

## Registration options

Sir

I am one of those NZIF members who has not applied to be a "Registered Forestry Consultant". Why I have not is summarised very well by the editorial of Bruce Manley in the February 2004 issue of this journal. My "consulting" is generally limited to writing articles, papers or comments and/or presenting lectures (for which I am sometimes paid but which rarely even covers my expenses, let alone the time involved). I am often contacted for an opinion, comment or viewpoint and mostly these are given for no financial reward. My "consulting" is a small source of income.

In most years my total annual income would not cover the cost of indemnity insurance. I see no personal need or advantage to have professional indemnity insurance. As I am semi-retired I also see no need to have the 20 hours per year of Continuing Professional Development. And I see no advantage in paying a higher subscription.

I am however very supportive of "Registered Forestry Consultants" and, as I always refuse to give advice on anything to do with current stand management, I recommend their use. I even do like to be called a consultant (although many assign me that title). One other important aspect is that being semi-retired (and I want to make the most of my early retirement) I am sometimes away and not available as someone who is in full-time employment.

As there are several retired members in similar circumstances perhaps the Institute could consider a separate category.

My point in writing is to record that although members like myself have not applied to be "Registered Forestry Consultants" it does not mean we do not support registration. I (and I am sure most others) wholeheartedly support formal registration.

Wink Sutton

## Fair timber imports

Sir,

I read with interest the article concerning "The Silver Beech Industry in Transition" in your February issue.

Last year New Zealand spent \$284 million importing "special purpose" timber into this country without any form of guarantee that it had been milled in a sustainable manner. At the same time we have legislated to ensure that, when it comes to our own indigenous timber industry, trees can only be taken from sustainably managed forests.

We thus have an unequal treatment between imports on the one hand and domestically sourced indigenous timber on the other. It means that the scales are tilted heavily in favour of imports. United Future is a free trade party but, in addition to being free, we also insist that trade be *fair*. This mismatch does nothing for world conservation, utilises scarce overseas funds, and at the margin, may make some of our indigenous timber industry uneconomic.

I believe our forest owners should at least be given an even break. With that in mind I have asked the Minister of Forestry Jim Sutton to change New Zealand's law to ban the importation into New Zealand of these timbers unless we have verification that they are sourced from sustainably managed forests.

**Gordon F Copeland MP**  
**Spokesperson Forestry**  
**United future Party**

## Guide to Forestry Investment in Australia and New Zealand

*Our Guide to the expanding plantation sector provides a new benchmark for managers and investors, and industry advisors, analysts and researchers.*

Contents include:

Management structures, Forest resources,  
 Management practices, Wood production,  
 Processing outlets, Financial performance,  
 Investment returns, Opportunities and risks.  
*Cost: AUD\$320.00; NZ\$360.00; US\$240.00*

*Contact: Trade & Media Services Ltd  
 5 High Street, Rotorua, New Zealand  
 Tel: 64-7-349 4107; Fax: 64-7-349 4157  
 Email: southem@wave.co.nz*