

SPIERS: I have a disquiet when people talk about loyalties and letting off steam. If you consider that your employer is on the wrong course, your duty is to argue with the chiefs in your organization to the best of your ability to try to convince them that their course is wrong. In most cases there are things that are influencing policy decisions that people at the field end are often unaware of. But once the decision is made within the organization, I think you have another loyalty. You have a loyalty to the person you are selling your services to. If, then, you find that what is being done goes against the grain of our total principles, you must have the courage of your convictions, and the only answer is that your boots are made for walking.

GLEASON: That is an extreme view. If you come across a brick wall, and if you still feel that your decision is the right one and your employer is carrying on with the wrong decision, you should have some means of expressing your opinion, otherwise you may do something rash like resigning.

SPIERS: Over the past few years we have had various instances where somebody has stated he is resigning from the Institute. In many cases they are resigning on a matter of principle. We refuse to accept these resignations in the first instance until we have had it out with the person. This has sometimes resulted in our changing our policy or direction.

GRAYBURN: Could I come back to the subject of public statements. Surely most of us recognize that the news media of the present time has got the developed world by the throat. It is high time we did not kowtow to them as much as we do. Nine times out of ten any public statements made will not be reported correctly anyway. Surely, what we will be judged by are our acts. If we act correctly and to our convictions and carry out the policies for anyone for whom we may work correctly, then that is what will count in the long run; not some statement which will be taken out of context half printed, half true — even if you do give them a written statement. As far as the subject of loyalty is concerned, you have every right to express your point of view, but for goodness sake in the first instance do it in committee. Then, if you find that you cannot get your point of view across and it still means so much to you then surely I hope you would resign, because you cannot work for an organization if you do not believe in the policies which it carries out. If you continue working for them, then your conscience will prick you for the rest of your life, so you would be better to find somewhere else to work.

*D. A. Franklin*

### Colloquium 3: Code of ethics

A. W. Grayburn chaired a discussion on the subject of a Code of Ethics for the N.Z. Institute of Foresters which was attended by 35 to 40 members. It was based on a proposed Code of Ethics which had been prepared by Council, circulated to all

Local Sections some time before and distributed at the Annual General Meeting. In presenting his summary to the meeting, Mr Grayburn said how much interest there had been in this rather old-fashioned subject and that the participation from all quarters had been most gratifying. It was felt, therefore, that the conclusions reached were representative of the total membership even though all did not see the need for the Institute to have a code. The younger members in particular felt that a code should be printed and available somewhere for a ready reference as ethical guidelines. The code prepared by Council was amended and, although that version is included here, it still requires editing to make sure that the meanings are clearly understood. Mr Grayburn invited anyone or any Local Section to communicate with Council if they would like a wording or section changed before the Code was finally adopted.

The amended suggested Code of Ethics is:

#### SUGGESTED CODE OF ETHICS

1. *Generally*: Each member shall act to uphold the dignity, standing and effectiveness of the profession of forestry. Each member shall act to promote the objects of the New Zealand Institute of Foresters. Each member shall endeavour to keep up-to-date in his professional training and study.
2. *Specifically*: Each member shall be beholden to colleagues, clients and employers, and the public in the following ways:

##### A. *Public*

He shall resist being involved in any professional activity which contravenes the law or is clearly contrary to the public interest. If he becomes aware of such activities he shall seek the assistance of the Institute to bring some remedial measures. He shall be part of the collective conscience as far as public forestry is concerned.

##### B. *Clients and Employers*

1. He shall represent his competence only in a truthful and dignified manner and shall not himself undertake work beyond it.
2. He shall not disclose any confidential information.
3. He shall not, without the full knowledge and consent of his client or employers, have an interest in or accept remuneration or gifts from any other business or principals which may influence his judgement.
4. If his professional judgement is over-ruled on non-technical grounds he shall present clearly the consequences to be expected.

##### C. *Colleagues*

1. He shall be scrupulous in giving full credit for the work of others.

2. He shall not do anything which would, by unfair means, harm the reputation, business or prospects of a colleague.
3. He shall not review the work of a colleague without informing him (except when reporting on subordinate employees or making literary reviews).

When discussing this subject, the Constitution must be kept in mind as a basic reference. The "Objects" are divided into two sections—the development of forestry first, and the interests of the profession second. Section 14 already permits Council to terminate someone's membership for misconduct. While there is always debate as to what "forestry" means, the meeting felt that its interpretation in the Constitution was adequate. With the Constitution as the foundation, it was unanimously agreed that a code of ethics was needed as a guideline for behavioural patterns but it must not be used in the judgemental legal sense. It is to be a reminder as to how the total membership should act and not be used for Consultants only. A submission was made that the conditions for making public statements should be more clearly set out and Council was asked to consider this point.

At the full meeting, the subject of "loyalty" was discussed as it affects B.2 and C.2 in the proposed code. One's loyalty to an employer, partner or colleague may occasionally conflict with professional standards and personal ethics and when this occurs the individual must decide with dignity and within the law what his action will be. It was agreed that the two paragraphs should remain as they are. Mr Weston pointed out that C.3 must not exclude literary reviews, hence the extended bracket.

Some discussion revolved around where the proposed code should be published. It was agreed that it should not become a by-law or part of the Constitution. However, Council was asked to publish it in a prominent place where it would be available for ready reference by all members.

Mr Grayburn then invited further discussion through the chair from the full meeting. General comments were made by *Professor McKelvey*, Messrs *Lovack*, *Spiers* and *F. Hutchinson*. *Mr Bunn* said that if a member's professional judgement was overruled he must point out clearly the consequences, especially at a closed informed forum such as this, provided always that the employer had been appraised first of the situation if it involves him. *Mr Franklin* hoped that members could always discuss their differences and opposing professional points of view with their peers at this type of forum. Resigning in protest was not always the answer. *Mr Johnson* said if you stay around you can continue the protest. *Mr Grayburn* agreed that this was one of the functions of the Institute but the opposing views must be handled responsibly. There will always be opposing points of view and, so long as there is the opportunity to air and debate them, the majority view must prevail. If this is still unacceptable, the individual must make his own decision and accept any consequences. *Mr Kennedy* reminded everyone of their legal responsibilities when being concerned about where their loyalties lay and about

what was confidential. *Mr Glead*, 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