what was confidential. Mr Gleed, in making reference to Lake Manapouri and South Island beech, said people could still write to the papers expressing their point of view. Mr Grayburn said life was one long series of compromises if it was to continue to function.

T. W. Swale spoke strongly about the Institute getting its priorities right. Too much time was spent discussing how members should behave when the Institute had no strong policy on vital issues for New Zealand. It should be more concerned with soil productivity loss, forest resource management and future wood supplies. The individual must make up his own mind to speak out against things he does not like and have the courage of his own convictions in a dignified fashion.

The discussion was terminated on that strong note. Mr Spiers thanked Mr Grayburn for the session and all colloquia chairmen for keeping to timetable.

A. W. Grayburn

Summing up the Colloquia

A. P. Thomson

In summing up, A. P. Thomson commented on some general impressions which the colloquia discussions had given. These were: the welcome fact that, despite some strong differences of opinion on a few issues, there had been no suggestion from the floor of a break-away movement; the virtually unanimous agreement that some major constitutional changes are necessary; and the absence of any obvious polarity in thinking into groups such as youth and age and academically qualified and non-academically qualified. He also commented that, although there had been a lot of talk about the need for involvement, it was noticeable that a large number of those present had not spoken up on any major issue; likewise it was noticeable, and regrettable, that the largest local section, Rotorua, had failed to supply any written comments. It was fine to talk of involvement, but it could not take place at the personal or the section level unless people choose to become involved. In this context Mr Thomson stressed his long-held view that to a large measure the strength of the Institute is the strength of its local sections.

Referring specifically to the matters discussed by the three colloquia, Mr Thomson suggested that a consensus had been reached on most issues and that the incoming Council would now initiate action to amend the constitution where this was necessary, or otherwise to implement the feelings of the meeting. He interpreted these feelings as follows.

The Institute's Constitution

(1) The present categories of membership, and the rules for admission into each category, are both outdated and are no longer appropriate to the practice and profession of
forestry in New Zealand. It is now illogical to equate professionalism with academic qualifications. Membership of the Institute should be liberalized in the sense that the criteria for membership (and perhaps the term "full" should be dropped) should be on merit rather than on academic performance.

(2) This conclusion begs the question as to how merit is to be decided. It was agreed that this was a matter which must be left for following Councils to decide; they would doubtless take into account criteria such as academic record and level of attainment, the nature and term of experience in appropriate forestry pursuits, published papers and addresses, and responsibility of positions held—in fact any good evidence of merit and professional competence. It was not considered desirable that the Institute should be an examining body or that progress from one class of membership to another should be on examination results. Furthermore it was considered undesirable to specify the length of time a member should spend in any one category of membership.

(3) The logical consequences of these conclusions are that non-academically qualified practising foresters with merit should be able to qualify for membership without delay and that, antithetically, recent university graduate should not be able to advance automatically—like everyone else, they would first have to demonstrate merit.

(4) In order to implement these conclusions, paragraphs 6 to 9 of the Constitution should be revised and submitted to the next Annual General Meeting for approval.

(5) Otherwise there did not seem to be any particular need to make major amendments to the Constitution. The objects, as stated, seemed to have stood up to the test of time. The discussion on what the aims and objects should be suggested five particular roles which the Institute should play. They are: a professional union looking after the interests of its members; a body which can and should speak out publicly and authoritatively on forestry matters and thus influence public opinion; an organization reflecting the collective conscience of the profession; a forum (as it always has been) for discussion and the dissemination of knowledge; and a medium for resolving any professional or ethical difficulties which could arise out of the employer-employee relationship. It was not suggested that the Institute did not have other roles, or that these should be enshrined constitutionally, but they were the ones which were stressed particularly in the colloquia discussions.

(6) There was a strong feeling that the size of the Council should be increased. Several arguments for this were adduced, not the least of which was the extra responsibility which the Council must assume if it is to be the arbiter on merit criteria for membership admission. It
was also stressed that a larger Council could represent a wider spectrum of age classes and interests. The concept of geographical representation per medium of local section delegates was not favoured, nor was the thought that councillors should be anything other than what has so far been termed "full members". The suggestion of co-opting, rather than appointing, additional members met with some, but not universal, support as was evidenced by a show of hands on this issue.

Institute Policy

(1) The discussions on the Institute's Constitution have already covered many matters of internal policy.

(2) There was some debate on the need for either permanent or ad hoc subcommittees, or both. The discussion tended to centre around the desirability of a permanent publicity or public relations subcommittee, but was inconclusive largely because some members recorded the history of previous failures. But there was nothing inconclusive about the feeling of the meeting that somehow or other the Institute must continue to involve itself on matters of important forestry interest.

(3) As a consequence to the last conclusion, it was suggested that local sections should be more active in speaking out publicly, particularly on local issues. There was some difference of opinion about how much authority local sections should be given, particularly since some important matters need full Council deliberation, taking national as well as local interests into consideration. Again a show of hands was necessary to establish a majority opinion. It indicated that local sections should be positively encouraged to speak out without reference to the President or the Council, but only on local matters and within a framework of agreed Institute policy.

(4) An even more important question of autonomy was that of the Council itself. The consensus of the meeting was that the Council should not normally have to seek a consensus from all members, or from annual general meetings, before making statements or taking action on particular issues. Having elected a Council, members should have faith in it and give it power to act.

(5) It was quite generally agreed that the Institute should continue to undertake technical investigations into important matters directly or indirectly connected with forestry. Past examples included Manapouri and South Island beech forests. The suggestion that the Institute should take the initiative in organizing inter-disciplinary meetings, symposia and colloquia was favoured, although a note of warning was sounded that the Institute must avoid the trap which some of its professional colleagues have fallen into, of speaking with authority in fields outside its own competence.
(6) It was also quite generally agreed that the Institute should continue to maintain its position as an independent authoritative body and be seen to do so.

**Code of Ethics**

(1) It was significant and gratifying that so many members attended the colloquium on this subject. It indicated that members recognized clearly their ethical and professional obligations and looked to the Institute to give a continuing lead and direction in this matter.

(2) Admiration was expressed for the draft code of ethics put forward by Professor McKelvey. It was agreed that this draft should be further considered by the incoming Council. It provided an excellent basis for what the meeting agreed was necessary—not a constitutional amendment nor a firm Council directive, but rather a set of guidelines for the personal use and the personal benefit of all Institute members.

Mr Thomson concluded that this was a most important and memorable meeting, and that the colloquia had collectively formed a major milestone in the history of the Institute. The breadth and fairness of the debates, and the firmness of the opinions expressed, would allow the Council to proceed with confidence to amend the Constitution and to take action to make the voice of the Institute heard with authority on important public issues concerned with forestry.