

scheme is voluntary and by no means covers all forest consultants or contractors in New Zealand. Under the scheme, consultants are required to meet certain conditions and the Institute's Code of Ethics. However, there is no requirement on recognised consultants to meet the conditions in the Forest Accord.

Tim Thorpe
Convenor, Environmental
Working Group
NZ Institute of Forestry

Far North Afforestation replies to Greenpeace

Sir,

It is important to set the record straight following a series of inaccuracies and incorrect assumptions in the letter from Greenpeace correspondence Grant Rosoman published in your May issue.

The first matter to deal with is the "recent incidences reported to Greenpeace", included in which is Mr Rosoman's allegation that Far North Afforestation Limited roller crushed 200 hectares of regenerating native forest south of Kaitia.

This is total nonsense. FNA has never been, and will never be, involved in practices which destroy what any reasonable person would recognise as New Zealand native bush or forest. In fact, this company has retained many hundred hectares of quality native bush as part of our development operations.

I cannot speak for all managers and contractors, but if Mr Rosoman and his fellows believe that they have a mortgage on concerns for the natural environment of this beautiful country then he is one who is misguided and irresponsible. Ill-informed comment like his, without knowledge of all the facts, does more to bring the green lobby into disrepute than anything this industry could say or do.

As other correspondents to NZ Forestry have already noted, Mr Rosoman seems to be particularly confused about the Forest Accord, including who signed it and who accepts it. FNA has never signed it, and we never would in its current form because it is totally unrealistic and unenforceable. I believe that even those companies involved in the negotiations which led to the Accord will be taken aback to learn that the environmentalists are now trying to include rough scrub country in their definition of a forest or bush.

I have no doubt that all participants in

the forestry industry in this country accept that there is need for some general acceptance of standards and operating procedures which address the concerns of both sides. But there is a growing body of opinion which says that the Forest Accord does not achieve this. The first instrument of the Accord defines a native tree as "any indigenous woody plant which ultimately forms part of the canopy of a naturally occurring forest ..."

If that is to be the literally applied standard by which the whole industry operates then the national economy will be devastated by the collapse of a major contributor to the country's business, employment, financial and export infrastructure.

If we are ever to achieve common ground, Mr Rosoman, we must start talking common sense.

We support the total protection of quality native bush and forest. We simply cannot accept the foolish attitude which says that every little bit of scrub must be saved forever.

Many smaller forestry managers and developers are cynical about the big forest companies represented by the signatures on the Accord – they had their forests well established before the Accord was ever dreamed up. And Mr Rosoman well knows that all major plantings are now being done by private investors and forestry development companies. In fact, 80 per cent of the 90,000 hectares planted in the last year were planted by private investors.

If Mr Rosoman and his cohorts were to spend more of their time and effort developing a philosophy that recognises that both sides of this argument have a legitimate point of view, and that both sides should try much harder to work together, they would make a far more meaningful contribution to make this country a better place for the future.

Graeme Jespersen
Chief Executive
Far North Afforestation (NZ)
Limited

Native scrub clearing – Waingake

Sir,

In reply to Mr Rosoman's letter I would make the following comments.

The area felled (approximately 18.0 hectares) comprised a mixture of manuka, 4-metre-high kanuka, fern, mingimingi and a small percentage of young podocarps. Had the podocarps been left standing, they would have died in the

burnoff and shaded the radiata seedlings. An area of larger podocarps and beech species (6.5 hectares) was left because of the presence of what was in our view a significant stand of native species. The area left was also larger than required by the Gisborne District Council under the Resource Consent.

As a consequence I believe Kohntrol Forest Services acted responsibly when the block was developed. Of the 9280 hectares under Kohntrol's management, 10-12% of this area has not been planted because it is covered in native vegetation.

The cost to the client is significant and affects the investors' return by effectively increasing the cost per plantable hectare.

I believe it is a matter of finding a balance between scrub that should be felled so that plantations may be established (and thereby inherently protecting more significant forests in other areas) and retaining bush within plantations which are important.

Mr Rosoman's suggestion that consultants have been giving their clients poor advice presupposes we are all tarred with the green brush. If we were then we certainly would be giving them poor advice.

My limited knowledge of the Accord leads me to believe that it has gone too far in restricting the felling of native species and it can only do harm to the environment and the economy in the long term. A classic example of this was the Ngati Porou Whanui Forests Limited/Tasman Joint Venture which was halted for that reason.

Julian Kohn
Kohntrol Forest Services Ltd

The public's perception of Forestry

Sir,

We should not be too surprised at the apparent lack of public insight towards our forest industries referred to by Peter Hill (NZ Forestry, May 1995). I believe each of us should look critically at our own contribution towards communicating with a community who are not aware of the potential that is accumulating within our forests.

Little has changed since the days leading up to the dismemberment of the Forest Service when we were about to pay the penalty for failing to communicate our aims and achievements over three-quarters of a century of forest expansion. Yet by comparison with today's level of dialogue, we were still comparatively well served with avenues of communication.

At least pre-1987 we still enjoyed a