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EDITORIAL

.... the saga continues ...

June has seen a number of developments on the creation of the Ministry for the Environment. The Working Group, set up after the Environment Forum, presented its report and recommendations to the Minister in early June; at the same time the report was released for limited consultation. In reaction to widespread concern about the limits to that consultation, the report was released to the public in the middle of the month, and on June 18th the Prime Minister issued a Press Statement after Cabinet Policy Committee, and full Cabinet, had discussed the proposals. The essence of that statement was:

* a Ministry with an advisory role will be set up by April 1986
* a Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment will have an audit function and the present Commission will be disestablished
* further public consultation on the "Heritage New Zealand" Department will take place, with a final decision at the end of August 1985.

Two working groups are now putting some "flesh" onto these recommendations.

There are a number of points concerning us as ecologists, irrespective of who employs us, or what colour our politics. We should consider the developments carefully and evaluate their implications for the values we hold and the work we do. We must try to separate these from our personal concerns about job changes, locations and promotion prospects. Of course these are important, but at present it is more important to establish Departments with the 'right' objectives, structures, functions and staffing arrangements to carry out the tasks which will enable better research, resource planning and management of the environment. We are still at the stage of building the framework.

So, has the Working Group got the framework right? Their report is over 60 pages long, and is available to everyone, so it isn't summarised here. But every member should try to read a copy and consider some of these points:

Our ecological training enables us to take an holistic approach - to look at the complex interactions and processes of a whole system rather than static situations. Is the proposed Ministry a system in which research, planning and management are linked, especially equipped with feedback from the operations (management) to research? If the Ministry is to be advisory, will the proposed structure enable it to gather the scientific, social, economic etc information on which to base its advice? How does the proposed network of DSIR, universities and other institutions integrate with the possible contract funding for "operative research" and the "joint funding" and "joint control" proposed for Heritage New Zealand?

And what has happened to the strong regional emphasis developed in early publications, and at the Forum? Good resource management, conflict resolution and practical conservation all depend on a thorough knowledge of specific areas and their problem. Can a centralised organisation perform these tasks?

It seems that the complexities of the environment have been simplified to speed up the process of change. Perhaps the voices of protest are warnings that the complex system must be treated with caution.

JUDITH ROPER-LINDSAY
SOCIETY NEWS

FROM THE CHIEF

Your far-seeing Council has now arranged Conference themes and venues up to 1987 (see items later in this Newsletter). But closer at hand, papers are still invited for this year’s Conference in Palmerston North. We also hope to get a Parliamentarian to address us on the subject of the proposals to re-organise environmental research and management.

Don’t forget (especially University teachers) that we now have an award for the best paper read by a student. The Council is keen to see competition for this award, so please encourage your rising young stars.

We need another sub-editor for mammals and birds. Anyone interested in making such a contribution to the production of the Journal, please write to the Editor (Dr N. Barlow, MAF, Private Bag, Palmerston North).

The Royal Society has now published its analysis of the effects of nuclear war. You may be gratified to know that the RS Member Bodies Committee largely endorsed the recommendations on p. 16 of our own nuclear statement. All responses so far are supportive. What do our members think? There will be a chance to say at the AGM but meanwhile your Newsletter Editor would welcome a “Dear Sir” or two.

NOTICES OF MOTION

Members intending to raise motions at the AGM are reminded to Rule 8C of the Society. “At any Annual or Special General Meeting no motion not included in the notice calling the meeting may be proposed, discussed, or put to the vote except of consent of two thirds of the members present”.

Those of you who were at last years AGM will recall the procedural delays caused by motions introduced without this notice. Please be kind to your chairman! Apart from that, this provision is a safeguard for the members of the Society. An AGM motion has some weight, and should be thought out and promulgated so that others can give thought to it too.

It is too late to promulgate motions in the NEWSLETTER, but intending motions should be displayed in a prominent place before the AGM to give members a chance to discuss them first. This may reduce discussion time before introduction is accepted or rejected.

CONFERENCE 87

A year of centennial celebrations for New Zealand’s National Parks system will begin in the 1987 August holidays at Tongariro National Park. To tie in with the 100th birthday of Tongariro National Park it has been decided that Conference ’87 will be held in Turangi.

The Turangi holiday camp has already been booked, and with its extra accommodation and hall there is an opportunity for us to have a joint
conference with another society (any ideas who?) Its early days yet for deciding on a conference theme but several possibilities do suggest themselves. National Parks and reserves, volcanism and the biota, lakes etc.

KEVIN HACKWELL

CONFERENCE 86

The theme for this conference (Lincoln College) will be "Moas, mammals and climate in the ecological history of New Zealand".

It has been believed for a long time that the NZ flora evolved in the absence of grazing pressure, and that it was thus vulnerable to the impact of browsing mammals. Many ecological changes have been seen as stemming from the ecological effects of introduced mammals: reduction of forest; destruction of vulnerable trees; accelerated erosion; near-extinction of palatable herbs.

Recent publications have challenged some of the assumptions behind these claims (examples listed below). It has been suggested that at least some of the effects attributed to browsing mammals may be a result either of natural events, such as extreme climatic events, or may be a misinterpretation of ecological processes occurring in forests - such as cohort senescence.

A topic whose time has come we think. And to do justice to it we will need to discuss the history of the biota, of the environment and of man in New Zealand. Descriptive and dynamic information will have to be drawn from geomorphologists, hydrologists, archaeologists, botanists, zoologists, foresters ... the list goes on.

We are hoping by giving advance notice to stimulate potential contributors into working up material and ideas with a conference. We may be able to produce a special society publication for presentation in view. Such a review of a topic of fundamental importance to NZ biogeography and land management.

If you have ideas or suggestions, please get in touch with Mike Rudge, Ecology Division, DSIR, Private Bag, Lower Hutt.

Also, let others who may have something to contribute know about the conference theme. Get in there and organize, or your favourite theory might go down the tube.

References


NZ COMMITTEE FOR WATER POLLUTION RESEARCH AND CONTROL

The executive committee for this organization (to which the Ecological Society belongs) has moved from Wellington to Christchurch for the 1985-1986 year. Penelope Luckens is one of our two representatives but will be unable to attend Christchurch meetings. The Ecological Society Council will therefore have to find a Christchurch based representative. If you are prepared to take on the task, or know of someone suitable, please get in touch with the council.

REGIONAL REPORT

NELSON

Henrik Moller (DSIR-Ecology Division) has recently transferred from Lower Hutt to Nelson. He is studying interactions between this, bellbirds, bees and wasps feeding on "honeydew" in beech forest patches amidst pine plantations.

The main excitement here has been caused by documents falling off the back of the truck carrying the working party set up by the Environmental Forum (see Ecol. Soc. Newsletter No 41). Many of the ideas tossed around on the truck can only be described as direct attacks on the workings of established ecological science in New Zealand. They reflect a sad lack of understanding between the environmentalists and the scientific community. That the Forum could have set up a Working Party with no representation from scientists also shows how we, as scientists and those who administer us, have ignored the rumblings out there in the community. Lay people are demanding an ever-increasing role in deciding the future of science. As natural scientists, we tend to think this involvement is confined to touchy subjects like genetic engineering. Recent events have proved this to be a false sense of security. Each of us has a responsibility firstly to do good ecological science, but we individually and as a group, must see that the community, and particularly the conservation movement, can see that this is relevant to conserving and managing all classes of indigenous communities and organisms.

Conservationists on the other hand should realise, that good science is essential to their cause. Moreover, good science can be done best when scientists are supported by those with a sympathy for the scientific ethic. It would be a disaster to have all the natural sciences in New Zealand administered by those with no scientific training, and with political barrows of one shade of green or another, to push around.

P.A. WILLIAMS
ENVIRONMENTAL AND CONSERVATION NEWS

SCOPE: WEEDS & PEST IN NATURE RESERVES

Bob Brockie attended a scope workshop session held in Paris in March to organise and set up a global review of weeds and pests in nature reserves. The half a dozen representatives came from North Africa, Europe and the Pacific and provided the opportunity to hear and discuss the range of problems in different parts of the world. While New Zealand has a severe problem with introduced animals in nature reserves, Hawaii faces more management difficulties from weed control, introduced species taking over in their protected forests. In contrast Russia has very few weed and pest problems and little time or money is spent on their control.

The representatives have undertaken to contribute chapters on the problems in major ecosystems including deserts, northern and tropical forests and remote island nature reserves. Bob will be preparing a chapter on the problems on remote island nature reserves including the Galapagos, Hawaii, Madeira, Campbell or one of our other southern islands.

JANET OWEN

CHATHAM ISLANDS NEWS

Peter Wardle, David Given, Brian Molloy and Ian Atkinson have recently been to the Chathams in a Botany Division expedition to look at areas of indigenous vegetation on Main Chatham Island. Their work concentrated on determining what sort of effects a major peat mining operation is liable to have.

Much of the expedition was concerned with the areas of very high biological value on the southern tablelands. Current interest in peat deposits is focussed on the Waitangi Peninsula in the north western portion of the island. Much of the indigenous vegetation in this part of the island is very modified and remaining areas of high botanical value are few and far between.

At present it seems that the likely social impact of the proposed development could be of greater long term significance than the environmental impact. Development of the peat resource will mean upgrading of roads, improved school facilities, construction of a new port and a processing plant the size of Motunui, a change from farming and fishing to a mining economy and a significant increase in the size of the resident population.

Botany Division's report on the botanical values of the peat areas is in progress.

Meanwhile Don Merton from Wildlife Service is about to return to the Chathams to continue with black robin breeding work. The Wildlife Service team will be pairing up birds for the next breeding season, trying to break up undesirable pair bonds and establish good breeding couples (the Family Courts willing). Don reports that the robins are doing exceedingly well.
When last on the island in February there were 38 birds and all indications are that the population is well on the way to recovery. Fertility, hatching and fledgling survival have been very high and last season there was 100% survival of young. No evidence of the potential genetic effects of inbreeding have been observed.

While on South East Island they will check up on the Chatham Islands pigeon population which was recently re-established. More news on their welfare may be available for next newsletter.

JANET OWEN

CHINCHILLAS – THE ALTERNATIVE VIEW

Recently, the Environmental Impact Assessment on the introduction of Chinchilla to New Zealand was completed by Animal Health Division of MAF. Its general conclusion was that chinchilla pose little or no threat to our environment and should, therefore, be permitted to enter this country; a view in contrast to that of a number of environmental organisations including this society.

I support the findings of the assessment and base this support on the overseas information and practical experience gained during a 12 month fur animal study tour of North America and Europe in 1984. My reasons for this view encompass both environmental and agricultural aspects.

The conclusions of my own studies and those of the assessment suggest that there is no where in New Zealand providing suitable habitat for chinchilla. Suitable chinchilla habitat must have:

- Rocky terrain (providing cover) with vegetation in close proximity
- A dry climate, probably less than 200 mm precipitation per year
- A dry diet
- Relatively free from predators (hawks, mustelids and cats)

These features infer that suitable habitat will be confined to areas which are not intensively farmed or grazed and not extensively inhabited by man, that is, class VII and VIII land and possibly class VI, AND which receives 200 mm or less annual rainfall. There is no place in New Zealand that receives as little as 200 mm (the lowest annual rainfall being 350 mm in a small segment of Central Otago); so there is clearly no suitable chinchilla habitat in this country. Even when the rainfall limitation is doubled to 400 mm per annum, or trebled to 600 mm, and mapped along with the other habitat constraints only a very small segment of Central Otago is potential chinchilla habitat.

In addition, the following salient points should be noted:

- The chinchilla has a low reproductive rate of only 2–3 young/female/year.
- Past liberation attempts have shown they have limited ability to adapt to new environments. Re-establishment even in their native Andean homelands appears to have failed.
- They are highly intolerant of wet, humid and draughty conditions.
From the economic and agricultural point of view the chinchilla offers a lot to the future development of this country's fur industry. Chinchilla fur is a high quality, high priced product which historically has exhibited a price structure more stable than for other furs. New Zealand fur producers badly need a top quality fur animal to complement the medium-high grading occupied by fitch and the medium-low grading of opossum, and in so doing stabilise the income of the producers which presently is prone to the extreme cyclic fluctuations commonly experienced when a new fur like fitch hits the world market.

There must always come a point where the economic benefits to be gained outweigh the environmental value at risk. In the case of the chinchilla the risk to the environment is as close to non-existent as can be proved and so for economic reasons the farming of chinchilla in New Zealand must be allowed to go ahead.

ROGER MACGIBBON
BSc Hons

IMPORTATION OF EXOTIC BIOTA

It was gratifying to discover that the New Zealand Entomological Society passed a resolution on the importation of exotic species at their AGM in May which was almost identical to the one passed by NZ Ecol Soc at its AGM last August. Whereas we had referred to "exotic animals" the Ent Soc were deliberately broader with "exotic biota" to include invertebrates, plants and micro-organisms.

RESOLUTION

That Government review all relevant legislation relating to the introduction of exotic biota to New Zealand so that future proposals for introductions are subject to a thorough assessment of their potential environmental impact, and that these assessments and the proposal for introduction be open to full public notification and comment.

(Passed at Entomological Society AGM 22.5.85)

KEVIN HACKWELL

ECOLOGICAL REGIONS AND DISTRICTS PROJECT
HOW YOU CAN CONTRIBUTE

Please do not be apathetic when you read this article. This is an opportunity for your participation.

Regional ecological patterns provide a framework for dealing with biological information and therefore a number of different regions have been identified throughout the country based primarily on differences in geology and landform but also on patterns of vegetation. These have been named Ecological Regions and there are 84 of them, including all the outlying islands.

In many cases these regions include a number of distinct areas which have been identified as Ecological Districts. The criteria for their
definition varies from one to another but usually includes biological
distribution patterns such as forest types, presence or absence of certain
species etc: they differ from one another in terms of their ecology. At
present 269 Ecological Districts have been distinguished and maps have been
prepared showing the boundaries of the Regions and Districts at a scale of
1:500,000.

The present edition (2nd) of these Ecological Region and District Maps
are temporary map overlays and refinements will be made to the boundaries
of several districts in the preparation of third edition maps. Maps are
available from the BRC but many agencies throughout the country have
already been sent copies (4 maps cover North, South and Stewart Islands of
New Zealand).

My contract with the BRC requires me to compile, collate and edit a set
of brief descriptions (prescriptions) of each of the 269 Ecological
Districts, summarising the predominant ecological character of the district
(including topography, geology, climate, soils, vegetation and human
factors); stating, in order, the major criteria used to define the
district; and describing the positions of the boundaries. This set of
prescriptions is being prepared for publication as an extended legend to
accompany the 3rd edition Ecological Regions and District Maps.

At the same time as writing the prescriptions I am compiling any
supplementary material which is supplied by contributors and filing
information about each district separately for use in the future "Handbook
of Ecological Districts of New Zealand."

This is where you, the reader, come in, whether or not you have already
been asked to contribute. We want to know everything which is special and
unique about your districts: the district you live in, the ones you
holiday in, tramp in, botanise and bird watch in - the parts of New Zealand
which you know best. What is distinctive about which district? What has
your district got that makes it different? Are there rare birds, or large
populations of less rare birds? Nesting colonies? Roosts? Endemic or
rare plants? Plants or animals with unusual distributions; e.g. outside
their usual range or at the limits of their known distribution? Please
write and tell me about the land snails, insects, other invertebrates: in
what way is your district special in terms of invertebrates? Likewise for
freshwater fish and other fresh water animals and plants - don't forget
wetlands. What about bats, frogs, reptiles?

If you know about something which you think is special or different in
any particular ecological district in New Zealand (not forgetting the
outlying islands from the Kermadecs in the north to Macquarie I. in the
south) or know of someone else who does, please write and tell me about it.

It is only the people who live in the districts who can know them
really well. You may think your knowledge of the unusual features of the
biology of your district is unimportant but we would value it very highly
indeed. So everyone out there in the wonderful and highly diverse
ecological districts of New Zealand, here is your opportunity to contribute
something really useful to the future planning process of New Zealand. The
planners can't make the right decisions if they do not have all the facts!

Get out your pens now, please, and write to me!

MARY MCEWEN
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES CENTRE, H.O. DSIR, PB, WGTN

FOREST FUTURES

In November the Minister for the Environment requested the Commission to undertake a comprehensive review of the nature and value of New Zealand's indigenous forests. The review focusses on possible management options for indigenous forests - on private as well as Crown land.

A thorough review was needed for several reasons:

* public concern reflected in the high number of letters written to the present Minister for the Environment and his predecessor, particularly about East Cape afforestation proposals and joint venture forestry plantation operations in Northland;
* concern about the inadequate protection given to some indigenous forests, especially those areas not set aside as public, ecological or scientific reserves;
* the pending implementation of the Government's North Island indigenous forest policy and its broader implications;
* increasing scarcity of indigenous timbers for various uses, caused primarily by the dramatic lowering of the State cut;
* it is now 10 years since the Management Policy for Indigenous State Forests was implemented;
* consideration of incentives to retain indigenous forests, particularly on private lands without interfering with the rights of landowners;
* changing public perceptions and attitudes to the values of indigenous forests.

The review is being published as an issues and options paper, prepared by the Commission for the Environment with assistance from the NZ Forest Service and background information from the Department of Lands and Survey, the Town and Country Planning Division of the Ministry of Works and Development and conservation groups. The paper

* assesses the present status of New Zealand's indigenous forests and the implications of current land management practices for them
* describes changing public attitudes
* analyses the existing administrative and legislative structure and its implications for the indigenous forest resource
* identifies possible options for improved management of the indigenous forest.

BRUCE GORDON
(From Commission for Environment Newsletter 1985:1)
QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

RESULTS OF NEWSLETTER QUESTIONNAIRE

165 replies. Results as percentages of replies.

I. CURRENT FEATURES

Would you like:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Extracts from other societies' newsletters</th>
<th>less</th>
<th>same</th>
<th>more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2) Press clippings of ecological significance</th>
<th>less</th>
<th>same</th>
<th>more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(3) Listings of projects underway in Universities and Government Departments</th>
<th>less</th>
<th>same</th>
<th>more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(4) Informal reports of ecological work in progress</th>
<th>less</th>
<th>same</th>
<th>more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(5) Reports of ecological expeditions</th>
<th>less</th>
<th>same</th>
<th>more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(6) Conference reports (ours and other relevant ones)</th>
<th>less</th>
<th>same</th>
<th>more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(7) Listings of forthcoming conferences, workshops etc</th>
<th>less</th>
<th>same</th>
<th>more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(8) Subcommittee and regional section reports</th>
<th>less</th>
<th>same</th>
<th>more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(9) Letters to the Editor</th>
<th>less</th>
<th>same</th>
<th>more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(10) Cartoons and other lighthearted titbits</th>
<th>less</th>
<th>same</th>
<th>more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. POSSIBLE FEATURES

Should we include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(11) Card cover for the Newsletter (additional cost 15-20% per mailing i.e. £40)</th>
<th>less</th>
<th>same</th>
<th>more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(12) Original research articles (we do not mean scientific journal quality, but informative interim presentation of interesting results)</th>
<th>less</th>
<th>same</th>
<th>more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional reports of changes affecting the ecological community.
For instance, new appointments, retirements, absences, returns, new facilities etc)

Listings of ecologically relevant documents produced by Government, University, and other institutions

Annual list of Ecological Society members and addresses

Annual biographic notes on Council Members

We have had an excellent response to this questionnaire: approximately 165 members replied, 97 made comments, and 30 extended comments. These comments will be kept and will provide a valuable guide to consumer thought on where the NEWSLETTER should be heading. We do not intend to change everything at once and indeed, from the comments we have had, there is much which meets with general approval. We thank those who complimented us, and previous editors, on the NEWSLETTER; our fragile egos need as much of that sort of massage as you can provide.

Below we will first make some general comments on what you thought about the NEWSLETTER, and then comment in detail on the various items.

To summarise: the Ecological Society is a serious, dedicated bunch with very little time to waste on trivia, and they want the NEWSLETTER to reflect this. By far the most common comment was that the NEWSLETTER must be kept short, snappy and informative. Many suggested a limit for any article or item of 1 page, or 1/2 page. Some comments gave us the impression that the NEWSLETTER was read with one eye on the waste paper basket to which it was shortly to be consigned; others made that explicit with barely veiled references to the 'round file'. There was also strongly expressed feeling that the NEWSLETTER should not be upgraded to quasi-journal status. Layout came in for some critical comment; many thought it could be improved, especially as regards typeface and headings. Although there was general support for extended functions, such as were suggested on the second sheet of the questionnaire, many thought that we would have difficulty in carrying them out. Especially chilling to the NEWSLETTER team were comments from a couple of editors of other newsletters along those lines. The graduates of the school of hard knocks must be listened to with some respect.

It is apparent that the NEWSLETTER will not follow the pattern which has been established by other scientific societies, such as NZ Geological Society or NZ Soil News. They have published short scientific papers for many years and are regularly quoted in the literature and have impressive card covers. We will attempt to concentrate on the news, broadly defined, bulletin board features, and comment. Short scientific papers will be accepted, but they must tend more towards the abstract end of the spectrum.
COMMENT IN DETAIL

1. Extracts from other societies' newsletters.

The high 'same' result combined with a substantial 'less' response will probably mean no change in our policy, or a slight reduction.

2. Press clippings of ecological significance.

Several correspondents outside of the metropolitan centres mentioned that they found this a useful feature. The general response means that we will try and maintain the current level or expand slightly.


A high "more" vote and a number of comments in favour of this service means that we will devote more effort to this department. This will mean approaching inmates of various institutions to come up with the goods.

4. Informal reports of ecological work in progress.

A majority in favour and few against argues for such reports to feature more strongly. There is little the editors can do to increase the trickle of contributions to a might flood, though. Think about it; people to want to know what's going on.

5. Reports on ecological expeditions.

A less positive result, since "some" vote actually means almost none!; perhaps readers shudder at the thought of climbing magazine saga-type contributions. We think that they are worthwhile and would like to encourage such write-ups (remembering the highest duty of brevity all the while).

6. Conference reports

A very substantial "same" vote plus several negative comments, makes us feel that ecologists are on the whole more interested in attending conferences than reading about them. We will try to report our own conference in some details.

7. Listings of forthcoming conferences, workshops etc.

Probably there is room for improvement here, although a fair degree of satisfaction with existing service.

8. Subcommittee and regional section reports

It seems as though a good job is being done here, and there is little need for change.

9. Letters to the Editor

In some newsletters this is a lively feature which attracts much interest, not to say controversy. A majority seem to prefer the present situation of a few letters now and then, although quite a few are prepared to have more.
We obviously cannot control letters at all, but potential letter writers should take note. Where are you "Mother of Six" and "Disgusted"?

10. Cartoons etc

Only a moderately positive response. It is a difficult area. Poorly drawn, only marginally humorous cartoons and such like can lower the tone of a newsletter something horrible. Sexism, racism, ageism etc are also hot issues these days, and cartoons and anecdotal material are notorious for offending on these scores. A sister publication, the NZ GEOLOGICAL NEWSLETTER, had some trouble a little while ago with a rather unfortunate cartoon strip which involved the concept of 'dehydrated women'. In the Ecological Society where the sexes are a little more evenly balanced it could have caused serious trouble I believe. We are interpreting the response as indicating the pitfalls which await the unwary in this area, and will continue to use good, genuinely funny and relevant material as it comes to hand. Let us know if you run across any.

11. Card cover

A very clear anti result; in fate, the highest. It would be a brave editor which would go against such strongly expressed views. We can just see members tearing off the offending covers and mailing them back to us. We were rather taken with the idea; nearly all the other newsletters have them we thought, why not us? "You are not like other newsletters" is the answer we received. We thought that the cover would improve 1. stackability 2. appearance and hence status; 3. the segregation of general, unchanging stuff which Newsletters are accustomed to stick inside covers. However, the replies - including a hurtful comment about "your pretty blue cover" - indicated that most thought it added little for the extra cost. To our horror we discovered that many thought of the newsletter as disposable, and some ripped it to bits in order to retain items for filing, and junked the rest. The cover would make this more difficult to do. Well, it's no card cover folks. But be warned, we're tough us newsletter editors, and we know you have short memories...

12. Original research articles

A 'U' shaped response, indicating a divergence of opinions. This was reflected in the comments as well. Negative comment homed in on not wanting yet another quasi-journal, the difficulties of quoting material, and the second-rate publication of data which needed fuller treatment. Positive comment was guarded and stressed short readable articles. "No more than a page" was a common comment. We'll accept short articles (although we feel that one page is too restrictive), but they must be of general interest.

13. Regional reports of changes affecting the ecological community.

A very positive response here means that we will be putting much more effort into this area. We've given up hope of regional volunteers, so we will continue our search for those who can be 'volunteered'.

14. Listings of ecologically relevant documents from Universities and Government etc.
Nearly everyone wants this, so we'll give it a go. Lots of work though, and several mentioned that it could be beyond our powers. Some said that this information was provided elsewhere but, to our way of thinking, if so many want it, they can't be satisfied with the other sources.

15. Annual list of Ecological Society Members

Leaving it up to us is how we interpret this result. Many made the comment that they would prefer a less frequent list. We feel that the list must be reasonably up to date to be of any use. We think we can produce a neat, small list for a reasonable cost. If we can, we'll go for an annual listing.

16. Annual biographic notes on Council members.

Once again, a pollster's nightmare of a result. Some were obviously titillated by the idea, and went further and suggest 'Council member of the month' centresfolds. So, they love you for your beautiful bodies, council members, not your incisive intellects like you always thought! We think its a good idea to have some notes on the top echelons of the society, so we'll go ahead with this idea, but bearing in mind the large 'no' vote, keep it all low-key and tasteful.

Many thanks to all those who replied

THE NEWSLETTER TEAM.

LETTERS

Dear Editor,

In response to a letter in the November (No. 40) Newsletter about Conference Field Trips I would like to make a plea for the 'status quo'. I like the trips that have been arranged at most conferences. They are usually value for money, give insight into the area and are coloured by the interests (not to say idiosyncrasies) of the local organisers. Good planning (God Willing and Weather Permitting) can reduce "whistle stop" problems. Regarding the embarrassment of changing seats perhaps it could be considered the "done thing" to sit in a different seat each time i.e. seats must be filled from the front as people return and persons engaged in conversations would automatically be ABLE TO CONTINUE (with the proviso of returning to the same bus to avoid the even more embarrassing prospect of being left behind with no money in the pocket!)

Colin Meurk indicates his suggested type of field study is an optional one. What about making this a pre-conference activity for the eager, energetic and able and then there is the possibility of presentation of a preliminary report as suggested in his Point 5 on the last morning?

If there is a considerable move away from the "conventional" field trip part of the programme perhaps it could be an optional extra too as pre- or
POST-CONFERENCE ACTIVITY BUT PLEASE DON'T DELETE IT FROM THE PROGRAMME.

Yours sincerely,
"INVETERATE FIELD TRIPPER"

MARGARET A. LESLIE
PATEA, TARANAKI.

NOTICES

ANTARCTIC RESEARCH PROPOSALS

1986/87

Proposals for research projects to be considered for inclusion in the 1986/87 New Zealand Antarctic Research Programme are invited by the Ross Dependency Research Committee. Research proposals can cover any of the earth, life or atmospheric sciences and be directed to a better understanding of the unique environment of Antarctica, its geological and geophysical structure, or those natural phenomena most suited to research conducted from southern latitudes.

Research proposals can be either short or long term, and based at New Zealand's Antarctic stations or in the field, depending on the logistic support required. Proposals should include a detailed outline of past research in the topic, biographical notes on team members, an outline of anticipated work, and details of required logistic support.

Applications, which close on July 31, 1985, are reviewed by the biological, physical or earth sciences working groups of the RDRC. Applicants will be informed of the status of their proposals in late December 1985.

An information package on research directions, available facilities and how to prepare a proposal is available along with a support information form from:

The Secretary
R D R C
C/- D S I R
Head Office
Private Bag
WELLINGTON
ANIMAL BEHAVIOUR CONFERENCE IN NEW ZEALAND

There is no scientific society in New Zealand which caters specifically for scientists and research students interested in field and laboratory studies of animal behaviour. However, several New Zealanders belong to the Australian Society for the Study of Animal Behaviour (ASSAB) which meets annually and which will be holding a conference here next year. For the first time ASSAB is meeting in New Zealand at Massey University, Palmerston North from 28 to 31 January 1986.

A glossy brochure with more information about the meeting is available from Dr Clare Weltman, Department of Botany and Zoology, Massey University, Palmerston North. Anyone interested in behaviour or behavioural ecology is warmly invited to request a brochure, and then return the looseleaf sheet with mailing list details. Future advice about the conference will be circulated to people on the mailing list.

Two symposia are under consideration, each of particular interest to New Zealand ecologists. They are "Behaviour and Speciation", and "The Control of Vertebrate Pests". Readers who may like to contribute to these symposia should write to the organizer soon. As well, an interesting variety of excursions and pre/post conference events have been planned.

So shake out the behavioural data you've sat on for years, mark your calendars now, and write away for the ASSAB '86 brochure!

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES


Aug 10 -16  Annual Meeting of Ecological Society of America. SYRACUSE, NY USA. Enq: Dr Duncan T. Patten, Center for Environmental Studies, Arizona State Univ., Tempe, AZ 85287 USA.

NEW ZEALAND ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY
1985 CONFERENCE PROGRAMME
20 - 23 August, Massey University

Tuesday 20 August
From 1.00 pm  Registration
2.00 - 3.30  Workshops including:
Talk by Philip Woolaston, M.P.
Under-secretary for The Environment
on: Environmental Administration.
3.30 - 4.00  AFTERNOON TEA
4.00 - 5.00  Workshops continue
7.00  WINE AND CHEESE

Wednesday 21 August
Chairman -
8.30 - 8.45  Formal Conference Opening – President; Conference organiser.
8.45 - 9.15  On strict and facultative biennials, or, why it is worth
being a short lived plants.  D. Kelly
9.15 - 9.45  Populations of Beilschmiedia tawa in logged and virgin
stands at Pureora forest.  C. West.
9.45 - 10.15  Rimu – Ubiquitous podocarp of New Zealands lowland forest.
Aspects of its evolutionary history and consequent physiology
and ecology.  M. McEwen
10.15-10.45  MORNING TEA
10.45-11.15  Habitat use by yellowheads in the Hawdon river valley,
Arthur’s Pass National Park.  A.F. Read
11.15-11.45  Comparison of an Island and Mainland population of the
house mouse in the Marlborough Sounds.  E.C. Murphy
11.45-12.15  Breeding of kakapo of Stewart Island 1985.  R. Powlesland et al
12.15 – 1.15  LUNCH
Chairman - Alice Fitzgerald
1.15 – 1.45  Die back and regeneration of Mountain Beech in Tongariro
National Park.  M. Steel
1.45 - 2.15 An introduction to the spread of Heath (Calluna vulgaris) in Tongariro National Park.  H. Chapman
2.15 - 2.45 Dry matter and nutrient relationship in stands of Pinus radiata.  H.I.A. Madgwick
2.45 - 3.15  AFTERNOON TEA
3.15 - 5.15 Excursion to Aokautere Centre

Thursday 22 August

(Chairman -

8.30 - 9.10 Presidential address M.R. Rudge. 'Science, management and accountability'  
9.10 - 9.15 Introduction to symposium 'MANAGED ECOSYSTEMS'
9.15 - 9.45 A geomorphological analysis of New Zealand's National Parks.  L.M. Rowan
9.45 - 10.15 Mountain land management.  A. Cunningham
10.15 - 10.45  MORNING TEA

10.45 - 11.15 An interventionist management strategy for a small lowland podocarp forest on the Poverty Bay plains.  L.J. Daniel

11.15 - 11.45 Peatland ecosystems.
   1. Peatlands for agriculture.
   2. Peatlands for reservation.  R. Irving, C. McKay, K. Thompson

11.45 - 12.15 Lake Wairarapa wetlands.  P. Moore

12.15 - 1.15  LUNCH

Chairman - M. Williams

1.15 - 1.45 Factors in the management of indigenous ecosystems - Some case studies from the Southern South island.  A. Mark & P. Johnson

1.45 - 2.15 The pasture ecosystem  A. Field
2.15 - 2.45 Present pest management in the Northern North Is.  R. East, R.A. Prestidge, L.N. Robertson

2.45 - 3.15  AFTERNOON TEA
3.15 - 3.45  Changes in the distribution and density of deer in part of the Waneti area of Fiordland 1969-1984  G. Nugent

3.15 - 3.45  Sustained yield beech forests  D. Franklin

4.15 - 5.00  Managed Ecosystems - Summary and Overview  B.P. Springett

Friday 23 August

Chairman -

8.30 - 9.00  Hawthorn populations in Mid Canterbury.  P. Williams & R.P. Buxton

9.00 - 9.30  The Cockayne plots of Central Otago - a 1985 evaluation.  B.J. Wills

9.30 - 10.00  Vigour in Chinonochloa: a question of energy or nutrition.  I.J. Pavton et al.

10.00 - 10.30  MORNING TEA

Chairman - Clare Weltman

10.30 - 11.00  Home range and denning behaviour of Brown Kiwi in Hawkes Bay.  J. McLennan

11.00 - 11.30  Behavioural responses of possums (*Trichosurus vulpecula*) to baits used in aerial control operations.  D.R. Morgan

11.30 - 12.00  Kiwis and possums: traps and baits. The dilemma of a flightless old New Zealander in the 20th century.  B. Reid

12.00 - 1.00  LUNCH

Chairman - Clare Weltman

1.00 - 1.30  Bird community structures in part of Tararua State Forest  M. Moffatt

1.30 - 2.00  Coevolution? or the true life story of flax and its floral violators  J.L. Craig

END OF CONFERENCE
NEW ZEALAND ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY (INC.)

NOTICE OF ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

Notice is hereby given that the 33rd Annual General Meeting of the New Zealand Ecological Society (Inc.) will be held at Massey University, Palmerston North, on Wednesday, 21 August 1985 commencing at 8.00 p.m.

The agenda for this meeting is set out below.

AGENDA

1) Apologies
2) Confirmation of the Minutes of the 32nd Annual General Meeting
3) Matters arising from the Minutes
4) Receive balance sheet and statement of accounts
5) Receive Annual Report
6) Election of Officers
7) Election of Council
8) Appointment of Honorary Auditor
9) Notices of motion:

From the Council, Minutes of 31 May 1985: It was moved: M R Rudge/I A E Atkinson

(1) "That the publication 'The Environmental Consequences to New Zealand of Nuclear Warfare in the Northern Hemisphere' be endorsed by the AGM"

(2) "That the statement be published in full in the Journal"

(3) "That if published, it be prefaced by an explanatory paragraph outlining the purpose and nature of the statement"

10) General Business
Annual Report for the year ending 31 March 1985

Overview

This 'annual' report differs from all previous ones in that it spans a period from the end of June 1984 to the end of March 1985. This arises from the decision taken at the 1983 AGM to make the period of our financial year accord with general practice.

It has long been my wish to free up the finances of the Society to permit greater participation in the wider affairs of the scientific community. The main move in this respect was to reduce the proportion of our subscribed revenue (over 80%) that was spent on the Journal. This was accomplished, while maintaining quality, by using modern phototypesetting methods. Further savings are possible if we use (or one day invest in) a word processor, but that would impose more work on Society officers who are already very busy people. The Journal is now produced for about 2/3 of previous rates. This has enabled the Society to make donations in support of worthwhile activities (awards, action funds) to produce the nuclear warfare statement, and reimbursed travel expenses for special purposes.

A second measure was to separate off from our subscribed revenue, the trading balance from Conferences. This, I hope, will provide a special purpose fund to promote a wider array of seminars/workshops, to bring prestige speakers from overseas from time to time, and to contemplate special symposium publications.

The Council also discussed sponsorship (which we have tried before) and special revenue earning activities (cards, calendars, posters) which other societies have adopted. These are very time consuming, and a last resort we don't yet need.

The year's highlight has been the production of the statement on nuclear warfare. It was not easy for the Council to enter the world of politics while remaining true to its scientific mandate. I believe it was achieved very creditably, and that view is supported by the many commendations flowing to the Society from other member bodies, and from the Royal Society.

Ever since its beginnings the Ecological Society has commented on matters of the day, mostly on Nature Conservation. Older members can recall previous issues and comments but it has become increasingly hard to retrieve the relevant documents from our records. I am very pleased therefore that a start has been made on an index of our records. This will be useful for many purposes. One thing we still lack is a biographical and pictorial record of the Society's past officers.

It has been a busy year for your Council and I would like to express great thanks to all of your officers and Councillors for their conscientious work.

Mike Rudge
President
Membership

The Society membership at 31 March 1985 was 449. There were 18 new members (13 full, 4 student, 1 introductory), and 12 resignations during the year. There were 163 subscribers to the Journal (70 in New Zealand, 93 overseas).

Council Activity

Council met 5 times during the year being from end of June 1984 to end of March 1985. All meetings were held in Wellington except the AGM which was held in Nelson. The following appointments were made by Council.
Dr Nigel Barlow succeeded Dr Murray Williams as Editor; Dr Mike Rudge as representative to the Member Bodies' Committee of the Royal Society;
Mrs Helen Hughes and Dr Penelope Luckens as representatives to the New Zealand Committee for Water Pollution Research; Dr Matt McGlone and Dr Judith Roper-Lindsay as Newsletter Compilers. Convenors of subcommittees were: AGM and Conference Organiser Dr Nick Clout; Awards Dr Nick Clout; Conservation Mr Kevin Hackwell, Dr Ian Atkinson; Education, Mrs Pam Williams; Consequences of Nuclear Warfare Dr Wren Green; Society Records Mrs Margaret Leslie.

Editor's Report (Nigel Barlow)

I succeeded Dr Murray Williams as editor in November 1984 and 3 sub-editors were appointed: Dr John Gibb; Dr Peter Johnson; and Dr David Towns.

The flow of papers was slow, and by the end of December there were insufficient to fill the Journal. The majority were submitted in March and virtually all required extensive revision, often because of problems with jumbled or unnecessarily long and discursive presentation.

As of mid-April, 16 papers were received and 9 accepted for Vol. 8 all with revision. There were 3 book reviews, and a new Short Communications section was included.

Bryce Francis & Co. was chosen to print the Journal again. I thank Dr Murray Williams for his help, and the sub-editors and referees for their vital contributions. Some extremely thorough referees' reports were received, which do a good deal to maintain and enhance the Journal's quality.

Newsletter Compiler's Report (Matt McGlone)

After an all-time low in 1983 when only 2 Newsletters were produced, we bounced back in 1984 with 4. Ecological issues covered have included the threat to Henderson Island, environmental consequences of nuclear war, introduction of chinchillas to New Zealand, and the saga of meat-eating possums.

Participation of Society members in the form of reports of work in progress, ecological issues, requests for information, letters to the editor, etc. has remained small. Unlike some Societies, we have no real tradition of writing for the Society Newsletter.
The Newsletter editorial team has decided to introduce some changes in order to increase both the usefulness of the Newsletter and participation from members. As a first step, a questionnaire was distributed to all members with Newsletter 40 (March 1985).

The response to the questionnaire (150 so far) has been gratifyingly large. Many have found the time to make detailed suggestions and comments. It is abundantly clear that members wish the Newsletter to be 1) informative; 2) brief; 3) not too flash. It is also apparent that members wish to hear more about what others are doing.

There will be no great changes in production or layout of the Newsletter, but we hope that there will be substantial changes in content in the coming year.

Report of the Member Bodies' Committee Representative (Mike Rudge)

There are now 55 Member Bodies of the Royal Society. The Member Bodies Committee (MBC) met on 12 March 1985, and the Management Committee met 3 times during the year.

The MBC decided to retain the management committee as it was a useful second forum alongside the Royal Society Council.

The Federation of Biological Societies, set up in 1983, maintained a liaison function through its Newsletter. It also undertook to canvass views on the support given for basic science, as a contribution to an NRAC strategic review.

The Ecological Society gave financial support to the Prince and Princess of Wales Award. So far 22 awards have been made for a total disbursement of $76 000.

The MBC meeting passed motions of support for the Ecological Society's statement "The Environmental Consequences to New Zealand of Nuclear Warfare in the Northern Hemisphere".

Conservation Report (Kevin Hackwell, Ian Atkinson)

The main conservation issue of the year for the Society dealt with the importation of new exotic breeds of animals into New Zealand. This issue was launched at the August conference when it was heard that chinchilla had been imported into New Zealand. Investigations soon revealed that little in-depth study on the possible impact of these animals on the New Zealand environment had preceded the approval for importation by both MAF and the Wildlife Service. The animals had been in the country for over 6 months before their presence was made public.

The Society was not only concerned about the possible impact on the native flora and fauna of this herbivorous rodent, but also with the animal importation procedures, which contain no legislative requirement for considering the possible environmental impact of a new animal should it become feral.

The Society organised a very successful dialogue between Federated Farmers, the Agricultural Pests Destruction Council, the New Zealand Acclimatisation
Societies and the Royal Forest and Bird Society. As a result of the pressure brought to bear by this group on MAF and the Caucus Committee on Primary Production and Marketing, the Minister of Agriculture, Mr Moyle, imposed a moratorium on the further importation of chinchilla. He also called for an environmental impact assessment on chinchilla farming in New Zealand, and for a review of the legislative and administrative procedures associated with exotic animal importations.

With moves to diversify farming the pressure is going to continue to mount to introduce more potentially damaging exotic animals. Since August there have been enquiries about Asian water buffalo, musk deer and alpacas. Improved methods of vetting and approving these proposals can not come soon enough.

Probably the other most important issue of the year has been the proposal to establish a new Ministry of the Environment and a Nature Conservancy Department. The Society made a submission on the paper prepared for the Environmental Summit in which it argued for the separation of the development and conservation functions of departments such as the Forest Service and Lands and Survey. The Summit also supported this view and a post-summit working party was given the job of coming up with the basic outline for both a new Ministry for the Environment and a department which would conserve and manage the natural lands owned by the State.

Other issues covered by the Conservation Subcommittee have been strategies for the management of mangroves in New Zealand, the threat to Antarctic wildlife of the building of a French airstrip in Adelie Land, Antarctica, the purchase of the Plimmerton Swamp north of Wellington, and the future of Himalayan tahr in the southern alps.

Education Report (Pam Williams)

A total of eight ecological slide-tape packages for sixth and seventh form biology courses have now been completed. The latest contributions are Stoats and Offshore Islands (Rowley Taylor) and Rocky Shore Ecology (Margaret Leslie). Two further packages are in draft form but beyond that no new drafts or proposals have been received, despite many initial offers. A companion package may be produced to illustrate the Society's nuclear warfare statement.

Financial assistance for costs and an honorarium are available, so we hope Society members and readers of this Journal may the effort to contribute to the important task of assisting with ecological education.

Consequences of Nuclear War Subcommittee Report (Wren Green)

This subcommittee was formed in June 1984 and its main activity has been to produce a statement for the Council entitled "The Environmental Consequences to New Zealand of Nuclear Warfare in the Northern Hemisphere". The 24-page document was endorsed by all Councillors and released as "A Statement of Concern by the Council of the New Zealand Ecological Society" on 5 December 1984 at a press conference in the Parliamentarian Theatre. The Statement was accepted on behalf of the Government and all MPs by the Minister for the Environment, Hon. Russell Marshall. As the Statement was
produced after the last AGM, the Society as a whole has not yet had the opportunity to pass formal comment on it.

Free copies of the Statement were sent to all members of the Ecological Society, all Members of Parliament, media outlets, and interested people in New Zealand and overseas. The initial print run was exhausted early in 1985 and Council approved a further print run of 5000. Copies will now be sold for $1 each (schools 50 c each). Council continues to receive favourable comment from within and outside the Society, and a continuing demand for copies.

This was the first substantive statement on the possible environmental consequences to New Zealand of a major nuclear war waged elsewhere and the major points in the document were given good press coverage. As many uncertainties exist about some of the projections, the Council felt it was appropriate to request Government to "support and finance the direct participation of New Zealand scientists in regional and global efforts to develop a better understanding of the environmental consequences of nuclear war".

The subcommittee will continue to monitor scientific developments on this subject and to liaise with other scientific societies. It may also develop an audiovisual package in conjunction with the Education Subcommittee.

Awards Report (Mick Clout)

At the 1984 AGM Dr K A Wodzicki was made an Honorary Life Member of this Society.

Alison Cree, Waikato University, became the first recipient of the Student Award for her paper given at the 1984 Conference in Nelson, "Habitat requirement of native frogs (Liopeolma archeyi and L. hochstetteri) in the Coromandel Peninsula". The prize is awarded to the student whose Conference paper is judged to be the best in terms of both subject matter and presentation.

Criteria have been formalised by the Council governing nomination to honorary life membership:

(a) Service to the Society
* generally: as a conference organiser, speaker, writer of comments/reports/submissions
* council: terms of service, subcommittee, contributions
* officer: editor, honorary secretary, treasurer, vice president, president

(b) Contribution to Ecology
Making a distinguished and significant contribution to the discipline (and its application) whether in research, teaching, or administration.

Nominations have to be made to the Council and be accompanied by a case for the candidate. The Council then takes the nomination to the AGM.
New Zealand Committee for Water Pollution Research (NZCWPRC)
(Helen Hughes, Penelope Luckens)

The Committee comprises 22 member bodies and two government department observers. The Executive for the Committee is now based in Christchurch with Professor A P Mulcock, Chairman and Dr M Noonan, Secretary.

A successful seminar on Ocean Outfalls in 1984 contributed to our growing list of sponsored conferences. Planning has begun for an IAWPRC Specialised Conference on Waste Stabilisation Ponds to be held in Auckland in 1987. As long as this steady effort continues the Committee will be achieving its main goal of encouraging information transfer in the field of water pollution.

The Committee gave its support to a number of findings and recommendations of the 1982 Water Conference and in particular has pursued the question of the need for a centralised waste treatment research organisation. Following representation from member bodies and further discussion we agreed that such a research institution is not feasible at present. However a mechanism for coordinating this type of research is most necessary and we have stated this to the National Research Advisory Council. Until the Government recognises that need we believe this Committee should continue to promote liaison between waste treatment research, water quality research, engineers, scientists and water managers.

The Chairman attended the 12th International Biennial Conference held in Amsterdam (report in the 1984 NZCWPRC Newsletter). It was significant that 75% of the New Zealand delegation were consulting engineers.

Society Records (Margaret Leslie)

A start has been made putting all the relevant Society records onto a card index system. Information from Annual Reports has now been indexed and work is progressing on the AGM and Council Minutes. Other records will be filed in due course and as they come to hand. This system of indexing records will give easy access to past pronouncements, decisions, and submissions of the Society and will be especially valuable for conservation matters.

Manawatu Group Report (David Kelly)

The last annual report described the first six meetings held in 1984. The last two meetings, both in September, were:

(1) Keith McNaughton "The effects of widespread deforestation on climate and hydrology"; and

(2) Peter Newsome "The Vegetative Cover Map of New Zealand"

The latter meeting was also the AGM and the following committee was elected for 1985: David Kelly (Chairman), Kathryn Rankin (Treasurer), David Drummond, Michael Greenwood, Heather Outred and Ray Zander.

For 1985 a reduced programme is being arranged with a less technical emphasis to try and appeal to a wider range of members. Proposed
activities include talks on African locust control and American birdlife, and a field trip to look at management of Keeble's Bush (a local forest remnant).
ANNUAL CONFERENCE 1984

The 33rd Annual Conference was held at Nelson College from 20-24 August 1984. It featured a joint symposium, field trip and social events with the NZ Marine Sciences Society whose conference overlapped with ours in both time and space. There were 120 Ecological Society registrants and c. 60 from the NZ Marine Sciences Society.

The general conference programme was as follows:

Monday, 20th
Marine Sciences papers
Marine Sciences AGM
Marine Sciences wine and cheese evening

Tuesday, 21st
Joint symposium: 'Effects of exploitation on marine ecosystems'
Joint buffet dinner

Wednesday, 22nd
Joint field excursion to Golden Bay
Annual dinner (with Marine Sciences)

Thursday, 23rd
Ecological Society papers
Poster session
Workshop: 'Future perspectives for biological conservation in New Zealand reserves'
Education packages
AGM

Friday, 24th
Ecological Society papers

Papers presented in the Tuesday symposium on 'Effects of exploitation on marine ecosystems' were:

D A Robertson Antarctic marine fisheries
R H Mattlin The New Zealand arrow squid fishery
M W Cawthorn Hooker's sealion: what prospects for an incidental bycatch?
R W Hickman Exploitation of the Marlborough Sounds by green-lipped mussels
H Kaspar & I G Boyes Effects of mussel aquaculture on compounds of the nitrogen cycle in Kenepuru Sound
M Bradstock Bryozoan corals in Tasman Bay
K R Grange Distribution, standing crop, population structure and growth rates of an unexploited resource of black coral in the southern fiords
T Healy, K Black & W de Lange Field investigations associated with large scale numerical model studies
W de Lange & T Healy The effect of beach nourishment on the sedimentology and shellfish of Pilot Bay beach, Mount Maunganui
G R Hicks Predatory exploitation: what are the effects on prey?
A fish - meiofauna example
N Martin Chione stutchburyi: population responses to exploitation
D J Gilbert & G D James Changes in Bay of Plenty trawl fish resources
over the last two decades

D A Robertson  Recent developments in orange roughy research
J H Annala    The use of yield models in managing the New Zealand rock lobster fishery
K Walls       A survey of the common sea urchin Euechinus chloroticus - a potentially exploitable fishery requiring management

On Tuesday evening 85 people from both societies enjoyed a buffet dinner held at Nelson College.

The field excursion to Golden Bay on Wednesday, 22nd was marred by wet weather, but despite this 75 people, from both societies, crammed into two buses and made the journey across the Takaka Hill. The theme of the excursion was aspects of ocean productivity in Tasman and Golden Bays. This involved visits to Port Nelson, the salmon farm at Pupu Springs, and Waitapu Wharf, where attempts to manage and enhance the local scallop fishery were described.

On Wednesday evening the joint annual dinner of both societies attracted 140 people for a kaimoana feast followed by socialising and dancing into the small hours of the morning.

Thursday, 23 August saw the start of the Ecological Society programme of contributed papers. Papers delivered were:

M J Williams  Fish y. fowl: the likely impact on waterfowl of the introduction of grass carp into New Zealand waterways
G P Elliott   The distribution and habitat requirements of the banded rail in Nelson and Marlborough
G Rennison  Management of Puponga Farm Park, Golden Bay
E B Spurr    Effects of beech forest management on bird populations
K A Wodzicki, H R Thompson & C Alderton  The distribution and numbers of gannets (Sula serrator) in New Zealand
D Robertson  The diet of gannets in New Zealand

A poster session was held in the early afternoon and included the following material:

D Butler     Bird survey of Nelson Lakes National Park
J E C Flux, A Bowen, N Gibbs, S Ruarus & J Beggs  Nest boxes for parakeets and kaka
W Q Green    Home range variability in the possum
D Hunt       Big Bush vegetation mapping
G T Jane     Survey of Wilberforce Ecological Area
G T Jane     Wind damage and related ecological processes in mountain beech forests of Canterbury
R M F S Sadleir Aspects of reproduction in Macropus eugeni in New Zealand
M J A Simpson Gene-banking
S N Timmins  Register of protected natural areas in New Zealand
Y B Weeber   Growth rates of canopy trees surrounding isolated Nothofagus fusca trees
The final part of the daytime programme on Thursday was a workshop with the theme 'Biological conservation in New Zealand reserves: future perspectives'. This was chaired by Prof. E G Young and included the following papers:

J Herbert  
The management of ecological areas and scientific reserves: a philosophy

J Innes & J R Hay  
The potential impact of predator control on survival of kokako populations in reserves

A F Mark  
Evaluation and designation of Protected Natural Areas in New Zealand: Historical perspective and future needs

G N Park  
The New Zealand Protected Natural Area Programme – scientific resources for a National Cultural Goal

On Thursday evening there was a display of education packages prepared by the Ecological Society's Education Subcommittee for use in schools. This was followed by the Annual General Meeting of the Society.

Friday, 24th was the last day of the conference and the whole day was taken up with the following contributed papers:

A Cree  
Habitat water requirements of native frogs (Leiopolma archeyi and L. hochstetteri) in the Coromandel Peninsula

G B Patterson  
A taxonomic reconsideration of the common skink, Leiolopisma nigriplantare maccanni in Otago tussock grassland

B W Thomas  
The Fiordland skink, Leiolopisma acrinusum Hardy

Y Ronghua, A F Mark & J B Wilson  
Aspects of the ecology of manuka, Leptospermum scoparium in New Zealand

I J Horner  
Fungal pathogens influencing establishment of kauri and kahikatea

D Kelly & P J Grubb  
Population fluctuations in short-lived plants 1978-84: explaining the chaos

C L Batcheler & D A Craib  
Constant count plot sampling: a flexible approach to forest/animal assessment

P E Cowan & A Moeed  
Invertebrates in the diet of brushtail possums (Trichosurus vulpecula) in lowland forest, Orongorongo Valley

M R Rudge  
Structure and performance of the rapidly increasing population of sheep on Campbell Island

J Parkes & K Tustin  
A reappraisal of that dispersal in New Zealand

In both scientific and social terms the conference was a success and several registrants commented on the value of holding joint meetings like this one.
32nd Annual General Meeting

The 32nd Annual General Meeting was held at Nelson on 23 August 1984 and was attended by about 50 members. The minutes of the 31st Annual General Meeting were approved and the Annual Report for 1983/84 was accepted. Reports were received from the Treasurer, the Editor, and Convenors of the Subcommittees. The Chairman announced that Council had recently set up a new subcommittee concerned with the environmental consequences of nuclear war.

The meeting elected the following officers:

President Dr M R Rudge
Vice President Dr I A E Atkinson
Secretary Mrs A E Fitzgerald
Treasurer Mr J G Innes
Council: Dr M N Clout, Dr J L Craig, Dr W Q Green, Mr K R Hackwell, Dr J R Hay, Mr J R Leathwick, Mrs M A Leslie, Dr P A Luckens, Dr J Roper Lindsay, Dr J P Skipworth, Dr C Veltman, Mrs P M Williams

The following motions were presented and carried:

(a) That Dr K A Wodzicki be accepted as an honorary life member of the Society.
(b) That the Society congratulates the new Government on its pledged consensus approach to planning
(c) That the omission of environment and resource interests from the proposed Economic Summit Conference is lamented
(d) That the Council make a press release and write to the appropriate Ministers conveying the Society's strong negative response to the introduction of Chinchilla into New Zealand
(e) That the Society urges the Government to review current policies of land development and afforestation
NEW ZEALAND ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY INCORPORATED

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS FOR THE YEAR
ENDED 31 MARCH 1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECEIPTS</th>
<th></th>
<th>PAYMENTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions arrears</td>
<td>$ 401.15</td>
<td>Printing Journal</td>
<td>$ 9,247.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions current</td>
<td>2,825.00</td>
<td>Volume 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions advance</td>
<td>287.28</td>
<td>Printing newsletter</td>
<td>376.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal current</td>
<td>2,777.08</td>
<td>Stationery, duplicating</td>
<td>250.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal advance</td>
<td>390.40</td>
<td>Address labels</td>
<td>71.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal arrears</td>
<td>1,027.76</td>
<td>Postage, freight, tolls</td>
<td>956.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal back copies</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Air travel</td>
<td>322.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprints</td>
<td>333.45</td>
<td>Nuclear war document, expenses</td>
<td>490.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference 1984</td>
<td>8,704.04</td>
<td>Sundry</td>
<td>263.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repayment Conference 1984</td>
<td>700.00</td>
<td>Conference expenses 1984</td>
<td>6,985.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank interest</td>
<td>1,337.40</td>
<td>Membership dues</td>
<td>115.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education fund income</td>
<td>76.50</td>
<td>Royal Society</td>
<td>116.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry</td>
<td>59.55</td>
<td>Education Fund expenses</td>
<td>272.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term deposit repaid</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>Commercial deposit</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance 1 April 1984 General</td>
<td>2,788.57</td>
<td>Interest added to commercial deposit</td>
<td>237.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance 1 April 1984 Education Fund</td>
<td>624.67</td>
<td>Balance 31 March 1985:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>4,437.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education Fund</td>
<td>458.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conference Deposit Fund</td>
<td>1,751.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$32,352.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>$32,352.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS FOR THE YEAR
ENDED 31 MARCH 1985

GENERAL FUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>INCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal nett cost</td>
<td>Subscriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10,406.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery, duplicating</td>
<td>Interest Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,274.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address labels</td>
<td>Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,704.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage, freight, tolls</td>
<td>receipts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>less payments 6,985.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear war document expenses</td>
<td>Sundry receipts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,718.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing newsletter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Conference Deposit Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income/Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,726.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$13,459.56</td>
<td>$13,459.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EDUCATION FUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>INCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slide - tape expenses</td>
<td>Balance 1 April 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$624.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide - tape honoraria</td>
<td>Interest received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$29.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry</td>
<td>Sundry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$76.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance 31 March 1985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$730.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONFERENCE DEPOSIT FUND

Conference profit 1984 $1,718.41
Interest received $33.19

Balance 31 March 1985 $1,751.60

COMMERCIAL DEPOSIT FUND (part of General Fund)

Initial deposit $6,000.00
Interest 237.90

Balance 31 March 1985 $6,237.90

BALANCE SHEET AS AT 31 MARCH 1985

LIABILITIES

Subscriptions in advance $287.28
Journal in advance 390.40
Education Fund
Balance 31 March 1985 458.46
Conference Deposit Fund
Balance 31 March 1985 1,751.60
Accumulated Funds
Balance 8,236.58
1 April 1984 Plus excess income/expenditure 3,726.48
Balance 31 March 1985 11,963.06

$14,850.80

ASSETS

Westpac Bank general account $4,437.18
Bank commercial deposit fund
Bank conference deposit fund 1,751.60
Bank education fund 458.46
Subscriptions in arrears 645.00
Journal in arrears 678.18
Filing cabinets 547.20
- depreciation 54.72
Stock of journals 492.48
150.00

$14,850.80

I move that the Society accept the Balance Sheet and Statement of Accounts as certified by H.M. Korschberg FCA...

[Signature]
ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Conditions and Prize for the Student Award

1 To be awarded to the student who is judged to have presented the best oral paper at the annual conference.

2 'Student' includes all bonafide students currently enrolled for any full-time course at a secondary or tertiary educational institute, or within one year of graduation. Membership of the Society is not a necessary condition.

3 The prize need not be awarded if, in the judges' opinion, the quality of paper(s) offered was not of an adequate standard.

4 The judges will include the President (or nominated representative) and one other council member. Council members who are also staff in the same department as any of the students should not be judges.

5 Any student who has won the prize can also try for it again another year.

The prize shall be one year's free membership of the Society, a book token for a sum equal to one year's full member subscription, and a certificate.

EVALUATION OF SPEAKERS

Council has been looking at the possible ways of assessing the performance of speakers presenting papers at Ecological Society Conferences. A thorough and constructive evaluation can help the individuals concerned, and raise the standard of 'performances' at our conferences. However, the way to achieve this is not clear - we already provide 'instructions to speakers' before they prepare papers, but other than on an informal, personal basis, there is no follow up. MAF use a very detailed sheet, completed by two members of the audience, but this covers a much wider range than we had envisaged. We would like some comments on how you think "Speaker evaluation" could be handled. The MAF check-sheet is printed in full below - is this suitable for our Society? Could an amended form be used? Would speakers like the option of having colleagues use the check-sheet, rather than have a compulsory evaluation? Please send your comments to the Secretary, or bring them to the Conference.
SPEAKER EVALUATION SHEET

FOR SPEAKERS AT ___________________________ CONFERENCE

Title .................................................................
Speaker ............................................................
Evaluator ...........................................................
Date ..............................................................
Time Started .....................................................
Time Finished ...................................................
Time Taken ......................................................

NOTE TO EVALUATORS: Cross out sections which do not apply to this talk and tick the appropriate boxes. It is important to list under "Remarks" helpful suggestions for improvement, especially when items are graded "fair" or "poor".

Visual Aids: (See Section 3). Cross out a number for each visual aid used, and ring the numbers of those slides you considered were unsatisfactory.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1. MATERIAL

Clarity: Points made clearly and without too much unnecessary detail? Ex VG Good Fair Poor
Sequence: Points presented in a logical, easy-to-follow sequence? Ex VG Good Fair Poor
Suitability: Terminology and the degree of technical detail suitable for this audience? Very suitable OK Unsuitable

Remarks ............................................................

2. PRESENTATION

Opening: Did opening statements arouse your interest? Yes No
Timing: Talk satisfactorily rounded off and completed within the allotted time? Yes No
Conclusion: Did conclusion summarise main points and reinforce the "message"? Yes No

Remarks ............................................................

Eyes: Speaker looked at the audience and appeared to be talking to them? Ex VG Good Fair Poor
Remarks ............................................................

Voice:
Volume: Suitable for easy listening? Too loud Too quiet OK
Speed of delivery satisfactory? Too fast Too slow OK
Variation: Enough variety and intonation to maintain interest, avoid monotony, and give emphasis where required? Ex VG Good Fair Poor

Remarks ............................................................

PTO.
3. VISUAL AIDS

| Quantity: Too many or not enough? Judge on the total effect of the talk rather than on the absolute quantity or number of visual aids. |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Suitable: Type of information: Did the slides/paper charts/printed hand-outs/blackboard contain information of real assistance in communicating the speaker's story? |
| Amount of information: Was there too much information on any of the slides/charts? |
| Legibility: Were the visual aids easily readable by all the audience? |
| Remarks |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|

| Use: Length of time for viewing: Was each visual aid dealt with long enough for the audience to read and understand it, but not so long that it bored them or caused their attention to stray? |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Use of pointer, finger etc: Was the pointer used to point to the figure or features being discussed, or was it used vaguely or distracting? |
| Lights: Were the auditorium lights turned on and off too frequently or otherwise used in a distracting or annoying manner? |
| Remarks |

| Remarks |

4. ANSWERING OF QUESTIONS

Did the speaker answer the questions well, giving concise and informative replies? | Ex  VG  Good  Fair  Poor |

| Remarks |

5. SUMMARY — THE TALK AS A WHOLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The total effect achieved was —</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement of objectives: Did the speaker achieve objectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact: How memorable was this speech?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action: Has the talk stimulated you to use the information presented in any way?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Remarks |

PREPARED BY MAF INFORMATION SERVICES
MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES
PRIVATE BAG
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