ... I think a lot of the confusion arises from the very restricted interpretation put on forest industries. My own interpretation on reading it was that forest industries include the whole of the activity of forestry — protection forestry and production forestry.”

Thomson — “I think we are all hoping that a New Zealand school would have a strong postgraduate course, and that this would attract students from other countries. ... In all the Asian countries, forestry is still at an unsophisticated stage of exploitation. Aspects of forestry such as soil and water conservation, such as wildlife management, such as recreational forestry, such as all these things that involve rational and full land management — are only just starting. ... Taking an historical view, I think New Zealand has a very great opportunity to help Asian countries because our problems in these fields are so acute, and so clearcut and specific that we will be training people to meet them — and we are going to have something to offer to other countries that do not have the trained personnel. ... I am certain that in 10, 20 or 30 years’ time we are going to be training, particularly at the postgraduate level, large numbers of students from other countries — and they are going to be particularly in the fields that Dr Pownall appears to have left out from his brochure. ...”

Grayburn — “Mr Chairman, I would draw Mr Thomson’s attention to the last paragraph on page two of the Subcommittee’s report. Thank you.”

Henry — “Mr Chairman, I would like to express again the concern I mentioned yesterday about this apparent division that keeps being drawn between production forestry and protection forestry. There is no division. ... Protection forests will ultimately get to the stage of producing a tremendous amount of wood in this country.”

Cameron — “It is right and proper that we, as the only professional body representing forestry in New Zealand, should be alarmed at the omissions from this brochure. I think the report presented to Council is a reasonable and constructive document. Now Professor McCaskill yesterday emphasized the need for an adequate staff for the forestry School. This I submit is our main concern at present. ... Can we be given an assurance that the University Council realizes the need for an adequate and competent staffing, and that they are prepared to meet the necessary financial commitments?”

McKinnon — “I think actually that Dr Pownall stated in his paper that the University would make no appointment unless the applicant was considered adequate. If that is so, some at least of the Institute’s fears can be removed.”

Wardrop — “I would like to repeat the compliment I paid to Dr Pownall at Rotorua on his extremely well-thought-out case for forestry on behalf of the University of Canterbury ... but I feel that the case for the good of New Zealand forestry has not been taken sufficiently into consideration — whereas undoubtedly the depth and breadth of the Canterbury University education will be greatly enhanced.”

Spiers — “The theme Dr Pownall keeps coming back to again and again is the professor and the selection of the professor for the
School. ... In this selection, is the University going to consult anybody outside the University?"

Pownall — "The University of Canterbury reserves the right to consult with, or not consult, such people as it wishes, in reaching a decision on any matter at all — not only on appointments, but any other matter."

Chavasse — "In spite of what Dr Pownall says, this question of staffing has been prejudged on a certain ratio of staff to students. In fact a lot of the argument this morning has been on the question of ratio of staff to subject matter — which is a very different thing indeed. Dr Pownall has not commented on this."

Pownall — "We haven't prejudged anything. The only person who judges anything will be the professor of forestry. The University of Canterbury has made some estimates, in accordance with its concepts and reality as it sees it. We haven't made any decision at all; we haven't made any prejudgements. ... We have got to discover what is the national need and the national pattern. ..."

McKinnon — "In asking you to express our appreciation to Dr Pownall, both for his paper and the patient way he has stood up to our questioning, I should like to make it quite clear to him that, as I said earlier, the Institute's concern is that New Zealand needs a high standard in its forestry school. The Institute has no intention that remarks or opinions spoken here should be regarded as an expression of no confidence in the proposed School of Forestry at Canterbury University. The Institute is concerned that if that Chair be established, the Chair be an adequate one and that the standard of teaching there be a high one."

Pownall — "Mr Chairman, may I thank you particularly warmly for the way in which you have unequivocally stated, as I understand it, that you do not lack confidence in the Senate's proposals here and this statement of no confidence does no longer lie on us. ..."

Mr Grayburn's Summing-up

"Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen: As my footwork is not as good as others' here today, I am completely punch-drunk.

I would ask Dr Pownall's indulgence if I refer to papers he has not had an opportunity to see, but I feel that previous speakers deserve some comment. We had a very good opening in lighter vein by Frank Hutchinson — it is a pity we could not have concluded, rather than commenced, with it. The first two speakers, Messrs Hutchinson and Poole, asked us to consider historical developments. I think this is most important: it brought out some of the Subcommittee's reasons for misgivings about lobbying and jockeying for positions that underlay the first two schemes in New Zealand.

Mr Poole then stressed the need for us to begin the study of forestry as land ownership. This is still valid. You cannot grow trees without land. One of the curious omissions from all papers was that the object of forestry was to grow trees — this had to come from the floor. I would challenge Mr Poole's comments on the hit-and-miss methods of forestry on pumice lands: I suggest that we would not have this large body of foresters here today if people like Roderick McCrae and Owen Jones had not gone out and done something about it. It is amazing to me to think back to the conditions under which something like 48 thousand acres
of forest, or tree-farm if you like, were planted during a single year in the mid-twenties—with dirt roads, poor transport, no radio, nursery 20 or 30 miles away and men living under canvas. Had this same sort of hit-or-miss method been applied on the same scale in Nelson we might have had a pulp mill there some years ago, instead of in 10 or 15 years’ time.

The theme that has cropped up throughout all papers, and which needs repeating, is the need for a broadly-based education. It is the most important common theme. Somebody added the further rider that students and the profession as a whole needed to be venturesome.

Then we listened to a very salutary warning from our overseas visitor, Mr Ernander, in whose country forestry is a major industry, about becoming too specialized. This makes your foresters inflexible and, perhaps more important to us personally, reduces the opportunity for staff to move around.

Mr Henry continued the general theme of being well-equipped and warned us against the dangers of the course being strongly compartmentized. This has been supported by other speakers. He stressed the importance of students being brought to think of themselves as foresters very early in their academic career. This is something that most of us, in recent years, have not had: we did our science degrees without any forestry influence at all.

Then Mr Pollard spoke about the needs of industry, stressing the need for better mutual understanding, which again can only be brought about by a broadly-based course. However, I would also challenge his stress on growing for specific products. Surely we should have confidence enough to concentrate on growing good trees, because, by the time they have matured, technology will have altered so greatly that we cannot forecast the specific product.

Next, we had to have a non-forester to put us back into perspective. Mr McCaskill’s main point was the need to produce men of culture, knowledge and wisdom who could think for themselves and make sound decisions. Most of his technical training would come in the field after he had begun his employment. Dave Kennedy would have no argument with this. He also mentioned teaching staff, and this was something we cross-examined Jack Holloway on, regarding the roles of university staff and research. Many of us have had the feeling that university staff are too preoccupied with research, rather than the job of teaching.

Mr Kennedy emphasized that the hard school of experience was the greatest teacher. The compromises that the forester must make can only be based on a formal education. Mr Holloway of course sees the well-grounded, broadly-based forester as the man to interpret and perhaps guide research. It was he, I think, who brought in the very important factor of enthusiasm. No man is any good to you today unless he is enthusiastic about what he is doing.

That brings us to this morning’s paper by Dr Pownall, and I am very glad that between him and Mr Poole many of our misgivings have been cleared, and that we can go forward with a much better understanding of what has gone on in the past. I think we are now better informed and therefore can place our trust, with an easier conscience, in the University. I think this is where the problem has been: we have been very cautious
about placing our confidence because of the lack of information. We’ve been accused of not seeking the information. There is some truth in this accusation, but if we hadn’t been cautious we’d have been giving the University and other authorities a completely open cheque. None of us was prepared to do this, without trying to find out what was going on.

I don’t want to dwell on the matter of production forestry as being the only thing specified in the advertisement, but it was because of this and our interpretation of this that we had fears about the staffing. We felt that if some prospective applicant read the advertisement he would think ‘Well, they’re only interested in production forestry — my interests are broader than that’, and therefore he wouldn’t apply.

I would like to conclude by going back to Lance McCaskill’s last page — ‘I suggest we aim at excellence in the liberal education of our graduates in forestry. This depends on three main factors: the attraction of quality students, the design of a curriculum with an exacting approach to knowledge, and creativity and dedication in teaching. Excellence in undergraduate teaching does not detract from the scholarly or research interests of staff — it can intensify them. We need teacher-scholars — men who pass on their scholarly excitement to students and set them thinking about important matters. And think what advantages such men, if appointed, will have — their classes will be small and they will work in a new school which can create its own exciting tradition.’

Finally, a word to you all. If we have presented this case badly, then it is what we as an Institute deserve — for the amount that we are prepared to pay for our own Institute administration. We’ve heard these words before today, but I suggest they apply to this Institute too. If you want action you must keep Council informed of what is going on, and what you want action on. We can only make decisions by being correctly informed by you all. Thank you.”

Following this meeting, the Council of the Institute, in conjunction with the Information Officer of the University of Canterbury, prepared and released to the Press on 7 May 1966, the following statement:

“In the light of assurances given by the University of Canterbury, the Council of the New Zealand Institute of Foresters last evening withdrew a statement that it could have no confidence in the new School of Forestry at the University because of what it felt were ‘disappointing’ terms of reference for the scope of the course.

The Institute’s Council said in a statement that the Vice-Chancellor, Dr L. L. Pownall, had removed these misgivings. He had made it clear that there would be no appointment of a foundation professor for the school unless he was a suitably qualified person; that the scope of the school would include protection as well as production forestry; and that it would be up to the foundation professor to make representations to the University Council about the staffing and facilities of the school.

The University and the Institute have the same purpose; our main concern is, and always has been, that lack of adequate finance may not give us a school of forestry equal to, and preferably better than, forestry schools overseas. The assurance of adequate finance can only be given by Government.”