

REPLY

Sir

We are grateful to Mr Chavasse for pointing out a small error in our paper. When we are discussing his studies on p. 20 we were actually referring to his 1954 paper, not his 1964 paper. The error seems to have occurred during the paper's revision for it is correctly cited in an early version. To be fair to Mr Chavasse the offending sentence should read:

"Later Chavasse studied the regeneration pattern (e.g., at Ianthe State Forest) and concluded that, while stands often appear even-aged they are not (Chavasse 1954)."

However, the error does not alter the general conclusion that Mr Chavasse and his co-workers considered the selection system to be the best option. This is clearly shown in their published papers and in Chavasse's unpublished 1956 report (which we were fully aware of but did not refer to as this was not meant to be a detailed review).

We believe the studies of Mr Chavasse and his co-workers were very valuable. They built on the work of earlier foresters as later workers have built on their studies. This is a good illustration of how silvicultural systems may evolve as understanding grows, technology improves, and economics change – a process which is still continuing as we point out in the last paragraph of the section on "Silvicultural Implications".

Finally, we would also be the first to acknowledge that the rejection of the selection system in the early 1980s (for reasons outlined in our paper) was not the fault of Mr Chavasse. We believe that in the future, due to changes in technology, economics, and our understanding of these forests, and with more stress on intensive management, we should be seeing a range of silvicultural systems, from coupe clearfelling to single tree selection, all being employed.

D. J. Mead
 School of Forestry
 University of Canterbury
 Private Bag
 CHRISTCHURCH

I. L. James
 Forest Research Institute
 C/o N.Z. Forest Service
 P.O. Box 9
 HARIHARI