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Meeting called to order by the President — Dr. W.L. Strunk

Words of welcome by the President

The following states answered roll call:

North Dakota
South Dakota
Nebraska
Kansas
Iowa
Wisconsin
Illinois
Indiana
Minnesota

Dr. Strunk: Ohio has advised that because of the pressure of business at this particular time they will be unable to be represented. Michigan has advised that because of the curtailment in out-of-state travelling expenses they can only attend two meetings a year on fish and game affairs and have selected for this year the convention of the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, and the Wildlife meeting in Toronto. Tennessee has advised that they are members of the Southeastern Association and will, therefore, not be represented at this meeting. Missouri did not answer the roll call but I expect representatives from that state to arrive this afternoon.

As you have already been advised we are to have, this year, an open forum discussion of the problems which are affecting all of us—problems brought on because of the war. I believe the best way to proceed is for each state to take a specific subject and go through the line in this manner so that we can become familiar with the various problems in the various states and the development of the same. The topics listed of
course do not cover all of the problems, these are just the high spots, so to speak, and suggestions on which to center our discussions.

We will take up, first of all, the problems in connection with shrinking departmental revenues. Ready for remarks.

Dr. Strunk: In our state, and I imagine that it is true in the majority of the states, we have a problem in regard to finding out from the county auditors what the sales of licenses amount to. We managed to get a law passed which demands that county auditors submit a report to the department within 90 days after the end of the calendar year. Since that time, under the state statutes, the county auditors have done this. For example, a county auditor is bonded for five thousand dollars and as soon as he has taken in revenues totaling five thousand dollars he has to turn that revenue into the state. In that way he cannot collect a large amount of money over a span of months and hold it six, eight or ten months. This is giving us a better picture than ever before as to what the revenue is but the picture is still somewhat hazy. An individual is bonded for five thousand dollars, he may not get five thousand dollars in for three or four months, in Minnesota, therefore, we feel that until about the middle of August we will not be able to tell what the trend of our revenue is. We have to guess but that is about all. Our guess to date is that the revenue is about the same as last year. In southwestern Minnesota a town of about five thousand individuals sold 1400 combination fishing licenses, man and wife, for $1.50, and sold approximately 2100 individual fishing licenses with a return of about 40% higher than last year. That of course does not mean the town alone but surrounding area also. On the other hand you take the two big counties in Minnesota, Ramsey and Hennepin, they show about a 10% decrease. Duluth is just about stable compared to last year.
You know the big problem right now is what are you going to do with reference to your budgets. Those of you who have commissions know they are demanding that budgets be set up corresponding to the expected decrease in the revenue set-up. Also, commissions are demanding that at the end of the fiscal year you have a "kitty" so you can carry on the following year if this war continues. Because, as you know, if the war continues we will be hit harder and harder as time goes on. We have a department of administration, the same as your commission, demanding the same sort of thing of us. A budget must be set up. How are you planning your budget for the year to come because of this revenue picture? I would like to throw this subject open for discussion.

Mr. Osborne - will you start it? Revenues and Budgets.

Mr. Osborne: Illinois

So far in our state the indications are we are going ahead of any previous year. We have had the greatest cash month so far this year that we have had in the history of our department and last year we were ahead of anything we had before. We anticipate our fishing licenses will increase very much. Probably our hunting licenses will go down a little bit. Of course a great deal depends on how much ammunition we can get after this year. Our fish and game department pays its own way from license fees. We, in our talks around the state, are trying to preach the fact that we must have for our citizens and for our boys, when they come back from war, places of recreation, places where they can enjoy their usual sport. Because of the high taxes and lack of jobs, boys coming back from the army must have consideration. If we can find some place to take care of this surplus of people during idle hours we will do a great deal for our country so we have that thought in mind in building up our department and selling the idea to others.
Our Governor, at the recent meeting of Governors in North Carolina, suggested in a speech that the national budget and the budgets of the different states be reduced as much as possible of unnecessary expenses. As far as our department is concerned we are going to try to keep our present budget and there may be a little increase because we are putting in a warden training school. This is the time to do this. After the war is over we are going to have more hunters and fishermen than ever before. We will have women hunters who never shot a gun before, boys who have gone to war and learned to handle guns will come back knowing how to shoot, so in this country we will have more hunters than we have ever had before and the question is will we be ready to take care of their needs at that time. Of course the question of revenues is one thing and we will have to keep that in mind. If our boys can go over and fight the game, we who are here can do our part with a little less help but do just as effective a job with less cost because sportsmen’s groups and other organizations can be sold on the idea of helping without cost. We are sort of "between the devil and the deep blue sea" because we want to do all we can and still remain within our budget so that we do not go broke. We haven't submitted our budget yet. We will probably do so this fall because our legislature meets in January and it is advisable to get the budgets through early because the political fight goes on at the end of the season and the budgets should be through before that time.

Mr. Lowe:
N. Dakota

We in North Dakota will, and probably do, sit in a little different position due to the fact that we are very small and our revenues are pretty much confined to the sale of hunting licenses. We are not going to know much about what our revenue is going to be until we find out what the hunting license sales will be. Fishing licenses, small trapping licenses and miscellaneous collections do not amount to much. We have, however, closer control due to the fact that we are small and we can make changes a
great deal easier, probably, than some of the larger departments so
during the past three years we have built up a nice reserve for a state
as small as we are. We are not looking for very much curtailment although
there is bound to be some. A lot of our people have left and we have no
defense industries so we are bound to lose some revenue. We still have
a large group interested in hunting who you can depend on from year to
year and while we may lose some revenue it probably won’t be very much.
Just how much we will not know until fall. Our sales are confined now
through county auditors who remit every 30 days during the heavy col-
lection season. In any event they remit 30 days after the close of any
hunting, fishing, or trapping season, so our revenue comes in very satis-
factorily and we do not have any trouble along that course. We know
what money we have to do with, the problem is how to allocate the money
we have - money for law enforcement, what are we going to do in propaga-
tion, how much on federal aid for the coming year etc. Like Mr. Osborne,
our budgets are made up in the fall and our legislature meets in January
and while our department has to operate on the funds that are collected,
we are subject to control by the legislature and we do not get all of the
money collected allocated back to us but, on the other hand, whatever
appropriation is made has to be collected before we can use it so we
are sitting in the position now of not knowing just which way we have
to go. We have to live from month to month and make our changes as the
need for them shows up.

Mr. Peterson:
S. Dakota

Relative to the matter of handling licenses in South Dakota, our
law provides that licenses are sold by the county treasurers and county
auditors and bonded license agents, bonded by the game commission. The
treasurers and auditors remit every month to the state and we require our
game wardens to remit every month so we have a good check on receipts
from month to month. Our sale of fishing licenses up to the present
time seems to be holding up to last year. We anticipate a definite
decline in hunting licenses because the greater part of hunting license
revenues comes from non-resident hunters. It is reasonable to suppose
that, because of the curtailment of tires and gasoline, we will not have
as many non-resident hunters in South Dakota as last year. If we have
fifty percent we will be well satisfied. We operate on our own funds and
are not dependent in any way on appropriations out of the legislature.
We make up our budget on the first of July and our funds go into the
state treasury, in the game fund, and the legislature has nothing to
say about the appropriation of those funds. We are accountable to the
state though for the expenditure of the funds.

Dr. Strunk: Do your wardens collect the revenues?

Mr. Peterson:
S. Dakota That is right. Our wardens handle licenses the same as the county
treasurers and county auditors. As to decline in revenues the commis-
sion is having that thought in mind and does not propose to go into any
extensive development work during the emergency. One thing that is quite
a problem in our state, we have a large number of WPA dams and excessive
rainfall puts a demand on our department for repairs and replacements.
It is some problem handling these dams. We hope to maintain our organi-
ization as I believe to do good work in any line you have to have good
tools and in this work the best tools are experienced personnel.

Mr. Atkins:
Kansas Our problems are similar to the rest. We handle our license sales
through county clerks and they are supposed to remit quarterly. Our
fiscal year closes June 30th. Last year our revenue was very good, in
fact higher than for several years. Contrary to public belief, we do
have fishing water in Kansas and 65% of our license receipts was derived
from the sale of fishing licenses. We have quite a few war activities
in the southwestern part of our state and our fishing license sales are on the increase. We do anticipate a decrease in hunting license sales, however. It is anticipated that our budget, although not approved as yet, will be cut 25% for the next fiscal year. We operate on a cash basis and we cannot exceed what our budget requirements are and for that reason we make them low to handle big leaks should some contingency arise. Like everybody else, a lot of our fishermen are going to stay at home instead of coming up here to Minnesota and Wisconsin to fish and that will affect us favorably. That is about all I can say, we have about the same trouble as the rest insofar as getting to our fishing waters, but in our congested areas, where our war plants are, we have been getting a large increase and will probably continue to do so.

Dr. Strunk: Which division is wholly dependent on receipts?

Mr. Atkins: Kansas

Every cent we take in is paid directly to the treasurer.

Dr. Strunk: Do you get any additional money from the legislature or does the license money cover everything.

(Answer not given because of interruption)

Mr. Swift: Wisconsin

We have two sources of funds. Our forestry activities are carried on by a two mill tax on all property so that that activity we can anticipate within a very close amount as to what we will have, that is for forestry protection, tree nurseries, and activities of that kind. Then we also have a conservation fund which is license revenues, wherein fisheries, law enforcement, game, activities etc., are carried on. We do not know ourselves yet exactly what the revenue is going to be although we are trying to keep as close track as possible. Our fiscal year ends July 1st. I was talking to one man who has a large license distribution business and he said he feels that resident license sales are keeping up about the same as far as returns at the present time would indicate.
This applies to non-resident license sales also. In coming through northwestern Wisconsin I stopped at Hayward, my home town. They have a tourist bureau there and they advised me that there was no place available where one could stop. A week ago, they stated, this condition was not true but at the present time it is. This is a somewhat spotted condition, I believe, because it is not true in the eastern part of the state and just why a certain area is having a good line of tourist trade and another is not, I do not know. In other words, why it is not general. I cannot say.

In presenting our budget to our commission this year we arbitrarily cut the anticipated license revenues 40%. That does not mean that everybody was cut 40%. We had built up a surplus, quite a nest egg, and in allocating funds some of this surplus is going to be used. Law enforcement was increased slightly. Fisheries decreased 25%, game decreased 25%, and others considerable but not to that extent. Now we are not using all of our surplus this year either and that could carry us on another year. We may be wrong in our 40% and more money may come in than we anticipated but we thought that was the safe way of playing the game at the present time. We all have a certain amount of "window dressing" in every conservation department and it is a matter of placing the most important things first. In other words we have to give to our work priorities, cut down on some and be able to eliminate some for the time being. It gives us a good opportunity to reorganize some of the things which should be reorganized. It gives us a chance to get more out of our dollar than in some of the ways we have been spending that dollar in the past and I think we can still produce a lot but as I say, we all have a certain amount of "window dressing" to do at this time and it is a good opportunity to revamp.

Dr. Strunk: Branching out a minute from the first point let me ask you a specific question in connection with game farms. How much are you cutting down
Mr. Swift: Wisconsin

Take at Poinette where we had a fair section. We are reducing part of it. As far as the production of pheasants is concerned, we are not going to reduce that, that is the ring-neck and Mongolian, but when it comes to fancy birds, quail etc., we are going to hit that particular angle. We are still going to put out a shooting bird for the hunters but when it comes to experimentation we are going to reduce it very drastically. We have quite a coon program in our state which we are going to drop slightly. We have always been a position to help the commercial mink farmer and our assistance has always been gratis. We are going to make him pay for some of the services he has received because we have a big commercial fur business in Wisconsin. We are going to try to put (interrupted by Dr. Strunk)

Dr. Strunk: Have you closed any hatcheries?

Mr. Swift: Wisconsin

You mean fish hatcheries. No. We are going to reduce our spawn take another year. Now when it comes to that we may reduce our pike spawning operations. We may reduce our trout in quantity. We have an idea we will but at this time I cannot say definitely. We will probably raise some of them to large size and not go into quantity production. We would like to hold up our bass production but we may have to reduce our muskellunge. We have what is known as the children's fish ponds. That is a matter of getting pan fish out of lakes, where they are too numerous, crappies, perch, etc., and transferring them into smaller lakes where children of twelve years and under may fish them. It is a very popular thing but it happens to be an expensive thing. It is going to be a big problem because it is growing so popular but it is a matter of eliminating some fishing operations and catering to the children's fish ponds.
Dr. Strunk: Do you have any questions gentlemen?

Mr. Peterson: Army camps. The gentleman from Kansas touched slightly on one thing I would like to take up. We have not had this problem in South Dakota so far but there is a possibility that we may run into it this year. We have two large airports coming into the state and there has been some pressure brought to bear already that these men coming into the state should be granted privileges as to licenses. There is, of course, a provision in the law that an individual must be a resident of the state for six months before he is entitled to the privilege of a resident license. I was wondering if this problem has hit the other states and how it is being handled.

Dr. Strunk: You have reference to both hunting and fishing licenses?

Mr. Peterson: Yes.

Mr. Lowe: We have that same proposition to contend with. You take for instance Williston, where we have three or four large airplane plants. There has been an influx of from anywhere to 25,000 workers. If a man lives there and is working there, to all intents and purposes he is a resident of the state. If you went out and tried to enforce the law you would have all the (interruption by Mr. Peterson)

Mr. Peterson: My question is as to enlisted men and not defense workers.

Mr. Lowe: How do they handle that at Williston? I think they buy a state license. The problem has not come up as yet but under our law, as it is now, we would have to charge those fellows for licenses. We tried to have a law put through on this question but nothing came of it.

Mr. Osborne: Illinois We passed a law in 1941 permitting members of the armed forces to buy fishing licenses on a resident basis.

Mr. Swift: Wisconsin As far as defense workers are concerned, there are two classes.
They would have to buy a license. Service men, we have no alternative there. In fact the constitution of Wisconsin says a man in the armed services of the U.S., by virtue of residing in Wisconsin, does not become a resident of Wisconsin. So we would have to change the constitution. We have told them that there is no alternative. I, personally, was not going to be a party to condoning something contrary to the constitution.

Mr. Schwob: Iowa

We have that problem in Iowa. Our commission has no authority to grant any special privileges to enlisted men or defense workers. A bill was introduced at the last session of the legislature, granting free hunting and fishing privileges to men in the armed services, but it failed to pass so we have simply been telling the people that we have no authority to do anything but demand that they purchase a license. If a man moves in and his intention is to become a resident he is immediately entitled to be a resident.

Mr. Mosbaugh: Indiana

We Indianans are blessed with defense plants. We have a number of them. Our law specifies you must be a resident of our state six months before you can get a license. To date we have had no difficulty. It is rather difficult to determine when they are residents because they have followed construction crews from one plant to another but I do not believe we are going to have any serious difficulty over this problem. The law is very specific and until an individual has been in our state six months we cannot grant any special privileges. A representative of the American Legion has recommended that legionaires, and also those men who served in the past wars, buy licenses. To date they have received free permits. There was a bill introduced in our legislature, to grant any man of the armed forces a free permit, but that bill was killed.
Dr. Strunk: In Minnesota, an individual coming in, say for example an enlisted man to Fort Ripley, is counted as a resident as far as a fishing license goes but not as far as a hunting license goes. As for defense workers, this does not apply at all. We have been running into some of these fellows, defense workers, coming in and fishing without a license. If you start arresting them right and left the first thing you know you have extensive complaints filed.

Mr. Peterson: S. Dakota The average defense worker makes enough money to buy a license. If we can get the commanding officer of the camp to cooperate with us, our plan is to have our men contact the commanding officer and try to get his cooperation. My idea is, if the commanding officer would post notices around the camps, asking the men to cooperate with the states and observe the laws of the states, there would not be very much trouble. We have to try something for there is really nothing we can do about it.

Mr. Osborne: Illinois We have found in some instances that the heads of the plants have told the men they did not have to buy licenses. We have prosecuted many of these cases and I think we have the practice about stopped in Illinois. I do not think anyone would be very sympathetic with the defense worker as he is making a lot of money.

Mr. Swift: Wisconsin The older people in the community are in the minority and they resent having too much latitude given to defense workers, because they are going to live there after the defense workers have gone, and they do not want all the fish and game killed.

Dr. Strunk: Minnesota As you know, Fort Ripley has not been occupied for sometime. The last time it was occupied was a year ago last summer when we did have some trouble with soldiers. However, we did not then have the bill I spoke about a few minutes ago so we went to the commanding officer of
the camp and they established a committee of military men and when one of these individuals was caught breaking the law, instead of the state going through with the prosecution, we turned him over to the military committee. A lot of those fellows said they would much rather have the state go through with it because the military committee really gave them little mercy.

Mr. Steen: I happen to be fairly familiar with the laws in a large number of states, on that question. They vary a great deal. There are several states, in fact quite a number, which have laws or interpret their laws in such a fashion that they permit members of the armed forces of the United States to hunt in some cases but in most cases to fish, on a resident license. I know of no state where they permit civil employees or workers to do that except three or four western states which have provisions in their laws which permit employees of the federal government, whether they be civil or military, to hunt and fish with resident licenses. In the state of Indiana, for example, they have a law which permits a war veteran to fish without a license. In other words he does not have to buy a license, they issue him a permit. Michigan has a law which permits the members of the armed forces to fish on a resident license. On that point I believe you have heard from all of the other states.

Dr. Strunk: Does anybody else have any questions on this point?

Mr. Schwob: Iowa

As far as revenues are concerned, the first month of our license sales this year we had about a 10% increase, the same experience as Illinois, we had the largest month in the history of the department. The next month we had a slight decrease, so probably, so far this year, we are about seven or eight percent ahead of last year. We have quite an accurate check on our revenues because our county recorders are required to send in their license sales receipts on the tenth of each
month. Our conservation officers also sell licenses and their reports have to be in by the tenth. County recorders have authority to establish license dispensaries and they also report to the county recorders and those come in with the county recorders reports so we really do have quite an accurate check. So far as our budget is concerned we are setting it up on past experience. There is and will be a reduction in the activities of the department because of the policies which have been adopted by the commission. For example, all new construction projects are curtailed under a policy adopted by the commission. We are losing personnel and not replacing it. When some of our men go to the armed services, unless we are compelled to, we are not going to fill their places. That is a reduction in expenditures. So far as history is concerned, we checked back to the first war, when revenues in the state of Iowa were reduced 20%.

I was surprised, at the Toronto meeting, when Mr. Gabrielson stated that the Fish and Wildlife Service had made a survey and found, over the United States, that there was a three or three and one-half percent increase generally, during the period. Our experience, in Iowa, was a twenty percent reduction. We set up our budgets based on our past experiences and our revenues are not dependent on any acts of the legislature. Our fish and game funds are trust funds and do not revert and our commission has sole control, power, and authority, at any time, to revise budgets and our attitude, up to this time, is that we are going ahead and are going to try to go ahead. We are going to curtail new development projects but try to maintain what we have. We are not planning on curtailing any of our activities at the present time although three months from now we may have to do so but, because of the set-up, having the commission with authority over the funds, we can reduce at any time. We have not reduced over last year, although there will be
a reduction because our extension program is practically stopped and at the present time we are not starting new jobs. We have a substantial cash fund so whatever happens we will have money enough to operate. I think that is about all I have to say.

Dr. Strunk: Are there any further questions, gentlemen?

Mr. Mosbaugh: Our revenues, of course, come entirely from the sale of licenses. We have made a slight reduction in personnel. We have lost quite a number of men because of the war. We conducted an officers' training school recently and we still have fifteen men in reserve. Our revenues for the fiscal year ending June 30th, will be slightly above last year. Our new budget, however, calls for a twenty percent reduction. All development programs have ceased. It is now a question of maintaining and carrying on those things already in effect. We have made a reduction in rearing birds and also fish. As far as closing any of our propagation plants, we do not anticipate that for this calendar year. What next year will bring we do not know. We have enough equipment on hand to operate for a period of two years and so we have made our entire program flexible and we have found that the sportsmen are giving whole hearted cooperation to this idea. We were a little concerned about the reduction in payments too but if further reductions are necessary they will be accepted too. We anticipate that more of our own hunters will now become acquainted with Indiana instead of Minnesota, Wisconsin and Michigan.

We find in our state that the loss to the armed forces is overshadowed by the increase of people coming into Indiana to work in defense industries. We hope our twenty percent reduction will not become a reality but if it does we have made plans to handle that. As a whole we are not losing ground at all. We have found that where young men have been called out older me, who formed the background,
are stepping in and carrying on. To me that is a good criterion of constructive conservation. There are going to be a number of activities carried on under the disguise of defense programs. We have been faced with that already.

Relative to pollution - we have been fortunate with all plants. Disposal plants first constructed. Army plants constructed below Indianapolis are caring for a pollution problem we have had for twenty-five years, so we have gained there. I think we can look forward to a very constructive program during this emergency.

Dr. Strunk: How about the problem of personnel? When an individual goes to work in a defense industry how many states grant that individual a leave of absence?

From the Audience: You mean into the military service?

Dr. Strunk: Any defense work.

Mr. Gaumitz: Iowa We grant him no privileges unless he has been drafted.

Dr. Strunk: What do you demand?

Mr. Gaumitz: Iowa A letter telling who has drafted him. All men who leave to enter the armed forces are given a leave of absence but we have not had any men yet drafted into defense work but that may come. We have had several men leave but they have been given no privileges.

Mr. Lowe: N. Dakota The only people we have lost are those who went into the armed forces.

Dr. Strunk: How about Kansas?

Kansas: An individual who leaves our department and goes into some type of defense work, the majority of times, leaves because he is looking for a better job. We do not feel that we are obligated to that man to take him back after the war is over. Now if he is drafted for that job, I do not recall such an instance, I think the commission would make some special privilege. However, where he just quits to get a
better job we have made no provision, he is just out of the department.
Of course if we needed him we might try to get him back but otherwise
he is gone.

Mr. Peterson:
S. Dakota

We have lost only one man. If we do lose any of them to the
armed forces we expect to take them back when they return from the war.

Mr. Swift:
Wisconsin

For those who go to the armed services, civil service protects
their rights. Under the laws of Wisconsin a man could ask for a leave
of absence for a year but if going into defense work he is leaving be-
cause of higher wages and so the bureau of personnel has ceased giving
leaves for that type of thing. They will not grant them a leave of
absence for the purpose of defense work.

Mr. Mosbaugh:
Indiana

We have lost fourteen men. Seven on leave of absence and seven
left of their own volition and so we have no responsibility. The seven
men who left were in the law enforcement forces.

Dr. Strunk:

When an individual leaves to go into a defense job, he must pre-
sent a letter, signed by a member of the armed services, a military
man associated with the defense project, before we can grant him a leave
of absence. Incidentally, how many of the states are under civil
service.

Mr. Osborne:
Illinois

The civil service commission refuses to grant a leave of absence
to anyone unless he is going into the armed forces and then he can be
reinstated.

Dr. Strunk:

Let's turn for a minute to the problem of tires. We have letters
from all over the United States relative to tires, especially with
reference to the law enforcement units. I, personally, think that as we
go through this point, out of this thing should come a definite resolu-
tion to forward to these specific committees or groups in Washington,
so we go on record.

Mr. Lowe:  
N. Dakota

When this tire problem first came up I thought I would write to Washington, to the Senators and Representatives. I got back a nice long letter saying there was a tire problem. That didn’t tell me anything I already knew that. Lately we have begun to think that we started at the wrong end. Here and there a man got a tire. So far we are not suffering although we have asked our personnel to be careful with the tires and protect them and not to do any unnecessary patrol work so up to date we are not suffering but the tire problem is there and we do not know what position we are in or are going to be in but we have sufficient tires for the time being.

Kansas:  

Our local boards have not been granting our department any tires at all. We have reduced our driving as much as possible and most of it has been reduced to 40%. We have a few tires on hand, picked up here and there, but after they are gone we do not know what is going to happen because there are no tires in sight for our type of work.

Mr. Schwob:  
Iowa

Do you get tires for state trucks and state cars?

Kansas:  

No – neither one.

Dr. Strunk:  

Mr. Maurek, has the Fish and Wildlife Service done anything on this problem?

Mr. Maurek:  

We actually started conserving rubber back about four or five months ago. We placed our men on an allotment basis beginning July 1st. In other words, men who travelled forty thousand miles during the present fiscal year will probably be cut down to about twenty thousand miles this coming fiscal year. Then we froze a considerable amount of our equipment, especially new cars. We froze the new cars and repaired the old ones and used them, so we have an "ace in the hole" - when the old cars are worn out and fall apart we can go back and get the frozen cars
which we are not using at the present time. One division of our ser-
vice gets preference and that is law enforcement. In other words, if
If I have a good car and the law enforcement car falls to pieces, I have
to give them my good car.

Dr. Strunk: Naturally, the law enforcement units of the various states work
closely together with your men. Has the Fish and Wildlife Service sent
in a resolution to the committees in Washington.

Mr. Maurek: We try to encourage our men to chip in on the states as much as
possible. Just how long the states are going to stand for it I do not
know.

Dr. Strunk: You mean our wardens ride your men.

Mr. Atkins: Kansas Have you any anticipation of being able to get tires?

Mr. Maurek: Not any more than you have. I think we are way down the line.
Seventeen or something. We haven't any chance to get anywhere.

Mr. Lowe: N. Dakota Has anything been heard from the committee which was appointed at
the Toronto meeting.

Mr. Schwob: Iowa No action. Gabrielson agreed to act as a liaison officer. He
said he would do everything possible.

Mr. Lowe: N. Dakota When we were in Toronto a committee was appointed and Mr. Gabriel-
son agreed to act as a Liaison Officer and keep us informed.

Dr. Strunk: Mr. Osborne, you were a member of that committee.

Mr. Gray: Wisconsin I think the various departments are facing a much more serious
problem than tires, when the gas rationing goes into effect and I believe
that it would be well for this organization to start now to try to get
some kind of a position where conservation activities, particularly
law enforcement and production of fish for food purposes, as well as
forest fire work, be given some definite consideration when gas ration-
ing goes into effect. I understand in the east they are quite liberal with certain activities being conducted. The rationing is being put into effect to curtail Sunday travel or non-essential cars and I believe you are going to face something and unless something unforeseen turns up you will have gas rationing, which is going to be much more serious than the tire problem.

Dr. Strunk: Mr. Osborne what do you have to report?

Mr. Osborne: Illinois

The chairman of the committee was director of the state of New York and he prepared a very extensive brief showing the duties of the different departments and wardens acting as fire wardens, protecting forests, plantings, bridges, and things of that sort, but the ruling thus far has been that, since the major activities of the wardens are not war activities, they could not be so classified and the petition, at least temporarily, was turned down, but it may be reconsidered and re-opened. From that angle it looks pretty slim. Our state had a number of tires on hand that the state had purchased which we are still able to get and just before this priority question went into effect I bought seventy-two new cars and they were delivered this year so we have good tires. We have seventy-two new cars out of one hundred and fifty. Wardens working in different communities than they lived in have been reassigned to work in the communities in which they live and that has cut down mileage. This reduces the mileage about 35%. I am of the opinion that eventually we will be able to get retreads on our tires. I am optimistic and think if we present our case we can come under class B.

Dr. Strunk: To date the thing comes down to this - thumbs down - as far as the committee goes.

Mr. Osborne: Illinois

The only way I know of getting tires is where the wardens can go
to the local boards and get them.

Mr. Swift:
Wisconsin

As far as Wisconsin is concerned I think we could break it down to state owned vehicles. We have a fleet of trucks for forestry protection, game and fish, and commercial fishing. I don't want you to think we hoarded, but last year we bought about three year's supply for forestry protection, and two years supply for game and fish, so we are not so bad off but when it comes to law enforcement, where men own their own cars, that is different. When this thing first started I talked with the tire administrator and he was very indifferent. First, what does the warden do and second, forestry men get priority because a ranger never stepped out of the ranger station unless he went to a fire. He did not think there was anything else to do. Some of our wardens have been able to get tires from local boards and others have been turned down flat. It is a matter of what county they live in.

Mr. Schwob:
Iowa

We are in about the same position. Cars are purchased through the state purchasing agent and so far we have been able to get retreads. We can get no new tires but we can get retreads for state owned equipment. Privately owned cars, wherever they have been good friends with the local tire retioning board and they have been sold on the conservation program, get tires. If you do not stand in so well in the local community they say, no. This is the situation in Iowa and we are getting along fairly well.

Mr. Mosbaugh:
Indiana

Our law enforcement men own their own automobiles and so do about fifty deputy fire wardens, which has enabled them to get tires from the local rationing board. As far as our state owned equipment is concerned we have worked out a travel schedule to the extent that we double up our assignments, for example, a maintenance engineer is assigned to
one section of the state to work in that section only and can travel
with the boys in game and fish, state parks, etc., using only one car
for four or five men.

We are collecting the extra tires we had and as far as our law
enforcement men are concerned, in over half of the state we do not
anticipate any difficulty. Some of the tire rationing boards are
very tough.

Dr. Strunk:

The situation in our state is just about the same as it is in the
rest of the states. Some of the wardens have been able to get tires
from their local boards and others not. I think though we have an
opening. In view of the fact that some of the wardens have been able
to get tires and local boards have designated that they are an impor-
tant unit of the war and should be so designated, there should be a
blanket set-up in connection with the whole thing, including all wardens.

Mr. Schwob:
Iowa

I was able to convince the man in charge of our tire rationing
that conservation officers were peace officers but he could not get
the approval from those higher up. I went down to see him once and I
read him the law and he agreed to give me four tires but then the order
was stopped from higher up.

Kansas:

I do not think it is left to the decision of the local boards, the
law is interpreted from Washington.

Mr. Schwob:
Iowa

Washington will probably catch up with the local boards sooner or
later.

Mr. Joslin:
Minnesota

The last circular letter that came from the committee was along
that line. They had not been able to get anywhere in Washington and
rather than to jeopardize the situation they decided they had better
keep still.

Mr. Schwob:
Iowa

If half can get tires from the local boards we are better off
than if none of them can get tires.

Dr. Strunk: What shall we do in conclusion with this tire business? Shall we send in a resolution or not?

Mr. Schwob: Everything that can be done has been done by the committee which was appointed by the International Association. That was a good committee, Mr. Gabrielson was on it, and if anything could be done it could be done by that committee. If that committee cannot give them as good an argument, or better, than the rest of us, I don't know what we can do about it.

Dr. Strunk: Shall we leave well enough alone and try to obtain as many as we need?

Mr. Swift: I think we had better leave it alone.

Mr. Lowe: There is a question relative to the purchase of trucks. In our state they consider a truck in a different category than an automobile. We have been able to purchase automobiles but the purchase of trucks has to go through the Interstate Commerce Commission. First you send in a request and then they send it back with a long lingo giving a list of every truck owned by every division in the state, asking that you try to get a truck from some of the other divisions. That of course is a physical impossibility as no other department is interested in loaning or giving us any of their equipment. What position are the other states in? Mr. Osborne seems to be quite successful.

Mr. Osborne: We have two pick-up trucks coming through right now.

Mr. Lowe: What do you have to do to get them?

Mr. Osborne: The head of the department which buys the trucks and cars put it through for us.

Mr. Lowe: Through your purchasing department?
Mr. Osborne: This is the highway garage and one man does the purchasing of cars and pick-up trucks.

Mr. Lowe: In our state each department buys its own equipment and we have no central purchasing division. We are in a little different position. I do not know how long our equipment will last. Then we will be in a bad position.

Mr. Osborne: Tell them you are going to fight forest fires.

Mr. Lowe: We have no forests.

Dr. Strunk: On what basis Mr. Osborne do you get your trucks?

Mr. Osborne: For fire fighting.

Dr. Strunk: What is the status of the truck situation in the other states?

Mr. Atkins: Kansas We haven't tried to buy any trucks. We bought several just before the freezing order went into effect and we have not tried to buy any since. I was wondering how many states have their wardens assigned as airplane spotters and wardens.

Mr. Sparks: Illinois We have found out in Illinois that the more you cooperate with national defense activities the less trouble you are liable to have. Every one of our field men is an air raid warden in his own community. Each one is a salvage collector for national defense. They do not collect it but they look it up and then the local man in that community goes out and picks it up. They made a survey on the rubber situation in the rural districts and figures show that in 76 counties out of 102 the field men found 382 tons of old rubber. These records go into the office of national defense and we receive many nice letters of commendation.

Our conservation department is about as well fixed on tires as any of the other states, for this reason: We get a lot of our tires, perhaps sixty-five percent, from the local rationing board. The men who
need tires write in to me and I write them a letter back and also write
the local rationing board explaining the duties of the men who require
the tires, and explain how we are connected with national defense and
what we are doing and that letter goes over pretty good. However, we
can get tires from the Supt. of Highways too. If the different states
would do everything possible to cooperate with national defense the
tires would be a lot easier to acquire. At the present time we are
almost cooperating with the coast guards. We have a lot of patrol boats
in the state of Illinois. It is just in the making but we might figure
out a plan to work in conjunction with the patrol of lakes and streams
and that would be another step toward national defense cooperation.

Over in Jacksonville they conducted an air raid warden school and
there were approximately five hundred who attended. Our Governor sugges-
ted we send a number of our field men to this school for one week, which
we did. At the end of the week they had to stand an examination on
first aid, etc., and were issued diplomas and now they are instructors
in first aid activities. Again I say that the more we can do, especi-
ally the field men, to aid in national defense, the easier it will be
to secure tires, gasoline and other equipment necessary to carry on our
departments.

Dr. Strunk: Are there any other comments on the tire situation or the truck
situation? Has there been any inspection at all of the states that have
piled up a lot of rubber, trucks, etc.? What about the gasoline business?
The latest information we have is that August 15th will be the effective
date for rationing of gasoline. The northerm states are vitally concerned
because of the tourist industry. The story you told Mr. Swift, in con-
nection with the camp at Hayward, is pretty general throughout the state
and I think you will find it true in Wisconsin too. We have had as big
a run as we have had in years. Illinois, Iowa, etc., have always been very heavy tourists but this year Colorado, California, Nevada, Missouri, and Arizona are among the license numbers seen. I believe the answer is that they are going to take one last fling and then let her go. Certainly fellows driving from California are going to use up a lot of rubber.

Mr. Swift:
Wisconsin

In talking with a party over there last night I pretty well gleaned that a lot of the tourists were defense workers who never before have been in a position to take a real vacation and who, now that they have a little surplus, are taking one. There are many new faces which have never been in that particular territory before, who are taking vacations.

Mr. Osborne:
Illinois

Careful consideration should be given to the fact that there is going to be an election this fall and the probability is you will not get gas rationing until after the election.

Kansas:

Down in our part of the country the feeling is that this gas rationing is not going to happen. One of the men on the commission thought it would be here by July 15th but since that time they have revised their ideas and we now doubt that it will happen at all.

Speaking of the tourist trade - we drove up from Kansas and came clear through Iowa and the state of Minnesota and I venture to say we did not see a half a dozen out-of-state licenses. I think I saw one South Dakota tag in Minnesota, and about two California and one or two Wisconsin but the most of the tags are local. Where is that tourist business you are talking about?

Dr. Strunk:

It is up here. A lot of the resorts in northern Minnesota, stuck way back in, are so packed already that you cannot get a reservation.

Mr. Osborne:
Illinois

In our state we have noticed fewer Illinois licenses and more out of state.
Mr. Swift: Wisconsin
When people get to a resort now they stay there and do not jump around.

Mr. Osborne: Illinois
Preston Bradley is going to preach a sermon recommending that everybody take a vacation. Because of the tremendous pressure on nerves, everyone needs considerable relief and relaxation.

Dr. Strunk:
The last report I heard on scrap rubber, I think that was yesterday, was that they had collected 200 million pounds. They want four million tons and if they can get it the possibility of rationing is going to disappear. Bob made a good statement, - if they are not going to give us tires, why worry about the gas?

From the Audience:
In the eastern states, employees are entitled to priority or unlimited supply of gas. Pleasure drivers are entitled to three gallons per week and the amount for actual business is 54 gallons every six weeks.

Dr. Strunk:
If we should take our wardens and spread them out too much there would be no law enforcement. And federal employees, if they cannot get gas or tires, what in the world are they going to do. What is your opinion of this gas business? Let's throw it out on the table for discussion.

Mr. Lowe: N. Dakota
How are you going to form an opinion? This week we hear one thing and next week something entirely different. I haven't been able to form an opinion. We are all agreed that it isn't the gasoline itself, it is the transportation of the gas that is the problem. It is a drug on the market in Texas.

Dr. Strunk:
They tell us there will not be any hunters.

Mr. Osborne: Illinois
We have to work more and more in closer cooperation with sportsmen's clubs. Last year I put on dollar a year wardens. We have about six hundred of them on now and they are doing a fine job. We put these men on periodic duty if we want law enforcement officers to help out.
You have to be very careful how you put them on, however.

**Dr. Strunk:** How is that going to increase your gasoline supply?

**Mr. Osborne:** Well those men live around locally, have their own cars, and do not have to travel.

**Mr. Schwob:** Iowa

There is no way to pass a resolution when we don't know what is going to happen.

**Dr. Strunk:** Well we are all in about the same shape. There isn't much to do about it.

What is your opinion **Mr. Lowe**, as to what phase of conservation should be cut down. Game set-up cut down, hatcheries closed, rearing pond program cut, or what?

**Mr. Lowe:** N. Dakota

We are not in a position to do very much talking on that situation because our program isn't anywhere near as great as the other states. Some states which have gone in for game farms in a big way should cut, I believe. Some hatcheries with birds maybe should be closed but, as I say, I am not in position to say very much on that subject. We only operate one hatchery and the federal government operates one hatchery. If we close ours we will be out of the fish business. We are going to work on a month to month basis and try to keep ahead of the situation.

**Kansas:**

We have not cut down on anything yet. We are carrying on our pheasant stocking program, particularly through Pittman-Robertson funds. We have two quail hatcheries and the production volume is about the same as last year. We are blessed with several state parks and their upkeep and improvement has to come out of the license fees and we are trying to cut down on them. Our propagation program, both on quail, pheasant and chukars, is limited of course, but our direct propagation program we have not cut down on as yet. We do not think we will have to. Our department of fish is carried on with up to date fish trucks and there
is no sign of them wearing out. The only thing we might be short on is personnel but I think what we will try to get rid of is our park problem and we are cutting down on that. Of course we are carrying on as economical a program as possible. We do not have much that we can cut out entirely.

Dr. Strunk:
Which of the phases, if a pinch comes, are you going to slice off?

Kansas:
I do not know, we think everything we do is essential.

Mr. Peterson:
S. Dakota
As I stated earlier, the only thing we have in mind right now to curtail is new development and construction projects. We do not have a problem in the propagation of game. Our problem is just the opposite. Take pheasants, for example, we have too many of them. I wish we could send some of them down to Kansas. As to fish propagation we have only one pike hatchery and one bass rearing pond and we cannot curtail our propagation of pike. We have lakes now that have been dry for twenty years which is an increased demand on our fisheries department, which we will try to meet in some way. The only place we can curtail is in the matter of development and we can curtail that.

Mr. Osborne
Illinois

Our thought is to at least maintain our present program on pheasant and quail and maybe increase it slightly. We only have one fish hatchery and several rearing ponds but we do a lot of fish rescue work. The fish are rescued from lakes and streams and used for restocking purposes and we expect to increase that activity. We expect also to put on additional crews to take out rough fish which bother the game fish. In other words, what we are trying to do is to get a bigger fish supply in the country because we are going to need it very badly. There will be a decrease in the reforestation program because of the loss of our CCC Camps. We staked about ten million trees this year but we will not have sufficient funds to
carry on this activity. Pittman-Robertson activities will also have to be cut down if we do not get the amount of funds we have received in the past.

Dr. Strunk: Which phases of your activities are to be curtailed Mr. Swift?

Mr. Swift: At the present time we are going to curtail on the game farm activities. Not on pheasants, but on certain other birds and we are going to curtail also on certain phases of the fisheries program. Our photography section is to be curtailed and some activities of that kind are being cut down. I think you can place these activities within the fisheries division and game division. Some are more essential than others.

Mr. Schwob: Our commission has adopted a policy that all new projects will be curtailed during the war period. As far as the game farm is concerned, we have curtailed activities this year. Production will be cut to about one-half. There will, however, be an increase in quail production. Fisheries activities will be carried on about the same and we are going ahead with all our hatcheries, nurseries and ponds. I think this is important. We have a lot of high water and rainfall and a lot of fish rescue work will be done. That is the cheapest way to get game fish for restocking purposes. We rescue them in streams and restock them in good water. We are going to try to carry on that program because that is very important, we believe. Pittman-Robertson is largely land acquisition and there will be very little along that line during this period. We are buying lands for refuges, public shooting grounds etc. It all depends on what funds we can get from Washington. The general policy of the Iowa Conservation Commission, during this war period, is to try, in every way possible, not to lose any of the ground we have gained during the last ten years. Not any of us can predict what is going to
happen and our attitude is that we are going to go ahead as fast and as
strong as we can and as things do happen make the best of the situation.
We are not telling anybody that we are going to quit or even slow down.

Dr. Strunk: On land acquisition - we will discuss that this afternoon. Do you
mean to say you are going ahead?

Mr. Schwob: Yes, we are. We had our budget already set up but no development
has been started but we are buying the lands as fast as we can, not
only with Pittman-Robertson funds but with surplus fish and game funds.
Buying lands for public access along some of our best fishing streams.

Dr. Strunk: So you buy the land when the commission OKs the purchase,

Mr. Osborne: Illinois The Executive Council and the Attorney General have to pass on the
title.

Dr. Strunk: Does the Executive Council OK this sort of thing during war time?

Mr. Schwob: Iowa All we have to have approval on is the Attorney General's Opinion.

Dr. Strunk: One quarter of your purchase price comes out of the fish and game
funds. The Executive Council passes on that.

Mr. Schwob: Iowa No, only on land that is purchased from money appropriated by the
legislature.

Dr. Strunk: From the general revenue. Does any legislature have anything to
say?

Mr. Lowe: N. Dakota Our Governor approves all land purchases.

Mr. Bieaulieu: S. Dakota In our state it is the same as in Iowa. Our commission approves
the purchase and the title is approved by the Attorney General's office
and they have to approve the voucher and authorize the state auditor to
pay it. It does not go through the Governor.

Mr. Osborne: Illinois Our Governor has to give a letter of approval on all land purchases
and the title has to be approved by the Attorney General.

Mr. Swift: Wisconsin Our set-up is the same.

Mr. Mosbaugh: Indiana Our land purchases are approved by the commission and the Attorney General.

Dr. Strunk: The reason I ask the question is that there seems to be a move on foot in several of the states that, during war times, the Executive Council and the Governor are loath to purchase lands with Pittman-Robertson funds because they feel that the price of the land is bumped up at that time.

Mr. Schwob: Iowa We do not buy the land if the price has been bumped up.

Mr. Osborne: Illinois If the price is too high the Governor will not approve it.

Dr. Strunk: I would like to go into this in greater detail this afternoon because there are a number of points I would like to discuss.

Mr. Blair: Minnesota A lot of the Executive Councils and Governors have not seen a letter which was sent out by Mr. Maurek some time ago making recommendations as to the use of Pittman-Robertson funds, in which he states why the purchase of lands at the present time is the proper thing to do with that money. That also can be taken up this afternoon and I think when the Executive Councils and Governors learn of his recommendations they may change their minds.

Dr. Strunk: I would like to call on Mr. Moe at this time to say a few words on fish propagation work in Minnesota.

Mr. Moe: Minnesota Well as far as the fish propagation work goes, we have had, during the past year, a considerable construction program. The point of course is that fish propagation work, law enforcement, etc., centers to a great extent on heavy travel, requiring rubber and gasoline, and revenues of
course may be taken into consideration, but those things are going to be a very determining factor as to what our program for the future can be. We cannot, of course, produce fish if we have no way of distributing them, so without tires and gas we would have to curtail that program. Window trimming - we are all blessed with that. We sort of inherit many things from the past, things that are carried on not because they are really essential but because we just inherited them. This should be a very good opportunity to curtail those activities and possibly drop them if they are not of particular importance. As far as my particular work is concerned, fish is the most important. We are in the midst of a progressive program and it is a difficult thing to curtail it and the best we can do is to hold the ground we have gained during the past year or two.

Dr. Strunk: It is almost twelve o'clock. We should establish a committee on elections. Nominations are now in order. Will somebody make a motion for the establishment of a committee of three.

Mr. Schwob: Iowa I move that the president appoint a committee of three as a nominating committee.

(Motion seconded)

Dr. Strunk: I will appoint on the committee Mr. Mosbaugh of Indiana, Mr. Lowe from North Dakota and Mr. Peterson from South Dakota.

Mr. Osborne: Illinois You gave Mr. Swift the duty to amend the constitution and by-laws.

Mr. Swift: Wisconsin The matter of any changes in by-laws I would suggest we take up in executive session just before the election of officers.

Dr. Strunk: The committee will report at the close of the afternoon session.

As you all know, to-morrow, we will take a trip up through the iron range. We will start in the morning, about nine o'clock, and have lunch at Hibbing. The Oliver Mining Company has kindly consented to take us, by train, down through the open pit mine, showing us what they
are doing there. From there we will go to Ely and through the Superior National Forest down to the North Shore and come back to Duluth that evening. Also, I would like to know if any of you would like to have a trip on the lake. That, of course, would have to be on Saturday but I would like to know in advance so that I can make the necessary arrangements.

Mr. Lowe:  What about transportation for the trip to-morrow.

Dr. Strunk:  We will take care of the transportation. That will save your rubber.

We will now adjourn to convene again at two o'clock.

Afternoon session of meeting held on June 25th, 1942.

3:00 P.M.  Meeting called to order by the President -Dr. W. L. Strunk.

Dr. Strunk:  If you have no objections I would like to take up the matter of the Pittman-Robertson set-up. What is the situation with reference to funds at the present time?

Mr. Steen  F. & WL Ser.

I think all of you commissioners and directors are aware of the fact that the appropriation bill came out of the budget committee with two and one quarter million dollars recommended and was cut a million in the house. The Senate restored it to two and one quarter million and it is now in the conference committee and what will happen to it in the conference committee is something no one can tell. However, the grapevine reports we have had are not too favorable. We may wind up with a million and a quarter and we may wind up with two million and a quarter. The minimum will be one and one quarter million and the maximum two and one quarter million dollars.

Mr. Gilbert:  Nebraska

How much did we have last year.

Dr. Strunk:  Last year we had two and three-quarters million dollars. What prerogative did they use for cutting this? These are dedicated funds.
Mr. Steen: It is just a matter of economizing and the natural tendency on the part of the house of representatives to economize.

Dr. Strunk: These are dedicated receipts, they are not like a tax, these are definitely dedicated for one purpose.

Mr. Steen: I know that and all of that is in favor of the regular appropriation but you know as well as I do that both in state and national house of representation there is a tendency to economize irrespective of what the results will be in order that they may say to their constituents - see all the millions we saved.

Dr. Strunk: Your opinion is then that it will be cut.

Mr. Steen: The grapevine has it that it may come out one and a quarter million even though it was put up to two and one-half million. It has not come out of the conference committee but the grapevine says it will probably go back to where it was in the house.

Dr. Strunk: I think we should discuss phases associated with Pittman-Robertson, relative to the nature of employment of funds. There seems to be a tendency to want to take those funds and spend more on research than on land acquisition. How many of the states have noticed that tendency. I know that it is true in our state. We had a request the other day to that effect. How many have noticed that tendency.

Mr. Swift: There is a tendency to curtail land acquisition but not especially Pittman-Robertson land acquisition. We have other land acquisition in the state forests. However, we are going through with a project in which a great deal of our Pittman-Robertson money is going. After that is completed I cannot foretell what the indications will be.

Dr. Strunk: Have you noticed any tendency at all for Pittman-Robertson funds to be curtailed from land acquisition?

Mr. Swift: Not Pittman-Robertson but other land acquisition - yes.

Dr. Strunk: What about South Dakota?

Mr. Peterson: S. Dakota The greater part of our Pittman-Robertson money has gone into land
acquisition. We only had one research project operating. This action you speak of must come from your own state. We have had no such action.

Dr. Strunk: The particular instance I am referring to is not yet finished. What was the amount of money involved Parker?

Lansing Parker: Minnesota $21,000 at Whitewater and a total on land of $50,000.

Dr. Strunk: How about Iowa.

Mr. Schwob: Iowa I had not noticed any such tendency. You mean as insistence on the part of local people that we spend the Pittman-Robertson money on research programs?

Dr. Strunk: No the council acts on its own volition.

Mr. Schwob: We have a game research program and a fish research program but our Pittman-Robertson program is a land acquisition program, statewide, and our people are very much pleased with our program.

Dr. Strunk: They have been in our program too but the tendency is coming, in fact it is already here, because no council acts without receiving some pressure from the outside. It is simply a group of fellows who think that research is going to answer every question we have before us. We know that research is an aid to administration but not administration itself.

Mr. Steen: Perhaps I can shorten the discussion up a little bit by reciting some experiences. Your state is the only one in which any situation, such as you state, apparently exists. Quite some time back, shortly after the 7th of December, based on observation and experience, in our best judgment as to the outlook of needs, we recommended to the states that they utilize their federal aid or Pittman-Robertson funds very largely in land acquisition. There are a good many reasons why that is logical, economical, and desirable. First of all there is the question of personnel. In these times, as you all know, it is hard
and becoming increasingly harder, to get and keep qualified personnel on research development projects. Secondly, on development at least, there is the question of materials. It is almost impossible under the priority system to get the necessary materials for the development of wildlife areas. And finally, there is the situation that we all face and must take into consideration and that is the overall requirements of the nation, the desirability of doing certain things in these times and planning to do certain things in the future. Everyone who is at all conversant with the situation is of one mind on this point that it is desirable in these times to acquire the sites that you desire to utilize for wildlife, get possession of them and formulate your plans so that when this conflict in which we are engaged is over and we have to put our people back to work, we will have some work ready for them to do.

Land, at the present time, may be a little higher than it was a few years ago but a few years ago you bought land for less than it was worth and if in some states you pay more at this time you are still coming out OK. If you were to buy a tract to-day and develop it also, your cost of development would be prohibitive under these times and conditions but you can buy all of your sites now, accumulate them, have them ready and work out your plans and specifications and when the war is over and when we have to put work projects back into play you will be in position to take advantage of the economies that may be exercised and practiced when materials and labor will be abundant and you can prosecute your development in the phases in which it ought to be prosecuted.

Finally, too, use this land for the duration for the production of food. In the last war we experienced a lot of things we should not go through in this war. We experienced a breaking up of lands for the production of food stuff for which they were not adapted and which could
not economically be cultivated for food, draining of a lot of marshes which should not have been drained, etc., and there is a tendency to do that now. We feel that those lands which are not primarily adapted to agriculture and which cannot be operated economically for agricultural purposes in normal times, should be picked up right now by the agencies which are in the game of buying lands and held for wildlife purposes so that all things considered it is highly desirable to put emphasis at the present time on the land acquisition program.

Research programs should be maintained as far as possible too but we think you will have to reduce that because you will not be able to get all the materials you want and will not be able to get the personnel. As far as development is concerned, it is not good sense or economy, as far as the state or nation is concerned, to develop at this time. Land is the field you should work in and you should acquire these lands and lay out your plans of development so that when the time comes you can proceed with the other phase of the work under the most desirable and economical conditions.

Dr. Strunk: You know how rumors come and go in connection with conservation. Other states are starting to emphasize research more and land acquisition has dropped out.

Mr. Lowe: N. Dakota I might explain these Pittman-Robertson activities further. The things you can do with Pittman-Robertson funds are probably the most misunderstood of any activities from the standpoint of the sportsmen and layman. We in North Dakota have never had the tools to work with by which we could find out what our resources were until federal aid came into the picture. It is true we have probably stressed research investigations more than any other but our activities are restricted. We were using federal aid to determine what our resources are and from that I think we will be able to determine what types of lands we should purchase,
where we should purchase them and what we should purchase them for. We had three game farms which needed considerable investigation; a situation had developed on the fox where he was beginning to be troublesome in certain areas and a law was passed by the last legislature giving us authority to recommend the fox be a predator. There again investigations had to be made. We are using Pittman-Robertson funds for all of these investigations. Our present personnel is not large enough to do that. We have too much territory. Our game birds, for instance, are very numerous but on the other hand there are some areas where shooting should be curtailed and some areas where it should be stressed. This all calls for investigations. While we have all three types of projects on the fire the development work is out but if this federal aid can get the information for us, to show where it is to our interest to purchase this land, they are paving their way. It is up to each commission, director, or department to determine for themselves how to handle and how to spend this money. Out our way the federal aid is giving us the proper type of information to determine which way we should go and what we should do with our money.

Dr. Strunk: Mr. Parker will you give us a brief resume of the Pittman-Robertson set-up in Minnesota.

Mr. Parker: Minnesota

In Minnesota, up to January 1941, a good share of the Pittman-Robertson money was spent on land acquisition. We have operated somewhat differently than in some of the states in that we have divided the project into four major divisions with two men on the big game, two on the fur bearers, two on the upland game birds and two on the migratory game birds. We also have a laboratory in conjunction with the project. The plan is to inventory the various species in the state and find out what we have and where they are and also give some first hand information relative to regulations and seasons. The project, of course, has taken
some beatings and we have lost four from our research staff already and there is a possibility of three more going before long. The question in Minnesota research is getting adequate personnel to carry it out as we have it outlined. We are turning our attention in research more from specific investigations to one tying in with land development and purchase, projects we contemplate for the future. All of the preliminary surveys on the land projects are being made by the federal aid research boys and it is our plan next year to concentrate rather heavily on this activity. A lot depends on the funds available but we hope to work on the development plans for refuges that the state now has or will acquire so that in the event there is a post war conservation program, we will be in a position to utilize whatever funds are available so that during the balance of this next year we will be devoting a great share of our efforts to that particular phase of it. Picking out areas to buy and developing plans for those needing further improvement. The greater portion of the money, of course, will be spent for acquisition. We have practically ceased our development here in the state now, from the standpoint of the scarcity of materials and high cost of labor. The only thing that we will be doing in the way of development is some tree planting. The greater portion will be spent on refuges. The first problem we are attempting is clearing off present state refuges to get them into the size and units we feel they should be and second we are going into new areas where it is essential to have shooting grounds and selecting areas that should be bought.

Dr. Strunk: It is the concensus of opinion of the group, especially during the duration, that land acquisition shall constitute the backbone of the Pittman-Robertson procedure.

Mr. Clark: Missouri I think Mr. Lowe has hit it, relative to the policy of the federal agency in administering the Pittman-Robertson Act, to recognize the fact
that each state, and even each warden of each state, has different
problems and to leave it to the state to determine what is to be done.
In Missouri we hold a little different view. It doesn't mean, however,
that we think that view should be taken for the federal aid program as
a whole. In Missouri it appears there is a tendency, and briefly it
comes from public opinion, and not wholly uniform on the board except on
the problem to acquire more land, to devote more funds to land. In
Missouri we have devoted very little to that purpose. This tendency
toward land acquisition, as we see it, and I do not mean to imply that
there is necessarily unanimous opinion about it because there are two
distinct points of view, is becoming more pronounced. First, looking
ahead to post war periods, we must provide land on which public work
projects can be applied. The other point of view, which I personally
favor and which the commissioner favors is this - this war is infinitely
bigger and involves many more problems than any previous war and the
amount of funds being spent is greater. By the same token the problem
of readjustment; after this war is over, will be infinitely greater
than after the last war. The theory that public works programs after
this war will have to be limited to state owned land is wholly unjusti-
fied. We are assuming that the post war period after this war will
follow the same trend as the post war period after the last war, viz.,
WPA and CCC had to be done on publicly owned land. We are working in
Missouri toward the preparation of a program of public works which
involves all of the interests, soil conservation, forests, wildlife,
water conservation, and flood control, in one broad program for recon-
ditioning our depleted condition. We are getting ready for the post
war period, not by buying land, which fully encourages the thought that
it will have to be limited to certain little spots on the map. Precedent
has been established during several years, that it is reasonable that
we urge, in the state of Missouri, that public works programs in this coming post war period be not restricted to state owned lands but to the same policies that govern Soil Conservation Service. We are resis-
ting this trend to spend money for land acquisition, particularly if it is based on the theory that post war projects after this war will neces-
sarily be limited to publicly owned lands. If we do not have any such land the project can be applied as well to state owned land. We hope in the next post war period the federal works projects will be more extensive and serve the state as a whole rather than a relatively small percentage of the state which can or ever will be in public ownership. They should expand to privately owned lands.

Dr. Strunk: What is your program with reference to the hunter and sportsman angle. Under our state set-up not more than one third of a land mass can be given over to a definite refuge, the rest is public hunting grounds. Does your program have in mind developing greater areas for the sportsmen.

Mr. Clark: No, we do not contemplate a problem in Missouri that will justify as a practical procedure, public hunting grounds as they are commonly thought of. We have our problem in the Ozark region where bare land is being acquired at a small cost of fifty cents or a dollar, or up to four dollars an acre, and call it a national forest. That is a multiple use project. They are publicly owned lands and will be open to shooting but we are not buying land and do not contemplate buying land for the purpose of public shooting grounds. The possible exception would be large marsh areas which could serve as public shooting grounds for waterfowl. Not for deer, quail or any other game.

Mr. Gilbert: Nebraska

I just want to mention, before you voice your opinions regarding the retrenchment program for your research work, that we in Nebraska have some very important projects and still need some of the information
which comes from the research program. There are projects and circumstances which would alter an opinion of this type. I do feel that the projects we have in mind can still be started, at least along with the realization that this war situation is cutting down on our personnel, so that I would not like to see restrictions too harsh when this opinion is made.

Mr. Blair: Minnesota

I would like to ask Mr. Maurek if he has a copy of the letter he wrote to the various states relative to the use of Pittman-Robertson money during the war period.

Mr. Maurek: I do not have it with me.

Mr. Steen

I do not want any one to get the impression that we are directing how to spend this Pittman-Robertson money, we are merely suggesting how it might be spent. It must be recognized that no two states have the same problems. North Dakota has, of course, very largely research work. Missouri has almost entirely research work. Iowa has almost entirely land acquisition problems. The logical thing to do is for those states to concentrate on problems calling for their particular activity. Production of game and utilization of game. Land is acquired, primarily, for one purpose, to aid in production and limit utilization. North Dakota has one particular problem in production and another problem in utilization. In Iowa land is used very exclusively, used to the disadvantage of wild life. Wild life is a product of the land. Iowa must have a land purchase program because it is the logical thing to do. They do not need the same thing they need in North Dakota. Missouri, on the other hand, is mostly research. The thing we are trying to point out is this - if you have two acquisition projects that you want to develop, the thing to do is to buy them now and develop them after the war rather than to buy one of them and develop it now and buy the other one and develop it later. That can only be prosecuted to the extent that you can get material and men.
Dr. Strunk: Do not get the idea we are against research because we are carrying on more and more of it, but we had a former commission which bought a forty here and a forty there, leaving a couple of miles in between and what we have been trying to do is to combine this whole business and make one out of it. I wanted an expression of opinion in regard to this land acquisition - shall we continue to buy lands, because the problem is definitely with us at the present time.

Mr. Maurek: One statement I will emphasize. Don't judge the Fish and Wildlife Service by thinking that we are trying to dictate to the states what to do on the federal aid problems. The letter that went out was merely a suggestion. You can do as you damn please about it because we judge the projects on the merits only. You are the doctor in submitting the projects whether it is land acquisition or any other kind. The letter was solely a suggestion to get ready for the post war period on the development projects.

Dr. Strunk: How many states are giving attention to the development of hunting grounds through the development of hunting projects.

Mr. Swift: Wisconsin We have just one but we have a few small hunting grounds under other funds. It has not been completed but it is contemplated that it will be public hunting and trapping grounds.

Mr. Schwob: Iowa In our Pittman-Robertson land acquisition program we are carrying out the recommendations of our twenty-five year conservation plan. These areas are not going to provide a lot of work during the period after the war. Most of them will require a fence around them and that will be all that is to it. Most of the areas are marsh areas. Ninety-five percent of our land is privately owned and in our opinion if we do not acquire these marsh areas, in a few years the average hunters won't have any place they can go out and shoot ducks. We are not carrying out our program with any idea that it is going to provide work after the war, it is
part of our long time conservation program. It is not practical to utilize $150 an acre land to provide quail hunting or pheasant hunting. That is a program that has to be worked out with the land owner. Then there is the problem of the state owned areas. We are getting to that problem by working through the Soil Conservation Service and stimulating in every way we can the creation of soil conservation districts. We are trying to make our game program a part of the private land owners land use program.

Mr. Osborne: Illinois

I have not noticed any particular interference yet. I am a little alarmed as to what might happen when the war is over, whether the federal government will turn their areas back to our department or maintain them themselves. We are going to make an effort to have them turned over to our department. The government did not use very good judgment in buying the best farm land we had in the state to put up defense plants on. If we can get those areas back we can do a real job in our state and I think the men connected with the wild life service are in favor of that and will give us all the help they can.

Mr. Schwob: Iowa

I agree completely that each state has its own problems and if they have not made the necessary investigations they should have a research program on which to get the facts on which to base their programs. If you are going to have a sound program you have to have facts on which to base that program.

Mr. Blair: Minnesota

I wouldn't want Mr. Maurek to misunderstand our reason for referring to the letter he sent out. It was a very excellent letter and just the type we needed in Minnesota to help us with the projects we had in mind. Dr. Strunk has mentioned about some of the projects we have made up having been interferred with by other state officials. We had two projects on land acquisition. The head member of the State Executive
Council said that no land should be purchased and the other members, not thinking, voted against the purchase of any more lands during the war period. Then the question arose, what are we to do with the Pittman-Robertson money. We have a fine research program in Minnesota and we are doing all we can at the present time. Because of lack of personnel research would naturally be cut down during the war period because most of the research boys are young men and are in the draft. Secondly, you cannot buy the materials necessary for development so that leaves but one thing left for us to do and that is to purchase lands for refuge purposes. Do not misunderstand Dr. Strunk. We are not buying these lands for public hunting ground purposes. We included all the areas as refuges and then when the time arrives, when we have a surplus of game, not to exceed one third shall be refuge and the balance public hunting grounds. Public hunting grounds are not open until then. This discussion is certainly going to help us in convincing our Executive Council that the purchase of these lands is a real asset because the federal government is paying 75% and the state 25% and, therefore, we have an asset which we would not otherwise have. We started out first with a Pittman Robertson act passed by Congress and the states, through their legislatures, consented to that act. There is no other agency in the state that has anything to say about that money. Naturally, we do not always get the results we expect but game and fish work is difficult. Mr. Nee thinks fish come first and game is secondary. I know most of the money comes from fish but I think game is most important.

Mr. Gilbert: Nebraska

Your research men in the past and present have been doing a lot of work on new types of projects with which we in Nebraska are not familiar. I would like to suggest that some policy of exchange bulletins, among the states within this association, be put into effect. We could then save each other a lot of research work in that respect.
Mr. Steen: We have had that in mind for quite some time. Do you favor the exchange of quarterly reports on these projects? North Dakota, Nebraska, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, are all engaged in research projects but none of you know what the other states are doing. North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Indiana, Nebraska, are all working on pheasants and yet none of you know what the other states are doing. Would you like to see something done which would permit the exchange of quarterly reports between all of the states engaged on the same type of activity or trying to ascertain more or less the same answer. Whether you would like to have us handle that, or whether you want to print enough additional quarterly reports, or typewrite or mimeograph enough quarterly reports so that all the workers in the other states can have access to that information, is something for you to decide.

Dr. Strunk: Do you have the money to handle that Mr. Steen?

Mr. Mosbaugh: Indiana I move that the Fish and Wildlife Service provide these exchange bulletins.

Dr. Strunk: I second that motion.

All states agreed.

Dr. Strunk: We will now discuss the recommendations for the 1942 waterfowl season.

I presume all of you have received a letter from Mr. Gabrielson. Is there any state present which did not receive or see such letter? I thought it was general.

Mr. Storz, what is the reaction of Nebraska on that?

Mr. Storz: Nebraska As far as the extent of the season is concerned, it won't do us any good in our zone because our duck hunting is over on December 1st and moving it to the 25th won't help any. On the other hand we do not have much hunting before the first of October in any part of the state and in the western part of the state less than that.
Well it looks as though many of you have not seen the letter so I will be glad to read it to you:

"The Service is making every effort to announce the 1942 Migratory Bird Treaty Act regulations at an early date. A report, covering our investigations of the past year, is now in preparation and we hope that it can be sent to you in the near future.

The status of migratory game birds may be summarized, however, as follows: Except for some species of geese (which unfortunately includes the important Canada goose), waterfowl in general have shown a most gratifying increase; the situation regarding the woodcock and the mourning dove, appears to be only slightly improved, such gains as have been made not warranting any extension of shooting privileges while for the dove it is felt that good management will require a further reduction of the legal kill; the white-winged dove also continues to be a problem species; while the band-tailed pigeon of the Pacific Coast has shown a considerable increase. Despite the complete protection ordered last year for the first time, a further decrease has been recorded for the Wilson snipe.

Some liberalization in the shooting of ducks may be justified and consideration is being given to lengthening the shooting day to include the period from sunrise to sunset (using whatever time is standard), and extending the season for 10 days. After a careful study of all factors, the following dates are being considered: Northern zone, September 26 to December 4, inclusive; Intermediate zone, October 15 to December 23, inclusive; Southern zone, November 2 to January 10, inclusive.

We appreciate the fact that many enforcement officers prefer specification of definite hours but by permitting shooting to sunset, it may be possible to eliminate some of the complaints of crop damage that have increased as the restoration program has advanced, and it will also eliminate the difficulties along time-zone boundaries.

It is hoped that if this change is adopted sportsmen generally will make every effort to cut down waste by retrieving cripples and birds killed in the latter part of the day.

On the subject of daily bag and possession limits, consideration is being given to changing the daily limit on mourning doves from 12 to 10 birds, and reducing the limit on geese to two birds per day, with four in possession, with the proviso that six blue geese may be taken in one day but not more than six geese may be possessed at one time of which not more than four may be of species other than blue geese. This reduction would give additional protection chiefly to the Canadian goose and appears justified since our investigations clearly indicate that the take of these birds in the last few years has been excessive. Consideration is being given to a recommendation that the post-season possession time be extended to 30 days, and that the possession limit for all birds on the opening day in each zone shall be only the legal daily limit. The reason for the latter proviso I believe will be obvious.
A recommendation that the Atlantic brant be restored to the game list and that the one wood duck proviso of last year be extended to all other states that desire it, also is being considered. Please advise me of your wishes as regards such action for your state. Both of these birds have increased satisfactorily and it is not believed that a limited take will affect their status.

We have studied other recommended modifications of regulations regarding the taking of migratory birds as they affect your state, but do not believe it desirable to take action on them at this time.

You, of course, understand that this matter must be considered as strictly confidential. I will, however, be appreciative of your advice and request that you so time your reply that it will be received here not later than June 22, using air mail if necessary.

Sincerely yours,

Ira N. Gabrielson, Director
Fish and Wildlife Service
Washington, D.C.

P.S. Please advise me if you desire a continuation of the 15 day season for mourning doves.

Dr. Strunk: How about sunrise to sunset?

South Dakota: We had our warden conference a week ago. The opening hour is the bone of contention. We had 28 wardens present and 13 recommended seven o'clock war time, 11 a half hour before sunrise and four sunrise to sunset. My recommendation was to the effect that as far as we in South Dakota are concerned, we would be better satisfied with an early opening rather than a ten day extension on the season, thinking that by giving them both ends of the day they would be better satisfied. Seven o'clock war time or one-half hour before sunrise.

Mr. Lowe: North Dakota Sunset was a surprise to us. We have constantly howled on this that we wanted the one-half hour before sunrise although the extension of the time from four to six will go a long way toward healing the bad feeling that exists. Sunrise to sunset will be a lot better than last year.
Mr. Osborne: Illinois  We are in favor of it.

Mr. Schwob: Iowa  We recommended the shooting to start thirty minutes before sunrise and close at sundown.

Wisconsin:  Sunrise to sunset.

Indiana:  Sunrise to sunset.

Minnesota:  Seven-thirty to six. Sunrise to sunset. We specify the hours so that we will not run into problems we have run into before. We thought we would specify specific hours—seven-thirty to six.

North Dakota:  We have a time zone in North Dakota. Extend the season ten days. September 26th instead of October 1st. Four days at the beginning and six days at the end.

Illinois:  We are for it for ducks but not for Canadian geese. If we extend the season ten days we would not have enough food and they would get slaughtered. We are opposed to the extension for geese.

Iowa:  We want the season ten days earlier.

South Dakota:  We are for it but would rather have one-half hour earlier than ten days.

North Dakota:  September 26th to October 4th, inclusive. Intermediate zone October 15th to December 23rd.

Iowa:  We recommend October 1st to December 15th. We asked for a little bit more on the early part of the season.

Mr. Maurek:  Probably it would be well at this time to clarify some of the suggestions. I happen to be a member of the regulations committee. In the extension of the shooting time from sunrise to sundown we took into consideration more important things than shooting and that was the depredation on crops by waterfowl. We have had a lot of complaints due to the closing of shooting at four o'clock in the afternoon when the birds learn the time practically to the second and run down the refuges and run down the farmers' crops and do damage. It is more critical on the
Pacific coast than in the central states. That is one thing that was in the minds of the committee. Personally I recommended one half hour before sunrise because about that time the ducks start to move in and hunters would keep them disbursed and cut down damage to the farms. Of course this is not definitely settled. It is merely a suggestion by this committee to Gabrielson and I presume that is what he acted on. Something has to be done about depredation. Birds are doing untold damage to crops and there are thousands of them slaughtered by the people, in order to protect their property, and left lying in the fields.

Illinois: What was the date on the intermediate zone.

Dr. Strunk: We will now hear from the southern zone. Daily bag and possession limits. Mourning doves from twelve to ten birds.

Wisconsin: We do not want any season on mourning doves.

Dr. Strunk: Reducing the limit on geese to two birds per day with four in possession (reading from letter)

No objections voiced.

Dr. Strunk: What about the wood duck? They recommend that one wood duck be allowed in the bag.

Iowa: We recommend that they be allowed one mistake.

Indiana: We recommend the same.

Iowa: One in daily bag or one in possession limit?

Mr. Clark: Missouri

As a matter of record, and I know it will do no good, I would like to bring up the matter of live decoys. You know Missouri has talked about live decoys. We still believe and recommend for consideration, at least for that zone that Missouri is in where the ducks fly through, that we be allowed to have at least a few live decoys and then maybe we could get a lick at them now and then. Actually that is true. They just go over us. If we could find some way to get them to drop in once in awhile it would be swell. It should be a very limited number
of decoys and not more than a certain number within the range of any
gun. Also no shooting within a certain distance of a certain number
of ducks. It can be worked out and is just something to be used in
that zone. We hope the other zones won't object to us asking for it.

Dr. Strunk: Any other problems.

Iowa: We had a lot of complaints about this last year. Most of the other
midwest states have been working for years on a refuge system to safe-
guard a brooding stock of ducks. Our duck shooting was so poor last
year we had delegations and petitions from sportsmen's organizations and
groups wanting to open up our refuges to shooting. Our refuge system
has been very effective and the system established has helped to bring
these ducks back. There is great danger right now that we better look
over this refuge system and be sure that we have an adequate refuge system
to safeguard a brooding stock of ducks but at the same time remember we
have duck hunters who want to go out and get ducks. We had better plan
our refuge set-up with the idea that the hunter must have a place in
which he can hunt ducks.

Dr. Strunk: Federal refuges should be revised so the hunters of the state can
get some shooting.

Mr. Schwob: Not only federal but state also.

Dr. Strunk: We can regulate state refuges easily.

Mr. Schwob: We have got our ducks back to the state where we are having crop
damage. If we have a refuge system we will safeguard that brooding
stock of ducks which is an all important thing in perpetuating this
thing. Safeguard that brooding stock annually. I, personally, think,
as a duck hunter, you go out duck hunting in the morning and most of
the time you get your shooting just at sunrise and if you don't get it
then you don't get any shooting all day long. I think that we ought to
have it thirty minutes before sunrise. I think we are getting to the
place where we draw the line too fine. It is becoming disgusting to
the hunter. Why not let them shoot the ducks when they can see them. Have the general rule that a man shoot ducks in daylight and not split hairs. I think this refuge problem is something we have to pay attention to now because our hunters think the refuge system has destroyed their opportunity to hunt.

Dr. Strunk: What do you consider as constituting the proper refuge?

Mr. Schwob: I would say in a state like Iowa we ought to have refuges, food and all things necessary for ducks. They should not be any closer together than a duck can fly from one to another in a reasonable time. Four or five miles apart is too thick. Refuges should be at least twenty-five or thirty miles apart and maybe further. Those are problems which should be discussed and we ought to call into consultation with us a department on what constitutes an adequate refuge system. Be sure we are not over doing it.

Dr. Strunk: The thing I am getting at is this. Shall the boundaries of a refuge be so fixed that they cannot be changed? Here is a refuge of thirty-five thousand acres. Shall those boundaries be set from then on or shall that refuge be utilized for the purpose of giving the men of the state some chance to get ducks.

Mr. Schwob: In your program you must have this adequate system. We have state refuges and public shooting grounds.

Dr. Strunk: This brings us to another thought gentlemen, and I want you to know that there is nothing personal in this entire thing between this department and the federal government. I would like to get an expression of opinion as to federal land expansion. What is your candid opinion of the federal government expanding in the state and taking over land and after taking over the land that land is theirs?

Dr. Mosbaugh: In Indiana our duck hunting is almost disappearing along the Kankakee River. Since that time we have had three refuges set up. One of 2300 acres, another on one of our game farms of 1600 acres and another
in the southwestern corner of Indiana. Under this set up at Hubby Lake, twenty-five percent has been closed as a refuge and the remainder open. It is a very satisfactory arrangement and if we can have ten days more extension on the hunting season the hunters will be very happy. We have two preserves twenty-four miles apart and within a reasonable radius they have shooting. We are interested in seeing two more refuges set up and whether it is the federal government or the state is of no concern but it appears that refuges of limited areas have been very effective and are really paying dividends. We do feel that a continuation of refuges along the Kankakee River is going to provide hunting for Indiana.

Dr. Strunk: What is the reaction to the federal government condemning the land?  
Mr. Mosbaugh: It makes no difference to us who does it, state or federal government.

Dr. Strunk: They do not mind whether the federal government takes over state land just so long as it is utilized for waterfowl purposes.

Mr. Atkins: Kansas What do you mean by the federal government setting up refuges, of their own or in cooperation with the state itself.

Dr. Strunk: The thing I have reference to is a certain project known as the Tamarac Lake project near Detroit Lakes in western Minnesota. The federal government moved in to establish a refuge known as the Tamarac Lake Refuge.

There are two major federal forestry set-ups established in the state of Minnesota. One the Superior National forest and the other the Chippewa National forest. These forests were established by an act of Congress and definite boundaries were drawn, inside of which these national forests were to be established. Now, the thing that has happened, since that time, is that the United States Forest Service has gone outside of these boundaries in all directions, both in the Chippewa and Superior National forests, they have spread out of the proclaimed
area in both sectors and in addition, in between, they have purchased large areas of land. Now they request another addition and another one over on this side toward the top of the Arrowhead. We claim that the trend is this - a consolidation of this whole northeastern section into federal hands and taking it out of state hands. The trend seems to be in that direction. I would like to hear from the other states. How do the rest of you feel about the federal government coming in and buying acres and acres of land and keeping those acres, without state cooperation whatsoever, for the establishment of federal land holdings?

Mr. Maurek:

I take exception. We do cooperate - you say without cooperation. The only protection we give is to waterfowl. As far as upland game goes we do not claim that. If there is a surplus the state gets the benefit.

Mr. Blair:

The question is - do the states favor the federal government purchasing private lands within the state without any restrictions.

Mr. Maurek:

Any time any federal agency goes into a state that agency must have the consent of the state.

Mr. Swift:

I do not think the question has been properly put yet. Has a sovereign state got the right to protect its own tax payers? If the federal government can come in and buy tax delinquent lands state rights will go.

Dr. Strunk:

I would like to get the consensus of opinion.

Mr. Clark:

Should the federal government come into the state and acquire lands without the cooperation of the state. Are we for it or against it?

Speaking for Missouri, we have had no occasion whatever to have any complaint or criticism regarding the activities of certain federal agencies, the Fish and Wildlife Service specifically. Even with the Forest Service, in Missouri our relationships are altogether satisfactory but we have all of us been familiar with the principles involved in the case.
In Missouri we have seen evidence of that tendency. The application of the principles of the federal government, as employed by some of its departments, is being applied in Missouri. The commissioner has gone on record on the subject. In our case it happens to be the U. S. Army case in acquiring lands for flood control purposes and building a dam and creating a body of water and then absolutely controlling the fish and wildlife within that land which they have bought and then proceeding, without contact with or reasonable consultation or cooperation of the conservation commission, which is the agency representing the state of Missouri, and responsible for its wild life resources, to control that area. The federal government by buying lands acquires the right to determine, without reference to state laws or the state department, under what conditions, when, how and where that game or fish may be taken.

We in Missouri are very much concerned over that tendency which is developing more and more in the federal government. Not in all departments of it, however, but as a whole they have a strong tendency towards that thing and Missouri has taken a firm stand that that is contrary to the principles of government in this country and we stand definitely opposed to the principles involved.

Mr. Maurek: Probably it would be well before any action or expression is made that all members be fully advised. The migratory waterfowl program was established on the Migratory Bird Treaty Act which provides that no lands of any state could be acquired until the permission of the state was secured to the purchase of that land. In other words, if we go in and purchase any land we must first have the permission of the state to buy it or it would constitute an illegal act.

Dr. Strunk: Why did you start condemnation proceedings before consulting with the state in question?

Mr. Maurek: Because we thought we had the consent of the state in question to purchase that land.
Dr. Strunk: There was no written understanding to that effect.

Mr. Maurek: We had a telegram.

Mr. Steen: Some of these things are more or less minor. They have to do with certain problems and difficulties such as we ran into in the Tamarac Lake area. That is a sort of a private fight. I have been in the state service and in the service of the federal government and have seen this thing in a lot of different states. Minnesota has no fight on this question at all. I have seen more real action in the state of Montana, where they really set up a howl. When you analyze the situation it is truly swell for the people who are interested in wild life. The biggest asset Montana has in wild life is big game and the big game is found on federal land. When land is taken over by private industries big game goes out. It does not seem to me it makes any difference who buys this land. Let any agency take it over and run it and better it. Our main object is to perpetuate and increase all wild life.

Mr. Swift:
Wisconsin
You are not talking about fundamentals you are talking about wild life. The power of the state to run its own business and perpetuate its own interest is an important issue and any time a high authority can come in and destroy the rights of the tax payers of that state, it is not sovereign.

Mr. Osborne:
Illinois
I do not agree with Mr. Steen there. It isn’t a question of one individual case. Most all of us believe in states' rights. The right of the state to tax its own land, and I think most of us have unusual alarm on the encroachment the federal government has made during the past few years on the assets and rights of different states. Federal agencies are taking over water power, public utilities and different sorts, and it might be a forerunner which might mean that the federal government will try to get control of everything. As far as what the Fish and Wildlife Service has done, I think we have no complaint. We cooperate with them and they with us so we are having no fight with them, but I
do think we ought to have some breaks and a time when we stop some of
this. We want to follow a democratic form of government. It is the
principle of the thing, and I agree with you that the state should have
certain control over any refuge that even the federal government has in
that state. We should be permitted to enforce the state laws in those
refuges. I wonder how long we are going to be able to do that. Certain-
ly the federal agencies did not think much of the citizens of Illinois
when they went down to the river bottom and deprived the people of the
privilege of duck hunting along the river bottom. The government simply
took this land over and said it was closed to hunting and they sure didn't
think of the state's rights when they did that.

Mr. Maurek: You know that is in the process of being remedied.

Mr. Osborne: This has not been done through your department Mr. Maurek. If it
had we would have gotten along fine.

Mr. Blair: Minnesota We believe the Pittman-Robertson project is a wonderful piece of
work. The same holds true with the expenditure of highway funds. Of
course the Fish and Wildlife Service operates in a sort of dual capacity
because they handle Pittman-Robertson activities which turn it all over
to the state and in addition they go in and purchase refuges which they
operate themselves.

Dr. Strunk: Don't you think one solution would be this. If federal agencies
would tell the state agencies involved just how far they intend to go.
What is your limit? Let us have your plan. Certainly a state has a
right to request that.

Mr. Maurek: You have that right now. When the federal government comes in to
purchase land they must first obtain the consent of your Governor, then
you can ask them - what is your plan.

Dr. Strunk: The Tamarac incident was thrown out of court by the federal judge
on the basis that what you just now said, Mr. Maurek, had not been done.
The commission had not met in the majority of instances in a full quorum. A federal judge threw the thing out. The thing is this—what we are trying to do in this state, and I think Wisconsin sees eye to eye with us on this, is to find out just what are the limits to which you intend to go. I think the state has a right to know that.

Mr. Maurek:

I would like an explanation from Mr. Lowe.

Mr. Lowe:

I do not feel qualified to argue the point. The state of North Dakota has more waterfowl refuges than any other state in the union. From our standpoint, if we did not have these refuges we would have had very little duck hunting the past few years. Last year, even taking into consideration what we considered very poor shooting hours, a great many parts of the state had the best shooting since 1928. If we had not had these refuges we would have burned these ducks out in North Dakota during the first two or three weeks but because the refuges existed we had birds up to and after Thanksgiving. We had excellent shooting the day before Thanksgiving. We have had the very finest cooperation in the administration of not only migratory waterfowl but resident game that existed there as well.

Last year it was decided we had far too many deer for the amount of food and in cooperation with the Fish and Wildlife Service we set up a part of that refuge where the public could shoot deer and they went in and harvested 399. While there may be some refuges that do not quite meet the qualifications and we have had some loss due to botulism, etc., we did not know that until we found it out by experience, but on the whole I would say the waterfowl refuge situation in North Dakota has given us a far better break than we would have had if they had not come in there and on the other hand the state of North Dakota would not have been able to acquire them, even under Pittman-Robertson, because millions of dollars have been spent building, maintaining and setting up these
Those refuges were established in North Dakota with the consent of the people.

I feel satisfied the state consented to what was done by the Fish and Wildlife Service. I was not in the department at the time.

As Mr. Maurek will tell you, our state has gone with them one hundred percent on the acquisition of land in the Mud Lake area because we feel that the work they have done there is an excellent piece of work. A request for acquisition of land was made and was granted.

The same procedure was followed on Tamarac as was followed on Mud Lake. There was no difference in the procedure.

Mr. Lowe, how many acres do you have in refuges?

I cannot give you the exact amount but something like 200,000 acres of refuges in North Dakota.

I was talking on an abstract principle without specific reference to any particular agency. Our relationship with the Fish and Wildlife Service, Forest Service, etc., has been most satisfactory. Where a state agency and federal agency approach a problem with an open mind, in a spirit of cooperation, all of these details can be smoothened out. Missouri does not want to become involved. We are definitely concerned, however, over the principle which has been displayed by the United States Army, where they acquire lands in the interest of navigation and close them and do what they please, and establish their own rules and regulations as if it were a political unit or region entirely removed from state jurisdiction, coming under federal control without reference to state departments. The principle illustrated by that case is something that is alarming and should be checked. Again I say our relationships
have been most cordial, with any service willing to consult and cooperate and work out differences, but when they come in without consulting with the state or seeking state cooperation, that is something else again.

Dr. Strunk: Are there any further discussions on the matter of the federal government taking over, arbitrarily, the control of lands within the states.

Iowa: Further on the subject of the seasons - I would like to say that we in Iowa are opposed to the opening date. If you are going to extend the season, extend it ten days at the beginning of the season and not at the end.

Nebraska: If there is any extension we would want it at the beginning.

Illinois: This goes for Illinois too.

Iowa: We will settle for October first.

Dr. Strunk: We have one more problem - one that is very dear to me - Carp.

Mr. Gray: Wisconsin I would like to get an expression, if possible, from the representatives of the various states in the middle west, regarding a new plan that is under the process of being put into operation at the present time, in regard to the disposition of carp taken in the middle west. Our problem in Wisconsin, and I believe it applies to Illinois, Minnesota and Iowa, has been the inability of a commercial operator, or the state, whoever it happens to be, to dispose of the carp as quick as they get them without having to take a big loss, and also the problem of being unable, at certain times of the year, to sell them at any reasonable price. Because the majority of the people in the United States do not eat carp, the amounts have been diminishing more and more each year without any marked demand for an increase in this particular activity. As most of you know, carp have been increasing right along and will increase more back of these dams that have been constructed in various
parts of the country and unless there is some definite program put into operation by states, with reference to educating the people as to the value of carp for food, or by processing them in such a way that they can be put on the market and sold as a regular commodity, the problem is going to get bad within the next ten years in lots of places.

Now, we have been working on this scheme for a considerable length of time. There is a company in Wisconsin which has a patent or a process, at least that is what I am told, which is a secret process of grinding carp up and mixing it with other meats and putting it in uniform packages. This man has made several trips to the east to the War Department, with reference to putting this up for the army and also putting it up to be shipped to Europe under the lend lease program. He showed me a letter stating they would use five hundred million pounds of this product, which would include fish taken from the ocean, as well as undesirable fish such as carp, but carp would form the base due to the fact that it has an oily or shell like substance which, when cold, molds it together. He asked me what I figured he could guarantee companies who are figuring on this, with reference to setting up little plants here and there. I said, if any at all, we can get you about twenty-five million pounds of carp a year if we can move them right away. If processed right away we can produce twenty-five million pounds. He wanted to know what price and I told him, if taken immediately, they could be purchased and sold at the point where they were taken out at 3¢ a pound and I thought Wisconsin alone could contribute from eight to twelve million pounds a year, depending on seasons and the ability to find people who could engage in this activity during the present emergency.

Now I would like to, if possible, have you indicate to me to-day just what we could expect from your state, so that I can submit the
information to him. I expect to meet him on Saturday morning and want to give him this information. He can then go to the people who are putting up the money and give them a definite statement as to what he can get and for how much. I would appreciate this very much.

We are finding, of course, that commercial fishing is going to have to curtail a lot on its activities inasmuch as there will undoubtedly be a shortage of labor, because of the present emergency, and you cannot not replace equipment or get repairs to certain types of marine motors etc., You cannot get lumber, waders, netting is a thing of the past, rope is hard to get, and all those things which tend to make up the commercial fisherman's outfit are getting scarce and there may not be a great deal of expansion. The curtailment of boats will result in a decrease of ocean fishing this year which will increase the demand for fresh water fish and may raise the price due to curtailment of fishing fleets on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. This coming along makes it difficult for us to say just what we can do and I would like an expression as to what I can tell him about taking care of this surplus of fish.

Dr. Strunk: Does he specify what kind of carp?
Mr. Gray: I don't believe you could figure on processing a fish much less than a pound and a half. It should be at least two pounds. They will bone them and grind them up and you would have to figure on a carp of two pounds.

Dr. Strunk: It would be about a #4.
Mr. Gray: It would be a size from about 1½ lb. up.

Mr. Gaumitz: We can produce, probably, a couple of million pounds but whether they would all be over two pounds is another question.

Mr. Gray: I have given this fellow about a thousand pounds of fish for him to make up into samples to show to different agencies and the fish I
have given him have been about three pounds.

Mr. Gaumitz: Iowa
- What is your New York market?

Mr. Gray: Not less than three or four for some and five for a few f.o.b. Wisconsin. I did sell some for two cents earlier in the spring. We hold our fish off the market to protect ourselves and by so doing protect a lot of other fellows because we could kill the market in a few days. This last winter Iowa produced a lot of fish and when that happens the bootleggers take them into Chicago. Fifty thousand pounds a week were brought into Chicago. This year there has been a curtailment in production due to the weather.

Mr. Gaumitz: Iowa
- We could not definitely promise to sell this individual the fish. Our fish have to be sold on a competitive bid basis and we would have to advertise and if he happened to be the high bidder he would get the fish.

Mr. Gray: I am afraid that that is what we are going to run into if something like this goes through. I am bringing this matter up at this time for the reason that the carp, as long as they are plentiful, will not bring over 2½ or 3¢ per pound.

Mr. Gaumitz: We are getting 3¢ to 3½¢ in Iowa.

Mr. Gray: If you are going to find an outlet for carp, through this new process, the state should take into consideration (interrupted)

Dr. Strunk: We would have to get open bids in Minnesota the same as they do in Iowa. We could guarantee between four and five million pounds for the year 1942 - 1943.

Mr. Hunt: Illinois
- I do not believe the industry in Illinois could exist selling carp for 3¢ a pound. I agree with what you say, that if you do find an outlet the price is going to increase. If you find some way of processing it is going to increase. Our catch in Illinois is increasing since the
erection of the dam on the Mississippi River as you know we have a lot more water now in the Illinois River.

There is from five to ten million pounds a year and it will probably be doubled. I can readily see where there would be an outlet for canned carp.

Mr. Gray:

As I see this picture, the carp population is going to increase materially during the next ten years and I do not see what is going to stop it. A lot of extra water, extra area, and the ocean fishing curtailed. Inland waters cannot compete with the ocean in any way, as far as price or quantity of fish is concerned. Carp are just going to be a drug on the market and so you have two alternatives. You can take them out and bury them or, if people are willing to go in and spend the money, the operators should consider a proposition of contracting at least one half of their catch, even though the price does jump when they take this surplus out of the lake.

Mr. Hunt: Illinois

The price of any food would not be what it is to-day if it were not processed to take care of the surplus.

Mr. Gray:

The idea was that maybe the fishermen, in the states where they have trucks and licensed men, or where the states are operating themselves, could work out a system of contracts for a certain amount of fish which they could produce and sell to them at a certain price. They seemed to think that 3½ was about all they could pay because they are going to have to take about fifty percent loss when the fish are dressed.

Mr. Gray:

Could I say that the state of Illinois could probably produce or put through a system on say three or four or five million pounds a year.

Mr. Hunt: Illinois

Say five million, but we have this to consider: Our increase in industry operations is going to bring on a pollution problem and we will have some trouble there. It will set back our fish production all
over the country.

Mr. Gray: Do you have the same number of operators in the Mississippi River this year as last year?

Mr. Hunt: That has had some effect. Lack of laborers.

Mr. Osborne: Illinois One of the biggest industries is the manufacture of dog food. The price of meat is twenty to twenty-five cents a pound. One company has been figuring on probably taking rough fish, including carp, buffalo, dog fish etc., and dehydrating it into fish meal and putting it up for dog food. That could very easily be done and would save a lot of money.

Mr. Gray: In order to put this thing into operation at the present time these operators have got to have an A-1 priority. We have canned a lot of carp and it keeps all right.

Mr. Gray: I can tell him that Illinois can line up four million pounds.

Mr. Osborne: We cannot guarantee the price of it.

**************

Mr. Swift: Wisconsin Under VOTING — Among other things in the By-Laws it says: Voting shall be by states as units. I think it would be just as well to add there: Each state represented shall have one vote.

I have never felt that there should be any restriction on discussion but when it comes to voting the states are represented differently, some may have several representatives and some just one and it is only fair that a state have but one vote. The authorized representative of that state should vote for the state.

Another thing, in Article VI it says: The Constitution and By-Laws of the Association may be amended at any regular annual meeting. The following has been added: by a two-thirds vote, provided, however, a written copy of such proposed amendment shall have been received by the President and sent by him to the Secretary and to the members at least seven days before the regular annual meeting or special meeting called
for that purpose.

In other words, when there has been a proposed amendment, the various members should have a chance to analyze it and not just hear it read at the meeting, before approving it.

In the Preamble, under Article II - MEMBERSHIP it says: Membership shall be by states and representation at meetings shall be by the Commission or Board administering the state's wild life resources. To be officially represented at a meeting of the Association a state must have a majority of its Board or Commission present. This should be amended to read as follows: Membership shall be by states and representation of each state at meetings shall be by its duly authorized representative or director or whoever they designate to attend the meeting to sponsor them, shall be considered at the meeting as the legal representative of that particular state, because we have never followed out the above rule.

Mr. Osborne: I went over all that this morning.

Illinois He is responsible for clarifying and making these changes.

Dr. Strunk: You have all heard the suggested changes in Article III of the By-Laws. Voting will be by states. Will all those in favor signify by raising their hand.

All states voted in the affirmative.

Dr. Strunk: You have all heard the proposed change in Article VI of the By-Laws. All in favor please so signify by raising your hand. All states voted in favor.

Dr. Strunk: You have all heard the proposed change in Article II of the Preamble. All in favor of making this change so signify by raising your hand. All states voted in favor.

Dr. Strunk: Will the committee on elections now make their report.

Mr. Mosbaugh: Indiana The committee submits the following report:
President for the coming year - Mr. Livingston E. Osborne, Director of the Department of Conservation of the state of Illinois.

Vice President for the coming year - Mr. W. J. Lowe, Commissioner, Game and Fish Department, state of North Dakota.

Secretary for the coming year - Mr. H. F. Mosbaugh, Director, Division of Game and Fish, state of Indiana.

The committee also recommends that the place of the next meeting be selected by the President.

Directors:
Elmer Peterson South Dakota
W. H. Lytle Nebraska
Guy D. Josserand Kansas
I. T. Bode Missouri
Fred T. Schwob Iowa
Ernest Swift Wisconsin
William L. Strunk Minnesota

Dr. Strunk: All those in favor of Mr. Osborne for President vote aye: Unanimous vote.

All those in favor of Mr. Lowe for Vice President vote aye: Unanimous vote.

All those in favor of Mr. Mosbaugh for Secretary vote aye: Unanimous vote.

Well Mr. Osborne it looks as though you are the new President - congratulations. I would now like to have you take the chair.

Mr. Osborne: Gentlemen, thank you. I am surprised in many ways. In the first place I am more or less new in this Association, there are others who are so much more familiar with the affairs of the Association that I would really have preferred to have had some one else take over the job of President for the coming year. However, now that I am elected I would like to say that we do want you to come to Chicago next year for the meeting. It is centrally located and accessible by train and will solve the automobile, tire and gasoline problems. I assure you that we can show you a good time.
Now I presume the next order of business is to call on the Vice President. Mr. Lowe.

Mr. Lowe: Your committee had a tough job on its hands and the happy suggestion came from two of its members. It seems as though Illinois was one of the last states to become a member and so has never had a meeting. North Dakota would, however, have been very happy to entertain the association. I believe we have made a very fine choice.

Mr. Osborne: Any remarks by the new Secretary.

Mr. Mosbaugh: I really have nothing special to say at this time - I will be very glad to serve in the capacity of Secretary for the coming year for this Association.

Further remarks by the President

Mr. Osborne: I think we should now give a vote of thanks to our past President, Dr. W. L. Strunk for his efforts in connection with this convention and also to Mr. Burnie Maurek and Mr. Steen of the Fish and Wildlife Service, for being with us.

(Rising vote of thanks)

Mr. Osborne: It is now 5:30 P.M. Is there a motion to adjourn?

Motion made and seconded that the meeting adjourn.

(Copy of amended By-Laws attached hereto)
By - Laws

ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND GAME COMMISSIONERS

ARTICLE I

DUTIES OF OFFICERS

Section I. The President shall preside at all meetings of the Association, appoint all special committees, preside at meetings of the Board of Directors, and countersign all warrants drawn on the funds of the Association.

Section II. The Vice-President shall perform the duties of the President in the latter's absence.

Section III. The Secretary shall keep a record of all transactions of the meetings of the Association, as well as meetings of the Board of Directors, shall notify members of the time and place of meetings, and perform such other duties as are naturally incumbent upon the office.

Section IV. The Treasurer shall be custodian of all funds of the Association and draw all warrants for the payment of claims properly presented.

Section V. The Board of Directors shall constitute an Interim Committee to conduct the usual business of the Association.

ARTICLE II

MEETINGS

One regular meeting shall be held annually; the place of such meeting to be determined by the Association and the date to be fixed by the Board of Directors. When necessary, special meetings may be called by the Board of Directors. Members shall be given thirty days notice of regular annual meetings and special meetings may be called by the Board of Directors on ten days notice.

ARTICLE III

VOTING

Voting shall be by states, as units. - Each state represented shall have one vote.

ARTICLE IV

DUES

Annual dues shall be $5.00, payable in advance at or before each annual meeting.

ARTICLE V

QUORUM

A majority of all member states in good standing shall constitute a quorum.
ARTICLE VI

AMENDMENT

The Constitution and By-Laws of the Association may be amended at any regular annual meeting by a two-thirds vote, provided, however, a written copy of such proposed amendment shall have been received by the President and sent by him to the Secretary and to the members at least seven days before the regular annual meeting or special meeting called for that purpose.

CONSTITUTION

ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND GAME COMMISSIONERS

PREAMBLE

The name of this organization shall be the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners. The object of the Association shall be to foster and promote uniform game laws and regulations of the member states; to gather and disseminate information, exchange ideas and lend helpful cooperation in all matters of research and investigation pertinent to the conservation of wild life and general outdoor recreation; to lend its support to the U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Biological Survey and U. S. Bureau of Fisheries, in an extension program beneficial to game migratory waterfowl and fisheries; to cooperate in the establishment and creation of Federal migratory bird sanctuaries, refuges and shooting areas, and to submit authentic information upon which the Bureau of Biological Survey may base conclusions in prescribing regulations for the annual take of waterfowl; to cooperate with the Bureau of Fisheries in their program and to encourage and assist sportsmen's and conservationists' organizations so that the fullest measure of cooperation may be secured from our citizenry in the protection, preservation and restoration of our wild life resources.

ARTICLE I

OFFICERS

Section I. The officers of the Association shall be President, Vice-President, Secretary-Treasurer and a Board of Directors composed of the President, Secretary and Treasurer of the Association, and one representative from each state not represented by the officers of the Association.

Section II. Such officers shall be elected by the members of the Association for a term of one year.

ARTICLE II

MEMBERSHIP

Membership shall be by states and representation of each state at meetings shall be by its duly authorized representative or representatives.