

18 September 1967

DIRECTOR-GENERAL:

CORRESPONDENCE

Confirming telephone discussion on 15 September 1967.

Complaint by Mr L.E. Gosse, Editor, Beekeeper

1. The Horticulture Division publishes a Horticultural Newsletter for the information of staff members. An item regarding Queen banks was forwarded by Mr R.S. Walsh of the Apiary Section and received on 9 September 1966. The Superintendent Beekeeping, Mr E.S. Smaellie, advised Mr Walsh that the item was not being published in the Newsletter but could form the basis for a Journal of Agriculture article or one for the Beekeeper and for either purpose it required some amendment.

2. Nothing further was heard from Mr Walsh or anyone else until a letter of 12 April 1967 was received from the Editor of the Beekeeper on 14 April. He had apparently heard that Mr Walsh had some material which could be written up for the Beekeeper on this subject, and requested that it be released. This letter was addressed to the Director of the Department of Agriculture and was acknowledged on 17 April by Mr J.H. Watt for the Director, Horticulture Division, indicating that the request for an article on Queen banks would be the subject of further correspondence.

3. At the same time, on 14 April, a TP was sent to Mr Walsh asking when the article on Queen banks would be submitted here. A loose reply from Auckland by TP 191 on 17 April did not answer the question but gave the impression that he thought that what he had done for the Newsletter could be sent on to the Beekeeper.

4. Mr Smaellie then spoke to Mr Walsh again and asked him to make suitable amendments to the material he had previously forwarded for the Newsletter.

5. On 18 June a further letter was received from the Editor of the Beekeeper addressed to Mr J.H. Watt who minuted it to Mr Smaellie. This letter was not answered in writing, but realising that Mr Walsh and Mr Gosse are both in Auckland Mr Smaellie reminded Mr Walsh of the action he was required to take and he was asked to telephone Mr Gosse and advise him that the article was not available until it had been amended by him.

6. Nothing further happened between June and August as Mr Smaellie was still awaiting the article from Mr Walsh. For several months the Auckland Apiary Section had been short staffed and at times Mr Walsh was the only field officer available and therefore he did not proceed with amending the article.

J.H. Watt
A.
J.H.

7. On 12 August 1967, Mr Gosse wrote to the Director, Horticulture Division. This was received on 15 August, seen by me and minuted the same day to Mr Smaellie for discussion. As Mr Walsh had recently been appointed an Apicultural Advisory Officer he had been called here and was in Wellington that day, 15 August, when the opportunity was taken to review his duties, work programme and the extent to which he could help Mr Smaellie carry the work load.

8. The Gosse letter was discussed by Messrs Smaellie and Walsh and it was arranged that Mr Walsh would revise and submit the article for forwarding to the Beekeeper and that he would advise Mr Gosse that the matter was underway.

9. Horticulture Division has not sighted the subsequent letter addressed to the Director-General, nor the subsequent note to you personally.

10. The conclusion I reach is that there has been some looseness in handling this correspondence and that Mr Gosse is probably technically correct from 18 June onwards but that the Apiary Section has been very close to the Editor, Beekeeper, and kept him informed and supplied him with a number of articles averaging two per quarterly publication. Some of the misunderstanding may have occurred if in fact Mr Walsh failed adequately to explain the current situation and the fact that both letters had been received even though they had not been answered in writing.

11. We have no commitment to supply articles to the Beekeeper as Journal of Agriculture has first claim. We have discretion to supply to the Beekeeper if any article has limited interest and is likely to be unacceptable to Journal of Agriculture or is urgently required by beekeepers and we have taken this action with one article written for the Beekeeper.

On the question of correspondence between Waikato Beekeepers and the Superintendent, Beekeeping, as raised by the Under Secretary of Agriculture, the situation is as follows:

1. That the Horticulture Division had reason to believe that some bees had been smuggled into the country which were not found until at least six months after their probable introduction.
2. This problem was frankly discussed in committee with the Executive of the National Beekeepers Association and the Executive was assured that if we had adequate evidence the Department was prepared to prosecute the individual concerned.
3. The beekeeper under suspicion was a member of the Waikato Branch of the NBA.
4. The President of the Waikato Branch, Mr Tuck, wrote the Superintendent, Beekeeping, and he did not reply because he was going to Hamilton shortly and he considered it was better to discuss the matter with Messrs Tuck, President, and Forsyth, Secretary, of the Waikato Branch of the NBA, rather than forward a reply in writing. The reason why he considered this was a better way of handling the matter was that the suspected offender being a member of the Waikato NBA would probably hear the reply in the correspondence tabled at the Branch meeting. This could prejudice a possible prosecution.

File at Gosse

5. Prior to a meeting of the Waikato Branch of the NBA Mr Smellie discussed the subject with Messrs Tuck and Forsyth and indicated why he felt it unwise to reply to their letter in writing. It was suggested and accepted that the letter should be withdrawn. This was duly done at the time.

6. Messrs Tuck and Forsyth were informed that the matter was viewed seriously by the Department and that the Executive of the NBA had been kept fully informed.

REPLY TO MR. G. H. WILSON'S LETTER OF 12/11/57

1. The Horticulture Division publishes a Horticultural News for the information of staff members. An issue regarding trees was published by Mr G.H. Wilson of the Spring Garden at Hamilton on 1 December 1957. The Superintendent Horticulturist, Mr G.H. Wilson, advised Mr Greig that the tree was not being published in the Newsletter but could form the basis for a column of horticultural articles or a section of the Newsletter and without prejudice it required more information.

Handwritten initials

2. Nothing further was heard from Mr Wilson or anyone else until a letter of 18 April 1958 was received from the Editor of the Newsletter on 18 April. He had apparently heard that Mr Wilson was principal which (A.M.W. Greig) as per the Newsletter this content. and Director, Horticulture Division This letter