

RECEIVED FROM OFFICE
OCT 10 1949
LIBRARY

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
SIXTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH, GAME, AND CONSERVATION COMMISSIONERS
HELD AT
LINCOLN, NEBRASKA
ON
OCTOBER 3 & 4, 1949

RECEIVED FROM OFFICE
OCT 10 1949
FISH & GAME LIBRARY

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
SIXTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH, GAME, AND CONSERVATION COMMISSIONERS
HELD AT
LINCOLN, NEBRASKA
ON
OCTOBER 3 & 4, 1949

- - - - -

OFFICERS & DIRECTORS OF THE
ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH & GAME COMMISSIONERS

LIBRARY COPY
ERNEST FORRESTER, FISH
AND GAME COMMISSIONER
No.

President - Paul T. Gilbert, Nebr.
Vice-President - Ernest Swift, Wisconsin
Secretary-Treasurer - Lloyd P. Vance, Nebr.

DIRECTORS

H. P. Cottingham, Director, Div. of Fish & Game, Dept. of Conservation,
State Library Building, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Dave Leahy, Director, Fish & Game Commission, Pratt, Kansas.

Hon. J. S. McDiarmid, Dept. of Mines and Natural Resources, Winnipeg,
Manitoba, Canada.

H. A. Morgan, Commissioner, Game & Fish Department, Bismarck, North Dakota.

Elmer Peterson, Director, Game, Fish & Parks Commission, Pierre, South
Dakota.

H. A. Rider, Commissioner, Division of Conservation & Natural Resources,
Columbus, Ohio.

H. D. Ruhl, Chief, Game Division, Michigan Department of Conservation,
Lansing, Michigan.

Leonard Schwartz, Director, Department of Conservation, Springfield, Ill.

Hon. H. R. Scott, Department of Lands & Forests, Parliament Building,
Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Melvin O. Steen, Chief, Fish & Game, Missouri Conservation Commission,
Jefferson City, Missouri.

Bruce F. Stiles, Assistant Director, Iowa Conservation Commission, Des
Moines, Iowa.

Chester Wilson, Commissioner, Department of Conservation, St. Paul,
Minnesota.

C. N. Feast, Director, Colorado Game and Fish Commission, Denver, Colo.

DELEGATES IN ATTENDANCE
AT THE MIDWEST FISH, GAME AND CONSERVATION COMMISSIONERS CONFERENCE
IN LINCOLN, NEBRASKA,
October 3 & 4, 1949

James Ager
Nebraska, Game, Forestation & Parks Commission
Lincoln, Nebraska

Carl Anderson
Supervisor of Lands and Waters
Nebraska, Game, Forestation & Parks Commission
Lincoln, Nebraska

Frank Brady
Commissioner
Nebraska, Game, Forestation & Parks Commission
Lincoln, Nebraska

Lester Bailey
Chief of Law Enforcement Division
Division of Conservation & Natural Resources
Columbus, Ohio

Cloyd E. Clarke
Commissioner
Nebraska, Game, Forestation & Parks Commission
Lincoln, Nebraska

William R. Cunningham
Supervisor of Law Enforcement
Nebraska, Game, Forestation & Parks Commission
Lincoln, Nebraska

David Damon
Assistant Supervisor of Game
Nebraska, Game, Forestation & Parks Commission
Lincoln, Nebraska

Floyd "Flick" Davis
Supervisor of Game Management Division
Fish and Wildlife Service
Minneapolis, Minnesota

C. N. Feast
Director, Colorado Game & Fish Commission
Denver, Colorado

Glen Foster
Supervisor of Fisheries
Nebraska, Game, Forestation & Parks Commission
Lincoln, Nebraska

Charles Fuqua
Fish and Wildlife Service
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Paul Gilbert
Executive Secretary
Nebraska, Game, Forestation & Parks Commission
Lincoln, Nebraska

A. F. C. Greene
Wyoming Game & Fish Department
Cheyenne, Wyoming

Wade Hamor
Nebraska, Game, Forestation & Parks Commission
Lincoln, Nebraska

Kenneth Hicks
Field Division
Missouri Conservation Commission
Jefferson City, Missouri

Dan Janzen
Regional Director
Fish and Wildlife Service
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Raymond E. Johnson
Supervisor of Fisheries
Minnesota Conservation Department
Minneapolis, Minnesota

S. E. Jorgensen
Supervisor of Federal Aid
Fish and Wildlife Service
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Walter Kiener
Fisheries Biologist
Nebraska, Game, Forestation & Parks Commission
Lincoln, Nebraska

Dave Leahy
Director
Forestry, Fish and Game Commission
Pratt, Kansas

Harry Lutz
Education Division
Forestry, Fish and Game Commission
Pratt, Kansas

Ed Martin
Chief, Game Management and Propagation
Division of Conservation & Natural Resources
Columbus, Ohio

E. D. Mason
Superintendent
Federal Fish Hatchery
Crawford, Nebraska

Levi Mohler
Pheasant Investigation & Upland Game Bird Investigation
Nebraska, Game, Forestation & Parks Commission
Lincoln, Nebraska

H. R. Morgan
Commissioner
Game and Fish Department
Bismarck, North Dakota

J. Morrow
Assistant Director
Missouri Conservation Commission
Jefferson City, Missouri

Bernard Patton
Conservation Officer
Nebraska Game, Forestation and Parks Commission
Lincoln, Nebraska

Carl Peterson
Legal Counsul
Nebraska Game, Forestation and Parks Commission
Lincoln, Nebraska

Elmer Peterson
Director
South Dakota Game, Fish & Parks Commission
Pierre, South Dakota

H. A. "Buck" Rider
Commissioner
Division of Conservation and Natural Resources
Columbus, Ohio

H. D. Ruhl
Chief of Game Division
Michigan Conservation Commission
Lansing, Michigan

John H. Sather
Biologist
Nebraska, Game, Forestation and Parks Commission
Valentine, Nebraska

George Schildman
Biologist
Nebraska, Game, Forestation & Parks Commission
Lincoln, Nebraska

Walter E. Scott
Chief of Education Division
Wisconsin Conservation Department
Madison, Wisconsin

Tom Schrader
Regional Supervisor of River Basin Studies
Fish and Wildlife Service
Minneapolis, Minnesota

C. W. "Bud" Shaffer
Conservation Officer
Nebraska, Game, Forestation & Parks Commission
Columbus, Nebraska

Paul S. Smith
Federal Game Agent
Fish and Wildlife Service
Ames, Nebraska

E. R. Starkweather
Assistant Director
Minnesota Department of Conservation
Minneapolis, Minnesota

M. O. Steen
Chief of Fish and Game Division
Missouri Conservation Commission
Jefferson City, Missouri

Tom Turner
Predator Control Division
Fish and Wildlife Service
North Platte, Nebraska

Lloyd P. Vance
Supervisor of Game
Nebraska, Game, Forestation & Parks Commission
Lincoln, Nebraska

Edward Wickliff
Chief of Fish Management and Propagation
Division of Conservation and Natural Resources
Columbus, Ohio

Clarke L. Wilson
Chairman
Nebraska, Game, Forestation & Parks Commission
Lincoln, Nebraska

ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND GAME COMMISSIONERS

ANNUAL MEETING

Morning Session, October 3, 1949

GILBERT -- If we had time for speeches, the Governor would have told you that you are welcome, the Mayor would have said that the key to the city is yours, each of our Commissioners would have paid you greetings, and if you don't believe all that they have said, we hope that it will be expressed physically by our offers of hospitality. Now, with those five speeches over with, we are ready to get to work.

This convention is going to be different, and we'll probably never have another one like it, but you only get a chance at this once, and I've always wanted to have a convention like this one. I apologize for not consulting the directors before we had it, but I was afraid if I did, we wouldn't have had it, so its going to be different, and I think it's going to be fun if you all cooperate.

First of all, I think it necessary that we find out who is here, and that we know each other. I'm going to offer you a very brief challenge--not a speech, but a challenge--at the beginning and the close of this convention, and I offer my pre-convention challenge now, and it is that this convention -- I don't even want to call it a convention -- this get-together of friends and colleagues, be built entirely in your thinking and your actions around the striving for professional unity among all of us, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and other Federal Services that are here, and every other State. As the Fish and Wildlife Service gets up and talks, as I want them to, I don't want you to immediately think "Well, he's a darned Federal, now what can I do to pick on him?". This isn't that kind of a meeting. We're here to get something done. I want you to listen to what they have to say, see if there's any way that you can help them, and see if they have any offers by which you can profit by their help. If another state gets up and shows something that you don't have, it's not going to be a matter of being jealous because you don't have it and they do; it's a matter of going to them and finding out how you can profit by what they've done. If you've got something some other State doesn't have, you're going to get up and tell about it, not in an egoistic presentation, but in order that you may offer what you have to others. Professional unity -- that's what we're going to strive for all the way through, and we're going to be a closer-knit group than we've ever been because of it. I want you now to stand up individually as I call your names. I don't want a speech; I don't want you to clap for each one or we'll never get through, but I do think we should know each other. I'm going to take them alphabetically as they are listed here:

Mr. James Ager, representing the Nebraska Game Department. He's on our planting and development crew. Thank you Jim.

Carl Anderson, from Nebraska, Supervisor of Lands and Waters. Thank you. Swirl your chairs around so you can look at each other. I want you to know these faces and put the names with them. Try to run through this rapidly.

Frank Brady, one of the Game Commissioners from Nebraska. Active in the Ike's for many years.

Lester Bailey, Chief of Law Enforcement Division, Ohio.

Cloyd E. Clarke, Commissioner from Nebraska.

William R. Cunningham, Supervisor of Law Enforcement, Nebraska. Way back.

David Damon, Assistant Supervisor of Game, Nebraska. He's your registrar.

Floyd "Flick" Davis, Fish and Wildlife Service, Supervisor of Game Management Division.

C. N. Feast, Director of Colorado Game and Fish Commission. He says he's a guest. We did extend him an invitation, but he's no guest; he's just a darn good friend and we're mighty glad he's here.

Glen Foster, Supervisor of Fisheries, Nebraska.

I hope I do this right, but I won't.

Charles Fuqua. How did I do it wrong? Where are you Charley? Well, that's what I said, all right. Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, New Mexico. We're sure glad you're here.

Paul Gilbert.

I don't believe he's with us.

A. F. C. Greene, Wyoming Game and Fish Department.

Wade Hamor, P-R, Nebraska.

Kenneth Hicks, Field Division, Missouri Conservation Commission.

Dan Janzen, Regional Director, Fish and Wildlife Service. Dan, it's a pleasure to have you here.

Raymond E. Johnson, Supervisor of Fisheries, Minnesota Conservation Department, formerly of Nebraska.

S. E. Jorgensen, Supervisor of Federal Aid, Fish and Wildlife Service, Minneapolis.

Walter Kiener, Fisheries Biologist, Nebraska.

Dave Leahy, Director, Kansas Commission.

Harry Lutz, Kansas Fish and Game. I believe that's Education Division. It's not down here. Isn't that right?

Ed Martin, Chief of Game Management and Propagation, Ohio.

E. D. Mason, Superintendent of Federal Fish Hatchery, Crawford, Nebr.

Levi Mohler, in charge of Pheasant Investigation, Upland Game Bird Investigation, Nebraska.

H. R. Morgan, Commissioner, North Dakota, Welcome, my friend.

J. Morrow, Assistant Director, Missouri.

Bernard L. Patton, Conservation Officer.

Here he is, right up here. And listen, these men are called in as I've told you in my letter for one purpose. Ask them for anything you want. If they've got it, you'll get it. And if they don't, maybe they'll tell you where to get it, or else they'll say they're sorry they can't get it.

Carl H. Peterson, our legal counsel back there, Nebraska.

Elmer Peterson, Director, South Dakota. Pete.

H. A. Rider, "Buck" Rider, Commissioner, Ohio. Our genial host of last year.

H. D. Ruhl, Chief of Game Division, Michigan.

John H. Sather, Biologist, Muskrat Specialist, Valentine, Nebraska Game Commission.

George Schildman. He's the man that's been living in the coyote stomach in Nebraska for the last three years.

Walter E. Scott, Chief of Education Division, Wisconsin.

Tom Schrader, another Nebraska product, Regional Supervisor of River Basin Studies, Fish and Wildlife Service. Hi, Tom.

C. W. "Bud" Shaffer, Conservation Officer. Call on him for anything you need.

Paul S. Smith, Federal Game Agent, Fish and Wildlife Service, Nebraska.

E. R. Starkweather, Assistant Director, Minnesota.

M. O. Steen, Chief of Fish and Game Division, Missouri.

Tom Turner, Fish and Wildlife Service, North Platte, Predator Control Division.

Lloyd P. Vance, Secretary, and Nebraska Game Division Supervisor.

Edward Wickliff, Chief of the Fish and Game - Chief of Fish Management and Propagation, Ohio.

Clarke L. Wilson, Chairman of the Nebraska Game Commission.

No X's, Y's, and Z's.

Just a few points now, preliminary that we want to get out of the way, and we'll get going. In the first place, we will announce the committees here, so that you can get your men together and get the job done--not during any business session as scheduled for this room, please. I must insist on this, because it's very important that you all be here, and you've got plenty of time for committee meetings at times other than the business session. I believe we've shifted these around so that everybody is present. We had to make some shifts at the last minute, so if some of you were told that you were on one committee, and have been shifted, don't feel badly.

Resolution Committee--The all-important Committee.

Rider, Ohio. Chairman
Starkweather, Minnesota
Steen, Missouri
Morgan, North Dakota

That's all you're going to have. We're making it small purposely, because it's easier to handle, and I leave the Resolution Committee with only one suggestion from your President. That is, let's not come back with twenty or thirty pages of resolutions. Let's figure out the key important resolutions, present them, and then after we've done so, not file them away--but, do something with them. I was to a convention recently where they had three hundred pages of resolutions. I defy them to do anything about them next year.

The Nominating Committee.

Ruhl, Michigan. Chairman
Cottingham, Indiana
Peterson, South Dakota

Auditing Committee. Dave Leahy, Chairman. Will you notify Bruce Stiles that he is your colleague on that, and if you want the Attorney General or the State Auditor or anybody to assist you on that--maybe you'll have too, I'm not so sure that you won't--why, just let us know will you?

Now, there is one meeting that has already been set. Mr. Mosbaugh--is he here? What's the matter, hasn't he gotten up yet? At any rate, Mose wants to meet with the regular committee of the ten-state committee on Missouri River Basin to go over this last letter we have from the Army Engineers regarding Memorandum of Agreement with the Engineers. However, any interested state is most welcome to that meeting. If you have any interest in these agreements that we're drawing up with either the Reclamation Bureau or the Army Engineers in connection with this Pick Sloan Plan, why you're welcome to this meeting. The meeting will be held at 4:00 in my office on the 9th Floor of this building. Mr. Feast, you said that you weren't going to say anything, and I told you that you were. You're going to be the first one to say anything. Are you interested in meeting with any of your fly-way group?

FEAST-- Yes, I understand that Mose has called that meeting, and I specifically want to attend that, Paul. I hadn't heard as to where it's going to be.

GILBERT -- The fly-way meeting?

FEAST -- Oh, oh, fly-way, excuse me. I was thinking Missouri River Basin. I did -----

GILBERT -- This other meeting, the Army Engineers story, will be in my office at 4:00.

FEAST -- I don't know. Dave, I don't believe there has been any plans on that has there?

DAVE -- I don't think so.

GILBERT -- Okay, that's fine. I just wanted to check if you did want to. Now, as far as the rest of you men are concerned, you pick your own times, and we'll announce it whenever you want it announced, or else you can just get together with your own men.

There are a few things that we would like to have you see while you are in Lincoln. We would like to have you know that if you want any checks cashed, any phone calls, any stenographic service, and I'm serious about this, it's available to you on the 9th Floor any time you want it. If any of you have some correspondence you want to get out, go up there and the girls will be glad to help you out. We would like to have you see our Fair Exhibit and our Wildlife Laboratory out at the Fair Grounds. It can all be accomplished in one trip. All you have to do is ask one of these officers and they'll take you out. We realize that it is not as grandios as some of you larger states have, but we're proud of what we've got and we want you to see it. Those of you that have wives with you-- we plan on making sure that they won't come to our banquet, by having a little dinner for them this evening, and we'll check the cards just as soon as we have a chance. We'll arrange with Mrs. Gilbert for about a 6:00 meeting on the mezzanine floor of the Cornhusker. I trust you will all come to the banquet. It's going to be fun. I believe that takes care of most of the preliminaries, and before we go into the actual discussion of the program topics as listed, it has been suggested by some of your board of directors that perhaps it might be advantageous if we would get a telegram off to the President, immediately, regarding the Dingle bill, and if it is your wish, we will entertain a motion on that right now.

Mr. President. Rider of Ohio. I move that a very strong telegram be sent to the President of the United States urging his signature to the Dingle Bill that it might become law.

GILBERT -- You've heard the motion. Is there a second?

Mr. Chairman, I'll second that motion.

GILBERT -- Excuse me. We have one. Peterson, South Dakota. Any questions? All those in favor, signify by saying "Aye".

AUDIENCE - Aye.

GILBERT -- Opposed, no. (No opposition.) Are there any other missives of this sort that should be taken care of immediately? I believe that's the only one. I prefer to let anything else go to the business meeting tomorrow, but if there is anything that should come up

immediately, now is your chance to say so. If not, we will get on to this program. The preliminaries have taken only twenty minutes. That's not bad.

Attacking the bounty system from an administrative stand-point.

I don't know whether you approve of the list of suggested topics that were sent to you, but they were things that we were deeply interested in here, and we tried to pick those things that the few of you who returned the questionnaire wanted -- I know how you feel about questionnaires, so I don't blame you. Now, actually the discussion this afternoon takes in about three of the topics that were on that preliminary list that was sent to you, so we will try to cover all of those this afternoon. I think we are all having some degree of trouble or anticipating some trouble regarding bounties. In some states it's coming to the point where the bounty question is becoming as prevalent as a legislative discussion. In some states they are putting out large sums of money for this purpose. In other states they are afraid they are going to have to, and what we want to do today is to unify our thinking, try to unify our attack and coordinate our information so that we may be better fit to tackle this problem in our own community. I want you to know that I'm not going to stand up here and pester you with my monotone all during this convention. We're going to pass this thing around. It's easier on me in the first place, and in the second place, we're happy to share the rostrum here with some of our dignitaries from other states. So we're going to call on various ones of you. You haven't been notified--if we would have notified you, you would have gotten out all of the literature and started reading and what not, and it would have been a nuisance to you, and this convention mustn't be a nuisance to anyone. It will be spontaneous. But, before I call this gentleman up here to handle the gavel on discussion, I want him to have a chance to get off his chest anything he wants to say so that the group leader won't be talking too much. He's making a face, he doesn't like it, but he's right down here, our good friend Mr. Ruhl. Will you lead off with anything pertinent that you have to say so that you can get it off your chest on coyote bounties and then take over discussion afterwards.

RUHL -- Well, I'll admit that Michigan is a horrible example, and we have bounties on the fox, the coyote, the wolf, and the bobcat. We don't believe in them. Our commission doesn't believe that they are fundamentally sound, but we have a legislative group, made up largely of farmers. They predominate. We have very strong feeling among our sportsmen's groups in regard to the bounties, so we have them, and our question is how to get rid of them. Our coyote and wolf bounties cost us about \$65,000 a year. The coyotes and the wolves have been swinging up and down, up and down, just about the same as the other large mammalian predators, without a bounty, a closed season, or what-not. In other words, as far as we can tell, all we are doing is harvesting a part of the crop by the bounty system. We are not eliminating the animal. Our largest loss as far as finance is concerned is about \$150,000 on fox bounty, and we got clogged in a legislative jam. We wanted to raise our license fees because everything was costing more money, so in the

horse-trade we got the license fees and the fox bounty, but I don't know whether we won on that or not, that is a debatable question. Right now there is a strong feeling among many of our sportsmen's organizations against the bounty, and our commission is being crucified because it has passed the bounty on bobcats which is voluntary--the only one that is voluntary--in fact, on the basis that while it was biologically unsound, it wasn't necessary. The people in the upper peninsula wanted it, so they gave it to them, and they are being bombarded very heavily from within and without because of that action. The most vociferous attack has been from the organized sportsmen, who, because they have their meetings very regularly, have gotten beyond the stage where they believe in bounty. I can't think of anything more controversial, unless it would be to have the fish people put a bounty on all fish predators, but it's a hot one and it's going to be with us a long time. We don't have too much trouble with the administrative part of it thus far, and that sort of thing. It has been handled fairly well, although we do have some such cases, but we feel we are wasting the money, we aren't controlling the predators and we find ourselves in the rather peculiar situation of having a perfectly good game animal. The hunters are paying people to kill them, and at the same time wanting more to hunt. That's a very indefensible position, as far as I'm concerned.

GILBERT -- You've laid a good foundation for us, Harry. Now if you will come up here, we will hear from the other states. Incidentally, may I say that you notice we have no stenographer taking down what you're saying, but we do have microphones scattered around and everything you say is being picked up and recorded. Don't be frightened, we are not going to give it to the press, although there are some members of the press here. It is, therefore, necessary when you get up to state your name. The good that you're going to get out of this type of a convention is what you put into it, and I think we're going to get a lot more out of it than with papers; so when you get up, and we want you to get up, state your name first so that it will be recorded. You're all in our hearing.

RUHL -- I don't know who wants to start off the ball. If any of you people want to put me on the spot about what we have done and haven't done, don't hesitate.

Mr. Chairman. Wickliff. Ohio. You mention the people wanted it. Why not give it back to the people and let them pay for it instead of the sportsmen?

RUHL -- That's a good idea if you can make it work.

RIDER -- Do I understand that you're still paying those bounties out of hunting license revenues?

RUHL -- Yes. All of these in our state come out of the Hunting and Fishing Fund, Game Protection Fund. They are not paid by the General Fund of the State.

RIDER -- Of course, we have one bounty in Ohio and that is on fox. Its not mandatory, but in any county in which the county Commissioner de-

sires to pay a bounty on fox, he may do so. If they pay a bounty at all, they dare not pay a bounty of less than a dollar, or more than five dollars, and if they set aside a fund from which to pay a bounty, they dare not set aside a fund which will cover a bounty on less than one hundred fox. That is, if they decide upon a three dollar bounty, they then shall set aside \$300 of the county General Revenue Fund to pay that bounty. In other words, we're fortunate in not having to use any of our Fish or Game money for bounties.

GILBERT -- Has there been an attempt though, to get it out of your Fish and Game.

RIDER -- No, just a slight attempt, without any effort upon our part. We have a deer herd in Ohio that spilled over from Harry's State of Michigan and from Pennsylvania. Those deer are a road hazard, and we have had a lot of wrecks on the road in which the cars were damaged--up to one Cadillac \$2100--and they have been in controversy with agriculture so we have had some agricultural damage. There was a bill passed putting a fee of \$5.00 -- a resident fee of \$5.00-- for the privilege of hunting deer and it was intimated in the passing of the bill that that money would be used to pay damages, but that's as close as we've -- we pay those game damages in Ohio, but pay no bounty, and it was simply that intimation -- we've never used any of that money, and we've received some \$200,000 of it, we've never used any of that money to pay damages.

RUHL -- Who's next? Scott.

SCOTT -- Harry, I think I've got to say a word for Wisconsin, and I think that Wisconsin is probably one of the states that is pretty bad in this respect along with Michigan. We've spent in Wisconsin, since the beginning of our state, close to a million and a half dollars on bounties, for wolf and mink, wildcats and fox. The fox bounty hasn't run all along, but we've had almost a hundred years of wolf bounties. They've succeeded in reducing our timber wolf to a very fine point, where we have maybe a hundred or so left, but when it comes down to the coyote, it has just increased in Wisconsin in spite of all these years of bounty, and a bounty of \$20.00 an animal. Now, we've spent about \$128,000 or \$130,000 a year on bounties. All bounty money.

AUDIENCE -- Repeat that figure again.

SCOTT -- \$128,000 to \$130,000 a year bounty. All bounty money comes from our sportsmen, except on fox. Now, Harry, we've got a system whereby when the new fox bounty was put on the general public pays one-half of our fox bounty expense. The farmers wanted the fox bounty and the same as in Michigan, our Commissioners, I think, would take the bounty off in a minute if they could. They've been forced to put it on. About four or five years ago, our Commission pulled a fast one and left the bounties out of the budget and for seven or eight months we didn't pay any bounties because it wasn't in the budget. The pressure from our north country, on the timber wolf or coyote rather especially, was so heavy that we were forced to put it back on. It's a matter of legislative pressure; the

same thing on the fox bounty. When the foxes came up in that big cyclic peak--our red foxes hit a peak that was higher than it had ever been in the history of our records--during the wartime, the legislature demanded that the fox bounty be put back on almost unanimously over our great body. When we appeared at legislative hearings, we were put on the spot to the extent that we were asked, "Don't the sportsmen want the foxes also bountied?", "Don't they eat game?" and such questions as that. Now it isn't an easy thing to answer when you have to account to all the sportsmen in the state, many of whom also think that the fox does a lot of damage. I think that we do need some sportsmen education and backing from them, if you want to take fox bounties off. That's part of the problem, and I want you to know Wisconsin is right in the middle of this problem. We'd like to save that money rather than to have the money go down the drain hole, and certainly we don't think that paying this money is doing any good. Our fox cycle has continued to go up and when the foxes start going down, our bounty will go down. We've got some fox trappers and whippers, of whom I think it can definitely be said that they simply farm the fox. They don't take the females, and they leave enough for the next year. I'd like to answer any questions on it because we've had a good bit of experience in this bounty business, but some of our research men are quite concerned that we're losing our timber wolf; we're losing our minks and we don't want to do that--some eastern states have. We don't know how to divorce the timber wolf from the coyote in the bounty, and it's been impossible to do that. As far as the procedure is concerned, there are several possible suggestions. I think maybe Missouri has found the way when they go out and teach people how to trap and that is an answer maybe to the legislature. We're going to teach the farmers how to trap the fox; therefore, we don't need a bounty. That might be one way out and sometimes I think we'd be better off if we had crop insurance for the farmer. Any crop damage by a fox, why you'll insure. I think we'd pay a lot less than we do on the fox hunt. I'm just making some wild suggestions, Harry, but my thought is this,--that you've got to be radical if you want to get these legislators to come across and be reasonable.

RUHL -- What you're saying, you'd have a substitute program.

SCOTT -- That's right.

RIDER -- Harry, I might say that this bounty has decreased in Ohio. These county commissioners, one county after another, have decreased the fox bounty and some counties that started to pay have now given it up all together. We have for the last four or five years used a system of a professional trapping instructor, who is made available to farm groups and individuals, but chiefly to youngsters, 4-H organizations and that group, to show them how to properly set and trap fox. I believe that that is helping, because when complaints come in, and commence to get really hot, we send this chap out to instruct the community. He's in good demand. Mr. Bailey can give you more information on his activity should you want it.

MARTIN? OHIO--He not only instructs the farmers, he instructs FFA boys, all youth groups and our game professionals. Of course, you all know that the fox is a wary animal and you've got to know how to trap him to be successful. Our professional trapper has been very

successful in educating people to trap foxes. He's been very successful. We get letters in from farmers that have been trying to trap them for a good many years, and after receiving these instructions, they really go to town and we have reduced our fox population tremendously in the last three or four years that this program has been in effect. I think that it has proved very successful.

RUHL -- You mean you're actually selling people on a "take care of their own problem" method.

MARTIN ? OHIO -- That's right. He goes around and invites farmers to a meeting back of the barn. He'll get ten or twelve or fifteen farmers, and he'll go out there and show them just how to make these sets and the farmer has shown a remarkable amount of interest in it.

RIDER -- Mr. Ruhl, I would like to bring out one other thing about this Ohio situation that it is quite dangerous. They, in setting up this bounty system that the counties might pay, took the fox completely off our list of game fur bearers, and they have classified him under Ohio law the same as the house cat. I think there is some danger in that. We did our best to keep the fox on the list of fur bearers. Some years ago the Ohio Legislature took the quail off the game bird list and made a song bird out of it. It seems to me that for a Legislature to continue taking various species off the list is dangerous. There was some talk and we got stopped about two sessions of the legislature ago to take raccoon off of the fur bearing list and place it in the same category as the fox. Well, I can see that as pheasant damage mounts, as rabbit damage mounts, any species in fact, they might take completely without the control of the Wildlife Council, who in Ohio sets all of the rules and regulations, seasons, bag limits, and so forth, on all of the fur bearers, game birds, game animals; they might take them all off and you'd have no control whatsoever. I think that it behooves administrators to be very cautious about agreeing that any animal is a definite out and out predator and is no benefit to game, and then place him in the same position as the common ordinary sewer rat.

RUHL -- We'd like to hear from some of these other states. Pete.

PETERSON -- We have a bounty problem in South Dakota. The Legislature in 1945 enacted a law making the game funds liable for all bounty payments, coyote, foxes, bobcat, and wolves. Since July 1 of 1945, we've paid out in excess of half a million dollars of game funds on bounties. In addition to that, we employ five full time state trappers, and we also try to encourage trapping by farm folks. Our experience has been this--during the past two or three years, with the rough fur at such a low level, there is not much incentive for the farmer, or anybody else, to go out and trap for profit. It would have to be sold to them on the basis of a conservation measure, and we haven't been able to do that. We can see some light in the fact that the first year the law was in effect we paid out, as I recall, in the neighborhood of \$200,000 in bounty. This last fiscal year it was down to \$68,000. That is the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949. During the present year, we have paid nothing out of game funds for bounties. I should have said at the outset that in passing this law, which was sponsored by

our livestock interests and principally our sheep growers association, every head of livestock in feed lots (except livestock in feed lots on the first of May) is set at the rate of two cents per head, and this goes into a state predatory animal control fund. If that fund isn't sufficient to pay the bounties from month to month, then the deficiency is made up out of the game fund. During the past four months there has been a sufficient amount of money in that fund to pay the bounties that have been presented, and that is an indication that perhaps we are catching up on our coyotes and foxes. In addition to that, we support or cooperate with the Fish and Wildlife Service on their predatory animal control program in the state. We know that where they have carried on an intensive program, particularly in the sheep country and northwestern portion of the state, our bounties have dropped down to almost nothing. As far as administration, our largest and biggest difficulty has been with the county Auditors. Our state law provides that these predators are to be presented to the county Auditor. A person killing a fox, a coyote, or a bobcat, must present the whole animal--the whole skin. Then the county Auditor clips off the lower lip and that is supposed to be kept until the claim is approved by the county commission. Then it is certified to our department. Our difficulty has been that many of these county Auditors don't like to be bothered. Many of our county Auditors are women. Particularly during warm weather they don't like to have those coyote lips lying around, and I can appreciate that perhaps. I believe it would be well if the states that paid bounty could get together on some uniform system of identification or cancellation if you please. I think North Dakota punches a hole in the ear, is that correct?

MORGAN -- That's right, Pete.

PETERSON -- Or is it the lower lip? We have examples where coyotes have been brought in from other states, and from Canada, and presented for bounty in South Dakota. I think that could fast be avoided if we had some uniform system of identifying an animal that has already been bountied. As a matter of personal opinion, I don't believe that the bounty is the answer, but we have stockmen and farmers on our commission who think it's all right. We have some sportsmen in the state that support the program for the reason that by supporting that program, we are in a measure repaying the landowner for producing and protecting our game. The biggest push for bounties in our state comes from the sheep growers, in the western portion of the state particularly. We do believe, though, that because of the fact that last year we had claims for only \$68,000--the year prior to that \$113,000--as I say a total of more than half a million in four years, we are to some extent catching up. We may be able to make the program self-supporting with this head tax.

RUHL -- Pete, I would like to ask a straight out and out question. Are the predators going down because of the bounty, or are they going down because it's time for them to go down?

PETERSON -- You're asking a question there that I can't answer. There may be some people here in this room that can answer it. Certainly, the fact that they have taken so many has helped. I might say that prior to 1945 bounties were supported by a state appropriation of

\$35,000. These bounties were paid once a year. If bounties claims presented exceeded the appropriation, then the claims were pro-rated. At that time we had what we called professional bounty hunters. We know positively that if one of those men had any female coyote in the trap, it was turned loose. It was. They farmed the coyote. It was a valuable property. That isn't true now because a large part of our hunters use airplanes, and there is no possible way that I know of to identify the sex of a coyote that they spot from the air. I believe that the intensive hunting, Harry, has been a factor in reducing the population. That's a personal opinion. I maybe couldn't prove that biologically.

FEAST -- Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask this question. Mr. Peterson, from the law enforcement standpoint, to what extent do you pay bounty on coyotes that are smuggled in?

PETERSON -- Well, I wish I knew, Cleland, but I don't. It's rather difficult to prove ordinarily, and I think the cases that we prosecute are perhaps isolated cases. We had one example two years ago. A man brought a truck load of coyote pelts in from Canada--quite far up into Canada. It so happened that one of our trappers was at the court house when he brought these in, and he, because of his training, knew that they weren't South Dakota coyotes because of the quality and texture of the fur. We had another instance. The man who was a fur buyer had been purchasing South Dakota coyotes for a little more money than they could get at the market and then, through a middle man, bringing them back south for bounty. Those are isolated cases and there may be much more of that than we've been able to apprehend. I have no figures to the same.

RUHL -- Gilbert.

GILBERT -- Mr. Chairman, I would like to give you a brief resume of the Nebraska coyote story. In the first place, there have been two attempts made in two different legislatures to try to charge the bounty up to the Fish and Game funds. Thanks to the help of a lot of people at the right time, this was shifted around until now the State of Nebraska does pay \$2.50 on bounties. That is paid by the individual counties, and, of course, in this case, it's the ears and scalp that must be turned in. That's not the point that I want to bring out particularly. In the State of Nebraska for quite a period of time, it was a wide open sport on Sundays and Saturdays. It got so that even during the week literally hundreds, and I do mean hundreds, of people would get together and form a big ring and have a mass coyote hunt. It was a great time. In many cases they set up great caldrons where they would roast weiners and really make a festive occasion out of it. I've seen as many as fifty or sixty coyotes taken at some of the large hunts that way. Of course, we're not going into it and take your time. You know some of the negative aspects of a hunt of that kind on your upland game birds, rabbits--on all game for that matter--not to mention your owls, hawks, tit-mice, and everything else that breathed or moved. Well, of course, this was not good, and at that time the Nebraska Commission went into a coyote study program from a research angle and from a straight education angle. We have only had two men on that, but with the help of the Fish and Wildlife Service and Tom Turner, who

is here,--and I think that after we get through talking here, we should hear from him because he really knows the coyote story--we have gotten down to the point where we have very very few of these coyote hunts any more. It used to be that every Sunday we didn't have enough Conservation Officers to police all of these mass coyote hunts. They are now down to the point where there are very few of them, and I think the people of Nebraska are to be congratulated on this. In order to sell the people that they shouldn't have these mass coyote hunts and that perhaps they do not always pay, you have to give them something to ruminate on a little bit, and in the case of the hunts, show what damage it does to the other game as compared to the good that they do by taking the coyotes. Then, of course, the question arises as to what harm the coyote is actually doing on our game population. Are we fighting a battle for the ranchman and the farmer, or are we fighting a game battle and the Nebraska Game Commission? Through the cooperation of the Fish and Wildlife Service, we set up a project just for this. Mr. Chairman, with your permission. We don't want to read a research report in detail, but I think it might be interesting because it is up-to-date, a report from Mr. Levi Mohler who is going to carry the ball here for the man, who has, as I say, been living in coyote stomachs, Mr. George Schildman. It might be interesting to hear a brief summary of that report as to cattle versus game. With your permission.

RUHL -- I think that would be a good idea, Paul, especially if you are going to make it brief like your letter of acceptance.

MOHLER -- I am carrying the ball for a couple of other fellows. The Commission was interested in getting more information from the land on this problem. Coyote studies were set up in order to find out more about what these coyotes were taking in the state, what coyotes were living on, and what the problem really was. There has been quite a bit of work done on that in various places, and most of you fellows are familiar with it. There wasn't too much of that from this state, and so the Commission was anxious to pin it down a little more to a locality basis, and set the field studies in progress and also laboratory analysis of stomachs and scats. Somewhere around a thousand stomachs have been run through the laboratory in the last couple of years, and George Schildman will tell you more about the details on that if you have questions on that. He has handled practically all of them himself. He's the man who can give you the facts and figures as to what was found. The stomachs were collected largely from the hunts that Mr. Gilbert has already described, and from individual airplane coyote hunters who were anxious to cooperate. We provided them with the materials so that they could save the stomach and send it in by express - a uniform system. In that way they all arrived at the Laboratory in about the same shape. And then we wanted to learn something not only from the coyotes in Nebraska. That's what you get from hunters. You may get the next six coyotes from down here ten miles, and the next two from up there four hundred miles, and so it goes. We got pretty good samples from a good part of the state in the stomachs because of that type of collecting--it was more or less random business. A lot of that was from good pheasant range, and some of it wasn't so good. I would like to say that good pheasant country

in Nebraska has always been good coyote country and good coyote country is pretty good pheasant country. We wanted to get information from a really good pheasant area, and also information from an area that had very few pheasants, because the sportsmen wanted to know what difference the coyote was making. We did quite a bit of scat collecting and picking up coyote droppings. Something like a couple of thousand of those have been run through the laboratory too. In addition, field studies as to what was going on and actual observations of coyotes and so forth were integrated into the program. We found out that in the areas where the pheasants were numerous and in the areas where the pheasants were scarce, the coyotes eat lots of mice. They eat lots of mice whether in cultivated land or up in the middle of the sandhills where there may be only 2% of an entire county cultivated or straight grassland. Coyotes eat lots of mice in all parts of the state it seems. We have had a terrific rabbit scarcity during the early and middle forties in this state, particularly a jack-rabbit scarcity--and in lots of areas, cottontails too--yet in cultivated range in the state, coyotes were feeding during that rabbit scarcity largely upon rabbits. They didn't seem to be as scarce to the coyote as they did to some of the people. In the sandhill ranch land or in the sandhill range I should say, specifically within Nebraska National Forest--which mostly is not an area of trees, it is wide open grassland area about a third of which has been planted to trees by man--a lot of the scats have been collected. You drive down a section of gravel road, which is not used by anyone excepting forest personnel, and fill your sack at any time at all. We've done a lot of that in the last couple of years. Edson Fichter is the man who has done most of that work. In that area, we found a very interesting thing. They've had a terrific pocket gopher infestation in the forest--which remember is mostly grassland, not timber--terrific pocket gopher infestation in the last few years, so heavy that they've gone back in with their poisoning program on gophers again. They have that pretty well taken care of now. Within that area, the pocket gopher was the most frequent thing found in the coyote droppings. The mouse is about the same there as in cultivated land. The pocket gopher was high in the grassland with no cultivation. There have been no pocket gophers at all taken from coyote droppings collected in other parts of the state and outside the grassland it has been chiefly rabbit and mouse. The breeding population of pheasants in our pheasant-coyote study area is as high as a hundred breeding birds per section. You have to multiply that a few times to give you the fall population. What I mean to say is, though that study has been conducted in an area of high pheasant population, pheasant occurrence in coyote droppings is a little heavier there than in other places, largely because pheasants are so readily available. Quite a few hunters go out to that county; quite a few hunters hunt right within our study area. There are lots of pheasants to be had there during and following pheasant season--I mean crippled and dead pheasants that show up on the Hunter's Report Card as downed but lost. They're not lost to the coyotes, and your curve on pheasant content in coyote droppings goes right up in the fall. That's about enough of that. Coyotes eat lots of fruit; they eat lots of insects; and they eat lots of poultry. Where you have general farming, you have lots of poultry, lots of coyotes, and lots of pheasants. Coyotes

eat everything that is available there. They eat lots of prickly pears in grassland and the cactus fruit. Lots of plums at this time of the year, lots of plums from now till Christmas. They eat lots of fruit in most of the range. To the department and food habits part of it, it has been my--well, I won't say my pleasure--but I had the job for a couple of years of working with some of the legislative committeemen when they were in session here. I don't think we always met the problem with an open mind, because we knew when they came to Lincoln what they wanted to get as far as legislation was concerned on coyotes. We did work with them quite a bit. In connection with that, we summarized the bounty payments in the state for quite a few years. Nebraska has had a bounty on coyotes for about seventy years, Scott. We haven't been a state as long as Wisconsin; and something about that length of time--we have been paying bounties, and in an ordinary year the coyote bounty is paid. It's been mandatory the last couple of years, and some of them don't have the funds to meet even mandatory laws. Don't know what they're doing with it, but they're supposed to pay it. It would run somewhere between 5,000 and 14 or 15,000 coyotes annually and for quite a few years it would average around 10,000 coyotes bountied per year in the state. It's very interesting, too, when you're mapping by counties. Elmer Peterson has told you of his bounty, and for quite awhile the Kansas bounty, if I remember rightly, didn't amount to much. We have a lot of good coyote range that borders Kansas. We certainly bountied lots of coyotes in these counties that bordered Kansas, and in the next tier of counties, which was our best pheasant range in the state and has been for quite awhile, we didn't bounty nearly so many coyotes as we did next to Kansas. Next to South Dakota--still good coyote range and pretty good pheasant range--we weren't paying many bounties on coyotes, weren't bountying many coyotes next to South Dakota. Now I didn't say why they were low up along the South Dakota line, but those are the facts as shown by the bounty records from counties here. Now if you have questions on our food habit studies, George Schildman can answer them, and I'm going to stop.

PETERSON -- We pay ten dollars per head for coyote bounty. That might answer Levi's question as to why you haven't had many coyotes along the South Dakota border.

MORGAN -- Mr. Chairman. Morgan from North Dakota. I came here today primarily to listen, but I guess I'm going to have to get into this. It is something that I have been interested in for a long while. In fact, about a year ago or a little over, we sent out a questionnaire to all of the Provinces and bordering states to find out what was happening, whether or not standardized marketing for bounty payments would be carried on to advantage, and the results of that questionnaire were rather interesting. We found out that in no single instance were two states or provinces using the same type of marketing for paying bounties. Frankly, I'm not as interested in the bounty situation on coyote as I am on fox. I'm convinced that the Fish and Wildlife Service in our state has the coyote problem pretty well in hand. I am for control on both of them. North Dakota has paid bounty on coyote, bobcat, and magpies for a number of years. About 1943, I believe, the fox was taken off the

list and made a predator in North Dakota. At that time, and it is true today, the bounty on adult fox was \$3.00. In 1945, the following session of the Legislature, \$200,000 was appropriated for bounty payments in North Dakota. About \$60,000 of that was a deficit that had been built up since 1943 when the bounty first went on fox. Now, we've also been carrying on work on stomach analysis on fox. However, I am not entirely satisfied with the results that we have by virtue of the fact that most of our stomachs have come in during the winter months. We have a long period of hibernation up there and I believe that that will have a direct effect upon what we find. I'd be very interested to find out here today whether or not population trends on fox in other states are following those in North Dakota. The last two reports that I have had from our research men are that our fox population is pretty much steady, but reports that I am getting from the field show that apparently, that at least in certain areas of the state, our fox population is up. Fox are a problem in North Dakota. In 1945, I was instrumental in getting the Fish and Wildlife Service Predator Control Work started in my state. I think it has worked out very successfully. I think I had something to do with getting that group to pass a resolution against a bounty system, primarily on fox. I don't think the bounty system has ever worked in North Dakota. I can't conceive of a bounty system working in any state, and certainly I'd like to see this thing thrashed out to the point where we could come out of here with some very definite recommendations.

RUHL -- The gentleman from North Dakota has made a very definite statement that the bounties haven't worked in North Dakota, and don't believe they will in any other state. I wonder if we could all subscribe to that without any reservation.

STARKWEATHER -- Mr. Ruhl, Minnesota is right in the middle of this bounty proposition, and perhaps a little brief outline of particularly the trend in our last session--the 1949 session--of the Minnesota Legislature might be of some value, and I'd like to also make a little comment on the position that the Ohio gentleman made here as to their sportsmen and their attitude on this bounty, because that condition does not prevail in Minnesota. When you think in terms of Minnesota bounties, it's qualified to the fox and the wolf and the bear, and we have a peculiar situation in that if you were to draw a line from the northwestern corner of the state, and cut it right straight diagonally across above the twin cities, most of our fox bounties would be paid in that angle, and most of our wolf bounties and bear bounties would be paid in the northeastern part of the state. You have your two factors. You have your farmers who are for the bounties on foxes in the extreme southern part of the state, southwestern part of the state, and the northwestern part of the state; then you have the farmers and the sportsmen who are concerned with bears and the wolf bounty in the north central, northeast, north, and northeastern parts of the state. Now, prior to 1947, and this is what I want you to know, prior to the 1949 session of the legislature, the payment in Minnesota on bounties for wolves was \$15.00. There was no differentiation between the brush wolf, the coyote and the timber wolf and the amount that came out of the Game and Fish funds was 50% on fox and wolf.

The 1949 session of the Legislature increased the bounty on brush and coyote wolves to \$25.00, and a fee of \$35.00 on timber wolves. They differentiated before on the cubs, and there is no difference now. The legislators there felt, and I heard the discussion in committee, that as was indicated here some of these fellows perhaps were farming, and that, after all, the cub should probably develop to do just as much damage when he grew up as the adult, so there is no difference between the cubs and the adults now. The bounty is paid on all just alike. Then there was a difference between the amount taken out of Game and Fish. Where heretofore it was 50%, it is now 75% of the bounty on wolf, fox, lynx, and bobcat which comes out of Game and Fish. Lynx and bobcat bounties were added this year. That's new in Minnesota for \$15.00. Bear bounties come out of the general revenue fund, none of that comes out of Game and Fish. That's considered more or less of an agricultural problem. I think the trend in the take up there is pretty well static over a number of years. I had the biennial report where I note—I just checked the two years—and there was very little difference in the take of the wolves in the one year or fox either. In the case of cub wolves, there was in the first year of the biennium 254 as against 331; there's an increase there. The last figure I'm giving you is for December 31, 1947, and adults 2945 as against 2800; there's a little reduction there. Grey fox, 8000 against 6000; there was a drop there. On red fox 29,952 against 30,600; there's an increase there. There is a big increase in bear; 76 cubs against 36, and 347 adults against 156. No doubt as far as the bear is concerned, there'll be a terrific drop this year for the bear situation up there is bad and they're finding the bears right in towns where they're coming in and working on the slop piles up there, and now it is causing a very serious situation. I heard the discussion of both last two sessions of our legislature there, and if our legislators represent public opinion, which certainly they do, we are going to continue paying bounties in Minnesota for some time to come.

RIDER — Mr. Ruhl.

RUHL — Just a minute. I will admit that we do everything wrong about this except that we don't pay any bear bounties. Haven't got that far yet.

RIDER — Mr. Ruhl, I'd like to hear some discussion on, first, whether or not the bounty system has proven it beneficial; second, whether or not the problem we face in the so-called predator is a problem agricultural or are they damaging to game. If it is an agricultural problem, just what is the responsibility of the game department and finally, I'm one of those administrators who believes that in the years to come, we're going to have to enjoy much less much more, and therefore, I'm wondering whether or not the killing of these so-called predators might be taking out of the picture game or fur bearers which in the years to come might produce real sport for genuine sportsmen.

RUHL — Let's hear from Missouri there. He's very anxious. Shall we open up now? I don't know why you fellows have to go back there, because nobody will bite you up here.

STEEN -- Harry, I'd like to sort of specialize some of the things we've been talking about here this morning, and to offer some comment or suggestion as to what might be a better way to handle this particular problem. I believe we can begin by agreeing that we all agree that the bounty system as a tool or a method for solving this problem is not successful. I don't think anyone in the administrative or management business in our field holds otherwise. I think we've all learned by this time that it is not the answer, and I think these are the reasons. We are dealing primarily with the fox and coyote. They are species which man and his activities on the land have benefited. They are species of considerable reproductive capacity. They are species to which you have to apply a lot of pressure if you're really going to cut that population down into the breeding stock. We can't put that much pressure into the field under any system that is economically sound. That's on the basis of pure economics now. When we pay a low bounty, we harvest only a portion of the surplus, a portion that we probably would harvest anyway if we paid no bounty at all. If we pay a high bounty, we start the farming and we're perhaps worse off than we were before. The bounty system is not successful. It doesn't solve the problem. What then may help us? Well, we have the same problems, the same difficulties I suppose as the rest of you folks have had and in trying to find an answer, we've developed some practices that we think are at least better than those that we used in the past. In our mind and our experience, we are dealing with a resource that has useful functions as well as some undesirable traits. Our experience and the experience of the Fish and Wildlife Service in predator control work tells us that it is not only impossible to eliminate the species, it is impossible to cut it down on an economical basis to a point where you remove all of those individuals that are doing the damage on a non-collective basis. The answer to your problem is to try to get at the particular individuals within the species that are giving you livestock or poultry damage. We find in Missouri that although we have a high fox population, and a fairly high coyote population, if we can get to a spot where damage is occurring--get there fast and get the particular individuals in that particular locality that are doing the damage--we can pretty well control predator damage, and still carry on a good high population of those species. In our state it is essential, I believe, that we carry a relatively high population of foxes because the fox in our state is a sport animal. Our people hunt foxes for sport. Some of them ride to the hounds with their red coats and everything as they do in bigger cities. Some of them run foxes ahead of the dogs for the purpose of shooting them on the ends with guns, but the great majority of fox hunters run foxes just for the love of the chase. They love to hear the dogs run, and believe me there are a lot of people in our state who get a lot of recreation out of foxes. In addition to that, in such times when fur is valuable, he is a valuable animal economically speaking. It is desirable, we believe, that we carry a relatively high population of this species. It is also desirable that we eliminate the damage. We recognize that that is desirable and we recognize that we can't do much of anything else about it, that we are not going to be able to put enough pressure by anything that we may do or by anything that the people may do to cut that particular species down to in-

significant numbers. You just can't do it. It would take the United States Army, and the Navy maybe to boot, to halfway do the job. So this is the decision we developed. We decided the bounty system was no good. We tried the dog system, and that was no good. We used the professional trapper with the aid of the Fish and Wildlife Service and that worked fairly well, but it has this disadvantage, that the services that were available were limited and we didn't get to the point of difficulty or the point of the trouble until most of the damage was over. In other words, it would take three to six months to set up and go through all the mechanics of getting this service out to this particular county, or this particular community, and by that time a lot of damage had been done and people were still dissatisfied. Well, what was the answer? We decided that the answer was to try to help the man who was being damaged to help himself and to try to get that service to him just as rapidly as possible. On that basis, and recognizing the fact that the other systems didn't work (we have witnessed this), we have what we call the Extension Trapper Program. We worked it out in conjunction with the Fish and Wildlife Service boys. We got ideas and sort of developed and perfected them as we went along. We use the Extension Trapper in that we train selected people in each county in the best methods for taking fox and coyotes on a spot controlled basis in order to eliminate those animals in any given locality that are giving trouble and causing damage. We work in this system - in this way. The county agent and the local conservation agent entered the picture. Complaints of damage are taken to the county agent. If men are trained in the county, he knows exactly where they are, who they are, and who might be available. He tells his farmer, "Bill, your neighbor over there, Tom, about a mile from you can get those coyotes for you. Why don't you go over and see him?" Well, usually that solves the problem. If it is a county in which no men have been trained, he gets in touch with us and we set up a training program in that particular locality or that county. Sometimes we set up three or four or five training programs in one county. We may go back and repeat a year later if we don't have enough trained men in that particular area to handle the trouble. These men who are selected for this training are hand picked. We don't just take anybody in the county. We believe that this system should be given to reasonably reliable people who will use the knowledge carefully and for proper purposes. They are hand picked by the conservation agent and the county agent. They are people that have fairly good standing in the community that the rest of the farming population will at least accept, and probably respect. By using that system, we have developed today in the State of Missouri about 2500 men. We've had the program in operation now about two years--about 2500 men who have the same knowledge or approximately the same knowledge as the three government trappers had two years ago. There is an army of 2500 men who are available locally, right now, on call to go out and take care of the spot damage problem. Now, some of those fellows are not nearly as good, of course, as a professional trapper. Some of them are pretty darn good. None of them has had as much experience as the professional trapper, but a lot of them are getting it. It is working for us a lot better than any system that we've ever used before, and as far as we can determine at the present time, it is just about the best way that we can devise to meet our conditions

in Missouri. Now, I don't know if this will work in other states. It probably won't--especially in western ranges where you have a lot of wide open space and other problems--but in our state we have a dense population, a lot of agriculture, and quite a lot of spot damage problems where we have intense public interest in this resource for recreational purposes. Recognizing the fact that we can't do anything about anything, except control damage on a spot basis, we designed this system and it worked. It is doing the job a lot better than any other device we have ever used before, and we throw that in to offer as a suggestion. Maybe it is absolutely no part of the solution for the rest of you.

RIDER -- Mel, have you had any--I'd like to ask you--have you had any obstructive tactics or have you been in any controversy with the fox-chasing or the fox-hunting groups on that sort of thing?

STEEN -- Well, to some extent. The fox-hunting boys who run their dogs don't like traps, of course. The system used is to trap, but we train our men. We train them specifically to exercise the right precautions in doing their trapping, to make their sets in the right places where the minimum of damage will occur to domestic stock and to dogs, to use the kind of traps that will not injure a domestic animal if he is caught, and to check those traps morning and evening so that if they catch something that shouldn't be in there, they can release it before too much damage has occurred. That's the reason, one of the reasons, we want to select reliable people. You see we hand pick them. We don't just train anybody.

RIDER -- Well, our difficulty down in Ohio was the pig-headedness of these fox-chasers or hunters. They just simply wouldn't give, and they finally got the national magazine "Life" in there to take pictures of the circle fox hunt with the idea of crucifying Ohio. They had their National banquet there. They had me over there as a speaker, not to speak to them, but to tell me off. As a result, the farmers, because our legislature is controlled by agriculture, pushed them dreadfully by making fox just a rat; and he can't technically, inasmuch as he is not a fur bearer or a game bird or a game animal, be hunted in Ohio. You can take him by any means you please, any time of the day or night. That was brought about by three or four very wealthy influential groups of fox hunters who just wouldn't give. They just wouldn't stand for the killing of any fox, and I wonder whether you've got that sort of thing.

STEEN -- Yeah, we have or have had the same problem. The fox hunter is as an individual now, or as a group, with relation to their particular sport. They are about as radical as any group I know. They just feel that the fox should be protected 365 days of the year, and that he is an angel wearing a crown and sprouting wings and nothing should ever be said or done against him. Now we convinced them of this--that if we didn't control property damage by the fox, they were going to be in far tougher straits in a few years than they were now. The people were not going to stand for continuation of property damage year in and year out without doing something about it. They were the only agents in the state that felt about the fox the way they did. The rest of the state, if it weren't for the Conservation Commission, would enact a wide open

season and a bounty the year around. We wanted to manage the resource in a manner which would make it compatible with agriculture in the state, and yet maintain the highest possible population for their use and for the use of the fellow who trapped the fox, for the use of anybody who wanted to enjoy part of that resource. We sold them on that idea very well, and therefore they're going along with this program. By hand-picking our trappers, and picking relatively good substantial citizens, we eliminate a lot of problems that we would have if we just trained anybody.

RIDER -- Well, we were getting along on just about that same line and cutting down and cutting down the closed territory on fox when they went off half-cocked and thought they'd crucify the Commission through this magazine "Life" and it back-fired, see.

STEEN -- Oh, some of those fellows are radical about the steel trap and thought they should be eliminated altogether.

RIDER -- Fellows who are radical about the killing of fox, don't think the fox there ought to be killed, he but to die a natural death.

STEEN -- Our boys down there, our fox hunters, are a good deal that way, but they're reasonable fellows. You can talk to them, You can show them black on white that this is to their advantage and to anybody's advantage, it's the best row, and it's the best solution to the problem. Therefore, they'd better ride along with it, because if they don't, something worse is going to happen.

???? -- Mel, just a question here. Who furnishes the equipment to these trappers?

STEEN -- To the local trappers?

???? -- Yes, to these 2500 men you mention.

STEEN -- They buy their own equipment. We sell it to them at cost. We have the traps available, but they buy their own equipment.

RUHL -- Feast, did you have a question or comment?

FEAST -- Yes, I wanted to. This is going to be rather in conflict with the Fish and Wildlife Service, may be making a mistake----

RUHL -- We'll give them a chance in a minute.

FEAST -- In Colorado, the taking of game (game is defined as all quadruped and animals or quadrupeds and birds) not under private ownership by law says that the Game Commission shall establish laws by which it shall determine when and where and what amount of game shall be taken. Then, by their action, they declare game on the protected list. Now, for example, for a long time badger was not on the protected list. It was considered a predatory animal. At this last Commission meeting, as a result of certain findings made in a certain part of the state, badger was enrolled to control and it had it's effect on the infiltration of one of our game birds

so badger was taken off the protected list. We work very similar to the way Missouri works, only we work from --- practically all the trappers that we have are on the payroll. We, the livestock men of the state, have accepted a mill levy by an act of the Legislature for so much a head on livestock, and that goes into the Fish and Wildlife, or that goes into a fund. The Game and Fish Commission appropriates or budgets each year a certain amount of its money and that goes into the fund. Then we work under a co-operative agreement where the animals are trapped in accordance with what Mr. Steen mentioned as in the areas where damage has occurred, or is being experienced. We try to work that out in a manner where it does as much good as we think it will do as far as game development, and we try to coordinate the entire program on a plan. That plan includes the spot trapping in certain areas and no trapping in other areas. We don't pay any bounty and each year we have to fight to keep from paying a bounty. So far by doing it that way, we have been able to take care of the men who are experiencing the trouble, and in the areas where there are no troubles, of course, we get no pressure for bounties. I believe Mr. Steen has the answer, because that's been our answer--to do the work where the work is needed.

RUHL -- In this day of science, I'm surprised that some of you haven't brought up 1080 and things of that kind. We may throw an entirely different light upon the control of predatory animals where control is deemed advisable. I'd like to hear from the Fish and Wildlife Service boys. Maybe I'm getting into deep water by mentioning that, but I think we might as well face it--1080 is here. It's potentially powerful for good, or bad, as you choose and I think it's something we should do some serious thinking about. I don't know how you folks feel out here in the West, but in Michigan, for example, we are scared of the use of poison, particularly by private citizens. I'd like to call on somebody from the Fish and Wildlife Service to make comment at this time.

JANZEN -- Well, Harry, maybe I'd better lead off on this. As you probably know, the Congress each year appropriates about a million dollars for predator and rodent control work. That figure varies a little bit. It averages pretty close to a million dollars and that is expanded by corporate funds from various states, counties, livestock associations, and even individuals who will figure maybe three or four million dollars--you might say a three or four million dollar Federally supervised program. Now as you probably have gathered from the discussion here, there is pretty well a line you can draw north and south with the Dakotas on the eastern edge of the western country and Missouri on the western side of the eastern country where entirely different methods have been in practice. The basis for this Federal appropriation, of course, has been primarily for two purposes--to take care of middle responsibility on Federally-owned land in the west, and in that section to try to keep under control the methods that are being used in predator control. As I said, it is both predator and rodent control. Part of that million dollars, a considerable portion, goes to rodent control which is primarily concentrated in the east and in the south. Now, I made some notes here to try to answer some of the questions I think that were raised by some of the points that I feel are a

pretty conglomerated mess. We've pretty well covered all phases of this, but I want to straighten out some things as far as Federal participation is concerned. First of all, in the area to the east of the eastern part of the United States, I think the method that Mel Steen has brought up is probably the method that will be used. Now Gale Lodocur is our representative, our district agent in the seven states, eastern states in our region, southern, eastern, and western region, and he has for a long time felt that some sort of an extension program is the answer for predator control work. As you know, our rat control work is extension work. We are trying to teach the farmers to help themselves and, of course, he has been very active in that for many years. He was brought up in that program, and he has felt that some similar program on predator control should be worked out. Missouri is the first state that has really put that into practice here in the middlewest--I think successfully from his view-point. Apparently, Mel thinks it's successful from his view-point. Now, as you get farther west, it may be probably a different situation. There you have large cattle ranches. If you did teach a rancher how to trap, he probably would hire someone to do the trapping, so that again revolves right back to a paid trapper system, we think, and we certainly agree that we don't think the bounty system is the answer. I don't think that that probably needs very much comment from the Fish and Wildlife Service because for many many years we have been gathering information on bounties and we yet have not found anywhere where the bounty system does take care of the situation. We had quite a complication in trying to work out a free trapper system sometimes in an area where they paid bounties. There are various questions raised. Where we are doing a particularly good job in cleaning out coyotes, we sometimes have quite a bit of interference from the local trappers who want to be in on the bounty gravy. They turn coyotes loose, they try to make them trap wise, and in cases where we are now using 1080 and some of these new methods, you might say wholesale destruction methods result on the coyote. We're trying to make them specific on coyotes. We have a problem--don't know what the answer is--of the public picking up the coyotes and bountying them. In some cases, the state has not raised any question; and in others, we just don't know quite what the question is. They follow our getter lines and pick up the coyotes and bounty them, so you really have a problem trying to handle those two programs in the same area. Now, Pete raised a question which our boys also found; that in some counties where they are using the 1080 program, they have practically cleaned up the coyote. There has been practically no bounty. I don't know whether he's been getting any kicks. I don't think there'll ever be any official kicks from the bounty trappers in those areas because they can't very well kick officially. There's a lot of grumbling underneath, because some of them were well on the way to being professional bounty trappers, I don't think there's any question about that. These new methods are very dangerous. Ten-eighty coyote getter must be kept under control by Federal Supervision. I think that if there's no other excuse for a supervised program, it is to keep such methods of control out of the hands of irresponsible individuals and in the west--now in the east, that might be taken care of by legislation--in the west I'm not so sure. Your economic situation there is tied up with your livestock situation and your legislatures are tied up with the

livestock situation. You're going to have control, and we hope to keep it the kind of control that will keep it specifically on the predators that should be taken. We had a meeting of all of our predator hunters here in the Black Hills about three weeks ago, and it was very plain to see at this meeting that the hunters did not believe that any one method was the answer. We may go overboard, but we have to be careful that we don't go overboard on some method--because as sure as we do, we find something wrong with that method. You always get back to slugging away with traps and other methods of getting specific coyotes or specific predators that are doing the damage. That thing I think we can be pretty sure of. Now, I'd like to say one thing about 1080 for the benefit of some of the eastern commissioners, because if they have been getting some of the information that I have been getting from some of the sportsmen, there is a great deal of misinformation on how that program is being handled. You western commissioners know how it is being handled and you maybe know that in some cases it isn't being handled as it should be handled, but those base stations which are impregnating 1080 are placed not to exceed one to every township--one to every 36 square miles--and those stations placed that way almost eliminate coyotes where they are placed. They are very carefully supervised, every station is mapped; under our policy, there should be two Government trappers go out with every one of these stations so they can be picked up, they're supposed to be put out in the fall, just before winter sets in. They're supposed to be kept away from water sources, timbered areas. The purpose of 1080 and use of the 1080 stations is to cut down the kill on other species besides the predator, besides the coyote I should say, so they must be kept away because 1080 is dynamite. It's particularly specific for dogs or coyotes, but it will kill other species very readily; it's very dangerous to man. There is no antidote, and when you use a poison for which there is no antidote, and don't know what to do if a man takes it accidentally, you are certainly playing with dynamite. We try to impress that upon our hunters, and I think that they all thoroughly appreciate it--maybe some don't as they should. There are always some individuals that get a little calloused in handling something like that, but certainly it isn't anything that the eastern commissioners, I think, should ever consider because it's going to get all dogs just as quick as it will get the coyotes. You can't use it in the east. I just can't conceive it. Some of the other methods, coyote getters are slowly working eastward. They will also get dogs. Dogs can be trained pretty well to leave them alone, but you've got to train each individual dog. Some of the states are experimenting farther east, but by and large, I think in the eastern section this experiment carried out in Missouri may be the answer. In the west, some of these new methods that we're trying--1080 and others--of course, have been in existence for quite some time. They may be the answer, but always will have to be supplemented with traps to get that coyote that they don't get that's doing the damage. Now there's one other question which has been discussed quite a bit by the Forest Service. I talked to Clyde Swift the other day--you might be interested in the east because you've heard of him directly--and the point I want to bring up is the close herding of sheep and it's relation to range and the fact that the use of 1080 for the elimination of coyotes apparently has made it

possible for some of the sheep herders in the west to open their herds. In other words, they've had no damage. They made a very strong point of this at this particular meeting. Some livestock men did, and some of the Forest Service boys said they were going to study that a little more carefully. Maybe there is a point there, I don't know. I think Feast probably has some comment. He might have an idea on that. Of course, that's an argument for the livestock people for it. I'm not going to make any comment on the spot. You've heard from North Dakota that maybe the Fish and Wildlife Service should go further into fox control. We have stayed away from it. In fact, in placing our 1080 stations, we've tried to stay away from fox control, so fox are not as susceptible to 1080 station placements as coyotes. If there's any questions on our program, I would be glad to try to answer them.

RIDER -- What is your coyote getter? You mean cyanide gas gun?

JANZEN -- I mean that cyanide gas gun, sometimes called the booby trap.

???? -- Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one question of Dan. This program Mel was talking about, will your men assist in the training of personnel that is picked out for trouble shooting?

JANZEN -- Yes, I think so, I think I can say yes. We did that in Missouri, is that right Mel?

STEEN -- Yes, the men we used as extension trapper trainers are former Government trappers.

???? -- But you are paying them?

STEEN -- We're paying them, yes.

???? -- You're also paying these trouble shooters? Are they getting any remuneration from your department?

STEEN -- We don't use the Government trapper.

???? -- No, but these 2500 men that you have, do they get any remuneration?

STEEN -- Oh no, oh no.

???? -- How do you get them to work?

STEEN -- Well, that's handled on a local basis. We don't have a bounty system in Missouri as such, we don't pay any and the state doesn't, but we have provisions where the county will pay them, sort of a local obligation. We've got to give the attitude, and it seems to work, that as long as we provide the individual man with the facility or the information to solve the problem, it's his problem from then on.

JANZEN -- I'd like to ask a question--well, make one comment here.

Iowa -- is anybody here from Iowa? -- Iowa just asked us to initiate the same program in that state that started in Missouri and arrangements are being made to start that program.

STEEN -- I'd like to ask you a question, Dan. When I said that you can't eliminate the population on an economically sound basis, of course, I ruled out 1080, because it would be utterly impossible to use that in Missouri. It not only would be dynamite; it not only would be T.N.T.; it would be an atomic bomb turned loose in our state. It's just completely out of the question altogether, but you are virtually eliminating the coyote in rather large means. Have you had any experience yet or any indication as to what that may mean biologically? What happens to your rodents? Maybe you're going to have more problems than you had before.

JANZEN -- Now that does worry some of the men in our service all right. Just what is going to be the effect? Now, just to show you how potent this is, one string of nine stations resulted in over 600 coyotes being picked up in that string--nine stations in an area, of course, where they had a lot of coyotes--but that practically eliminated coyotes in that local spot. It has been that coyotes range a long distance, but stations (one to a township) practically eliminated coyotes in the country in the west.

RUHL -- I'm sure we'd like to enter this, but being near the time to break up--I'm sure that the Fish and Wildlife Service and the various states where this is going on is going to tell us whether they're going to have millions and millions of rodents or whether they are going to have five times as many foxes to take the place of the coyotes pretty soon. I think we can summarize this that as far as I can tell, nobody has defended the bounty systems or claim that they are very successful. We certainly have them with us, and while we have them we ought to do what we can to bring the techniques of marking and handling the administrative policies together, particularly in adjoining states. Peterson should come down to \$7.50 and the neighbors should come up to \$7.50. Might be an example of that, to keep from trading coyotes. I think we also have pretty good evidence that they start out by paying it, through general appropriations, then they ante some of the game funds, and they ante more, so that there is a thing to watch, and the history I think is pretty much that more and more and more tends to come out of the game fund. I think that we are pretty sure that the Missouri experience, which has been tried elsewhere, has probably a very good chance of working everywhere in the east with modifications to fit the particular circumstances, and I'm sure we haven't heard the last of 1080 and these new things. We should always keep them in mind, but remember that they are also hard to handle. I wonder if we don't need to consider the possibility of some joint action to keep these things out of the hands--some legislative action perhaps in the various states--of individuals without training who do not know what the things will do. I'm sure that I for one am not satisfied that we can't shift taking predators somewhat at least, from the work class over into the fun class, but we've had some horrible examples as Rider got panned for. That's not easy either, but I think it is one of the things we should be watching and attempting to do, to change hunting for money over to hunting for sport to the extent that it's workable. It won't be all of the solution, but it may be part of the solution, and it

may be one of the things that you can do to offer a program as a substitute for the bounties. I'm going to turn this back to your president, Mr. Gilbert. Did you have an announcement?

GILBERT -- Thanks a lot, Harry. That's a wonderful job. You see what I mean by professional unity? When we opened up, I said that's the thing we had to strive for all the way. Here's a case of it. We've got to get to doing the same thing together and maybe we're going to have to have a separate liaison group in here. That's something we're going to discuss tomorrow---the possibility of a special committee, so keep these things in mind. Will Mr. Heine Moesch stand please? He just stepped out, the girl says. Mr. Jack Lowe, Commissioner from Nebraska. Those men were not introduced before. Thank you, Jack. I don't know, stand up Cap. Cap! Where is he? W. O. Baldwin, Commissioner from Nebraska. Jack Strain, Conservation Officer, Nebraska. Another boy at your service. Robert Benson, Conservation Officer, Nebraska. Right back there. Edward Cassell, Conservation Officer, Nebraska, at your service. Harrell Mosbaugh, Missouri River Basin Study, at your service. Harrell, glad you're here, and, well, stand up Roy. You'll meet this fellow later. Roy Owen, He's the man that you're going to challenge tonight if any of you can tell a story at all. A box of shells, 12-gauge, high base, number fours, Remingtons, good stuff, some beautiful duck minatures if you can tell a better story than he tells, but that's all a part of the program tonight. How many of you would be interested in a conducted tour through this building at 1:30? Are there any of you? There will be no tour. There will be a session here at 2:00 on the nose, and it is now exactly one minute of 12:00. That's all. Nice going.

Afternoon Session, October 3, 1949

GILBERT -- We're running five minutes behind and we don't want to do that, because I want to quit exactly at 4:00. You remember that there is a meeting of Mosbaugh and his group in my office at 4:00. There will be a meeting of Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Vance, and the Nebraska Game Commission in one of the Senate chambers--I don't know which. Check with Clarke Wilson on that. Buck Rider would like to have any requests that any of you have for local resolutions. He'd like to have them just as soon as possible, because his committee wants to start functioning as soon as possible. This afternoon, if my constitution will permit, I would like to -- I won't say take the privilege or the pleasure either one, but for reasons of my own on some things that I want to bring out -- handle, for a time anyway, the discussion of what, I think, is probably the most important topic of the entire convention. You notice that I changed the wording of it a little bit from my original missive to you--The Valuation of Present and Possible Federal Aid Projects for Fish and Game, the Effects of Such Projects, and the Various Federal Agencies Involved on the Game and Fish Management Activities at the state level. Now, that is quite a topic. It covers a multitude of sins, and I can assure you at the start that I don't want this to degenerate into a Federal duck hearing. My apologies over there. As I told you this morning, this is a convention aimed at professional unity, and I don't want anybody here today, as your President, I don't want anybody making cracks at the Federals, Federals at State, or State at State. Unless the criticism that you put out is constructive criticism for which you have a positive suggestion, we don't want any criticism just to bolster somebody's ego to say that they told somebody off. We're not here for that purpose. We're here to achieve, again, professional unity in our profession. In order that we don't get too far off the subject, I want to enumerate the way we'd like to handle this. We're going to take P-R first, because we're best acquainted with that, and we're going to run a roll call of the states as Buck suggested. We want you very briefly to enumerate the Pittman-Robertson projects that you're carrying on at the present time in your state. We'll call you by state names, and you can designate your own speaker. We'll pause at the conclusion of each enumeration for any questions, and we can go into any one of those projects as heavily as you wish. After we have enumerated all of them, I would like to go into a discussion of some of the problems that are arising pertinent to certain of those projects--such as conflicts that we may have, either administratively or biologically. I want to go into conflicts or problems that might arise from the undo drainage of personnel from certain state divisions into Federal divisions, or vice versa, and accompany that with a discussion, if you please, of just where this drainage, as I call it, is leading us. I know that, here in Nebraska, it's a very very serious problem, and I think it is in some of the other states. From there--you can see by the points that I'm listing that we're not going to be able to waste much time in long prolonged discussion--we want to then apply the knowledge that we have gained from each other on our Pittman-Robertson discussion to possibilities within the new fisheries Federal Aid set-up that is being born. Then, if time permits, we will bring in the relationship of other agencies besides the Fish

and Wildlife Service -- the Army Engineers, the Soil Conservation Service, the Reclamation Bureau, and so on. Now, that's quite an order, I realize, so we will first of all go into an enumeration, and questioning, if you wish, of the various Pittman-Robertson Federal Aid projects of the various states, and I'll take the states just in the order in which they are listed on your program. Illinois. Representative from Illinois? We have none? Indiana.

COTTINGHAM -- Mr. President.

GILBERT -- Remember, please give your name so that the wire recorder can pick it up, and they'll know who is talking.

COTTINGHAM -- Cottingham from Indiana. Our projects, our Pittman-Robertson projects, at this time are in three categories--Research, Development, and Acquisition. In research or investigation work, we're working on Indiana problems right now--pheasants, quail, waterfowl, squirrel, and the fox. We have a deer problem, too, but we don't have the personnel at this time to work on it. We intend to have that soon. In acquisition, we are on an upland and waterfowl development acquisition program right now, or that will be developed, consisting of around 8,900 acres in the old Kankakee and Iriquois basin; 6,900 acres have been acquired, and the balance is in the process of being acquired. It is to be developed around 1,500 to 1,800 acres of water and marsh, the balance developed for upland game with the usual 50% of the total as a refuge and the balance opened to public hunting. It is a project that we need badly in Indiana, and one of the last, probably, that will be available to us of this nature due to the agricultural development of the state. Development plans for this are being worked on at this time. Our other development work we are pushing as much as we possibly can with built up personnel and provisions for sufficient moneys to operate a large Habitat Development program. We've been on that program for eight years. We feel the need of it, and we are pushing that project harder than anything right now. Incidentally, Indiana is in the belt that apparently will develop multiflora rose. We have a tremendous interest in the living fence program which it hasn't been necessary to push very hard to take care of what rose seedlings we were able to get. We're raising the greatest portion of those rose seedlings in our state nurseries, our four state nurseries, with those seedlings coming to our P-R project at cost. We anticipate a distribution of approximately three million plants this fall and next spring. The program for next year calls for approximately five million seedlings. That is our P-R work that is going on at the present in Indiana.

GILBERT -- I know that there is a lot of interest on this development work or cover planting project. What is the basis that you plant on private lands, and if so, do you contribute everything, does the farmer share in the contribution, or what is the story?

COTTINGHAM -- All of the P-R development--habitat development--is on private lands. We're leasing plots of land from a half an acre up to ten, twelve, fifteen, maybe twenty acres. We're leasing it for a period of ten years, platting and planting, furnishing all of the planting materials that are planned, and to some extent furnishing

fencing materials. We do that, incidentally, by contract with the farmer. He builds the fence to a designated type. He knows how much he will get for the fence at the time we sign the lease with him, and he is paid for the fence after he builds it. His obligation is to complete the contract for fence construction if there is a fence on the area, protect it from fire and grazing, and carry out all of these development plans that we provide. That program is working very successfully right now in Indiana. We're taking small pieces of land, a half up to two acres, and doing that with a simple agreement for a ten-year period instead of a lease that is recorded on the larger areas. Each of those are planned particularly on almost the same pattern, providing for a rose fence on the perimeter of it to tie around it and close it up -- eventually, at least, close it up, and the interior of the area developed to suitable habitat. The large areas are planned in a similar manner, except that we are not able, of course, to put a perimeter of rose on it. We do use as much rose on the fence lines as we possibly can to eliminate future maintenance.

GILBERT -- Do you have any further questions of Mr. Cottingham?

???? -- Do you have the figures on the cost of your rose that's produced in your state nurseries as compared to private nurseries? We'd like to know what you do pay for them when you have to buy them.

COTTINGHAM -- Our nursery cost is--well, we got a steal this last spring. It cost us \$7.50 a thousand, and it cost the nursery considerable more than that to produce it, but we agreed on that figure last year. When they got into it, they found they couldn't produce it at that price, but they still carried out the agreement at \$7.50 a thousand. The cost that they have figured out that this year's production will amount to will be \$12.50--\$12.75 a thousand--and we purchased a million and three quarters seedlings, a million of them at \$17.50, that's the three quarters of a million at \$17.50 and the million at \$16.50. I had a letter on my desk when I left Indianapolis from a rose nursery that was feeling us out on a contract for next year, around \$10.00 or \$12.00 a thousand. I imagine that probably all of the states will get that same offer.

GILBERT -- Any further questions of Mr. Cottingham? If not, we'd like to hear from Iowa. Incidentally, we haven't introduced Iowa yet. We don't need an introduction. Bruce Stiles. Who'd you bring with you, Bruce?

STILES -- Ray Beckman, the Chief of our Fish and Game Division. Where's Ray?

GILBERT -- Stand up, Ray. Incidentally, before you get started, we've got one other visitor to whom we do want to say hello, and that's your good friend and mine, Frank O'Connell. Glad to see you, Frank. All right, Bruce.

STILES -- Mr. President. Gentlemen. On the P-R program in Iowa, I might first tell you something about our Coordination project. We have one P-R Coordinator and two assistants. We just recently have added an engineer to our Coordination project. We have one secretary.

Some of the secretarial work and bookkeeping is channeled through our regular office staff. That makes up our personnel on the P-R Coordination project. In Iowa, we have concentrated on land acquisition. That has been what we thought was our most important project. We have very little public lands or wild lands in Iowa. About 97% of the state is in private ownership. Much of it is, of course, agricultural land, and the wild lands have been going at a premium. In fact, in many instances, lands that we have considered waste land, that should be bought up from \$7.00 to \$10.00 an acre because of their value, are being bought by hunting lodges, private hunting lodges, and hunting clubs. In many instances that marsh land or waste land is selling as high as our best corn land, and one of our bottlenecks, one of our most serious bottlenecks in Iowa, is to find a place for our hunters to go--a place where they can hunt. We have probably 300, I believe about 385,000 hunters in Iowa, and have about 600,000 licensed hunters and fishermen, so we have concentrated on our land acquisition program on P-R. We have also set up a development project. We have one small research project which will be completed this year, and the reason we haven't gone into research is because our research work is handled through a cooperative research program that is contributed to by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Wildlife Management Institute, the Iowa State College, and I think it is one of the oldest, if not the oldest, Cooperative Research Unit in the United States. They have been doing an excellent job for us, and I wouldn't attempt to enumerate the number of research projects that they have carried on. We have, of course, projects on all of the major species--ducks, pheasants, quail, squirrels, other upland mammals, cottontail rabbits--and, we feel that we have been pretty well taken care of, so we haven't gone into the research step in this one instance. The thing that we are especially interested in now is a farm-game habitat project which we have just been working out. I do not believe that we yet have approval on it from P-R, but I feel assured that we will get that approval. Three years ago, we set up a trial balloon, a farm-game-habitat-improvement program on private land, which was financed entirely out of our state funds and our fish and game funds. The thought at the time was that this would be a trial project so that we would know how to get into it when we set up our P-R project, and we're in the act of getting that going now. That will consist primarily of leasing pieces of waste land, especially on farms, and the signing of a lease with the farmer. It is our thought that we will pay for all of the habitat development such as planting, construction of farm ponds, living fences, and anything that goes along with habitat improvement. We have been in the multiflora rose business in our Fish and Game program for sometime; I can't tell you just how many of these multiflora rose plants we put out last year--about a million. We have been producing these at our state-owned nursery, and we have also been buying them. In the spring of 1950, we'll have something better than two million plants to go out. We've raised about a million plants at our own nursery, and we have bought another million. We let them out for bids, and, I believe, C. R. Burr and Company, Manchester, Connecticut, got the low bid at \$15.00, which is about what it has been costing us to produce them in the nursery. In Iowa, our P-R, besides our Coordination project, consists of a Land Acquisition project, Development project, and Farm-game Habitat project. That about covers it in Iowa.

GILBERT -- Any questions of Mr. Stiles? I would like to ask one. Bruce, you mention the fact that some of your brush land and some of your swamp land has become about as expensive as your corn land. We've been running into that same thing, and as a result, we immediately run into the proposition with our P-R friends of the difference in asking price as against the assessed valuation on which they, of course, base their P-R story. Have you been running into any complications on that?

STILES -- Rather serious complications. I might tell you something about an acquisition project that was started in Clinton county several years ago. I believe that we had an original appraisal, an average appraisal on this land, at somewhere in the 30's-- \$30.00 - \$35.00. If I'm not mistaken, we bought a small bit of the land at the time we started for \$25.00 or \$26.00 and this was an old drained lake bed. It was still a marsh, it wasn't agricultural land by any manner or means. It furnished, during dry seasons, a rather poor grade of pasture, and during wet seasons, it was waste land entirely. We bought what we could get there somewhere near the appraised price, and I'll say that the Fish and Wildlife Service has been very reasonable in making adjustments. So, about a year ago, we asked for a reappraisal, and the P-R people sent their men in there. They did give us a reappraisal, and the reappraisal was in the 60's, \$60.00 - \$65.00, something like that. We were able to pick up another one or two pieces, but some of the key pieces of the land we couldn't get. We decided that we would have to condemn it. I don't know what the set-up is in other states, but on a condemnation jury in Iowa, the District Judge is required to appoint five jurors--one juror from five separate counties, only one juror can come from a county--and the condemnation; so we condemned it. The condemnation jury award was something like \$118 or \$120. We talked it over with the P-R officials, and with our commission, and finally decided that, because these were key areas, we would take it. There were three land owners that got together and each of them hired an attorney and decided that they would appeal. An appeal from the condemnation jury award in Iowa goes to the district court. They appealed from the award, which we thought was way too high--somewhere below \$120--and it went to the district court. The district court awarded about \$168, so we dropped the project. We had to. We thought we'd let it set until we saw whether or not the local people would get interested, and possibly, we can pick it up a little later. That completely stopped us. We have had any number of areas where the duck clubs have gone in and paid what we thought was just exorbitant prices for marshes. That's an example of our experience, at least, Paul.

GILBERT -- I think, probably, when Dan gets a chance, he may have a comment on that, I hope. It isn't time for his chance. It's time for Mr. Dave Leahy of Kansas.

LEAHY -- Mr. President and gentlemen. We have in Kansas but one P-R project. It is all that we have ever had. Now, we're presently engaged in waterfowl refuge-waterfowl restoration project. We have acquired in Horton county Kansas, that's near Great Bend, if it means anything to you, what is known up there as the Cheyenne Bottom Basin. There is contained in that Basin about 18,000 acres

of land. We've acquired that in the last seven or eight years, most of it was gotten by purchase, and some through condemnation proceedings similar to Bruce's. Of course, that Basin has no inlet or outlet and we're required to divert water into it, so we'll go to Wallman Creek--that's about five miles from the Basin proper--for our first diversion. For our second diversion, we have to go to the Arkansas River, about twelve miles away from the Basin. Now what we plan to do there--the engineers have planned to impound about 15,000 acres of water within this Basin. Fifty per cent of that area is going to be opened to duck hunting, and about 50% of it will be treated as a refuge. Now, at the completion of that project, we're going to start this; we have already done some of our ditching, and the next phase of the project is the building of our first diversion dam. Contracts for that will be let here in the middle of October. For ultimate completion of the project, we have to go through an airbase with some of our ditching, and the ditching that we already have now went through some valuable farm lands, but the ultimate completion of the project is, I'd say, about three or four years away. Mr. President, that's going to cost in the neighborhood of two and a half to three million dollars. That's the only project that we have in Kansas.

GILBERT -- Thanks, Dave. Michigan--Ruhl.

RUHL -- Well, as far as P-R, P-R is just another pocketbook as far as we're concerned. In other words, we don't segregate except for business purposes. We may have a project in which we use two or three different kinds of money, all legal. Sometimes, we're able to avoid the situation you have by using another pocket. We put about \$60,000 in our Coordination. Land acquisition is divided between upland and waterfowl areas. Even though we have quite a little water, we're concerned about more marsh areas and maintaining what we have. Our developmental project: Part of that is development of state-owned lands in the southern part of the state; part of it is dams; and part of it is farm-game habitat improvement, where specific plans are made for specific farms with specific agreements covering it. About \$125,000 of the total is for small maintenance projects and research. I think that our situation is quite a little bit different. We have quite a lot of land which is not good for agriculture, but we also have a high demand for urban residences, twenty-five to fifty miles from Detroit and Flint. We are finding that in some cases we either have to move now, or else the project is out, because the cost of private development which you've got to liquidate is too high. Sometimes you have to pay the price and pay it quick, and it's cheaper to get it over with than it is to go pushing off. We think, at least. One of our problems, of course, has been men with the know-how and the experience. I think that our research program is lagging, because there are a lot of things that we want to do which we haven't been able to do, simply because we haven't found the men with experience, training, and judgment that have gone out to do that sort of a job. Those projects are not projects where you set them down--they're close supervision. It means setting out to get the answer to a question which is really tough, in which you must not only know your biology, but your people, and that's been one of our draw-backs. Another thing has been our engineering. We've had the same problem as far as engineers

are concerned. Of course, maybe some people say we don't pay them, that's the reason we can't get them, but we've found it difficult to get engineers who understood what we were trying to accomplish, what it was worth to make a waterfowl marsh, and who are willing to design structures, taking some chance on the floods of a hundred years or two hundred years, and yet not paying too much of a premium in that chance. In other words, we are finding that the kind of engineers we want are hard to get and keep. That's been another trouble.

GILBERT -- Any questions of Mr. Ruhl?

STILES -- Mr. President.

GILBERT -- Mr. Stiles.

STILES -- I'd like to ask Mr. Ruhl -- what do you pay your engineers?

RUHL -- Well, now let's see, from about \$4800 down, I guess. It depends on their experience and training.

STILES -- That's the same trouble we've had. We haven't been able to hire them at that price, the kind of men we want.

RUHL -- We get a young fellow who's got the makings, a couple of years experience and off he goes.

GILBERT -- May I suggest we postpone the personnel discussion until after we finish the project discussion, and then we want to go into this heavy, Bruce. Minnesota - Starkweather.

STARKWEATHER -- Mr. President. Gentlemen. The Minnesota projects, since 1939, have covered about twenty Pittman-Robertson projects altogether, and expenditures have been right in the neighborhood of about \$800,000, and that does not include 20-D which is the big Rose Bog Development, because the funds there have not yet been encumbered, and that's a project of about something like 30,000 acres in its original plan. We had some difficulty--prior to the 1947 session of the Legislature--on habitat, because we were hide-bound by the Minnesota code which would not permit the furnishing of any nursery stock on anything except public-owned lands by the state or county, but the big fight in the 1947 Legislature brought through what we call the Nursery Bill, which does permit the state to take easements and do some fence line planting and things like that. We do not furnish any material amount of stock to private individuals, however, unless we can secure a twenty-five year easement on the land. That's based on an attorney general's opinion, which - - -

GILBERT -- If so, do you furnish all?

STARKWEATHER -- Yes, we furnish all. That's right. We get those easements, and our men in there make recommendations and then it becomes a cooperative project, but the little plantings in and around the buildings and homes furnish some cover. In those instances we can go into that now, where previously we could not. We hope eventually to get P-R into some stream-bank improvement in habitat. At the present time, it's being handled under a fisheries deal. We're not

talking very much about it as yet, simply because, as yet, I've been handling it more or less. The bee was put on me, too, and being rather a screwball of a trout fisherman, I was a little bit interested, maybe that's why Frank put the bee on me, and we've been going to our major trout streams all through Minnesota and taking easements which are costing us nothing. I suppose we've got at the present time, Ray, pretty close to 200 miles of our trout streams where we have easements that run from fifteen to fifty feet back from the bank. This easement reads that it gives the public right-of-access, which, of course, is what we're interested in. Now, some of that, of course, isn't in the upland game area, except in the southeastern part of the state, and there perhaps some stream habitat work can be done at a later date. The vast majority of this particular thing, however, is in the east central, the central, and the northeastern parts of the state, which is primarily big game, and you don't get into much of a habitat problem where we need it on upland game birds like your pheasant, your quail, or your huns. They're not in there, and the snow-shoe rabbits and the rough grouse don't seem to need too much habitat improvement in that portion of Minnesota. We hope eventually, at least, to see what can be done with P-R taking those areas over and doing some development work on them which will be aside, of course, from the fact that it would improve the fishery habitat as well. The nursery stock: I think the department entered into only one contract with a private nursery individual, and that didn't work out very well; however, we are developing our own nursery, the Carlos Avery, on the White Water area where a lot of land acquisition has been done under P-R down at the Calcut Lake. The Forestry Department is cooperating in getting away from the coniferous plantings to some extent, and getting into the type of stuff that we will be able to use, so we will be taking, without a doubt, some stuff off the Forestry Division which we will probably pay them cost for--that is, from the Game and Fish funds. All game research in Minnesota is under P-R. The engineers: Perhaps we have the same difficulties as you do there--with one exception. We have within the conservation department what is known as the water resources division, which is strictly an engineering proposition, but their appropriation always reads that just about 100% of the expense of that division is reappropriated out of game and fish funds, but we support it. We do have a little trouble in getting those boys to give us attention, because they're still a little independent. They have a director and one thing and another, although we pay the bill on those diversion propositions. We still are having difficulty, and I suppose they are in the matter of personnel also. Now, I don't know what else we can touch on as far as Minnesota is concerned, that's different than the other states in their set up.

GILBERT -- I'd like to ask you a question. In this habitat development along streams, are those originally private streams?

STARKWEATHER -- No, they're public waters, but the acquisition is being taken on the basis of the public having the right to have access to those streams. Some of them are in semi-wild areas.

GILBERT -- Previous to the time of the acquisition, could I walk along the bank of those streams and fish?

STARKWEATHER -- If the property owner didn't post them and say you were trespassing, yes.

GILBERT -- But, after you've purchased them with your Pittman-Robertson funds, I could walk along there and fish.

STARKWEATHER -- Well, these are not purchased. We--as yet, I don't believe we've paid a nickel for all the two hundred miles of--something like that--easements we've got on these streams. The people are just giving us the easement. You understand we're selling them on the proposition that we're going to try to do considerable improvement work on those streams. We have had one exception, now, I'm going to call attention to this because it's a very fine one. In one of the streams up in Cass and Beltrima county, Capacona Creek, which we're going to do some work on, a large area on both banks of that stream is owned by a big lumber company, and when we presented our easement to them, they wanted to make an exception to the easement. I'm going to mention this, because it's a very fine exception. They were thinking along good lines. They wanted the privilege written into the easement that they would have the right at any time to close that to the public when there was any extreme emergencies as to fire hazards. Now, we thought that was a very fine gesture on their part, and we, of course, were very happy to write it into the easement, naturally. As I mentioned, we're not saying too much about this, simply because of the fact that the thought was, that while you might at first think it would be a good deal for some publicity as far as the department was concerned, we rather debated the advisability of it. Some of the fellows who are screwballs like I am on trout fishing, but still have some means, might go in there and want to gobble up some of that, and we would have a little trouble on condemnation like you people have, so we have felt perhaps publicity in this case was not desirable. Now, we've had a couple of instances in the state--maybe this is what you were leading up to, I don't know, or trying to lead me on--where streams have been posted, and we have found a remedy for that. I don't know what the remedy would be if we were taken into court. Our Commissioner Wilson is quite sound. As most of you know, he's been a little thin-skinned as to what would happen, and that is why we have taken the position under our law--and it's been a good selling point as far as these people are concerned that have posted it--a so-called spawning bed under fisheries. We can set aside a certain portion of public waters to be used as spawning beds, so where these people have attempted to post and keep the public out just so they could go in there, we've told them, all right, that's all right, you can post it if you want to, that's your privilege, you can keep the public out, but if you're going to post it, so are we. We're going to set that area aside as a spawning bed, and neither you nor the public will be able to fish on that portion of the trout stream. That usually cures them of wanting to post it, because they wanted simply to keep the public out of something that is already public water; it's a stream of which you can't wade up the middle; you can't get in without trespassing; it's a boggy bottom or something; and we have found that that's been a pretty good remedy. When they find out they can't fish it, they take their signs down.

GILBERT -- Any further questions of Mr. Starkweather?

RIDER -- Mr. President. I'd like to bring up ---

GILBERT -- Yes, sir.

RIDER -- A little along that matter--it's getting away from P-R, but it might avoid some trouble for you. In Ohio, we have had as many as nine men taking stream-fishing easements. Under the laws of Ohio, if a landowner owns to one bank of a stream, he owns to the middle of that stream. If he owns both banks of the stream, he owns the land under the stream, and the water in the stream, so long as it's on his land. He can't, of course, divert from ---

STARKWEATHER -- That condition, of course, is not true in Minnesota.

RIDER -- Yeah, and he owns the air above it and the minnows beneath it.

STARKWEATHER -- We have a very fine attorney general's ruling which stipulates that they are public waters in so long as they are serving any public purpose, even so far as bathing, using the water, wading, and traveling on the ice. Wisconsin, I think, has a law that's something about, if you can float a four foot log--are some of the Wisconsin boys here?--if you can float a four foot log down a stream, and so forth, and so forth, why it's public water. By the way, I think Wisconsin has used this posting proposition in a couple of places over there, too, where they've gone to the people and told them, sold them on the idea.

RIDER -- Here's the difficulty we've gotten into. We've taken a good many thousand miles of these easements, and they are perpetual easements for which we pay nothing. We promise to pay a dollar, but we don't and they are recorded easements. We find that they are usually taken on small plats of land, eighty or ninety acre farms, that's what the average trout farm is. We find the owner about to sell his place, and he's told by the prospective purchaser that he'd like to have that farm, and a great many times it is a sportsman, but he objects to that easement and will not buy the farm with that perpetual fishing stream easement on there. Now, the attorney general of Ohio has ruled that we cannot give up that easement. The Wildlife Council or the Division can't give up that easement anymore than we could give away the trucks or the automobiles that we own, because that is the property of the State of Ohio. Not even the Governor of the State of Ohio can give away any state property. We're up against a situation now, where each time we wish to be relieved of one of those easements, we have to have a specific act of the legislature. For example, in the Army Engineers work where they're putting in installation and buying the land, the Federal Government will not accept that as a clear fee simple title to the land. As long as there is that encumbrance, that perpetual easement, during each session of the legislature we now have to chuck in a bill or two that releases the easement...

STARKWEATHER -- We have that, too.

RIDER -- ..on this land. Well, I was going to suggest that it might

be a good idea to write an easement, if it could be done, in conjunction with the attorney general's office in such a fashion that it could be broken under certain stipulation; that is, not let it become so completely the property of the state as to make it unalterable except by legislative action.

STARKWEATHER -- We have a, I might mention here, we have another law that just came into Minnesota some few sessions back, and was broadened a little bit in the last session, which ties right in with this accessing of public water which provides that the Commissioners shall acquire by lease, gift, or condemnation, and so forth, and so forth, access to public waters which the public does not now have--prior to 1947 or 1949 it said access, but now it says adequate access--so that we're in a position where we can demonstrate that they are public waters, even though they might be trout streams, up to five acres for parking place and right-of-way, and we're doing that. We have one man on that right now who is doing nothing else but acquiring those, and in some instances, we're not having to pay anything for it.

GILBERT -- Mr. Steen, Missouri.

STEEN -- Well, in Missouri, we have all three of the types of projects that are legal under P-R--research, acquisition, and development. Our research projects involve investigations in the management problems of all game species we have in the state, either individually or sometimes collectively like the fur-bearer. They're studied more or less as a group. In acquisition we are carrying on two major types of activities. They include the development of special-use areas such as public shooting grounds, particularly for waterfowl; and construction of fishing lakes in the immediate vicinity of our large cities where we have very high angling pressure in relation to the available fishing opportunities in that particular territory. Now, we're taking a little different approach to this acquisition program, I think, than perhaps most states, in that, we attempt to make them economically sound investments as well as management areas. In the case of the special-use areas, we, either through croppings or through fees that are collected--as, for example, in the case of the duck hunting areas--make them self-perpetuating, and we believe that we can retire the capital investment over a period of fifty to seventy-five years. We make an economic and need survey in each locality where we propose a project to determine whether or not it appears that the thing can be made self-supporting, and we rather hold to the theory that if a project is not capable of being self-supporting, it must be because the project is not justified in that particular location; it shouldn't have been built in the first place. We are buying also, rather extensive acreages of Ozark lands. We handle them in this fashion. We buy this land at rather low cost--it runs around two and a half to three bucks an acre--use it for forestry, public hunting, game management, not on an intensive basis, but rather a not-so-intensive basis without much administrative overhead. That is a sound investment, too, because that land is going to be worth all we paid for it, and maybe five times over, ten years from now. In other words, we feel that we can't afford to load ourselves down with a lot of projects that are white elephants if maintenance is going to eat us up ten or twenty

years from now, because if we do, we are just going to be sunk. We feel, also, that in the development of special-use areas, the people who use them should pay the freight and maintenance in order to enable us to continue that program up to the point where we reach a saturation. The saturation being whether or not you, Mr. Angler or Mr. Hunter, are willing to pay for these special advantages in your particular territory. If you aren't, it must be because you don't need it or don't want it. So much for acquisition. Development? Yes, we develop these special use areas with P-R funds, and we also conduct this habitat development, that type of activity that we touched on. We approach that in a little different way, too, I believe, than most of the states, in that, we don't attempt, and don't kid ourselves into thinking that we can do the job with our own manpower and our own money. We use this P-R money in the development field largely in demonstration and promotion. I say we don't attempt to do the job ourselves. We don't, because we realize that we can't do the job ourselves. Let me demonstrate this briefly. Our major farm-game species are quail and rabbits. Well, you go out on the average farm in Missouri and you spend, let's say, \$200 in development on that particular farm. That's a very conservative figure. You're not going to do too much for wildlife on that farm for two hundred bucks, taking into consideration administration, labor, materials, rentals, and everything else that you'd have to pay. Using that as a figure, we have more than two hundred and forty thousand farms in Missouri on which we'd have to do this. If we spent two hundred bucks a farm, that would be roughly forty-eight to fifty million dollars. Now, we can make available P-R funds to the extent of, let's say, about a quarter of a million bucks annually for that purpose. We could then get the job done in about two hundred years, and that, we think, is a little too long. We can't do it that way. We promote, using as an illustration again, the farm-pond project. We started that promotion eight or ten years ago. Today the farmers of Missouri are building ten to fifteen thousand ponds a year on their own. They're building them because they believe that they are to their individual agricultural and economic advantage. We're promoting the living fence on the same basis. This past year we put out 650 miles of living fences in Missouri, and that was our first real year. Next year we expect to have available out of our own nurseries eight to ten million rosa multiflora seedlings, plus probably an equivalent amount in our commercial nurseries, and we think our farmers are going to take it all and ask for more. We've got the thing pretty well sold in Missouri. Our approach to a habitat restoration program, I say, is along those channels. Now, I don't know that that is the answer in all of the other states. It may be that in many states where a little work on the land will add up to a lot of results, and where you've got quite a lot of funds to spend, you can really raise the level of the ocean, so to speak, by doing all of the job yourself, but we know we can't do it in Missouri. It just can't be done, and we can't wait two hundred years to get it done.

GILBERT — A very encouraging report. Do you have any questions of Mr. Steen?

MORGAN — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask Mr. Steen how he warrants expenditure for development of fishing lakes under P-R? You mentioned that you were doing some fishing development?

STEEN -- Well, I was in error in saying that. We are building fishing lakes. We're not doing that with P-R funds, however. We're doing it with regular money. In my thinking, I failed to weed that out of the program. It's a part of this overall program, but we don't pay the cost of the fishing lakes out of P-R funds.

GILBERT -- The boys are on their toes, Dan.

STILES -- Mr. President.

GILBERT -- Yes, Mr. Stiles.

STILES -- May I ask Mr. Steen this question? You said that your approach to the farm-game habitat improvement was through education and demonstration areas, and, of course, many states, including Iowa, have demonstration areas, but at least you implied that your educational program was P-R. Is that in P-R, or is that something separate from P-R?

STEEN -- Well, the educational program is carried separately. The demonstrational work is financed under P-R. We set up demonstrations, rosa multiflora demonstrations. We develop the cultural techniques with investigational work financed by P-R, and we demonstrate. We have mass meetings. We may have two or three hundred farmers at a demonstration of how to prepare this seed bed, how to plant this stock, and how to put it in with power. We use tractors, we show these facts, and we think--

STILES -- And those demonstrations are all financed out of P-R?

STEEN -- They're all financed out of P-R, but we don't believe that we can take P-R money and go out and do that job ourselves. We operate on this theory in Missouri, that we haven't got manpower or money enough to restore habitat on the land, and that the only way it can be done is to sell to agriculture a practice that they will accept and go with, because it's agriculturally or economically advantageous to them. You can't get the job done any other way in our estimation. No matter how good the program, I have the most beautiful schemes for restoration in the world spread out on my desk. They aren't worth a dime unless I can put them on the land, and I can't put them on the land with the money and the men that's available to me. I've got to project that. I've got to pyramid it. I've got to get fifty, seventy-five, a hundred thousand farmers working for me in order to get that stuff on the land. That's the only way it can be done.

GILBERT -- Mr. Starkweather.

STARKWEATHER -- Did I understand you to say that Missouri anticipates charging an extra fee in addition to license to hunt on these areas in Missouri?

STEEN -- Yes sir, yes. We certainly do, and we do--

STARKWEATHER -- How are you, how do you propose to limit them? Supposing you have more calls for them than --

STEEN -- Well, in the case of, in the case of public shooting grounds for waterfowl, we have. We build the blinds, and we rent you a blind. This is the deal. You pay a dollar a day rental for the blind and a dollar for each gun that goes into that blind. If there are two of you, it costs you a dollar and a half apiece to hunt on this area, but we provide reasonably good hunting, and we limit the participation to the capacity of the blinds on an area. They're a quarter of a mile apart.

GILBERT -- First come, first served?

STEEN -- No. Yes. In a way, yes. You make reservations in advance. You can make reservations in advance for a specific date and when all the capacity for that date is sold out, why, of course, you can't have that day any more. You can have the next day or the next week.

GILBERT -- Now is that done locally? Do you have a man at the reserve?

STEEN -- Yes sir, and the sportsmen themselves pay for this type of management, and they pay for the area out of the fees that they make available to you and out of agricultural returns that we can get from crops and other types of management. In other words, our theory is that these areas have got to pay their own freight. They've got to pay their own way. We can't afford to continue to build them, and pay for them out of P-R or out of their permit fees, because it's going to sink us in the end.

GILBERT -- Gentlemen, if we're to discuss the latter points of the program, which are fully as important, we're going to have to move along just a little faster, and Mr. Vance, you'll set the precedent for that by giving Nebraska's report.

VANCE -- Gentlemen. Starting in 1939, Nebraska began to participate in development projects, directed primarily at the restoration of habitat for quail, and followed that through in the subsequent years with development on additional private lands throughout a larger portion of Nebraska in which this development was directed for all species of upland game. With that, we also set up a research program, studying upland game birds, migratory waterfowl, fur bearing animals, and to a lesser extent, some of our deer. That program was then added to and enlarged on by an acquisition program, by which we have, at times, when lands become available either for waterfowl or upland game or big game, purchased lands in strategic areas which we had need of as a refuge or a possible potential public hunting grounds. Nebraska has been handicapped to some extent by not having enough Federal Aid money, or rather not having enough state funds to utilize more Federal Aid moneys. There are so many things that we think we need to do for our present generation's sportsmen and our future sportsmen, that while we build up plans, we are not always able to carry them through to completion, but we're still trying to make strides ahead, anyway. One of the things that we are most proud of in our developments is the Wildlife Laboratory that we have developed here in Lincoln, most of whose activities have been directed to finding out the answer to our coyote problem, a subject that was discussed this morning. We are attempting to

work on each of our major species of small game, to develop lands that we may have more and better hunting, and to purchase lands on which we will have homes for this wildlife to live. Is that brief enough, Paul?

GILBERT -- Any questions of Mr. Vance? Mr. Morgan, North Dakota.

MORGAN -- Mr. Chairman. Gentlemen. Our P-R projects, very briefly, are confined quite largely to consensus work on both migratory waterfowl--working very closely with the Fish and Wildlife Service--upland game species, and big game. We, this last year, have stepped up our development program quite a good deal. We're doing a pretty good job of development on about 25,000 acres of state-owned land, and are carrying that farther by doing some development on privately-owned land, working at this time on more or less of a trial project with two Soil Conservation Districts. Apparently, our work on those Soil Conservation Districts on privately owned plots is going to work out quite favorably, and we anticipate that it can be stepped up to include possibly 20 or 25 counties during the coming year. That work is done on a lease basis, with the department furnishing the planting stock, and some of the fencing. The land preparation work is done by the individual farmer, who also agrees to see that the cultivation is taken care of and that the fences are kept in repair for at least a ten-year period. We're also doing some development planning work with the Basin Studies group on the major impoundment areas in the state. We have, most of the time, anywhere from one to four men detailed on that work. We're thinking very strongly about doing a little bit more for the farmer, realizing that he is the keynoter of any wildlife program in our state. So far as land acquisition is concerned, we are not going all out on land acquisition. We realize that we own at this time approximately one-half of one percent of the area of the state, and that under our wildest flights of imagination, we couldn't, at any time, own over one and one-half percent of the entire area of the state. As a consequence, if 98 or 99 percent of the game is going to be raised and harvested on privately-owned land, we must use pretty much the approach that our good friend Mr. Steen is using in Missouri. In other words, through some channels, we must develop cover on privately-owned land, and, so far as possible, tie the farmer of that land into a development program. We feel that that's the only way that we can accomplish the thing, the job we have to do. I believe that's sufficient.

GILBERT -- Any questions of Mr. Morgan? Mr. Rider, Ohio.

RIDER -- Mr. President. Gentlemen. To set the thinking straight at the out-set, let me say that we have a cooperative wildlife station at Ohio State University, and we depend upon that station to do all of our research work. We make an annual contribution to that station of \$10,500 each year and sight to that station in addition to the regular research work any specific projects, and along with that make an appropriation. Last year our appropriation to the Wildlife Station of Ohio State University, I think, amounted to \$27,000. We think that's a good plan because we feel we want our research work being done by capable men and by men who have no pride of office. If we're wrong, we want to know it. We want to know it from an outside

source that is free to tell us so. We confine all our research to only those problems with which we are confronted in the field. We realize the benefits of pure scientific research, but we've only got so many dollars in Ohio, and can only spend one hundred cents out of a dollar. It keeps us a humping, with \$28,000 or \$30,000 a year, to solve these problems that we encounter in that division of our program in the field. Now, in Ohio, we have a program of policy for game. That program of policy is printed and circulated throughout the state. The first objective of that program is to maintain habitat for game. The second objective of that program is, within the limits of our funds, to restore habitat for game. Now the Pittman-Robertson program in Ohio is, as I think it should be, simply Ohio's game program. There is no separation whatsoever. It is all under the control and direction of Dr. Ed Martin, Chief of Game Management. We've got all our eggs in one basket. Oh, we have a few maintenance projects, but we do not acquire land and you can understand why we would not. The total land and water area of this state is 26,000,318 acres, and in that area lives 8,000,000 people. They're active enough that, while we're 35th in size geographically in the United States, we're fourth in population; they're so active that the sales percent is the second highest tax in the United States. Only New York exceeds us. We've got more cities over 10,000 than any other two states in the United States combined. We've got about 15,000 or 15,000,000 acres in agricultural land. They're occupied by about 260,000 farms that average about 90 acres to the farm. We have practically no wild land--only a few acres of which are semi-wilderness. We've got coal that's either reached by mine-shafts, drift-shafts, or scalpan. So in Ohio, we can't possibly buy much land. The program amounts to simply a maintenance of habitat, which is already existing, and the restoration of habitat where the habitat is gone, chiefly for ring-necked pheasants and cottontail rabbits. As a result, the entire field force, excepting those engaged in fish work, in the Ohio Division of Conservation is under and working on Pittman-Robertson. In other words, we have 88 counties in the state. In each of those 88 counties, we have one game protector--a county game protector. We have the state divided into seven districts, containing from ten to sixteen counties. Now, we have Dr. Martin directing as Chief of Game Management at Columbus. In turn, he has seven district men--one for each district. In turn, each game protector in the state of Ohio is a local game management agent, if you wish to call it that. He gets one-third of his pay (his pay is \$213.50 a month) from P-R funds. He gets one-third of his travel (he's allowed 1500 miles of travel at 6²⁴/₁₀₀ a mile), and 500 miles of that comes from P-R funds. All of the District Manager's salary comes from P-R funds. As we all know, we've got to have water, food, cover, and particularly, undisturbed nesting cover. Now, in Ohio, we don't have to worry about water. We're a very humid state. We average 36 inches of rainfall, 38 inches maybe, distributed over the entire state each year, so water isn't a concern to us. The matter of food and cover in the summer isn't a concern to us, because we are a small grain state and never lower than fifth in agricultural production in the United States. You know in that very small area, we really produce crops, so food and cover in the summer is not too much of a worry. Our worry is winter cover. We have intensive row cultivation in the state, and so our objective first is to

establish winter cover. We do this by going in and leasing this privately-owned land and using it, without cost to us, then developing; or if to maintain, if the farmer is, we'll say grazing a wood lot, we make an arrangement whereby sometimes we have to pay to take the stock out of that wood lot. We fence that wood lot so that pheasants may concentrate in there and secure winter cover. We, then, buy standing foods for the critical winter periods, because until December, immediately after harvest, we've got to have food on the ground for game. By the time that these storms come into Ohio, that food is all used up and we have to purchase food to make that available. Then, we come next to undisturbed nesting cover. If any of you were at the International at Atlantic City, I gave a paper on the agricultural situation in Ohio and how it was affecting game. In one county, we had 16 alfalfa mills. We followed three of those mills in their operations and in their cutting that year in that one very, very, small county--it would hardly be a township in one of these western states--as large as a township, 15,000 pheasants were killed, to say nothing of the thousands of nests which were destroyed. We're hard put in Ohio for undisturbed nesting cover, and, therefore, we buy, pay the farmer for that crop that he does not harvest. This year, we bought, I'd say, Dr. Martin, about 6,000 acres, and it cost us, roughly, about \$200,000. We paid, I think, an average in there, Dr., didn't we, from \$17, \$18 -----

MARTIN -- Oh, it was around in there somewhere--as low as \$5 an acre up to as much as \$60.

RIDER -- Up to as much as \$60 an acre for alfalfa, that was not to be mowed or disturbed in any way. We found out, incidentally, you may be interested in this, that when you've got about 15,000,000 acres to hunt, you've got, maybe, 750,000 people who buy a license to hunt. Then, because they are land owners, there is another quarter of a million who are privileged to hunt without a license. When you've got a million people hunting on 15,000,000 acres of land, you've got a very serious farmer-sportsman relationship problem. Well, this is the first year that we bought that amount of cover, and we realize that it was both soil conservation, and, certainly, good wildlife conservation--that is, nesting cover. We failed to realize that it would be from a public relations standpoint, a ten-strike, and that's what it really turned out to be. The farmers of Ohio were saying--after an expenditure of a couple of hundred thousand dollars by the Wildlife Commission--something like this: "Well, this is the first time those city slickers ever gave us anything for producing this game." Well, that's the story. In other words, we do not set up a special field for P-R. P-R is to us our game program for Ohio. We feel that we, we in Ohio, not the Federal Government at Washington, or the District Office at Boston, certainly ought to know what's best for Ohio, and let me say that I have heard from time to time some of my fellow administrators say, "Well, they can't get away with that; they can't get away with this", but we've had nothing but the finest kind of cooperation from not only the Boston Office, but from Mr. Albey in person, Mr. Rutherford, and everybody connected with the Fish and Wildlife Service; so the Federal program in Ohio is Ohio's program for game, nothing more, nothing less. That's about it.

GILBERT -- Thank you, my friend. Mr. Peterson, South Dakota.

PETERSON -- Mr. President. In South Dakota, we're carrying out research, development, and land acquisition as provided by the Pittman-Robertson Act. Under research, we have a project covering upland game and fur-bearers, one on waterfowl, and one on big game. This is our third year in cover development on our cover development project. We have found from experience, that in South Dakota, our bottleneck, particularly in pheasant management, is the severe winter that we ordinarily experience. In all, we have found that--unless the number of pheasants that we can bring through the breeding season is the number that winter cover will maintain--it is a reason for developing cover areas. Most of those have been developed on state-owned lands and we aim to have areas of at least 10 acres in extent--these cover plantings to be at least three hundred feet deep. We use the hedge type, or shrub type, of plantings, principally with larger trees to help our snow traps. We have developed some areas in the western part of the state under easement on privately-owned lands. These areas are not always 10 acres. We have 107 plots now, and, I think, the total acreage is 885 acres. Now, land included in the land acquisition program that we have: We are purchasing winter deer range areas in the western part of the state and developing browse on those areas. These areas are, what you might call, marginal lands to some extent. The timber has been cut on most of it, and we are trying to re-establish browse, particularly for winter range for our deer. Deer that range in the higher regions of the hills during the summer come down into the lower areas to winter. As an example, we had 138 inches of snow fall in the northern Black Hills region last year from the fourth of November to the first of May. You can readily see that that would drive our deer down into the lower areas and set up quite a problem as far as an over-concentration is concerned. The matter of multiflora rose has been discussed. I wish that some of you men would develop a multiflora rose that would survive in South Dakota. We have tried it. We tried it last year on twenty acres and it winter-killed on all but two. On most of these areas we would find that it was covered with snow, so we're quite convinced that multiflora rose of today is not suitable for South Dakota. If that could be developed, it would be a boon to us because it's the type of growth that produces a growth that would be wonderful for winter cover. Time is short. I'm not going to take up any more of your time, Mr. President, unless there is some question.

GILBERT -- Thank you, Mr. Peterson. Mr. Scott, Wisconsin. Are there any questions of Mr. Peterson? Mr. Scott, Wisconsin.

SCOTT -- Mr. President, I'll try to be brief. Wisconsin has had a coordination project, acquisition, development, and research. We evidently are very similar to Michigan. We throw a good bit of our money into the work, as well as Federal Aid money; however, our projects have been quite distinct. We've had eight to ten research projects on specific species--deer, grouse, quail, pheasant, fox, muskrat, waterfowl. I think there is one coming up on beaver. We've spent close to ten years studying our deer. We've had a report come out on that--several reports, in fact--and this coming

year, we're going to have, finally, I think, a harvesting season on our deer. That is, a season on all deer, except the bigger bucks. It's been a long hard fight, but if our research project has done that much good that we could get away with a season and have it, I think they have succeeded and paid their way. I'd like to make a comment about research projects that aren't connected with your Cooperative Wildlife Research Units. I'd like to pay a tribute to our research men in Wisconsin. They have come up with recommendations that don't necessarily agree with the department in spite of the fact that they're working for us. In that respect, of course, they are good. Otherwise, we might just as well get rid of them, but we've had a lot of respect for our research men. I would say, too, that we'd like to have a Cooperative Wildlife Research Project in Wisconsin. I think that would be a fine thing. We've spent a lot of money on acquisition in the past buying Horicon Marsh. Lately, we've gone into smaller projects, mostly on acquisition of waterfowl areas and such as that. Some of the prices come pretty high. We can't even talk turkey with the landowners, but we usually follow the practice of waiting the landowner out. We've done that on state parks for many years--sometimes waited until the present generation dies in order to get the land--maybe that's how we'll finish up some of our projects. Our experience has been that when we condemn, the price is always higher than what we want to pay, and usually higher by far than any of the appraisals. I think, now, Steen has the idea for states like our own where we have a big agricultural program. Dairying is Wisconsin's, of course, and grazing is our great problem in Wisconsin. I think we're finally getting into the work where we are using Federal Aid money for a very good purpose. We have set up a wood lot demonstration project, we call it, under Federal Aid in which we have set aside now in the county about two hundred wood lots which are fenced--no grazing allowed. If we didn't plant a thing--the trees that come up, the shrubs and the shrubbery--we'd have good coverage. It's doing just that, but we also plant. We have our own tree nurseries, and we put in quite a bit of wildlife food. We also are working on the stream improvement idea. I believe if the Dingle Bill goes through, we'll have a project, both game and fish, paying for the same thing. Right now, game is paying it out of the Federal Aid, and fish out of their own funds. We're starting on some projects where we're acquiring land or leasing it along streams, fencing it off, and trying mainly to hold those banks, as well as to get public acquisition to those streams. Basically, those are Wisconsin's projects, and I'd be glad to answer any questions.

GILBERT -- Any questions of Mr. Scott? Thank you, Mr. Scott. Incidentally, before he sneaks out, I want to introduce Dr. Kennedy, one of our Commissioners whom we didn't get to introduce this morning. He wasn't sneaking out, he was just checking with the secretary. We're glad Doctor got here. He came all of the way from Washington to make the meeting.

KENNEDY -- Glad to be here, Mr. President.

GILBERT -- Gentlemen. Do not get panicky, you fish mongers, because if we don't hit you today, we'll dangle the Dingle tomorrow. This program is so outlined that time is always available tomorrow until

tomorrow. How many--I want to have a little fun now, just with myself and you--how many of you directors, or commissioners, or executive secretaries, whatever your name happens to be, have lost personnel to some Federal agency of some kind during your tenure in office? Let's have hands. All right. Pete's got his two hands up. If I had five, I'd put them all up. Now, another question. How many of you have lost personnel to other states during your tenure in office? That, too, is interesting. We come to a question now for which we may not find an answer, but for which we have something in mind. I don't know whether we'll get around to selling it to you today or not, but we are leading up to something, your directors and myself. It seems as though the states, and some of the states who are at the lower end of the financial belt, seem to be in the unfortunate position of having to take these young people right out of a four-year school or out of a wildlife school where they are thoroughly indoctrinated in pure research, but so far as I can see--and I've been through one of those four-year institutions myself, in fact, it took me six years--I find that the human element, the public relation element, the element of diplomacy, if you please, is many, many times lacking and it's something that you as directors in your various categories and your assistants indoctrinate into that individual. They learn by experience, just the same as we all did, and I'm not criticizing those individuals. We all learned the hard way, making mistakes, and then seeing that we never made them again. Along comes some other agency, some other group, after we get that man trained up to the point where he's just beginning to be useful to us--we've got our investment in there, we're ready to draw premiums--and he's gone. As I say, I don't know what the answer is, but it's a problem that's facing many of us, and it's becoming so serious that some of our departments are going to find themselves slipping in efficiency if this continues. Everybody suddenly seems to need biologists from the Army Engineers to the Reclamation Bureau on down, on up, any way you want to call it--it's according to your own matter of opinion--to the Fish and Wildlife Service. Now, what's the answer? Are we to continue to be a training institution? Are we going to have to continue to take these youngsters? They, in turn, are being encouraged to go into these wildlife schools that want to enlarge until there's going to be too many little freckled-nose fledglings ready to go into the school of hard knocks and our trained men seem to be pulling out. Now, let's kick that around just a little bit and then we want to hear from Dan Janzen. Buck, you and I discussed this a little bit. Do you want to add anything there?

RIDER -- Mr. President, I think that you've covered it pretty well, but it seems to me that you've talked about unity. I think that we ought to get together and set up certain standards for the minimum qualifications. In Ohio, for instance, we have a wildlife course at Ohio State University. It's headed by an upstanding individual, Dr. Charles Danbaugh, and it's only human that Charley wants to build that up into a bigger unit--that massive university of twenty-two thousand students--if he can, to get recognition from the President and from the Board of Trustees and the rest of them. He's encouraging more and more and more and more boys to enter that wildlife course, and as a result, he's going to graduate somewhere

between twenty and thirty-five, and he graduated last year, how many, Doctor?

MARTIN -- Approximately sixty, slightly over sixty.

RIDER -- Now, the rub comes in this fashion. Of course, out of sixty men there are some good men possibly. They have had the laboratory training, they have had the classroom work, and we find that that isn't all that's necessary or even half of what is necessary to go on out and put a program into action in the field to actually produce game. They, in other words, can become good architects in a way, draw fine plans on a desk. Usually they're lacking in one thing that Dr. Martin--and I agree with him on this--says a man must have before he can do a job in management or farming for game, and that is a knowledge of the behavior of the species. You might know all there is to know insofar as the laboratory can teach you, and insofar as classroom work goes about a particular species, but unless you know the behavior of that particular species, you can't work with them. Well, we find out that it takes a year or two years to round these boys in the behavior of a species. We find they come out and if you were to say, "Well, there's a two hundred acre field of good high producing calibre. We want to do what's necessary on that field to get it ready for habitat for game. Here's a tractor and a plow and all the equipment you need", we find out that that man couldn't get up on that tractor and plow that field. In other words, he hasn't had that practical experience and then last of all, he's had little or no experience with human behavior. He just can't handle the public. I'm called out there to give a series of lectures each year to that senior class. I've said time and time again, I've said it to the Dean, to the President, and the Associate Dean, that I believe it would be well if you could do this--of course, you can't--to not graduate those boys, but put them out to work for a conservation agency for one year on expenses only, possibly they ought to pay the agency a little to work for them, and then if they were successful out in a practical active program, then bring them back in and give them their degree, and they would, then, be ready with facilities adequate to apply for a job, and do a job. But they come to my office, and they come to Dr. Martin's office, and they ask for a job. We'll talk a little terms to them, and maybe say "Well, \$2900". Well, here's some state that is offering them \$3600, \$3900, \$4000. Well, that's ridiculous. I think first we ought to have a professional standard, and I'll give you this comparison. If I went out to the University of Nebraska and tried to enroll, put my high school credits on the desk, and talked to the registrar, and he says "You can't get in here except under this or that or some other circumstances", I couldn't say to him "Well, hell with you, I can go over here to Minnesota". No, because you've got the American Association of Universities, and you've got the North Central Association of Colleges and Universities. They've got standards. Well, now, I think we administrators should be in a position to know whether or not we're being given a lot of baloney when this chap, whom we know by his qualifications, comes to us and tells us that he can get a thousand dollars more to start in without a bit of experience in some other state. I believe this, too--that we're running, Paul, into a very serious situation. I, frankly, am getting to

the place where I'm afraid to send our men to the North American Wildlife Conference, or to the International, because every time you attempt to send a good boy to either of those spots, he comes back, and within a month he tells you that he can move on for a thousand or fifteen hundred more dollars; I believe we should have some ethics in that respect. I never answer a letter to an employee from any other Division of Conservation without sending that letter, that original letter, or a copy thereof, to the administrator of that state. I think I've sent Harry Ruhl a couple of them this year, and I don't think either one of them deserved to be answered, did they, Harry? At least, I didn't answer them when I heard from Harry, I just ignored them. But I think we ought to have certain standards. In other words, we ought to set up certain standards such as the universities do for entrance. We should describe what is adequate experience and what is adequate training. In other words, unless we do that, we're cutting our own throats, and I realize, of course, there is that salary item. You can't possibly regulate that as a group, but I believe that we can prescribe certain professional standards that will put this thing back in balance. I, for one, in Ohio, am not interested in any more of these youngsters without experience. I'm hoping to be able to promote from the land capable men. I'm happy to tell you that in our last game protector's examination, we did have three wildlife students take it. Two of them passed it in good shape. One was a master's degree and he's now working as a game protector. If he, after going through the practical hard work of that local agent, that local conservation agent, the game protector, in that time in which he's responsible for putting into action a program right out there on the soil for game and right in the water for fish and keeping law enforcement on an even keel, can demonstrate then that he can do a practical job, that he can handle his public, and do the work on fish, land, and game, we'll move him into the classification of a game management man or a game technician. But, I'd like to hear some discussion along that line, as would your President.

GILBERT -- Mr. Shrader.

SHRADER -- I'd kind of like to get my two bits worth in here. I don't know what part in this I have, but when Paul was talking about these fellows jumping away from him, he was talking about me a little bit, and I was quite interested in what the gentleman from Ohio had to say just now, because I've always been on the side of the young biologist in this matter of what kind of a salary he ought to be paid. I'm in the position now where I have to go out and hire some once in a while. They ask me for \$4000 a year to start out with, and I can remember when I was working for \$125 a month and I sort of wonder how they get that way. I'm kind of glad that the situation has gotten around to where it has, where the young biologist can ask for a little bit of a salary because the unfortunate thing about it as I see it, is that these biologists are human beings, just like everybody else, and they kind of like to get married, and they kind of like to have their families eat, and I had plenty of tough times on it on that \$125-a-month days, so if you set some standards, set them high enough so that the fellows that are getting the jobs can live on it.

GILBERT -- Mr. Johnson.

JOHNSON -- I'm the second man at whom Paul talked this morning for leaving Nebraska.

GILBERT -- Good boys, we trained them all.

JOHNSON -- But I think perhaps it should qualify both Tom and me for an observation or two because we have grown into minor administrators ourselves. We haven't lost a fish man out of our fisheries research unit for almost three years now in Minnesota, and we're not near the top of the scale yet in salaries. We have done it, I think--I wish I really knew, because we may have to know for sure someday--but I think we have done it by developing a feeling of gratefulness in the employees first, and an interest in their work second. With us, it's worked this way. Our Civil Service Regulations make it a lot safer to pick up residents and non-residents, and we obtain a good line on our residents as they come through the university. They work for us three months each summer. In that way, we have helped them keep body and soul together, and we have helped ourselves by spotting the good men. I'll admit it has led to some trouble because the green men are in the field almost immediately and some fracas do occur, but we try to smooth them over. When the men have developed an interest in our side of the work and ask for a job, although I am not able to tell many of them this, I do point out to them what lines of work I will assign to them when they are hired, and it's up to me as the boss of that little outfit to keep those men interested and to keep their work varied enough so that they don't start looking in other directions. One of the best ways that we've found so far, is to forget about the eight hours a day biologist idea and, if we can do so without stepping on too many regulations, keep the boys moving ten and twelve hours on an interesting job. They won't complain; in fact, they'll forget themselves in that job. It's a little hard on the boss once in a while because he has to be there, too, but so far it's worked, and I think we have benefited by it.

GILBERT -- Thank you, Ray. I don't want to take any more time than we have away from our good friend Dan. Dan, I think you should be proud of the fact that you haven't been abused a bit here. You've got the darnedest bunch of friends here. I don't think you even realized you had them, but you can see some of the problems a very few of them have evolved, and I'm sure that you have something to say. I've seen you taking some notes, so hop to it, Dan.

JANZEN -- Well, this question of personnel is one which I think is a problem to those in the Federal Service, just as well as in the state service. There probably hasn't been the migration of employees to the state service as to the Fish & Wildlife, but on the other hand, maybe there's some pretty good reasons why there has been especially this migration in the last couple or three years. I was trying to check here and see just what activity in the Fish and Wildlife Service does draw from biologists, trained men. We have the National Wildlife Refuge System, we have the Federal Aid work, we have River Basin Studies and a few men in the

Predator-Rodent Control Division. Very few men have come from the state in recent years to the Wildlife Refuge System. We have our own training program, we have training divisions and we are trying to promote within the organization entirely, the Refuge System. Every once in a while a state employee decides to take a Civil Service examination, and if he's eligible, especially if he is a veteran, he is probably at the top of the list, and is taken for the Refuge System. We welcome what additional experience we can get, but most of our men that have been in the Refuge Program have been educated within the organization and promoted within the organization. Federal Aid? Most of those men received their training in the state organization, and I think you will all agree that you would like to have the best trained men possible acting as Federal Aid Inspectors out of Regional Offices. They certainly wouldn't be much good to you if you didn't have men who had had training. If you have men who have had training in the state organization, they much better understand your situation, so I doubt that anybody is going to deplore the fact that we have some of the better grade men possibly in the Federal Aid Division. When I say better grade, I don't mean that at all. There are some of the Federal Aid positions in the state agencies that are just as high as our highest grade in the Federal Aid Division in our Regional Office, but I think we all agree that we should have the best qualified men in that division as we can. River Basin Studies have drawn very heavily upon state men, and I think there is probably a good reason for that. I think that you will agree that it would be impossible to take men right out of school and have them go right away to the various projects of the Army Engineers, the Reclamation Service, and the Soil Conservation Service. I think you want the best trained personnel evaluating those from the Federals up. I doubt that you'll question that. It does make it a bit difficult, but that's a new organization. That organization has sprung up within the last two years. We've tried to stab at an organization that will study the various federal projects and have set up a scale to try to get qualified men. I think that, for example, maybe Harrell Mosbaugh might like to make some few remarks himself, because he probably has the largest organization of River Basin personnel in one office or one group in the United States, so he might like to make some comment on that. He has some men, however, that he has taken right out of school also. The Civil Service Commission is setting up standards where standards do not now exist. They have felt exactly like you have felt, well--as we have felt, too, standards must exist. We have it in our own Fish and Wildlife Service. The respective branches sometimes squabble because one is robbing from the other, and so we have that problem right in our own organization. If there are any questions, I'll try to answer them; but that is the way I see the situation at the present time. Maybe I haven't answered your question at all, Paul. Would you like to have them tell me?

GILBERT -- Do you have some questions for Mr. Janzen?

MOSBAUGH -- Mr. Chairman?

GILBERT -- Mr. Mosbaugh.

MOSBAUGH — You'll have to observe this _____ up here. I just ran a little score sheet here and I think

AUDIENCE — Odds or evens?

MOSBAUGH — I'll have to put up with this heckling here. I've been running a recruiting service, and also a training program, now for four years. Out of forty men that I have at the present time, nine were associated with some state department of some kind, speaking of wildlife and aquatic biologists. I am excluding my engineering staff; that's another story. It is interesting to note that none of the P-1 has had state experience other than probably working during the summer months while they were in school. Several of them have worked in hatcheries or on surveys, and so forth. Now, I've done a little stealing from some of the states, and I think it has all been done above board. I haven't gone in the side doors. As you know, there are certain changes in state conservation departments at times which are beyond the control of state directors — you know to what I am referring — and at that time we often get inquiries from some of the boys who are employed by those respective states. Now, we operate under Civil Service regulations that are rather strenuous. I have objected, I have declined a number of P-1's, particularly pre-medic students, and until recently we had many of those on our Federal register. That has been changed quite a lot with the issuance of the more current register. As most of you know, there was an examination announced, I believe, in August a year ago covering the various positions that we have in the Basin Studies, and there were a lot of state employees that took that examination. I find that most of my boys who have been transferred have come either from other branches of the Fish and Wildlife Service or from other Federal Agencies, and I, in turn, have lost men to other branches of our own Service and to other Federal Agencies. Now, the thing that worries me at times is some way or means of providing these boys with some experience. I would certainly like to have men who have had state experience. That's a training—a type of training—you don't get in school. You don't get it anywhere, and I'm very frank in that statement. It is impossible probably to provide training for some of these young fellows that will develop the type of judgment so we would like to see them use. That will come from a longer period of experience. Now, maybe it would be impossible to set up standards from the various states that would be comparable to the Civil Service standards. I doubt whether that would be possible, and until that is done, you are going to lose some personnel. I think, in all fairness to the young biologist, he should be given an opportunity to select the position that he feels is most advantageous to him, and the one which he will most enjoy. Again, I have certainly attempted to do some stealing, and others have attempted to steal from me, on this quest for personnel.

RIDER — Mr. President. I'm in agreement with what these gentlemen have said, and I compliment you on getting high-class men. I certainly would want to do it, and I don't want to stand in the way of any young biologist. I always tell them "For goodness sake, go", but I think again it comes right back to we administrators—that's possibly the reason we're having to do this in some cases because

these men are taken--comes back to we administrators putting out too much money to the starting biologist. I'll give you an idea. I have a friend who is personnel director of one of the largest banking chains in the United States. He has 38 banks and they run from 13 to 250 employees in each of those banks. He employs all of them. I asked him about a month ago what he would give them. "Well", he said, "you've asked a good question, because I have a few model graduates of the Harvard School of Finance and I have a few model graduates of the Horton School of Finance. I've put them both to work at \$160 a month. Now, if they move along, this fall we'll up them to \$200. I don't think the Horton School of Finance man is going to be worth a darn he probably won't last until spring in this organization. The Harvard man seems to be coming along. If he progresses like that, he ought to be a branch manager around \$6,000 a year within the next five years". Now, I believe that we ought to run state organizations like an industrial concern. I think that we are at fault when we get into paying \$3600 to \$4000 to an unknown coming out of any college--that's just not good business. Smart businessmen don't do that, and I believe that we could correct some of this situation if we, ourselves, set some standards which would not encourage that sort of thing.

LEAHY -- What do you think, Mr. Rider, is the best starting salary for a biologist?

JANZEN -- I'd like to mention that . . .

RIDER -- OH, I'd say somewhere in the neighborhood of \$3000. In fact, I was tickled to death to come out of college and go into one of the toughest professions on earth. I stuck by it for some twenty years--coaching. I was tickled to death to sign a contract for \$1800 a year that terminated with the loss of a game. I worked under that contract for two years. Anytime I lost a game, I was out of a job.

???? -- Salaries went farther in those days, Buck.

RIDER -- Well, yes, it did, but it didn't go any farther than about \$3000 would go today.

JANZEN -- Probably most of you are acquainted with the entrance salaries in the Federal Service, but since Mr. Leahy asked that question, the P-1 grade--which is the grade in which all biologists out of school without substantial experience--is \$2900. That applies to biologists, foresters, junior chemists, and almost all scientific grades in the Government service. They start as P-1's. That used to be the old \$1800. Then back in '29, it went to \$2000 and now it's gone up to \$2900.

RIDER -- Well, I find this. If the man really thinks he's got it on the ball, he's not going to worry about, too much about that salary. Incidentally, I worked for two years, and had two years of undefeated football, and then said \$5000 or I leave. They said, "Gee whiz, we can't pay that", and I said "Well, I know of a town that can, so I'll go", and I went. I collected \$5000, I think, which was an awful high salary for a football coach in 1941, a high school football coach.

GILBERT -- Any other comments?

RUHL -- It seems to me we might as well recognize the fact that supply and demand just can't be circumvented too successfully, and that we shouldn't be too discouraged by it. In the first place, I don't think we could leave it to the colleges to train people for specific jobs; I don't think they could do it. That means every state agency has to have a training program. How you do it, how many compartments you have, depends upon what you have to do and on your supervision. What you need to develop your own staff and training program, you need to start with enough base. You know some of them aren't going to make the grade. Some of them are going to want to go. They don't recognize public contacts, they don't have savvy, to use the word. Some are going to be sucked off into other fields because they find that this other field happens to be perhaps more interesting, or there is more money in it, and then I'm encouraged by the fact that they've got -- how many down in Ohio State?

RIDER -- I guess sixty down there.

RUHL -- Lord help them if they had six hundred. Presently, we can take the cream and then our problem is over as far as getting the men, a matter of supply and demand. I'm happy to see, as far as employers are concerned, a large number of people taking wildlife management. Now, as far as the kids are concerned, a lot of them are going to make a mistake, perhaps, but so far as the employers are concerned, that's going to be our salvation. We could do a little picking then. We're right now behind the eight-ball, because we held it back in the war--held it back in the G. I. training period. We have P-R and now we have the Dingle Bill. We're going to be scratching for about three years yet.

RIDER -- Well, Harry, we could use sixty from Ohio state if they were all willing to take the Game Protector's examination and start at the bottom rather than as president's.

RUHL -- Well, then offer them that. If they don't take it, come up and get the Michigan boys.

RIDER -- But the difficulty is that if you offer them that in Ohio, some state out here is offering \$3600 to \$4000 for that young unknown.

RUHL -- Well, that's mostly in the south.

RIDER -- We can correct our setup.

RUHL -- Well, that's mostly in the south, and it isn't going to continue very long either.

GILBERT -- Mr. Mosbaugh.

MOSBAUGH -- Mr. Chairman. At the present time during the past field season, I had 24 SP's on my staff for a period of 90 days. About 70% of those were under-graduate students. The others were graduate students. This fall for the first time, we are using the limited number of SP's on wildlife studies. Now, I'm thinking, if we used

all those boys, still running a training program, some of you states can get some of them some of these days. There's some very good boys coming up. I've been pleasantly surprised with the calibre of boys we've been getting in this SP class, so maybe it will work both ways.

GILBERT -- Gentlemen, it's three minutes after four. We started at five minutes after two, and we're going to have to discontinue this thing on time. We've got only a few minutes to close, and I want that few minutes. In the first place, I would like to say that perhaps we would have more biologists if the Hoover Committee, among other things, would check on why we have to have certain Federal Biologists to check up on the work of other certain Federal Biologists. Enough of that. Now, this all leads up as with -- what's the matter, is that just sinking in? You know, I'm wondering if you're beginning to -- yeah, Feast, Feast just got it too -- I'm wondering if perhaps now you're not beginning to catch the feeling of what we meant when we said we were building this convention around professional unity. In our coyote discussion, all of our project discussion, and our personnel discussion, that thing's been brought up again and again, as I hoped it would be. Now, it's foolish to have resolutions, it's foolish to have conventions or committees, unless you do something about it, and I'm talking to some of you directors. We've come up with this suggestion. We want to find out now if you are interested in it, and if you indicate your interest, tomorrow sometime, after we've given serious thought to it, we'll get going, but we feel that it is necessary that at time of legislative stress--and, certainly we all have that, some of us more than others--that we be fully armed with every single bit of pertinent information of proof possible. There is only one way to get that proof, and that is by writing around to the various states and so is born that obnoxious questionnaire thing that we get every day in the week from somebody someplace. Maybe we fill it out or maybe we're so sick of them that we forget them. This is too bad, because, as I say, there are times when definitely all of us need certain information that is pertinent to our attacks on certain groups, certain legislatures, and so on, and in thinking this over, I couldn't help but realize how wonderful it would be to me personally, if just before legislative time, I could receive--be it printed, mimeographed, written, typewritten, or what--a complete synopsis of the administrative break-down, by departments, by jobs, of all of the various states in this group, and there's a lot of us now. If I could get a copy of the salary schedule of that group along with the paper, if I knew the trends of the thinking of my colleagues in these various states, so that our Commissioners could understand those same trends and know what was happening and be so armed, we would have a Utopian goal, perhaps, if we tried to arrive at a uniform salary schedule, but we'd have something with which to work, even if it's a little thing like coyotes, whether it shall be the scalp or the ears or the lips or the tail or what not, if we're going to claim our bounty. There are many points in there which would be very very valuable to us and if we had--be it called a vigilante committee, it would be a diligent committee, that's if it's going to work--first of all, a committee of three (I don't think it should be anymore than that) men appointed to draw up a questionnaire, to end

all questionnaires, which would be duplicated, as many copies as needed by all of the various states, and sent out each year and especially on the legislative year and especially prior to the meeting of the legislature and a compendium, if you please, which would coagulate this unity which we are all striving for--unity of breakdown of administrative personnel, unity of breakdown of salaries, unity of regulations, and so forth. We meet here once a year and we talk over all of these things and appoint a resolution committee; usually little's done about it, but if we had a committee of three men that are really willing to give their time and energies to this thing, I think that we would begin to achieve this professional unity that I'm talking about. I'd like to have your discussion or ideas on that before we close, and it is quitting time.

RIDER -- I move that such a committee be appointed by the President, to devise such a questionnaire and correlate the results when they are returned, and submit it to the executive committee along with recommendations.

GILBERT -- Is there a second?

SCOTT -- I'd like to ask a question. However, I'd like to make a comment while I second the motion. There is no question as to the merits of your suggestion. I think it's wonderful, but I think it doesn't go far enough. Many of our states would like to know what New York and California are doing too--what their plans and their salary scales are--and I think that nationally, we need a division of information which can answer these questions and whose business it is to answer the questions. We had cases at our last legislature where we needed information fast. Sometimes you couldn't even foresee that you needed it, but you needed it in two days. If there was an agency to which you could wire and be sure you got an answer with the facts, it would be a wonderful thing. I certainly would like to throw that out publicly as a suggestion for either the Fish and Wildlife Service or the Wildlife Management Institute. I'd like to see some agency that would have all these facts at their fingertips so we could get them when we want them.

GILBERT -- I think, Mr. Scott, your suggestion certainly has merit. It would be a tremendous job, and we're starting on a very small scale in our little family group to coordinate our own thinking in unity between us. If that spreads into the International, that's wonderful.

FEAST -- Mr. Chairman, may I . . .

GILBERT -- Mr. Feast.

FEAST -- ...say a work or two as a member of the Executive Committee International. That has been considered for a number of years, and the only thing that defeated it was its varied magnitude. We felt that it was above the time that could be given by anybody who has so much work to do at home, and that was what came out of the discussions in the Executive Committee, that perhaps it could be started on the group level. I know that we'll probably consider such a proposition out west, and I, frankly, think it's one of the most im-

portant things that we administrators have to contend with.

GILBERT -- I'd like to mention that if you do approve this motion, there will only be three men appointed and they will be appointed from neighboring states in order that they may be able to get together periodically. We find out that it works very fine. Mr. Mosbaugh, and Mr. Feast, Mr. Bode and myself have tried it continually on this Army Engineer-Reclamation Bureau story. We've had lots of meetings, we can get together quick, and it can be done.

???? -- Mr. Chairman. Last year the Wildlife Institute published such a report, and I'd suggest the committee obtain a copy.

GILBERT -- That's true. They did publish such a report, but I don't believe that it had all of the things that we have mentioned here in it pertaining particularly to our local mid-western area.

???? -- It would be a good basis, though, for a beginning.

GILBERT -- Yes, a very good basis, a very good basis.

STARKWEATHER -- Mr. President. As I have listened to the discussion here, there are two things that strike me, and Ray has given me some information here as to the various starting salaries to the different states, and certainly the salary is not the only answer as it was brought up over here. Starting salary doesn't mean anything unless you have a unified minimum requirement. Now, you can't tell me that the starting salaries listed here for Iowa, Nebraska, Dakota, Colorado, and Wyoming, of \$2000, that those people have the same minimum requirements or the responsibilities in the position that Florida, Washington, and California does where they start them in at \$4000 to \$4500, so the classifications of the job, and when I say classifications I'm talking about what we call specifications on our Minnesota Civil Service law, tie in directly with the starting salary. You've got to have that minimum requirement.

GILBERT -- That should be in there; but Mr. Starkweather, for your information, I must not agree with you, because the individual is working at those low salaries in Nebraska and has the same responsibilities as the individual at those higher salaries.

STARKWEATHER -- Well, that may be true, perhaps, in Nebraska, that's a matter of appropriation, but generally speaking, there's one item I'd like to touch on right along that line, which, I think it was, Ohio also mentioned about their game protectors and the examination which they took. Now, here's been our experience. Since the Minnesota Civil Service Law went into effect, we've had two Civil Service examinations over there for our law enforcement personnel, and both times something in excess of 600 individuals from all walks of life took those examinations. They have to be residents of the state. In the first examination, I think there were 15 or 16 who were graduates of the four year University Wildlife Management course. Not a one of them got high enough so we picked them up. Why? They never gave them any protector service over there at all. I mean law enforcement as far as that Game Management course isn't included in there and part of our examination over there was on their

knowledge of wildlife. I would say about one-third of it was on game and fish law and yet we never were able to pick up one of them. Now, I think there were about 10 or 12 graduates of that class who took the last examination about a year ago. We have picked up three of those. Only one who--and we're down to 90, almost a 100 from the top of the list now--we have picked up three of those boys--very good men. I'm saying this because as you say, we would like to get those fellows in enforcement or fisheries or any place. Let them gather the experience and then by a competitive promotional examination, rather than a competitive open examination, promote them along the line, and get what we are now trying to get. Out of these 10 or 12 that took the last examination, we have picked up three. Only one of which we would have picked up in 100 if all three of them wouldn't have had better instructors. Now, that doesn't speak very well for the course in my judgement.

RIDER — That's right.

STARKWEATHER — Four years of training that these fellows are getting in Game Management and they can't take a game protectors, or warden's service, or law enforcement examination, and qualify above the average run-of-the-mill sportsman throughout the state--that doesn't make sense to me, Ray, and I think, Tom Schrader, Dr. Martin, and Dr. Lloyd Smith. It has been one of my pet phobias that they do not give that over there and that we do not pick more of those boys up, both in our fisheries, that is, our fish cultures. Ray will tell you that, I think, we graduated too many, about '60 or something like that, over there and they're not qualified biologists. Ray can't, those boys can't take our Civil Service examination for a biologist over there and expect to pass it. Now that don't make sense to me.

RIDER — Now, Mr. President, I, to cut time short, in one of my discussions with Dean Rummel, I brought this question out to him. "Well," he said to me "just what are the standards?" I mentioned just the things you mentioned. I said if you are going to give a man a course in Wildlife Management, certainly, we all agree that restrictive measures are a tool in management. We can't dispense with them. I don't think any of us will agree that we can. And certainly the enforcement of these regulations, there's certainly an awful sharp tool in game management. My God, we don't need to establish restrictions unless you can enforce them.

STARKWEATHER — Most of your restrictions, your laws are based.....

RIDER — Sure,....

STARKWEATHER — ...on game management practices.

RIDER — ...but who am I, one individual, to tell the Dean of a great university what the standards should be? I don't believe that college professors are adequately trained to know just what those folks need. I sight to you the American Medical Association. They tell the Medical Schools what kind of courses are necessary to turn out efficient M.D.'s. Well, if we had standards, we could possibly pass them on to some of the university professors who are working in ignorance.

GILBERT — Are there any other questions? We better vote on this only by one delegate from each state. All those in favor signify by raising their right hand this time. All those opposed, left hand, same. The motion is carried. Gentlemen. Tomorrow morning at 10:00 we'll start out with the Dingle Bill.

Morning Session, October 4, 1949

GILBERT — I hope that before this afternoon, you will find time to— if you haven't done so already—read the changes in the By-laws here. I think you all have copies of them. If I sound like I just got up, I did. A few announcements. Some of you have not availed yourselves, as yet, of the rare privilege of seeing our fair exhibit, so you're going to find yourselves with more time today. You're going to have again from 12:00 to 2:00, of course, and for those of you that are not pulling out right away, we'll be out of here at 4:00, so our officers will still be around to furnish any transportation you may need. Does anybody have any announcements that they want to make before we get started?

SCOTT — I'd like to make an announcement. Gentlemen, I want to remind you of the Midwest Wildlife Conference at Madison, December 15th to 17th. You've all probably heard about it, but I want to extend a personal invitation here today to all of you who can come. Please come to our fair city and to a very fine meeting.

GILBERT — Any other announcements? We'll pick up right where we left off. I think we're to the point that we were about ready to dangle the Dingle. I said no speeches; but frankly, while some of you probably picked up the story at International, some of us are anxious to have it repeated in order that we may crystallize our thinking. If it's signed, I have a letter here in which you might be interested which was handed me last night from Carl Schumacher. Maybe you've seen it. "The Dingle Bill, providing for Federal Aid to state fishery projects, is on the desk of President Truman for his approval. There is some opposition to his affixing his signature to this bill, arising not from any opposition to wildlife, but from the policy of the Treasury Department to oppose earmarking excise taxes and cover revenues for specific purposes." In talking to Cap last night, he was grateful for the telegrams that we sent out, but he says if any of us had any personal approach to Truman, which, of course, lets we Nebraskan's out, to by all means capitalize upon it. In other words, if you know anybody that knows anybody that knows someone that knows Truman, get on them, and get on them right away. Our office is available upstairs for your service. So, inasmuch as this is to us, such an important topic, Dan Janzen, I wish you would come up here, if you will, and explain to us. I realize that there are many things that are not known yet about the Dingle Bill and the possibilities, but try to motivate us and stimulate us into some possible project thinking, if you will. Just come up here, because I don't want you to give a speech now, we just want down to earth stuff. You're looking fresh and fit as a fiddle this morning.

JANZEN — Paul, I feel fit. Well, I don't know if there's—I don't know how many of you were at the meeting at Winnipeg when this question of the Dingle Bill was discussed. Al Day talked on it briefly. The Bill, as you know, gives the same program to fish that Pittman-Robertson does to wildlife. It's drawn up along the same lines. The Bill has a few differences as over the Pittman-Robertson Act. In general, it provides for research, rehabilitation, and restorational projects, in much the same manner as does the Pittman-Robertson Act; you all have probably had a chance to see the Act, so

I don't know why I should go into the particulars, except that you might want to ask me questions. There is one matter, however, that I think we might discuss, and that is the question of how it might be administered. Those of you who were at Winnipeg know that the association, International Commissioners Association, passed a resolution asking the Fish and Wildlife Service to combine the administration of the Dingle Bill and the Pittman-Robertson Act in one division or branch in the Fish and Wildlife Service. The Society of American Fisheries two days later passed the same resolution, not the same resolution, but a resolution to the same effect. Now, I didn't sit in at the Resolution Committee, I didn't sit in on the background of the discussion, but talking to the various game commissioners, I found that they felt something like this about this particular phase of this problem. That they didn't want another set of instructions, they didn't want another set of forms, another procedure, or the possibility of another procedure being set up in this Federal Aid Fisheries work. They said they now felt that they had enough of a job to keep up with the rules and regulations as set up under the Federal Aid program. Well, now, if this is going to be combined, of course, it's going to mean a complete revamping of the present hand book on the Federal Aid work, because there are some features in here that are a little different from the features we have found in the Pittman-Robertson Act; but how it will be handled, I cannot say. I talked to Director Day just before we left. He says that the thing is not settled, but he said it was quite significant from the activities of the two associations at Winnipeg. Now, there are probably a number of questions here which you might want to discuss, I don't know. One of them has to do with how this money is going to be apportioned. It's here in the Act. It's a little different than in the--it's a little different than the wording in the Pittman-Robertson Act, and is going to be quite different probably in the way the results will finally end. It says "forty percent will be determined on the basis of the area of each state, including coastal and great lakes waters"--now it's going to require quite a bit of determination on just what is coastal and great lakes waters--"bears to the total area of all the states." Forty percent on that basis. "Sixty percent on the number of persons holding paid licenses to fish for sport or recreation in the state." So you see that's a little different than the Federal Aid to Wildlife Act. I don't think, you didn't want me to take time, Paul, to go over the whole provisions of the Act, did you? I didn't come prepared for that.

GILBERT -- I want you to take time to answer any questions that come into the mind of the delegates here if you can answer them.

JANZEN -- Well, I'd be glad to do that. I don't want to leave with any of you, the idea that definitely it is going to be administered as one program. That is the Federal Aid and the Wildlife--to Fish and the Federal Aid to Wildlife as one program, but I have a hunch that that's probably the way it will end up in some form or other. Incidentally, for those of you who weren't at Winnipeg, and haven't given this a great deal of thought, now, and before I go into that, I want to be sure that this applies only to the Federal administration, not to the administration in the respect to state. It was cleared up in various cloakroom discussions, that this resolution was not intended to apply to any state requiring it, or asking or suggesting that

it combine it's Fish and Wildlife Federal Aid program, but it was that the Fish and Wildlife Service, in it's overhead administration, combine it's program. The reason for that is this. We have now some engineering service, land acquisition service, auditing service, and clerical service which could be used for both branches. You don't need to be a specialist in any one of those for the particular, whether it's fish or wildlife, it makes no difference, so that could be common. We will have to have, of course, a section of fish technicians and a section of wildlife technicians in our regional offices and central office to handle this program, but all of the rest of the services can be used common to both sections. It's a question of administration. Are there any questions?

RUHL -- Dan, I don't see why it's necessary to combine the manuals because in some states the fish division and the fish work will be in a separate agency almost. Can't the boys read two books, if necessary?

JANZEN -- Well, maybe, I -- maybe.

RUHL -- It seems to me it might be simpler, perhaps, since there are some differences of calculations to keep them separate so far as the manual is concerned.

JANZEN -- Well, you would probably be in as good a position as anyone to speak with knowledge on that subject, because of the long association you've had with that special committee that's been working on the manual for the Pittman-Robertson Act.

RUHL -- It just might well be that you can write certain sections that will apply to both and then sub-divide the rest of it, I don't know. I wouldn't think that would be any particular difficulty.

JANZEN -- We expect quite a number of projects that will have both fish and wildlife value.

RUHL -- Should have.

JANZEN -- We know that some states are holding back on projects now which have some fish value, and which they know we can't approve under the Federal Aid Act, because they haven't the money, or don't want to spend the fisheries money on it now, and hope they can spend it under the Dingle Bill. Now, whether we will require two projects to be submitted simultaneously, or whether we could work out a form whereby one project could have both, I don't know. That will be something that will have to be worked out and that will depend a little upon which is the least complicated.

RIDER -- Do you anticipate that all states are going to have to pass enabling acts similar to --

JANZEN -- It's required. Let's see, oh, oh, I haven't got that. Have you got a point on that Sam Jorgensen?

JORGENSEN -- It's the same. The wording is the same.

JANZEN -- The wording is the same? Do you think the enabling act now in existence would --

JORGENSEN -- Power or assent of the Governor until the Legislature convenes.

JANZEN -- That is the same, but would the wording of the enabling act that now exists in most states cover this bill, do you think?

JORGENSEN -- Well, that I don't know. Well, no, the present enabling act wouldn't apply to the Federal Aid to Fisheries.

RIDER -- No. That enabling act is practically the same in every state, that is, the Act was handed right out of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

JANZEN -- Yes, was that specific?

RIDER -- I suppose that there might, because of some constitutional differences, there's probably some differences in the various states, but it's pretty general.

JORGENSEN -- I think probably you'd have to have a separate enabling act.

RIDER -- I think that's right. I think that act --

JANZEN -- I think that will include most states, but some of them were, for example, we stuck in fisheries too in the diversion because our funds were made of state fish and game licenses, see.

LEAHY ? -- All that act requires is that the funds be not diverted to Fish and Game usage. If you already had it on the statute as applying to both fish and game, I wouldn't think you would need another enabling act.

JANZEN -- Yes. Now here's what it says specifically. "No money" and this is what I think is all that will be necessary to read here, "No money apportioned under this act to any state except as herein-after provided shall be expended therein until it's legislature or other state agency authorized by the state constitution to make laws governing the conservation of fish shall have assented to the provisions of this act and shall have passed laws for the conservation of fish which shall include a prohibition against the diversion of license fees paid by fishermen for any other purpose than the administration of said fish and game department except that until the final adjournment of the first regular session of the legislature held after passage of this act, the assent of the Governor of the state shall be sufficient"; so, apparently, it's going to require a special assent act, all right, but it will probably be worded just like the other act.

RIDER -- As I read that, I interpret it to mean that we do not have to wait until we have a legislative session ...

JANZEN -- That's right.

RIDER -- ...to go into this thing.

JANZEN -- The assent of the Governor is okay until the first time that the legislature meets. Paul.

GILBERT -- Yes sir. If these are combined, wouldn't there be a tendency, first of all, I think, probably from an economical standpoint, we'd better say a word. We don't want too many eight percenters floating around--guess Dan's a five percenter. By the same token, I'm wondering if there's a possibility there, since Pittman-Robertson on the game side is already set up, if there wouldn't be a tendency towards a submersion of fisheries underneath. Now, to me, that would be serious, because as far as we're concerned here, we wish that certain other phases of the Federal Government, and I'm speaking on a wider scope than the Fish and Wildlife Service, but we're including some of it, certain other agencies and certain other departments in the Fish and Wildlife Service, could learn an awful lot in diplomacy, public relations, and getting along with states and people, by following the Fisheries division. We have less trouble there than any place. We get along better. We don't have a bible thrown in our face with a legal interpretation every five minutes, and frankly, it's the most wonderful thing you've ever had. You should try to motivate and stimulate that same type of relationship with your states. That's the reason I say, and I'm not picking on Sam here at all, I think everything's been well with him. Now--no, really, really, I'm not. Sam is harnessed with this thick P-R bible, maybe you're reading it a little more safely now, but we are harnessed with this thick book and you have to have an attorney go through the thing and figure it out, and Sam here right with us, figure out what the devil you can do and you can't do. Now, if we're going to add fisheries to it, it will get just twice as thick. If this thing can be simplified, equalized and personalized on the state level, we'll have something wonderful, but if it's going to be bureauized and complicated, it's going to be tough.

RIDER -- Well, Paul, I can answer your question. As I said on the Resolutions Committee at the International, as that was drawn, it was our feeling for administrative simplicity and to save dollars that the organization that's already set up down at the Service might be termed a Federal Aid section or division, see, and the two funds administered right through the same channels. Always, however, the fish men who were there didn't seem to think that it would hurt the fisheries at all, that it would hurt their fund to do it in that fashion.

JANZEN -- Paul, what I'm thinking of is this. I think that probably you can visualize it. I don't want to see, or you don't want to see, the fisheries auditor come here one week, the next week the wildlife auditor, the following week the fisheries engineer, and next week a wildlife engineer. You send in a combination fish and wildlife --

GILBERT -- If we can get them here that often, we'll be happy to have them.

JANZEN -- Remember, that comes out of the apportioned funds.

RIDER -- Yep.

JANZEN -- That costs money. If we had a combination fish and wildlife project, or if you had two separate branches, they'd each want to send their own engineer to look at it. You'd have two engineers.

RIDER -- Or two appraisers.

JANZEN — If they will do it?

???? -- In the bill, the appropriation.

JANZEN — Well, that was my understanding, but I wasn't sure, because there was an amendment. I guess maybe that was the duck stamp amendment that requires appropriation, also. That's what had me confused for a minute, but I think you're right on that. There's been no amendment on this particular bill. But, Ed, on your question on commercial fisheries, it's answered right here. "For the purpose of this act the terms 'Fish Restoration and Management Projects'" in a quote "shall be construed to mean projects designed for the restoration and management of all species of fish which have material value in connection with sport or recreation in the marine and/or fresh waters of the United States" and then they include four points.

???? — Well, there are certain species like the walleye that have both a commercial value and a sports value. They're sort of hybrids.

???? — I have a hunch there's going to be probably quite a different interpretation on this particular bill.

JANZEN — As I say, it's pretty difficult to go into a complete discussion of the Dingle Bill at this stage. The Service has not spent any time, or very little time, on this because the bill wasn't passed, and as you know, some of these bills take ten years before they pass. If we spent all that time trying to work out the details before the bill was passed, and we don't know what the amendments might be, why we would be wasting a lot of time.

RIDER — There is no question about it, though, the intention of Congress on this was sport fishing.

JANZEN — That's right. I think it's very ---

RIDER — I don't know, is there an excise tax on a gill net or a trap net or the equipment and the gear used in commercial fishing? Is there? If there is, I don't believe this bill includes that.

JANZEN — I don't know. Paul?

GILBERT — Maybe I'm asking too many questions here, but as I say, this means a lot to us. This may be a little bit off of the discussion, but I wonder if either you or Dr. Rider could give us an idea of what the trend has been in the last few years in some of your training institutions. Has the majority of training been done in the game field, or are they getting some budding fishery biologists available? What is the trend there?

JANZEN — Well, there are probably others that are better qualified to answer that than I, but by the contacts that I've made, I would say that the trend has been, of course, in the wildlife field, because the boys would have a chance, or felt they might have a chance to work into this expanding program of wildlife, especially because of the large number of technicians that have been hired under the Pittman-Robertson Act. Now, we have a similar incentive for fish, but there hasn't been that incentive, and it's been very difficult

and there's going to be, probably, quite a bit more grumbling about robbing Peter or Paul, here, of personnel.

RUHL -- A lot more states, or there's a lot more places where game management is being taught than fishery management, too.

JANZEN -- That's right, that's right.

???? -- Must be three or four times as many schools.

JANZEN -- Ray, would you want to make a comment on that? Does anybody? Mel?

STEEN -- You know, I've been listening to this discussion. I think what Paul Gilbert was trying to say, although he may be too much of a gentleman to say so, is that he likes the administrative policies and activities that are obtained in the fisheries branch of your work. He likes them better than he does those that exist in P-R. That's what he says actually, although he doesn't quite want to say so, and he fears, I think, that fisheries are going to be molded along P-R lines, whereas he would prefer to see P-R gravitate towards the fisheries mode of operation.

JANZEN -- Well, I've been thinking for quite awhile that I'd have to have "Cap" Culler get up and take a bow.

STEEN -- The other thing I wanted to mention was that he said this morning something about the personal contacts. Well, that sort of puts us Missourians on the spot, but I can tell you that the President was in Missouri last week, and that that personal contact was made at that time.

JANZEN -- Well, are there any other comments on the Dingle Bill? If there's no further questions, why the floor is all yours, Paul. I want to reiterate one more thing here, Paul, as you come up, and that is that what you and Buck were here discussing on biologists. As I visualize it in our office--and the states do deal primarily with our office in the day to day administration of the Federal Aid Act--we will have a supervisor or a coordinator in our office, whatever you want to call him. He may be a fisheries man, he may be a wildlife man. We don't select them for ability as a fisheries or wildlife man, but for ability to supervise and administer the program. He will have two sections, a fish section and a wildlife section, a section for each. Then there will be engineering, land acquisition, auditing, and the clerical office, which will service both sections. That's the way I picture it now. Maybe it won't be that way, but that's the way I think the trend will be.

GILBERT -- Thanks a lot, Dan. My only point was that if I had made a study of feminine pulchritude and had figured out the personalities and peculiarities of blondes more so than brunettes, I'd probably date blondes, if you get the point. We now have come, and we're going to have to move right along on this, to the, actually the first phase of this discussion. It can be brief. I think it should be handled the same way we handled our Pittman-Robertson discussion--that's what it chiefly was yesterday--that is by roll call of states in order that we may know what our neighbors are doing, what the

trends are in game populations, game trends and so on, because we are asked all the time "How's antelope running in Colorado or Wyoming," and "How's fishing in Minnesota," and so on, so we'll run right through a brief, but on-the-nose report, each one of you, of the game conditions by states. Elmer, would you direct this phase of the discussion, just run through--

PETERSON --Pardon me.

GILBERT -- Would you come forward and lead this phase of the discussion? Just take the individual states through a report. We would appreciate it, and feel it's an honor to have you up here with us. Here's the states, and you can take them by name and make this short.

PETERSON -- You betcha. As Paul told you, we're going to have to move along. As I look at this program, and look at the time, I hope you'll keep that in mind. At the same time, we want to give you time enough to bring out the things that you want brought out and as much time as possible for discussion. The topic is Report on Game Conditions by the Individual States and Provinces and we'll call the roll alphabetically. Indiana. Mr. Cottingham.

COTTINGHAM -- Mr. Chairman. Game trends in Indiana are better and looking nicer than we have had them for a number of years now. In going through our different species, we have the squirrel season on right now and with a normal population, possibly down a little bit in our best habitat in the south due to four mass drops last year. Reports on the season have been good, however. They have been good. Quail--Indiana has lots of them--population in our better habitat areas in the south part of the state is normal--up too, I'd say--this year which will furnish very good hunting. We do have something that surprised us a lot in the northern half of the state which isn't considered our best habitat. We have the highest population of quail that we have had probably in twenty years. Such a surprise as finding two or three coveys of quail on a 100-acre farm, and that's pretty general all over the north half of the state, due, I guess, to a good carry-over, the mild winters in the north half of that state that we've had for three or four years, and an excellent early nesting season this year. Rabbits comprise a very heavy bag of our hunters, and are up generally all over the state. Pheasants have been on an all time low for about three years and their populations there show about the same this year as it was last year and the year before, or we're still in--this year will make our third year--an all time low. We are opening the season for three days. Hungarian partridge which established themselves in the northeastern part of the state in the early thirties have been progressing and spreading from the establishment that was in about two counties, to about twenty counties, moving south and west. The general picture, as I said, on all the small game is good, with the exception of pheasants. Indiana has a deer herd. We attempted to get an open season on it in this past legislature which ended last March, and we failed on it. We don't know what to expect at this time. We might be able to get it open in two years or it will be three years this fall. Our legislature doesn't meet again for two years. It probably sounds odd, but Indiana actually has a deer problem, and as far as venison here in Nebraska, I think Indiana probably had it last night in a good part of southern Indiana. We have an awfully lot of illegal deer killing. I think that's all.

PETERSON — Does anyone have any questions they would like to ask Mr. Cottingham?

???? — Does Indiana depend entirely upon the legislature for everything they do in regulations?

COTTINGHAM — Just in opening the season. We have discretionary powers to regulate, but we can't open them. We can close one, limit the seasons, or set the seasons and the bag.

PETERSON — Any further questions. If not, we'll go on to Iowa.

STILES — Mr. Chairman. I think the game populations in Iowa are a little above—considering all species—the last five year average. The pheasant population is about 15% better than last year, somewhere between 15 and 20 percent, approximately. I think our biologists report was 12 to 15 percent at the time they brought in a recommendation for an open season, but they are even a little more optimistic at the present time, so I think I am safe in saying that our present population is up 15 percent. We're having an open season in seventy-five of Iowa's ninety-nine counties. Just about the reverse is true of quail. Our quail population is down. In order to better manage the harvest, we have cut down on the bag limit; we haven't changed the number of hunting days; and, we have increased the number of counties in which quail may be hunted in order to disperse the concentration of hunters. We have cut the bag limit and added a few counties around the periphery of our quail range. We have fifty-one counties open to quail. The quail population is down. Our rabbit population was low last year. It is no better this year; especially in the southeastern part of Iowa, our rabbit population is noticeably down. Squirrel population is probably about on a par with last year. We haven't noticed much change from last year or the year before. In the area of the state that produces ducks, the northwestern part of the state particularly, we had some increase in the number of ducks—local ducks—produced in Iowa. We're adding one new fur-bearer to our list, and that is the beaver. We are opening the beaver season in thirty-three counties. In the past, for about three or approximately four years, people have been allowed to trap beaver where they are causing damage on a special permit, but the last legislative session put beaver on the fur-bearing animal list as a regular fur-bearer, allowing the commission to provide an open season, and it will be open for seven days in thirty-three counties. Muskrat and mink population probably is not greatly different considering the state as a whole from the year before. However, last year southern Iowa had a very low population of muskrats. There has been some come-back in that population, and there was a low population along the Mississippi River above Muskateen. That means that we had that area closed last year, and we had about a southern third of the state closed. We have no open season on the deer, in Iowa, but like Indiana, the deer has caused us a lot of headaches; and like Indiana, we are not able to open the season on deer except by a legislative act. The commission can open seasons, or close seasons, adjust bag limits, possession limits, and territorial limits on all species that have been named by the legislature and upon which there is an open season, or has been; but we can't add any new species to the list. In order to provide an open season on deer, we will have to have a legislative act. We do have a heavy

concentration of deer, especially along the Des Moines River valley north of Des Moines, along the Skunk River for a fifty-mile stretch around Saney in the northeast corner of the state, and again north and east of Council Bluffs along the Missouri bottom. I think that just about covers the principal species there.

PETERSON — Thank you, Bruce.

???? — I'd like to ask a question.

PETERSON — Go ahead.

???? — You say you're going to open your season on beaver in thirty counties, is that right?

STILES — Thirty-three counties. That will be open for seven days.

???? — What fee do you charge? Is it the regular trapping fee?

STILES — Regular trapping fee.

???? — How much is it?

STILES — \$1.50.

???? — No limit on the take?

STILES — No limit on the take.

???? — Well, you won't have any beaver crop up there next year then, will you?

STILES — Well, we hope not, and I'd like to add this, that in Iowa we feel that game species must be compatible with our agricultural practices. When we have a species in Iowa that is not compatible to agriculture, we would much rather concentrate in more areas demanding the species that are compatible to agriculture. In certain sections of Iowa, the beaver is compatible to the agricultural practices there. In the flatter areas in the northwestern part of the state, we know that beaver do cause substantial damage. Now, we don't find many farmers that complain bitterly about cutting down cottonwood trees, but when a man has a valuable piece of flat black soil out there that's drained by a drainage ditch, and the beaver come in and build a dam in there and flood that land and make it so wet that you can't get in to work the field, and a man is delayed as much as two or three weeks in getting his crop in, we feel that that's damage. I think that as far as Iowa is concerned probably there may be a few beaver there and the greatest value that they can provide in Iowa is just some aesthetic value. That is in the northwestern part of the state. I doubt if they could do a great deal of damage in the rest of the state. That's the way we feel about the beaver. We're not a great deal concerned if they do take them.

???? — Well, are you going to tag them or anything?

STILES — No. No. We have no provision in the laws which requires them to be tagged. That's a matter of a legislative act and not a regulation of the commission.

???? -- Listen Bruce, do you allow non-residents to come in and trap?

STILES -- Yes. We have a reciprocal agreement and a non-resident from any state can come in and trap on the reciprocal basis providing that state allows a non-resident to come in.

RIDER -- Bruce, have you any idea—I'm interested to know if you know—why is your quail population down?

STILES -- What's that, Buck?

RIDER -- Why is your quail population down compared to last year? Do you have any reason for that?

STILES -- No. One reason that I'd like to give -- this is an unusual circumstance, and I think that it is probably closely related to excessive hunting pressure. Iowa had quail on the songbird list for sixteen years. Then in 1937, or '36, the legislature got it taken off. The legislative session of '35 got it taken off the songbird list, and our first open season was in 1937. Because it had been on the songbird list for sixteen years, many of our quail hunters passed out of the picture and no longer kept quail dogs, and the people that started hunting quail in our first open year were apparently few in number. I think even as far back as five years ago, we probably didn't have over 20,000 quail hunters in the State of Iowa. About a third of the state was open to quail hunting. It seemed to take ahold and more people got interested in it, more people bought dogs, and the pressure just increased enormously, tremendously. I think that probably the pressure on quail now in southern Iowa is approaching, has reached, or is approaching, the pressure that is exerted on our pheasant population.

RIDER -- Is the Audubon Society, the nature clubs, and the bread-crumb managers doing you any damage now?

STILES -- Doing any what?

RIDER -- Are they up in arms at all, doing any damage?

STILES -- No. No. They haven't been up in arms. In fact, I think, that, except for the normal ups and downs, our quail population has gone about the same as it did during the sixteen years when it was closed. We had apparently a peak season on quail in 1939. We had another high in about 1947, and I think that except for this last year, those highs and lows were completely unrelated to hunting pressure. I feel that probably this last low is related to hunting pressure, and that's something that we've tried to correct by reducing the bag and increasing the territorial limits in which they may hunt to disperse the hunters.

RIDER -- You've been so recently off that songbird list, I just wondered if there was any opposition working up now because of the fact that they're down a little bit this year. That is, does that give the folks who want to put them on the songbird list an opportunity to come back and argue that they should never have been taken off?

STILES -- They have not. We have met with our Audubon Clubs, and in fact, I have met personally with many Audubon Clubs throughout the State of Iowa. I think we have the Audubon people sold on the proposition that harvest is a part of management. We haven't had any complaints.

COTTINGHAM -- Bruce, may I ask a question here on your beaver, because we have some beaver petitions too. We also failed to get an open season on them as we did on deer in this past legislature. Are you actually attempting to eliminate the beaver?

STILES -- No, except we're not really concerned if the population is materially reduced. Some of the areas in Iowa have enormous beaver population. It exceeds the muskrat population, I'm sure. Last week I was on the Des Moines River. I was doing a little catfish fishing on the Des Moines River, probably thirty miles above Des Moines, and within a half mile above the bridge where I parked my car, I found four beaver lodges in addition to some bank dams, many many slides, and I wouldn't be surprised if what we had reached the saturation point there. Enormous numbers of beaver are found in those streams. They have spread pretty rapidly in Iowa. If we should almost eliminate them in certain areas, I think it would be just a matter of a short time till we'd have them back in there.

RIDER -- Have you set the season dates, Bruce?

STILES -- Yes. The beaver season is December 1 to 7.

STARKWEATHER -- Bruce, that will create a beautiful situation for Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan.

STILES -- It probably will. Now I might say something about tagging beaver. I think that the tagging of beaver differs from the necessity that requires the tagging of deer. It seems to me that if it is a legitimate enterprise to trap, that's a legitimate business, it should be conducted along somewhat the same lines as other legitimate businesses. I think the place to stop illegal trapping of beaver is with the fur dealers. I know that our laws as they deal with the handling of furs and with the fur dealers are very weak, and I also feel sure that we have made several attempts in the last two or three sessions of the legislature to get these things corrected, but I see no reason why we can't correct the bootlegging of beaver skins from one state to another through our regulation of the fur buyers. I'm sure that we could do it in Iowa and do it more effectively than we have with tagging.

???? -- Bruce, how long after the season closes are your beaver skins being accepted in Iowa?

STILES -- Thirty days after the season closes.

PETERSON -- Are there any further question? One more. Paul?

GILBERT -- I don't want it said now that I'm afraid to come out and pick on Bruce, because I'm not picking on Bruce when I say this. There's only one thing that I'm striving for and that's unity, but

I would say that this is just another good example of where this committee that we're talking about could function, because we're not together on our thinking on beaver. Frankly, we're scared to death of this Iowa season, because we think that we're going to have a lot of our beaver going over there. It's just a difference in thinking on the part of the game departments or the state legislature deal and ...

???? -- That's right.

GILBERT -- ...it's just another case where we can stand some uniformity in thinking on these various seasons and the tagging of beaver.

STARKWEATHER -- I want to say right along this line that my thinking is not a fear of our beaver going over there. If they're going to permit a non-resident to buy a trapping license which we, of course, do not, our boys can go over and buy an Iowa license and the fur buyer can go over there and buy some of your beaver.

STILES -- They can't buy a non-resident license unless their state provides for a non-resident license. It's on a reciprocal basis.

STARKWEATHER -- Oh, I see.

STILES -- In that way it's only ...

STARKWEATHER -- The question was asked whether we could buy it.

STILES -- ...the states that sell non-resident licenses that can buy them.

STARKWEATHER -- That doesn't apply to your fur buyer, however. A non-resident fur buyer can come in there and buy a license and buy your beaver. They're not required to tag them. It would be easy to go over there, buy two beaver, and bring them back to Minnesota as Iowa beaver; as long as we can't catch them bringing them over, they're going to be Minnesota beaver.

STILES -- That's right. That's a problem, there's no question about it.

BAILEY -- It seems to me the best way to bring about uniformity which you're talking here is for each state legislature to give the commission or council, or whatever they're called, discretionary powers to do as they see fit. You can all get together, write your own rules and regulations; if they should be similar, they are. If you want to make them different, you can. When you wait two years, it's impossible.

STEEN -- I think that's absolutely true. It's no more reasonable that you can measure a wildlife crop two years in advance of the harvest than it is that you can measure a farm crop two years in advance of the harvest, and yet of all the states represented here, probably the only one that has full power to do that is Missouri as far as I know.

BAILEY ? -- Ohio does.

STEEN -- Do you?

SCOTT -- Well, Wisconsin has good authority, too, and I do think that one way out of our problem might be to effect an order that any fur buyer going into Iowa to buy fur during the season has to have a tag that you furnish when he comes in.

STARKWEATHER -- Well, we, our law will take care of Minnesota providing that this season doesn't concur with ours. In other words, they can't bring fur from any other state into Minnesota during our closed season without a permit before they come in. Now, few states have such a law. It means it protects us from about the first of December until the twentieth, along in there; although this year, I question whether we're going to be able to knock the beaver down sufficiently. That will be some achievement.

PETERSON -- We'll go along now to Kansas. Dave.

LEAHY -- Kansas has some adult deer herds; we have two herds, I think, that the populace of Kansas wants us to get rid of quickly; but we have pheasants, and we have quail. Now, due to the conditions of this spring and last winter, our pheasant crop in western Kansas has depreciated, although I think we have a fine quail crop this year; but we've had a problem in Kansas. Not until this session of the legislature has the rabbit been declared a game animal. They could take them at any time, and as a result of that we have had a shortage of cottontails and jacks. The legislature, through a little manipulation this year, did give us authority to have the rabbit designated, or did designate the rabbit, as a game animal, which now requires that the hunters of Kansas be licensed which they have not heretofore been, but they haven't bothered with limits as the rest of you do, as Ohio. Bringing up the question of rabbits to that legislature was dangerous, it was dynamite, like waving a red flag. They could remember years ago when we had rabbit drives out in western Kansas where we slaughtered rabbits by the millions. In their objection to the rabbit law that we asked for, they were fearful that we'd have a long closed season on them, which we should have I think, so we compromised it this way. We went to them and told them that what we really were after was the hunters from Kansas City, Wichita, and the other large cities, which is always popular with the legislature. We put this point up to them--that we wanted a season on rabbits to control the illegal taking of quail and pheasants just prior to and just after the seasons on those birds, so the legislature gave us this law. They have declared the season open for nine months, for ten months, and during the other two months they have authorized the Fish and Game Commission to have a closed season, except during the upland game bird season and such other times as the Commission may designate, but the one thing I think we have accomplished this year in Kansas is getting the rabbit declared a game animal as it should have been, as I said, four years ago. Now we -- as I say, the quail crop in Kansas is up this year. I'm not sure about next year's. Mr. Feast of Colorado is coming down there to hunt with me and it's the first time he's hunted quail. Now, how many he'll take out of Kansas this year, I don't know,...

???? -- Booooo!!

LEAHY — ...but it's been suggested here that the next meeting of this Convention be at Kansas in 1951, and it was also suggested that we might arrange to have it during our quail season. I'm sure that we'd be glad to have you come to Kansas, and if you want to hunt quail, we can arrange it at that time as I think our quail crop—if Mr. Feast doesn't take them all out—will be sufficient. That's the situation in Kansas.

RIDER — Is Kansas dry?

PETERSON — Thank you, Dave. Are there any questions that you'd like to ask Dave Leahy?

RIDER — Does Kansas have prohibition now?

LEAHY — No. We have our liquor stores, sir, and you'll have a good time.

RIDER -- Well, I mean, Feast won't get too many quail, then.

PETERSON — If not, we'll pass on to Michigan. Harry Ruhl.

RUHL -- Our deer are one of our major headaches with a good population. Don't know if it's as high as we've had, but up pretty close to it, with increasing difficulty as far as over-browsing in the winter range and the rapidly pyramiding damage to farm crops in some sections, particularly to fruit, where it's impossible to establish a new cherry orchard in counties that didn't have any deer ten years ago to speak of. We still haven't the authority to handle the whole situation. They did dump the damage thing in our lap. Some of them thought we'd stumble, and they would get rid of us, I suppose, but we'll see about that. We are actually getting to work on that. To aggravate the situation, we had in our northern oak country a frost that took off the leaves last spring and there are no acorns in thousands and thousands of acres, which is going to make the situation that much more serious for deer and for squirrels. Our fox squirrels are not high, but they're not low, and we expect them to drop, particularly in the oak country, severely this year. Bear are at an all time high, but not large in number. We're still getting people who are a little concerned about it. We don't take many, never did take many, probably 1500 bear. Grouse, our ruffed grouse and our prairie chicken—I'm not talking about the sharp-tails—are distinctly on the increase, not to the peak, but well started up, definitely better than last year, as are our snow-shoe areas. Waterfowl: Everything is encouraging, but not back to the previous high: much better than last year; last year better than the year before. Cottontails are lowish, but not as low as they were last year and are showing signs of a come-back in pretty good shape in part of the area. Pheasants are up from ten to fifteen percent in some areas, to thirty-five percent in others, particularly in the southeastern counties—that's not high, probably about half way between the low and the high of the forties. Our larger mammalian predators, the coyote, the wolf, the bobcat, and mink are unfortunately going down. They have receded last year and the year before, not because of bounties, but because that was time for the combination of circumstances to produce that result. The one

exception is the raccoon. As far as we can tell, there is an all time high, with more damage being done to poultry and things of that kind by raccoon than by foxes and all the other predators put together. We aren't harvesting the crop, non-residents can't hunt, our season is too short and too early, and we can't do anything about it.

LEAHY -- What do you do on beaver up there, Mr. Ruhl?

RUHL -- We have had a season, not every year, but most every year, in part of the territory for about ten or fifteen years. Last year we had it closed in the upper peninsula; the northern part of the lower was open; and in our farm country, we've had it open for several years in spite of the fact that there are relatively few beaver doing some damage. It really don't belong there in any numbers. We've been taking from a couple thousand up to twelve thousand a year when we've had a season. We seal -- they must put a seal on it within a few days after the season before they can dispose of them. I don't know whether it's worth while or not, but we think so, Stiles. We wouldn't do any different. Our big problem with beaver is this. In our upper peninsula a lot of the trout fishermen believe that those beaver dams are very beneficial to trout fishing and our fish technicians don't agree with them by and large. We're in the unique position of trying to open the season where the sportsmen in the upper peninsula want it closed which is contrary to the advice of our fish boys, so what happens is that the technological people of the Game Division recommend an open season and the sportsmen put the pressure on our Commission and sometimes we'll have it opened and sometimes closed.

PETERSON -- Any further questions? Bruce?

STILES -- Harry, in your laws governing the regulation of fur buyers, do you require the fur buyer to keep a record of what he buys and who he buys from?

RUHL -- That's right. He's licensed, and he must keep a record of the numbers and the species, the man's address and name, and the date which he buys and sells.

STILES -- Then aren't you able to control any illegal beaver that he may be buying from outside the state? Doesn't he have to show where he got them, and have a record of it so that you may check with the state?

RUHL -- Well, yes and no. We get some of them. We don't get them all.

STILES -- In any type of fish and game regulation, you can't get them all, can you?

RUHL -- No. We've had unfortunate experiences; for example, we built up our beaver population when the furs were high, we kept it closed a little too long and actually a very strong bootlegging beaver ring developed which we have pretty well gotten under control, but we don't kid ourselves that we get them all. We think it's worth while. The tagging does actually do this. They must be tagged by our officers within seven days after the end of the season--short season. If the boys trap before season, they bring the pelts before the officer. The

officer doesn't, can't always prove that those pelts were taken before the season, but he knows the guy to watch next year, and in some cases we've been able to show by laboratory tests and prove to the satisfaction of the jurors that those particular pelts which were brought in to be sealed were taken before the season or after. We use our pathologist as an expert witness, and we try to qualify him by taking skins at certain times, subject to certain treatments and observations. It's difficult to do it on an exact basis, but we think that we actually curtail the temptation to trap before the season and afterwards, and to bring in pelts from other states, because they must come to a conservation officer to be sealed and looked at.

STILES — The reason I asked—we can't require that our beaver pelts be tagged even though we might want to. Under the Iowa law we can open the season, close the season, set bag limits, possession limits and adjust territorial limitations, but we can't do any more. We can't tell how any species may be taken or prescribe any manner in which you may take it or any other condition connected with it. We have to go to the legislature. Now, the thing that I'm concerned about—you can only get about so much from the legislature. Should we go to the legislature at the next session—and we're going to ask for some laws that we hope will correct that—and ask for a tagging law, or a law that more closely regulates the activities of the fur buyer? I'm of the opinion that if the activities of the fur buyer are more closely regulated, you have a better chance and you can regulate it more closely than you can by tagging. We know from our own experience that we've taken beaver in July and August. We put them in refrigeration and sell them at our January fur sale, and fur buyers come from many states and take them for prime furs that we took in July and August. I don't know how you can tell them apart.

RUHL — Well, my advise is to get blanket authority and work on both angles.

SCOTT — I would like to make the same recommendation, to work on fur buyers along with the tagging laws. Now, in Wisconsin, the penalty for buying untagged fur is \$25, and any fur buyer doesn't care a whoop about whether he pays \$25. If we've got to catch them the hard way where we prove that that fur isn't taken legally or wasn't taken legally in Wisconsin, in your case there's no bag limit and the fur buyer only has to get one man to lie for him—to say that he took ten or twenty instead of just one.

STILES — We've been starting on that work.

SCOTT — If they can pick up their records in the season, you've got to tie those things down pretty tight if you want to catch a man, and it's not easy, as I guess Harry knows.

RUHL — One other angle of the tagging is to limit the bag limit as one device, to have a season every year even though limited rather than to build them up, have damage, and then go the other way.

SCOTT — Wisconsin charges a dollar for a tag. Even though the money ----- and on top of that we have now changed our law to require the fellow to tag his beaver as soon as he takes it out of the trap.

He's got to tag it even before he walks out of the woods with it just to make sure he can't make a change in the claim.

STARKWEATHER -- I think there's two things, two things, possibly, that you're overlooking in the record law, and that is the fact that something well over 80% of all the beaver taken in the United States and Canada wind up in New York. They're not concerned only with the manufacturing profit. I mean to say they're not concerned with ours--the states that are producing--consequently, they really have very little encouragement for checking these guys in New York. Some of the Federal boys have checked with us some years back and it's rather difficult to require a record law. The other phase is where you do not require tagging, as Mr. Ruhl pointed out and you have no control over bag limits. Our concern is that by purchasing in your state, they will then get any beaver from any other state or Canada and co-mingle them, and you will be unable to identify. That's the only real reason for the tagging. Minnesota, perhaps, is a little tighter on that than anybody else, because our law specifically states that these tags must remain even when it's out of the state. That is, we have it so fixed that if a man claims--that is if he's got a beaver from your state--he caught it in Minnesota, and there's no tag on it, it's still contraband if it doesn't have our tag on it. Now, if it doesn't have a seal--you can remarket a seal on the Federal market, but the professional trapper handles just about 80 or 90% of all beaver taken in this country--perhaps that's a compliment, but that's your phase of it. We're interested in that, but we give a whoop about--we who are producing and try to protect--if all the states had a recording law. We could touch a little bit more on this law enforcement, maybe we could get to it, as the law enforcement men have recommended that we get the Lacy act, requiring the recording and keeping of records on interstate trapping, then I don't think we'd need any tags on beaver, no more than they do on mink or anything else. Until such time, we want to try to cut down the shipment by the fur buyer, or the trapper, as far as that's concerned, and tagging seems to be the only answer now.

PETERSON -- Any further discussion? If not, we'll call on Minnesota.

STARKWEATHER -- Well, Minnesota conditions, I think, as far as upland game birds are concerned are perhaps just about the same as has been reported in any other state. We're way up--particularly on pheasants, sharp-tail and ruffed grouse. Sharp-tail and ruffed grouse, I think, are probably anticipated next year to have their peak year. Quail--we have only about three or four counties where we consistently have quail up in the extreme southeastern part of the state, and they're pretty static so far year in and year out, but it's a little sport for the boys that have the dogs. Our big game season: Reports have been just a little bit pessimistic in the research boys' reports. They're not too far off, though, and I think the research boys' reports probably are much more stable than the word-of-mouth reports you hear in the deer country. We think our deer herd is in exceptionally good shape. Last year they had some very unfortunate hunting situations. Those, so called, road hunters and tenderfeet that didn't get out into the woods had a little tough luck, and they're the quickest ones to howl anyway, so they've done a little bit of hollering, but I don't think we should be too concerned with them. Our big game hunting

license has jumped to between 60 and 75 thousand within the increase in the hunters in a period of just about 4 or 5 years, and our take this last year I think--1947 was down--I don't have the 1948 figures here--was down to a little less than 50% success ratio. Now I think most of the states would be very happy about that, but Minnesota is, in my judgment on deer, just simply spoiled, that's all. Sometimes we have too good a situation over there. I maintain if we had a hundred thousand deer hunters, and were taking 35 to 40 thousand deer per year, that we'd have a much better condition than we do now. We've got 70 to 75 thousand fellows that are hunting deer now that are not deer hunters and never should hunt deer. They've only got a day or a day and a half to go and if they can't buy one for a buck--or no higher than forty dollars--why, there just never should have been a season. I don't think game management can recognize those things very well. The fur situation: I think both our muskrats and we know the beaver are way up, and right there I'll say our boys, our research men, have felt that the December season has been desirable, and we've had a December season for quite a number of years in order to permit the trapping of beaver on a sustained yield proposition, but all our field personnel now--this is particularly true of our refuge and our warden service--definitely are stating that in the real beaver range they are not taking the beaver; they are not taking sufficient beaver in that range in the December season and that they will not take them and that will probably be particularly true now because the beaver pelts are going to be down. They probably won't be worth only about half of what they have been in the past, so they're either going to have to have a real long December season or they're going to have to go back to having a spring season, at least, in some of the areas where they really are doing a lot of damage and eating themselves, I think, out of their homes. Rabbits and squirrels in Minnesota: The boys up there just don't go much for the rabbit and squirrel hunting. Some of them do, of course. Generally speaking, there's lots of them there, and squirrels I know are way up; the rabbits, I think, are too. We have the snow-shoe, the cottontail and the jack, which are all potential, and we have seasons on them, so we are looking -- the game conditions in Minnesota, I think, as far as we're concerned, are very very healthy conditions.

PETERSON -- Thank you, Starky. Any questions that you'd like to ask Starky? If not, we'll go on to Missouri.

MORROW -- Mr. Chairman. Last year we encountered very severe icing condition in northeast Missouri which has had it's effect on our quail crop up there, but generally, over the state, it appears that we're going to have a little better than average season. We had a good nesting year and carried over quite a large breeding reserve, so quail in Missouri may be a little better than average. Rabbits are just coming out of a low, and are beginning to appear in good quantities over most of the state. In Missouri rabbits probably constitute the main sporting animal, and we have been hard-pressed to avoid establishing restrictive legislation on rabbits during this low period. It looks like they'll come back this year. We had an excellent mass crop last year and squirrels have been abundant; we're just about to complete a very good squirrel season. This year we will have a deer season in twenty-five of our Ozark counties for a five-day period. Deer are only increased in Missouri by completing a

rather intensive transplanting program. Transporting deer into good deer range where they do not now exist, and down in our Ozark country, we have a rather peculiar situation. We'd like to go past a Sunday, but we've held our season this year to a five-day season to avoid going through a Sunday, bringing in a complaint from the local people down there, because the people walk to church and they don't want deer hunters shooting at them mistaking them for deer. Foxes are at an all time high. We have a very intense problem. We'll open the season on fox, or we'll extend the season on fox for an additional fifteen days, at the request of fox hunters, I'd like to add. Raccoon are back in very good shape and last year we harvested about 75 thousand raccoon. It looks like we'll harvest a few more this year. We're beginning to have a beaver problem similar to the one that Bruce has, but as yet it hasn't gotten too much out of hand. Most of our problem occurs in the area close to the state of Iowa, and I'm afraid we may have a little difficulty this year on that account. Turkey and prairie chicken are in very desperate straits in Missouri. The land-use pattern is turning to one of grazing, and our turkey and prairie chicken are suffering very badly. Mink and muskrat have been low. We will have a thirty-day season on both species this year, but we're looking to our mink and muskrat very carefully. I believe that is sufficient.

PETERSON -- Thank you. Are there any questions?

???? -- I'd like to ask one. Is your deer season bucks only?

MORROW -- Buck only.

SCOTT -- How many deer did you transplant this year?

MORROW -- I can't give you an accurate figure, but I'm going to say somewhere around three hundred deer during the last year. Now that's been going on for about five years and it should average somewhere between 150 to 200 deer a year.

SCOTT -- You're putting them from places where you don't want them to places that are good?

MORROW -- That's right.

PETERSON -- Well, let's call on Nebraska. Pardon me. Did you have a question back there?

BECKMAN ? -- Yes, I did.

PETERSON -- Go ahead.

BECKMAN ? -- I have a question for Mr. Morrow of Missouri. I would like to know--you spoke about the high take of raccoon you had down there--whether or not you have any special regulations which will allow raccoon to be taken other than during the trapping season by dog hunters?

MORROW -- I think, Ray, what you're asking there is, we do allow them to pursue raccoon for training purposes for their dogs earlier in the year,

but there's a closed season on that activity prior to the raccoon season to the extent of about 45 days, I think. Now we have the same problems in Missouri that they have everywhere else on this fox thing. Our fox hunters like to chase fox. We can't protect raccoon from dogs while the foxes are being chased at night. The fox hunters tell us that their dogs chase nothing but fox; we think they chase raccoon. Undoubtedly, we lose a lot of raccoon on the ground. They may be taken by the trapper and later sold. Bruce mentioned that some of his beaver are taken in July. We're convinced that some of our raccoon are taken in July and August, but I don't know in what quantity they reach the market later.

BECKMAN ? -- That isn't getting to the point that I wanted to bring out. The point I wanted to make is that we have considered seriously trying to get the legislature to establish regulations whereby the dog hunters could take raccoon earlier than the trappers simply because of what we might term our over-population. Now, what I was getting at is that since you take so many down there, I thought maybe--your season is open, then, to all people at the same time--trappers and dog hunters alike?

MORROW -- That's right. December 1 to January 15.

PETERSON -- We'll call next on Nebraska.

VANCE -- Gentlemen, I'll make a short report. We went into the 1948 season on pheasants in this state with a wonderful carry-over, and I believe we reported to you in Ohio last year that we had a nominal increase in the pheasant population. With a short season last year, and a small bag limit, we went into the winter with a beautiful pheasant population. We had a blizzard here in areas that took out from 70 to 90 percent of the potential pheasant breeding population. It covered almost a half of the state. In the portion of the state that was not visited by tremendous winds, in addition to deep snows, we've come into the fall season with a good pheasant population and considerable increase over a year ago. In the areas of the state that caught the snow and the tremendous winds, our pheasant population is pretty sorry. We have another short season this year and another small bag limit. We're hoping that trends will follow what Starky said of Minnesota, that they have a good increase in pheasants up there, and probably will carry through in some of these other states, but we did lose a lot of birds last winter. We have an open season on deer in Nebraska this year. Our past legislature saw fit to make it easy to have deer killed merely by a written application of the land owner of deer doing damage. Our men go out and kill the deer. As a result of that, our Commissioners declared an open season in the counties in which they have legislative authority to open the season--special permit. They're putting out 1500 permits that were let out on a drawing. That season will extend from December 5 through December 23, in the northwestern counties of the state--bucks only. Our waterfowl picture at the present time is very bright. The snows of last winter gave us a lot of water. Our sand-hills lakes carried more water than for many years. We had many ducks stay here this spring and summer, and bring off broods. We have a better local waterfowl situation than we've had in many many years. The coyote suffered from last winter's snow. We had beautiful snow

coverage. The pilots who airplane-hunt coyotes had a field day, and I believe that they took care of a good portion of our coyote problem. Depredations that have been claimed against the coyote, we got rid of enough coyotes that we're not going to have so much trouble, we think. The raccoon problem is more serious each year. With the price of long-haired furs what it is, there is no demand for them by the fur-buyers, and the trappers don't pay too much attention to them. We have a long season on them extending from October 1 through March 15, I believe, or March 1, and we still have too many raccoon. We will have a short open season on quail in our south-eastern counties, as was pointed out by Missouri, we're about a year behind on regulations on it. The preceding year we had a severe icing condition and the birds were a little hard-put for food, but they're showing a nice come-back again this year.

PETERSON -- Thank you, Vance. Are there any questions? Feast?

FEAST -- I would like to ask Mr. Vance--are you having any season at all in those storm areas?

VANCE -- On pheasants?

FEAST -- Yeah.

VANCE -- I can put it this way. The state is divided, roughly, from northeast to southwest. Some of the border counties that opened along the storm area, were open to pheasant hunting, but are in some poor pheasant range. That is, we could have dropped down in some instances a tier of counties in that diagonal line and have not shot in counties that were severely damaged.

FEAST -- What I'm particularly interested in, Vance, is that corner that juts into Colorado. Do you have a pheasant season there?

VANCE -- The corner that juts into Colorado on the north line, east-west line?

FEAST -- Yeah.

VANCE -- That area is all closed. On the north-south line, on our west boundary and your east boundary, that area is open. We had some loss in there, approximately 25%.

FEAST -- I asked that because we had the same storm, see,...

VANCE -- That's right.

FEAST -- ...and we have at present a controversy, an objection to a three-day season, which we prefer.

VANCE -- Our pheasant population in there was severely decimated and we're still getting letters from the areas in there that were opened. Some of them want to send in petitions to get it closed, even at this late date.

PETERSON -- Any further questions? Cottingham.

COTTINGHAM -- What is your coon problem?

VANCE -- Coon problem?

COTTINGHAM -- Yeah.

VANCE -- Too many coon. They're destroying corn in the roasting ear stage, and poultry. It exemplifies itself in another manner too. We have too many people picking up baby coon and using them for pets. After they become semi-domesticated, they're not afraid of man and they're not afraid of dogs. The coon are turned loose and they get over to the neighbors and take up habitation in the hen house.

PETERSON -- Harry?

RUHL -- There was a question, and that's -- you've had a big die-off of pheasants, big population in the die-off in the storm area. If you'd had, was it a matter of exposure or was it a matter of food? In other words, if you'd had a smaller carry-over, would you have lost less?

VANCE -- No, probably not. The loss was strictly due to suffocation. I had the opportunity to fly over a good bit of our pheasant area in the storm loss area in the middle of January last year, and out in the fields where the birds were caught, probably during the night, you'd find two, three, or four hundred birds together in the fields there where the birds had just their tails flapping up in the air. You get down on the ground and examine those birds and in every instance found icing up of the mouth and nostrils, and suffocation.

RUHL -- High wind and low temperatures in other words.

VANCE -- Yes, particularly the high wind. There was quite a feeding program carried on, and while we don't necessarily want to make a statement one way or another, the birds that were not subjected to artificial feeding came through as well as those that were. There were some pheasants lost.

???? -- Will you repeat that, Vance?

GILBERT -- We can't hear you, Lloyd.

VANCE -- Sorry. In the artificial feeding program, while it may have done some good, birds that were not artificially fed came through the winter as well as those that were; but the loss that occurred, occurred during the height of the storm from icing up and suffocation.

PETERSON -- Any further questions? If not, we'll pass on to North Dakota. Bud?

MORGAN -- Mr. Chairman. Gentlemen. North Dakota was fortunate in getting some legislation passed last year, although I don't believe that we were handicapped from the standpoint of the powers of the commissioner as much as some of the states were and are. Those powers were still broadened by legislative action last winter. At the present time, the Governor, at the recommendation or from the recommendation of the

Commissioner of North Dakota, may do with the seasons about what he wants on any game species, including take. The migratory waterfowl situation in North Dakota is excessively good this year. In fact, I don't recollect any time when we have had more birds in the state, and the chances for quite a heavy migration look very bright. Pheasants which are our cash crop year in and year out in North Dakota, haven't increased as much as we hoped that they would. We enjoyed a very good nesting season with possibly one exception and that was in the southwestern corner of the state where our heaviest pheasant populations have existed for the last few years and in that area, we had less of an increase than we did in the more sparsely populated areas of the south and eastern portion of the state. In the south and in the east where the season hasn't been declared open for a number of years, our increase was quite phenomenal this year. Grouse of all species are up and, we believe, as does Mr. Starkweather, that we will possibly reach the peak in grouse population either in '50 or '51. We're approaching it, and this year, although we are only opening on sharp-tails in North Dakota--we are opening on sharp-tails for a period of thirty days beginning next Friday--we could have, I believe, in the more or less restricted area where we have ruffed grouse, opened on that species, but because of public opinion, because of the fact that it was not an important thing, and because of the fact that our ruffed grouse area is very small, we did not see fit to open on them this year. We do contemplate a trapping program on ruffed grouse during the coming winter. Pinnates we have not opened on for a number of years, although our population seems to be slowly increasing, the possibility is very good that we probably will never open on that species again. Hungarian partridge which have been down for a number of years are showing a very nice increase beginning about last year, and possibly we would have been justified in opening on that species this year in certain constricted areas. However, we felt it the course of wisdom to hold that season closed for another year, and by virtue of the fact that we did not have any particular public sentiment for the opening on them, it remains closed. The deer season in North Dakota will remain closed this year. Our gun pressure on big game has been pyramiding very rapidly, beginning in 1943 when almost 7,500 big game licenses were sold. It jumped to 15,000 in 1945 which was the next open season. In 1947 it pyramided to 30,000, and last year when the dividend season was open--ordinarily in North Dakota, we only hold an open season every other year--we sold somewhere in the neighborhood of 35,000 licenses and harvested somewhere in round figures around 17,000 deer. Our hunter success in North Dakota for the past ten years has averaged between 50 and 60 percent. That's caused by the type of terrain and the sparcity of coverage that we do have in the state. Fur-bearers? The coyote and fox are predators in my state, and we do have the privilege of issuing flying permits whereby they may be taken by plane. Just what our action in that respect will be this year, we haven't decided definitely yet, but we have done that consistently for the past four years and as happened in other states last year, the flying hunter did really take a lot of fox and coyote. The mink, I believe, is quite static as of the last three years. Last year our rat population was very low and as a consequence we kept the season closed on muskrat. A large part of our rat population consists of bank rats, which makes it just a little bit hard to inventory.

If anybody has a technique for inventorying bank rats, we certainly would be very interested in getting it. The chances are that our rat season will be declared open a little bit later in the year. Like many of the other states, including Nebraska, we have an overpopulation of skunks, raccoon, and primarily and particularly badger, that have been causing a lot of havoc in the agricultural areas which comprise the entire state, as far as that's concerned. By virtue of the fact that these rough pelt fur-bearers have not had any material value so far as pelts are concerned on the market in the last two or three years, and probably because of economy of the state in the last three or four years, our trappers haven't bothered about taking them and as a consequence this year, the season was opened on the first of September on badger and skunk and will remain open until closed by executive order in my state. It opens on raccoon October the first, or did open October the first, and will remain open until the fifteenth of February. Now one new piece of legislation that North Dakota passed this year gives the coon hunter the right to pursue coons at night with the use of a flashlight or dogs. I believe that's my report.

PETERSON -- Thank you, Bud. Are there any questions?

???? -- How much does your resident deer hunting permit cost in North Dakota?

MORGAN -- Five dollars. However, in 1947 - in 1945 our legislature passed a law that provides that farmers may be issued a free license, or shall be issued a free license, if they apply for it. That is to hunt only on their own land, however.

STILES -- Bud, in your duck production, how does the production of red-head and canvasback stack up with the other species, does it, has it come up along with the other?

MORGAN -- Well, I would say, yes, Bruce. However, not to the extent that mallards and pintails have this last year.

STILES -- Did you say that you probably will never open on prairie chickens again?

MORGAN -- I doubt that we'll ever open the season on pinnates again.

PETERSON -- We'll pass on to Ohio.

RIDER -- Dr. Martin.

PETERSON -- Dr. Martin.

MARTIN -- Mr. Chairman, Ohio had their jitters as far as a low game population in 1947. We have gradually come up since that time in our pheasants, in our cottontail rabbits, in our raccoon as fur bearers, in our muskrats, and, I think, with the exceptions of the fox squirrel and grey squirrel, they dropped a little bit this year on the basis of our census work. However, our season on squirrel has just closed and we have received reports that it probably was slightly better than what our census showed. Now, I might, if I may

have a minute, I would like to discuss something about this pheasant situation in Ohio. We, in Ohio, had a census carried on by the Wildlife Research Station since 1938, in which each year that census was comparable with the exception of change in personnel. In six of our northwestern counties since 1938 we were at our--one of our high years was 1939, the all time peak was '41--then we started downward, and we came down readily to 1947 when it hit the bottom. The last two years that has gradually went up until this year, this census shows this year that only two years, 1939 and 1941, were two years in which we had a higher population. On a statewide basis, we had this year, based on our census work, and that, of course, is all done as far as the compilation of it by our Wildlife Research Station. The census is taken by our field men in combination with our Wildlife Research Station personnel, and that has been carried on that way each year since 1937. I can say this to you at this time, we have based on that information the best distribution of pheasants in Ohio that we have ever had and the greatest population. Our cottontail rabbit on a statewide basis has stepped up very much from last year. Now, I wanted to bring out one thing and that is--this is the first year that we can say that quail is a game bird. It is, and it isn't, in a way. Our legislature finally has seen fit to give us an opportunity to manage the quail for ten years and see what we may be able to do with it. It will require legislative action before there will be a season or can be legally a season. Now, the quail based on last year's census, as compared to this year, has come up wonderfully. Probably that was due to the mild winter more than anything else, and we did carry out some management practices naturally that were beneficial to quail on our wildlife habitat development areas. Deer--and I just want to mention this to you--we had a season in eight counties in 1947; we had a season last year in thirteen counties; and, by taking both sexes and all ages, it looks like we have cut that population down approximately 50% in those counties in which we've had an open season. In other words, we have found that know-how, at least, in Ohio if we can hold it where we can control a deer herd. That doesn't seem true with some of the other states in this section. I don't know what our Council will do. They meet this coming Friday. We've had a discussion whether or not we will have a deer season at all in Ohio this year, and it will be decided definitely at our Council meeting this coming Friday. I think that's all I have to say about it.

PETERSON -- Thank you. Are there any questions?

???? -- May I ask, Dr. Martin, in regard to your deer hunting, do you restrict them to use certain types of firearms?

MARTIN -- That's right. Slugs, shot guns slugged, or balls, and we also give the archery people a chance. Two years ago we set aside two days for them in which there was no gunning allowed at all, and the best information that we could get on that was that there was one deer killed by a bow and arrow.

SCOTT -- How many deer did you take last year?

MARTIN -- Our report--now, I want to explain that to you. It was cards sent out with everybody who bought a license and their return was on a voluntary basis, and on that basis, we had turned in 1586 deer killed.

MORGAN — Dr. Martin, does Woods county usually have a high pheasant population?

MARTIN — No, and that's rather interesting. You take your northwestern counties in which we've done this intensive study work ever since Dr. Hicks you might say started as leader of the Wildlife Research Station around about 1932, that gradually came up to be the top county. I want to point out a thing that I think has been very detrimental to our pheasant population in these northwest counties and that is our alfalfa mills. That forced us, if we wanted to try to have any pheasants left in that section of the state that amounted to anything, we simply had to nail down that alfalfa and other means in which our birds were being killed off by mowing and such as that. Henry county, which could be classed in that particular section of the state, is our high county this year. It has come up better than any of those northwestern counties. In central, or just west of central, we have a county this year--Champaign--which at one time was considered a very good pheasant county, then it dropped down terribly low, and that thing has come up this year within the first five counties of the state.

PETERSON -- Any further questions? That brings us down to South Dakota. We estimated that we had an increase of approximately 10% in breeding waterfowl in South Dakota last spring going into the breeding season. I don't have any report on the reproduction, although personal observation indicates that we have a good crop of local ducks in the state. Our game men estimate that we have an increase of approximately 25% in our pheasant crop. That is over the better pheasant range, or I might even say, the important pheasant range in the eastern part of the state, particularly. We have two or three counties west of the Missouri river in the southern part of the state that are good pheasant areas. We took quite a beating last winter during our severe storms in western part of the state in the northern section of the west river country, but this is not important pheasant range, and is not any particular factor as far as our pheasant population is concerned. Our sharp-tail grouse population is good. The prairie chicken--pinnated grouse population is low, and we don't see any particular hope of improving that because of the lack of proper habitat. We had a good hungarian partridge population a few years ago. Then, with seven years of normal and above normal rainfall, that population declined very definitely. As a matter of personal opinion, I have thought that perhaps they're a dry-weather bird. This year with a dry season, they have shown a definite improvement and that leads me to believe that perhaps these birds are dry-weather birds and I'd be happy to have an estimation on that if some of you men have made any studies of it or have some information that might be of value. For a number of years our deer hunting was confined to five counties in the Black Hills area. About ten years ago, our deer started to spread out over the state and two years ago that had reached a point where the population in certain east river countries were a definite problem as far as agriculture is concerned. They are now well distributed over an entire eastern section of the state, that is, east of the Missouri River. In this area, they range entirely on privately-owned lands. Last year, in addition to our regular season in the Black Hills, we opened thirteen counties east of the river. Also in addition to our regular season, we had antlerless deer season in the Black Hills area. I might say that the Commission has full authority to set

all hunting seasons. This year we're trying out an innovation as far as South Dakota is concerned. We have had for years a buck law set up by statute. Four years ago, this statute was repealed and the Commission was given authority to set seasons, but we carried out that statute up until this year. This year in our twenty-day deer season, we're permitting the killing of bucks, only, the first fifteen days, and a deer of either sex or age the last five days in the Black Hills area. We're pretty well convinced that the killing of deer of either sex is perhaps the most practical method of management and control. Since 1942, we have had open season on antelope, but we suffered a terrific loss during our storm in the northwestern part of the state last winter with the result that we'll have no antelope season this year. About twenty-five or thirty years ago the beaver was practically extinct in South Dakota, but today we have them in all of our watersheds; in fact, we have an over-population. Our beaver are handled under a permit system. We require them to be tagged, but the difficulty has been in interesting farmers, particularly, in applying for permits and actually trapping beaver, especially last year with the price of fur down. We didn't take many beaver, in fact, didn't take nearly enough, and we're trying now to set up a campaign to encourage the trapping of beaver. Unless we can get the land owner to go in and take them under permit, it's going to be necessary for us to send our own men in there to virtually eliminate them in many areas in the state. Rabbits in South Dakota are not classed as game. Some of you might be interested in this--cottontail rabbits in many areas constitute a nuisance, where we are trying to develop game cover around some of our lakes. Where we are planting recreational areas, it's even been necessary to go in and poison rabbits in order to save our tree plantings. Perhaps we could get together with some of you fellows and trap some of these rabbits and make a trade for something, where they could be put to some practical use. Time is short. I'm not going to take any more of your time except to answer questions, if you have any. If not, we'll go on to Wisconsin. I might say that it's rather unfortunate for some of us down here toward the tail end of the alphabet. We get crowded for time, but, Scott, we'll let you take whatever time you need.

SCOTT — I may be last, but I'll make it brief. Generally, the rules set for Michigan goes for Wisconsin. Our deer are in good numbers and we expect to harvest between 150 and 200 thousand this year with our season on any deer for five days. We have bear going down slightly, and some indication that there may be a little more protection given them. We've been having an open season all year around. In the case of pheasants, there is a slight increase. We've stocked close to 200,000 this year so our stocking program is about the same as in years past, but the wild bird which gives us most of our hunting, is on the increase slightly. We expect a little better season. Our waterfowl production is not too important in Wisconsin, that is for local breeders, but important enough, and it's as good as previous years or slightly up. In the case of grouse, quail, and hungarian partridge, we record an increase and are very pleased to have a good ruffed grouse season going on right now, a good chance for a sharp-tail, and even prairie chicken season next year. Of course, prairie chicken are tied in with sharp-tail. We feel we can't distinguish

in the field, maybe we should try, because our prairie chicken—although it's recovering—habitat is not there to give us the numbers we'd like. We may have a season next year or the year after. Squirrels are about the same; rabbits about the same, and may be on the way up. Snowshoe rabbits, certainly in the north, are on the way up. There is some indication of a slightly downward trend on fox and raccoon is still high. We have a goodly number of beaver. We have been harvesting in the winter, and I should tell Ruhl that I wish some of his sportsmen would come over in Wisconsin in the trout section; our sportsmen wanted to trap the beaver because it isn't good to have a beaver dam on a trout stream. We're having plenty of trouble on that now, so they say, and we may have an extended season. We take from five to twelve thousand beaver a winter; muskrat slightly up. Of course, that depends on trapping pressure year after year in Wisconsin and last year wasn't too good. Mink seemingly are on a downward trend. Hungarian partridge—we hunted last year and are going to hunt this year and they are coming back. Quail in a secluded portion, but there's an indication of an increase.

PETERSON — Thank you, Scott. Are there any questions that you want to ask Mr. Scott?

???? — What's the spread of the Hungarian partridge over your state towards the counties?

SCOTT — Southeastern Wisconsin covers maybe fifteen, twenty counties now. It started at Vernon county and has spread northeast. One year our huns seemed to get up and fly out of a series of counties and showed up in large numbers in other counties, but that has increased the spread and these other counties now that lost the birds seem to be coming back. It isn't a bird, though, that increases too fast, it seems, in numbers, and it isn't hunted too heavily, so we feel that there isn't too much difficulty if you do have a season.

R. JOHNSON — What's your bag limit on huns?

SCOTT — Four a day. Four daily and eight possession.

PETERSON — Any further questions?

???? — Did you say you expect to kill 200,000 deer this year?

SCOTT — Well, the last season we had like this, there was 128,000 that we took and we've got an awful lot more hunters now. That was during the war, so just roughly it's 150 to 200 thousand. It should be approximately. We'd like to see, and this can be for the record, if you wish, 200,000.

STARKWEATHER — What's your hunter success figure there?

SCOTT — Our hunter success has not been too wonderful on deer. About 25%; of course, we've been hunting on bucks for years and when they hunt many deer why we — our success like in our previous season on any deer, or a split season on buck and antlerless deer, two separate periods, our hunter success has been around 80%, so a lot depends on

what you're shooting. If we're 80% this coming year, we're sure to kill 200,000 because we have mighty close to 400,000 deer hunters.

PETERSON -- It's time to recess for lunch, and I'll turn the microphone back to Paul Gilbert. Thank you.

GILBERT -- Thanks a lot, Pete. That's a good job all the way. That's all for now. We'll get together again at 2:15, not 2:00, but 2:15. I want you to have your full two hours.

Afternoon Session—October 4, 1949

GILBERT — I don't know where we all are, but we're starting. We've got the press with us, and we've got our recorder going, and we can always read poetry. I'm quite proud of the way this convention has held together. We've held almost a 100% attendance continuously right up to now. We've got to roll right along this afternoon, because I want to quit just pretty much on time, but I'd like to take a few minutes off right now for Dan Janzen again. I didn't laugh at him; he laughed at him. You can discipline him for that when you get home. I think, Dan, you want to check with all of us a little bit on duck hearings.

JANZEN — There are a couple of commissioners not here that I'd like to have be here, but the reason I wanted to bring up this question of waterfowl hearings was that a resolution—

GILBERT — Dan, would you prefer to wait until they got back?

JANZEN — Is Bud Morgan here?

GILBERT — No.

???? — I think you should wait for him.

JANZEN — I think we should wait, don't you think we should?

GILBERT — I think that might be well.

JANZEN — I prefer to wait, if it's all right with you, Paul.

GILBERT — That will be fine. You notice that we have three things listed here for this afternoon. Coordination of Game Laws and Administration Between States, Conservation Education, and a Business Session. We're going to have to cut each one of them down to about half an hour, however, if you were giving a paper on it, you'd be given ten minutes, so you're all better off than you would have been otherwise. We've touched, I believe, upon the Coordination of Game Laws and Administration Between States. It's come up several times. We've mentioned the need for this committee, which would start pointing the way for assisting in this type of endeavor. We've mentioned discrepancies, for example, with Iowa and Nebraska with our beaver law; the difference between South Dakota and Nebraska with our coyote law on lips and scalps; and so on. And this is not a new topic. It's been discussed at other conventions, but, I think, gradually as we move along, we are—we are making a little progress, and I would like to do something—Dan, you can answer this if you wish, or pass it on to Flick, our good friend, and I hope you will do this, but I would like to have one of you lead this thing off by giving us suggestions. Standing back where you are, you see we several states in a little different light than we see ourselves, and most of the discussion on this Coordination of Game Laws and Administration Between States has been from the standpoint of the administrator to the administrator, or from the standpoint of our individual law enforcement groups to the other law enforcement groups. I can't help but feel that with the experience that your division has had, that you couldn't lead off, perhaps, with some

statements which might be provocative of questions which would perhaps point out some of the weaknesses that we have missed, because we're too close to the—too close to the sunflowers, and our hay fever's bothering us, so we can't see their beauty. Dan?

JANZEN — I'm going to pass this on to Flick, because I didn't know what was coming here. I have a hunch that with his enforcement work, especially in regard to the Lacy Act, in the inter-traffic of illegal game between states and so forth, he has run into a lot of situations where more uniform laws would have helped. If that's the subject for discussion, certainly I would like to ask Flick to be the elocutionist, if he'd care to lead it.

GILBERT — Fine! And Flick, I would appreciate it if you tie in any possible closer unity that we might be able to develop between our Midwest Law Enforcement Association and this group. We used to be together, and then we decided down at Omaha, when Jess was down there, that we didn't discuss law enforcement too much in this, so the Midwest Game Law Enforcement Division was born, and now we have the two groups, but I think maybe we could hook them up a little. Maybe you can give us a point on that, tie it all in together. Flick, come on up here. He didn't expect this, and we don't apologize for it, because this is all ad lib.

DAVIS — I think perhaps that Dan threw me a strike here and I swung at it. Dan mentioned about the Lacy Act, and you've had the discussion on that this morning here in regard to the beaver thing in Iowa. I can see really where there's going to be a lot of difficulty in this beaver business in Iowa where you're not having any tags on the beaver. They have practically no control over their fur-buyers, and certainly I know that some of the beaver from Nebraska and all the surrounding states that do have beaver, their beaver are going to wind up down in Iowa in one way or another. There was a comment made this morning that maybe they should not try to control the fur-buyer too much by making a report or having him keep an accurate check on everything he does—buying fur, selling fur, and who he buys from, and who he sells to. Maybe for the state themselves, that wouldn't be too important, but there are a good many states that do require that, and in running down some of these fur invoices and allegedly illegal fur, now you come right back to the state, and if it doesn't have the check on the fur-buyer, and he'll tell you that he's bought these furs, for instance, in Iowa, and you don't have a check on the fur-buyer that he bought it from—maybe he bought it from the fur-buyer. You go over to check there, and you find that this fur-buyer—all he has to do is make an inventory. Over there, he makes an inventory after the close of the season on the number of furs that he handled and that's about all. He doesn't have to keep any record of who he sold the fur to, or who he bought it from, so it is important from that standpoint that you cooperate with the states that are adjacent to you to run this fur down. That, I think, is one thing that should be worked out. I think they should have some uniform laws on handling their fur dealer, particularly the fur dealer. We run into that a lot, but in Jay Morrow's state now, he runs into Missouri. They have a lot of fur that comes out of Missouri and comes into Iowa. They have fur-buyers down there that buy a lot of fur in Iowa too. They say they buy it up there, and when you go up to Iowa to check

to find out where they bought the fur, why there's no record of it up there, if they did buy it, because they don't have to keep a record up there, so there's an opportunity for the state to lose some of it's fur in that respect. I mean the fur-buyer will buy illegal fur in his own state, say that he bought it in Iowa, and you get up there and there's no record to show that anyone did sell him any fur. Well, I think that's one thing that could be worked out. I think it should be worked out. Our Lacy Act has been emasculated in the requalification of the Federal Laws, and they were requalified here a couple of years ago. We lost a lot of the powers that we had in the Lacy Act. The Lacy Act is one of the oldest acts that we have in game law enforcement work. It was enacted back in 1900, and it took a good long while to get a lot of the powers that we had in the Lacy Act, however, we lost a good share of them. They're working at the present time, trying to get some amendments through that will give us back some of the powers that we had. The Lacy Act is, as far as fur is concerned at the present time, is almost inoperative, so we've got to do something about this regulation ourselves. The Midwest Game Law Enforcement Organization—I don't know whether all of you are acquainted with it or not; some of the states here probably don't belong to the organization—it's the only Game Law Enforcement Organization—Game Law Enforcement Officer's Organization that we have in the midwest, and we make a lot of fine resolutions down at this Midwest meeting every year, and we go back and talk to our commissioners and try and do some of the things that you people are trying to do here now. That is to have more uniform laws between the states. We run into a lot of difficulty on borders, the states do particularly I know, in the channel of the river, and the boys were just talking about it here a little while ago, and reciprocal agreements and so forth. It seems that something could be worked out on that. It's difficult, of course, as we all know, to have uniform regulations between states. Some states have to handle everything through the legislature and others don't. It's just as Jay Morrow said that by the time you're able to get some of these uniform laws that you'd like to have enacted, why the thing has outgrown it's usefulness, and the state has changed, and it probably wouldn't be of any benefit at that time. But that's certainly one thing that you should strive for. You should strive for uniform regulations. It's difficult to enforce the thing, if you operate on one side of the river where you can use a trammel net, and the other side of the river where a trammel net is illegal or unlawful. We have conditions on waterfowl hunting where some states don't allow steamboats, and yet just across the channel of the river, why they're perfectly legal. You have steamboats on the other side of the river. Now that makes for bad feeling between states, between hunters, between everybody generally, and it seems to me that something could be worked out along that line. I'm sorry, Paul. I don't know just what else to say here.

GILBERT — What do you—let me ask you a question, Flick. Do you see any immediate hope, or do you have any suggestions as to how in the world we are going to get together on these regulations? Now, we all go our happy merry ways, setting these regulations at legislative time, going ahead setting our laws, making our changes, but has there ever been, to your knowledge, an attempt to actually sit down and take the law books of a given group of states and, in even

the slightest degree, try to unify the things?

DAVIS — Well, I haven't had any experience in that particular respect, Paul, and I don't know whether there has been or whether there hasn't been. Certainly, in trying to work on that, it seems that that would be the sensible approach to it.

GILBERT — Those of us in an administrative capacity realize at almost a glance—it's like these walls here. It just seems insurmountable, knowing the exegesis of some of our legislators, to try to arrive at any common uniform group of laws, but, I think, by just continual pounding it can be done, but I don't think we're starting that pounding as much as we ought to be, and I don't know whether that should arise in this group or in your law enforcement group.

RUHL — There's quite a history in the Great Lakes Commercial Fisheries.

GILBERT — Let's have them.

RUHL — A fish man can tell you. There's one right there.

GILBERT — Ray?

RUHL — It's not very encouraging history, but it's history.

RAY — Oh, excuse me, and I'd like to make a comment. Personally, I don't think you'll ever do it through the legislature by making laws. My comment this morning, and I still stick by it, and that is have the legislature give you the power to make rules and regulations that should be made. Then get your twelve states together and write your rules and regulations as you see fit. Let them fit the particular case involved. Now, we have that in Ohio. Now, it may not be constitutional, but it's never gone to the Supreme Court, but at least we have it.

GILBERT — Your regulation—your point is very well taken. Your regulation is a good spot to start. How many states here are able to some degree or to a total degree, either one, to make their own regulations, other than actual setting of the date? I mean other than the actual setting of the date? Can you make regulations in addition to that? Let's have hands, just see how—huh?

???? — Partially, you said?

GILBERT — Partially or entirely. Well, now there's about, there's, Ha, Ha—he holds up half a hand. There is a start. Now, there's a lot of states there that are doing just what you suggest. Nebraska, for example, in some of our categories, the commission can go ahead and make the regulation. In others, the legislature. We're in that half 50-50 stage. Well, we could still take advantage of the regulation end of it. Now, in the unification of regulations, we have another man here that we want to hear from that we haven't heard from. We're happy to have with us from Washington Mr. John S. Rose. Now, John is in the Technical Division of the National Rifle Association, and that might seem to some of you here

a little remotely removed from the immediate discussion, or from this group, but it isn't, because tied right in with these game law regulations, and the need for uniformity of them, and the need for our being able to tie them all together and not let them get away from us, are those regulations pertinent to guns, the use of guns, how we shall use them, and what guns we shall use. And John, just come right up here where Flick was and we're going to tie you right into this discussion right here. We don't want a speech, but we do want your ideas.

ROSE — Well, I'm not trying to scare you with this portfolio.

GILBERT — Well, that's what scared me. That's the reason I said it.

ROSE — No, that's just to answer a question that I might get. I may have the answer in there. Although I certainly have been interested, particularly in the last eight-ten minutes of discussion here dealing with uniformity, because the uniformity of game laws is a subject that roused my interest some four years ago, when I started delving into game conservation and conservation legislation. One of the first questions that took my attention was the trend of legislation, which outlawed or specified what cartridges were or were not suitable for big game hunting in the various states, and I found that it was an exceedingly difficult proposition to list the actual cartridge which was prohibited in each state, where such legislation had been enacted, but I went ahead and just did it for my own curiosity, pursued it, and in some states, as you probably know, the cartridges that are outlawed are done so on the basis of their overall length in inches, tied in with the calibre, or the diameter of the bullet and in other cases, the muzzle energy is involved, and in other cases, the remaining energy at a hundred yards, and in other instances, the muzzle velocity, and with this great variety, it took some time to lay out in tape tabular form, the cartridges which were acceptable, and I listed on the left of my table the states involved, and across the top the cartridges involved, and blacked out the squares where certain cartridges were prohibited, starting with the most impotent loads, and working up to the more powerful loads, and on the assumption that a deer in Michigan is the same animal that he is in Colorado, if he weighs the same, so far as vulnerability is concerned, I assumed that he would be just as hard to kill in one state as he would in another, and that if your techniques in determining what cartridges were right and which ones were wrong were sound, I would have on this table a solid black square starting with the most weak load and ending some place in the middle and a sharp line down showing demarcation, but I was a little disappointed to discover that I had a checker board when I finished which indicated to me that at least half of you were wrong, because you were contradicting one another. It was indicative that there was a lack of unification, a lack of study and perhaps the fact that it wasn't time to legislate and I'm still of that opinion. I think that perhaps some states are—many states, I should say—are accepting burdens that aren't rightfully theirs. I think some of you are taking upon your shoulders a load in enforcement, since enforcement right now is the question at hand, I'll touch on it. You're taking enforcement problems upon your shoulders that rightfully belong on the shoulders of other persons who are profession-

als in enforcement and who are only too glad, apparently, to let you take the load. Some examples of that are these. This year, during the heavy season of state legislature--this is the heavy year, as you know--I had across my desk all the bills that were dropped into the 1948, or I guess the '49 hoppers this year in the various states, all the bills, that is, dealing with conservation and firearms where both subjects were involved and I noticed when I sat back and looked at the results that the majority of them were directed towards two angles. One was safety and the reduction of hunting accidents, and the other was the more efficient killing of animals, or a slacking off or prevention of wounding and crippling and animal loss. Maryland submitted Senate Bill 59 which went to great--into great detail to make illegal the hunting with a silencer or hunting with a machine gun, and in both instances, the subject is covered very nicely with a much more powerful Federal Law and the problem was one that was made artificially for your game management officer, who is already over-loaded. He's now an enforcement officer and it's just thickened his book by that much, insofar as what he has to learn to do his job properly. Actually, the Alcohol Tax Unit, Department of Internal Revenue, has a network of enforcement men employed to follow up exactly that problem, and by accepting the load on their shoulders, Maryland would have just increased their problem and done it entirely artificially, and I think you know right here among those who are here in the room, there are representatives of states that have that little phrase in their game book. There's no need for it really. Actually, if a man is hunting with a silencer or with machine gun, he is violating a very serious Federal code or statute and the penalty for that is going to be much more severe than anything that you people can inflict. It's a matter of education and you can do it--you can educate I think a lot more inexpensively than you can enforce. Another one that Maryland tied in there in the same bill was the use of the full jacketed bullet. Now, I, with the cooperation of the game directors, the directors of game departments in each of the states, have been collecting as much as possible a national hunting accident file for each of the past three years, and although only a few states really do anything at all that resembles a good job of gathering the information, I was able to accumulate these figures. Now, this full jacket proposition is another thing that many of you have adopted, particularly in the big game states and out of 1948 out of 154 accidents that occurred in four of the fourteen states which prohibit the full jacket, and out of 186 accidents from eight of the twenty-four big game states which permit the full jacket--the others prohibited it--they had a total of 340 accidents and only 5 of them were reported as being caused by ricocheting bullets. Three of the five occurred in Colorado and New Mexico where the full jacket is already prohibited. The other two occurred in Wisconsin. There were two out of 33 accidents occurring there and one of them was a ricocheting 22 bullet and the other one was ricocheting fragments. The indications were that the 22 was very likely other than a full jacket and the fragment proposition was also unlikely--it was unlikely that it was a full jacket proposition, because they're inclined to hold together instead of breaking up into fragments. The point that I'm trying to make is that there's another piece of legislation that is being accepted as the proper thing by an increasing number of states throughout the country because another state has

it. That's the way it appears to me. Maybe I'm wrong and it is undoubtedly something that should be discussed and considered, but I don't believe that there's been enough study to justify that type of legislation. I managed to get returns on the killing of some 5,000 deer in 1946, deer that were killed in that year, and I spent the entire year of '47 analyzing those kills and insofar as the anatomical zone involved, and what cartridge hit them, and how much energy it had left when it hit them, because the range was also available to me, and how far the deer traveled after he was hit, I was able to break that down on the basis of bullet design, what bullets were used, and you may be interested to learn that—I won't go into the detail of telling you how we figured them, but they were from one-shot kills where the wound was in the heart area and where the deer dropped in their tracks. Well, the poorest or the least efficient bullet in this little screening, traveled with one exception—there was one out of the whole group and that was one of the Remington products—the poorest one gave a result of 51% dropping in their tracks and the most efficient one 60% dropping in their tracks, and the full jacket military bullet was about 55%, right square in the middle, and the Remington coil lots were 52 and 53, and the Western open point expanding was at 60. Now, I would say, in the absence of any other study that showed mine to be wrong, or in the absence of any work on the part of your departments, that perhaps some consideration should be given to a project which would show the wisdom of pushing more and more bills into the hopper which eventually result in your doing a bigger and bigger job in enforcement. Your unification certainly will be helped by an understanding of what your problems are. You have in Pennsylvania a bill introduced this year, and it had a lot of support, which would require that a man had his safety on on his rifle whenever he was hunting deer, and your enforcement officer would have to—in order to get a conviction—would have to discover a hunter in the brush with a rifle safety off and be able to prove that that hunter was not in the act of seeing a deer or listening to one at the time that the arrest was made. That bill had a tremendous amount of support. I must have gotten about five letters a day for weeks in support of that bill when I made—when I was supposed to criticize it ever so gently. It's a matter of hedging a little to protect yourself from the demand for that type of legislation. The State of Maine put one in this year, another one directed towards hunting accidents, to prevent them and they were going to go through with this test, this examination requiring hunters to be examined, and the bill was introduced and considered seriously. No one had gone to the trouble of making the study that I made in about twenty minutes there in Washington with a telephone. I called the Census Bureau and found out how many towns there were in Maine; I looked in my file and found out how many hunters there were last year. Their provision was to set up an examination board each Saturday for eight Saturdays prior to opening date for a half a day, and those boys were to examine the hunters. All I had to do was one problem of long division and find out that each hunter would have seven seconds to be examined and that was on the assumption that they were all spread smoothly instead of piling up to the last day before the season opened, and it's possible that if there aren't people who are working against such bills, that those things will get in and bedevil you from an enforcement standpoint. I notice here—I just

made a rough list as I left the office—that the vast majority of your bills that were submitted last year—and many of them became law—that dealt with firearms struck at this hunting accident problem and I think that you will save yourself a lot of grief in the long run if you cooperate with one another so that—to this extent—that your hunting accidents will be reported accurately and in a uniform fashion and that the material will be made available to some group, some qualified person—I'd like to have a hand in it, but I don't care who does it, I'd like to see it done—that the material be gathered on a National scale, because to put it bluntly, and perhaps a little strangely, there aren't enough men killed in any one state in any one year to give you conclusive evidence, and I think perhaps that some cooperation is needed on a statewide, or I make a correction, on a National basis to get some straight answers soon and do away with this trial and error, hit or miss type of legislation, that which says that so much of your uniform will be red, and that you won't shoot in this direction or that direction, and that a real study be made of it. I will not take another minute, but in closing, I will say that I figured it out roughly and I decided that about 60% of the legislation that, in my opinion is giving you trouble from an enforcement standpoint, could be done away with, if you do find some way of pooling your information and setting up some little group to study the thing on a National basis before any bills are submitted by, particularly bills that are sponsored by the Conservation Departments themselves. Thank you.

RIDER — Nicely done.

GILBERT — Wait a minute, John. I think maybe there'll be some questions.

???? — Who enforces the machine gun law? I don't know a thing about it.

ROSE — National Firearms Act. The National Firearms Act is not very old, the early '30's, I guess. It provides for the registration of firearms, weapons defined as firearms, and firearms under the meaning of that act are sawed off shot guns, hand guns with detachable butt stocks, weapons capable of rendering full automatic firing, any silencer or weapon equipped with a silencer. All right, any of those instruments must be registered whether they're rendered inoperative or not, and at the time of transfer of ownership, either by loaning, sale or theft, or if you have lost it, a \$200 transfer tax must be paid. You can see there that not very many of your hunters are going to pay \$200 tax on a weapon to be used to kill squirrels or deer, and you've got them cold. Last year, just to check on it for this Maryland problem, I did make a phone call over to the Internal Revenue and found that only two weapons were transferred legally in that fashion last year, and neither one of them in Maryland, so that bill was not justified.

???? — What I was thinking about was the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Quite a number of the states promulgate exactly the same regulations of the Federal Government because the state officers enforce it. You have more enforcement men doing the same thing. Very

few Federal men. It's a duplication, but it seems to be a necessary duplication.

ROSE — Well, you may have that. You probably will. I don't pretend to know where all of the duplications exist, where all of the parallel efforts exist, but I do contend that some of you better be about searching that information out. That's the way it looks to me. I can't afford to spend any more time on it. There's no return for me. My business right now--Wildlife Conservation is a very interesting subject to me. I was schooled in it, and I got into this field because of the shooting game. It's also a hobby of mine and I'm trying to combine the two now and I think maybe we can help you. My bosses have indicated that I and we are to cooperate with you in anyway that you think that we can be of help in this thing. If you think that we can do some projects or perform some projects that will really tie in with your work, we'll be glad to do it. One thing that has my interest now, as Mr. Ruhl here will testify, is this trend of legislating against the use of the rifle in certain areas from a safety standpoint and whereby shot guns only are used on deer, and I'm in the process now of--I should say starting. Don't write next week please, and ask me for the results, because I won't have them, but I'm getting some ricochet figures together, flying against timber. I'm picking some stands of brush, now that the sap, or when the sap gets out of them during the typical hunting season conditions, and I'm going to try and work out some figures on how far from the center of say a five inch or three inch tree can a 30-06 slug be deflected before it will ricochet, and then how far from the center of the same tree can a 30 calibre--approximately 30 calibre ball, nine of which come out of the Double O buck load of a twelve gauge shot gun, and from what I see so far, that shot gun is a lot more ricocheting, has a lot higher ricocheting potential than a 2,700 foot a second rifle slug, and the accident figures that some of you have been kind enough to give me the past three years, have indicated to me that the biggest percentage of our hunters are wounded or killed with about a maximum distance of 50 yards between the wound and the muzzle which encompasses both the shot gun and the rifle very nicely.

GILBERT — Do you have more questions of either Flick or John?

RIDER — Well, I think John brought out a matter that all we administrators ought to be familiar with. I believe that our law enforcement staff should know these Federal regulations on guns. I know of one specific instance down in Ohio that, had this game protector woke up just a little earlier to the fact that he had this man and had him for a penitentiary sentence, he wouldn't have worried so much. We've got one old judge down there, an old moss-back that has always maintained that the Commission has no right to set seasons and bag limits, that that is an unconstitutional delegation of authority by the legislature, so regardless, any time we get a case and take it before that judge, he just sets it aside and finds the man not guilty. Well, this chap was shooting squirrels out of season on a Sunday with a silencer on his gun, and the game protector made the arrest, and it was taken to this concrete court of appeal and the court, of course, found him not guilty and he turned right around and sued that game protector for \$10,000 for

false arrest, and we had the gun and he just worried this chap to death. He was having a lot of trouble, lot of family responsibility and sickness in his family, and he just worried him sick, and this thing went on and he was stalling it off and paying attorneys, and stalling it off, and stalling it off, and finally our supervisor woke up to the fact that there was a Federal Law. This chap was demanding his gun back continuously, and this case had been set up and finally the case came up. The supervisor came to Columbus and got the gun and arranged for the F.B.I. to be in the courtroom and he took the gun to the courtroom the day this trial was coming up for \$10,000 false arrest, and said to this individual, "Now, we don't want to have any more trouble about this gun. Is this your gun?" "Yes", he said, "it is." "How do you identify it?" "Well, there's this marking." "All right, that's fine and now, how further can you identify it?" "Well, there's this", and at that the F.B.I. said, "Well, there you are." The F.B.I. took him by the arm and I guess he's serving yet. But if that game protector had known that Federal Law, he wouldn't have put in that long winter of worrying about what was going to happen if he lost that case, with attorney's fees going up and up and up week by week and month by month.

ROSE — I wouldn't like to leave you with the idea, or the mistaken idea that it's a simple matter to get information on firearm legislation, civil firearm legislation, I'm speaking of now, because it isn't. It's a sweet tough job. We have what we believe is probably the most complete file in the country, and it is a sad sad situation. There's a network of firearm legislation in this country that makes it impossible for you to travel a hundred miles in any direction in any area—you can take a hundred mile rule and lay it on the map in any spot, and this is guess work on my part and I'll admit it—but I guess you have at least violated one city ordinance or county regulation or state law, and they change frequently, and there's obsolescence involved, and it's a mess, but some of it can be of use to you, and I think certainly that you'll agree that your game, your trained game management personnel are being used more efficiently, if they're dealing in problems of biology and ecology than they are, if they're dealing in problems of law for which they are not fundamentally trained.

GILBERT — Scott.

SCOTT — How does your outfit feel about New York's new law that all youths up to 17 first time hunting have to—

ROSE — I'm hieing right up there myself. I'm going to hunt. I'm going to kill two birds with one stone. I'm going to shoot at my first deer with a shot gun—I hate the thought of it, but I want to see it at a little closer range, and maybe if I'm not kicked out of Michigan, I'll stop by there in the southern tier—

RUHL — We'll live through it all right.

ROSE — Well, that wasn't my fear, but I think perhaps they were on more solid ground than any of the approaches that I've heard. We—I kept figures on it for a while, and we were receiving a plan, a suggested plan, that is in one way or another, about three times a

week, year in, year out of how hunters should be examined before they should be permitted to take to the field with a firearm, and most of them were very very shaky and juvenile. I think, to answer your question definitely, I think that this is a good approach, and I'm sure that that gang there will be the first to change it wherever changes are indicated as being necessary. Yes Sir?

STARKWEATHER — Mr. Rose, did the National Rifle—has the National Rifle Association made sufficient studies to give any recommendations as to the rifle itself in—one rifle compared to another in the hunting stages?

ROSE — That involves the mechanics and the sighting arrangement, rather than the cartridge potential itself, is that it?

STARKWEATHER — I'm not speaking of the cartridges.

ROSE — You're not speaking in terms of cartridge now. You're speaking in terms of the rifle, the firearm itself?

STARKWEATHER — The firearm itself.

ROSE — No, and I doubt very much if we will. I doubt it seriously. I'm sure there are Arizona representatives here, but that doesn't prevent me from saying that when we were interviewed for a reaction to a proposed law which would outlaw the 22 calibre rim fire for turkey in Arizona, I did everything that I could to vote down such legislation, because I feel quite certain that it will not accomplish what is desired if the picture has been presented properly, and that's not the only state. Many other states have it. I am more interested in doing as we talked during lunch. I am more interested in preventing the adoption of unsound laws than I am of adopting new good ones. I'm not belittling that. I think new good ones are necessary, but I think more damage can be done by a mass of bad ones and more damage to your future plans can be rendered by such legislation than can be gained by a panel of good laws. I think you can become so involved in the administration of the bad ones that no time remains for the care and the use of the better legislation.

STARKWEATHER — On what principle was your objection to the regulation against the 22?

ROSE — The 22 as I saw it there was objected against because men were tossing—it was an easy rifle to get, a cheap one. It could be thrown in the back of a car carefully and it made itself available nicely for poaching and illegal shooting of turkeys along the road. Everybody had a 22 tossed in the back of the car. It's the very principle that's at stake there, as far as I'm concerned. I don't believe that that law should be accepted and enacted in order to make it easier to make an arrest for poaching. I think that strikes at a fundamental of democracy. The problem is there. The restriction of another and honest individual should not be imposed in order to make it easier for an enforcement officer to convict or arrest a dishonest person. The second reason is because of volume alone. I didn't think that enough violations were occurring—enough 22's were involved, and I didn't think that all of the possi-

bilities of education against the use of the 22 where indicated as being necessary had been exploited. I think that when, for example, the rim fire on deer is desired by a very small minority, I think it's far better technique to educate against it, rather than legislate against it, because if you choose to legislate each time, you build yourselves up a thick law book that you have already, and they'll be even thicker, and they're not effective. You know as I do that—and I hunt in many many states and have been doing it for several years, and because I've been interested in this thing, I've made it a practice of interviewing your game men, and in almost every instance, I am much better informed on his laws than he is, almost every time.

SCOTT — Do you know Wisconsin's M-40? We have an order called M-40...

ROSE — No.

SCOTT — ...on the books. Maybe you've never found it because it's not on the books, it's just an order, but M-40 is the law restricting the use of high-powered rifles in deer country during certain times of the year. All the good citizens of the state want it in order to stop the poacher...

ROSE — I see.

SCOTT — ...who otherwise have preference, and in that case, that law for years has done us very good service. I just wanted to disagree with your general principle here, because it doesn't work all the time. Sometimes the good citizens are willing to be restricted in order to catch the poacher.

ROSE — Well, to carry out the democratic idea, if you have really felt the pulse, then you're on solid ground, but if you're not kidding yourself, you're right. I don't know here and I assume that you're—

SCOTT — We've made a lot of arrests under the law.

ROSE — Well, you say all the honest citizens, that's the phrase that I'm thinking of right now, is to the method by which you ascertained that all the honest citizens wanted it with—

SCOTT — Well, we have an Elective Conservation Congress elected by the people, largely sportsmen, but those are the people that tell us what they think. It isn't all the people in the state.

ROSE — I'm sure you're right.

STARKWEATHER — That's chiefly true in Minnesota and I don't agree with you on your—the outlawing of the 22, for instance, in the taking of deer. You're probably familiar with the Minnesota law there, but we've had practically no trouble—

ROSE — May I add, I didn't mean that as an opinion. I do not preach the use of the 22 on deer. Let me have a moment to make myself clear on that. I preach against it every day. We split

up between three of us there in the Technical Division about 1,200 gun nut—as we call them—gun nut letters a month, and a big percentage of them are recommendations for big game hunting, and whenever a youngster writes to me about whether or not—in other words, he's arguing with his dad. His dad has said, "Well, you write to the N.R.A. and we'll go by their answer". I'll tell them invariably that they would be making a serious mistake to use that 22 in the deer woods, and I do try to be as honest as I can and point out that a lot of deer have been killed with it, but from an efficiency standpoint he isn't going to do a good job. He's going to lose deer. If he's a true sportsman, and we've got to assume that he is, he'll be spending the most productive hours of the day trailing a deer that he probably won't recover, or will come up to only when—in time to see someone else dressing it out, and at the same time, missing good shots and good shooting at other deer, whereas, if he had had a more—a better qualified arm or load, he probably would have brought that deer down within close test distance.

STARKWEATHER — No, what I meant was there, your differential. You said you'd rather see it brought about by education rather than legislation, and there's no question that your activities and other game management agents, and fellows—even average sportsmen, that knows the shocking power of ammunition or whatever you want to call it, killing power, but over the years they just continually did use 22's because they were available. When it became a law in Minnesota, we have had practically no trouble with it at all. They just dropped out of the picture.

ROSE — That's true. If it stopped at 22, there would be no problem, but it's a thin gradation. It's a wedge, and the next time you have a change of commissioners, you have a man in there who feels that—he in his last season saw a deer gut-shot running for miles and miles, and he managed to follow it up and find out what was at fault, and it's the next one on the step, cut her off. One experience. You can tell just about how old I am, and you can see that in this situation, one of my biggest problems was arguing or discussing or putting myself anywhere near the same plane as a white-headed individual who had many many winters in deer camps before I was hatched, and in order to beat that—I watched this thing go time and time again, these opinions on killing power based entirely upon personal experiences, which in every instance could only be a few, a handful of kills, and never any two of them in the same anatomical area with the same situation, same disintegration involved—the winner of the argument was always the man with the whitest hair. He was the man who had done the most shooting, even though it wasn't enough from a scientific standpoint to make him right, so that was the reason I, with your Nebraska representative's encouragement in his little study, I decided to make a little one of my own on deer, and I had the N.R.A. members to fall back on and I put a form, a standardized form in the magazine and asked for returns and I was hoping for about 7 or 8 hundred, and I was tickled to death when I got 5,000 of them, and it, as I say, it did take my whole year of 1947, and I got kind of tired of it before I was finished, but nevertheless, now, when a man tells me that he has shot two deer in the heart, and he got this result, I can look at some of these forms that have been checked by staff men and tell just

about what the average trailing distance is for that area, that anatomical zone, as compared to other anatomical zones. One thing that I learned was that if you hit them in the neck, it doesn't make much difference whether you hit them with a stove bolt or the best engineer's bullet in the world, they're going to be a mighty sick animal in short order.

GILBERT -- Any further questions?

SCOTT -- Where's his report going to be published?

ROSE -- Oh, it was published in two issues of the "Rifleman".

GILBERT -- Any further questions? This topic has brought out several juicy tid-bits that should be illuminated on a little bit, but time isn't permitting it. I wonder if it would be possible, Starkweather and Cunningham, is he here? and Flick if it--no, I meant Bill Cunningham--if it would be possible for your Midwest Law Enforcement Association, perhaps in conjunction with--I wish I could get a name for this all important committee that we're going to have; I hope it turns out to be as important as we are stressing here--to kind of check together before and if possible, have your meeting before the next Midwest Association meeting, and make at least a preliminary attempt on a study of the various regulations, forgetting laws pretty much, because there we're going to get into our legislative angle. We might take that somewhat, but at least starting out with a little ball before it rolls too big and using regulations and seeing what can be done in the way of unification. Perhaps John would consent to come to that meeting. I believe it's to be held in South Dakota. Isn't McKeckerin the President this year? And then, instead of just having your Midwest Law Enforcement meeting, and letting it go at that, draw up a resolution or suggestions or a continued discussion, which would be carried to this group, and we can kind of carry on from there. What do you think of that discussion?

???? -- I think it has possibilities.

STARKWEATHER -- Mr. Gilbert, I don't know whether you've discussed this phase of it or not. I was sitting on edge. I happened to be out with a couple of your boys on something that tied in with Minnesota, but you're just about five years behind, you directors. If you'll read the minutes, and we petitioned on our second annual meeting when the Act of the Midwest Association was performed, we petitioned the directors, taking the position that we were the subordinates, and all we could do was to petition you people to take it up with you in your being, and from there go get legislation or whatever is necessary, a regulation to do this thing, and that applies not only to--it applies as I recall it, specifically applies on the beaver case, and on the bounty case, and specifically on the regulation pertaining to shipment of game by sportsmen.

GILBERT -- When was that?

STARKWEATHER -- I believe that was at the second meeting we had. It came up for discussion at the very first meeting we had here.

GILBERT -- And this group did nothing about it?

STARKWEATHER -- Never have done anything about it, and we've been quite discouraged by it. I say we, because I am not now in charge of law enforcement in Minnesota, but I'll never be anything else but a game warden. I loved the work...

GILBERT -- We know that, Starky.

STARKWEATHER -- ...and feel it's all important, and I just--I'd rather spend my time on that than almost anything else.

RIDER -- Why don't you offer a resolution?

STARKWEATHER -- We did, and the thing Mr. Gilbert's asking for--

RIDER -- I say, offer that resolution right now that we do the thing that's necessary to cooperate.

STARKWEATHER -- Well, that's already a motion. Yesterday that this committee be pointed up--set up--

RIDER -- Oh, I see. Oh, fine.

STARKWEATHER -- Now the committee's to be set up within the directors and if you want--I assume it's perfectly the prerogative of the President of this Association, if he so sees fit, to appoint members of the Midwest, some of whom are the--I hope not too many of them, but most of them who are chiefs of the bureau. We, of course, included the Fish and Wildlife Service and we should have.

GILBERT -- Well, Starkweather, I'm just striking for this same thing, and if we fell down as directors before, the thing to do is to pick up and not let it happen again. I don't remember the situation, but if we can remedy that now and continue this unification by tying just what you say was done there, but this time do something about it when we get it--

STARKWEATHER -- I would say this and as I say--well, I suppose I am-- we passed the buck immediately to our new man in charge of law enforcement, because we wanted him to get acclimated in that group and be active--I would say this, that if you'll--and I hope you will--name this committee now at this meeting, and if you'll make a majority of that committee those who are also--will be the official representatives of your departments in the Midwest Enforcement group, I'll guarantee you, you'll get something out of it.

GILBERT -- My friend, I--realizing the importance of this three-man committee, I tried to take as many things into consideration as possible, but now, if I add to that the possibility of whether they do or do not attend the Midwest, it will probably get a little difficult. A member or the whole committee might be invited to attend the Midwest, even though they themselves were not in the Law Enforcement Division. Invite them to attend the thing.

STARKWEATHER -- I don't see this problem, Mr. Gilbert, as one to be taken up at the convention. We anticipated at that time and if

this committee was set up, it's an interim group that's got to do all this work,...

GILBERT — That's right.

STARKWEATHER — ...with all of our member states. Then it's got to be -- somebody's got to get the bull by the horns, or the bull by the tail, or whatever you want to call it, and spearhead the thing to get -- to keep a continual correspondence. Maybe get a meeting or two, if the group, it was named that there would be three members, is that right?

GILBERT — My feeling is that the Midwest Game Law Enforcement Association, in conjunction with this three-man committee, can definitely at our next meeting of this Association have a definite reporting and it's -- this is being recorded, so it's going to be in the minutes -- that we do something about it then and carry on from there and keep the ball rolling from there, isn't that the answer, Starky?

STARKWEATHER — That's right, and our meeting, that is the Law--the Midwest Law Enforcement meeting--usually comes in June, and I assume, Pete, that's when you'll be having it, is that about right do you think?

PETERSON — Pardon?

STARKWEATHER — You don't know whether McKeckerin has set about when he thinks he will have it, about the usual time?

PETERSON — I don't think so, Starky, but I would imagine -- when did you meet this year?

STARKWEATHER — Usually in June.

PETERSON — June? Well, that would be my guess. That's the most--

STARKWEATHER — See that it's when the South Dakota trout season is open, will you?

GILBERT — Well--

PETERSON — That opens the first of May.

???? — Well, Starky, Beckman said that they intended to have it in June this year.

STARKWEATHER — That's fine.

GILBERT — Pete, will you carry that information to McKeckerin?

PETERSON -- Yes, Sir.

GILBERT — And, it will, of course, be in the minutes which will be sent to all of you. Our time is no longer--

PETERSON — This committee is Starky, Cottingham, and Flick Davis, is that correct?

GILBERT -- Pardon?

PETERSON -- This committee?

GILBERT -- No, Sir. Unless you are talking about a different committee than I am. I have not named this all important committee as yet.

PETERSON -- Oh, I misunderstood you. I thought you named those three men.

GILBERT -- No, I -- the reason I was naming them is because they -- they are always in attendance at this -- this Game Law Enforcement Association. That's the reason I was asking them, because they kind of carry the ball.

PETERSON -- Well, Paul, you mentioned bringing the word to McKeckerin. He should know who this committee is so he can extend them an invitation.

GILBERT -- He will. It will be in the minutes. The minutes are being recorded, I hope. If that wire recorder isn't working, somebody's going to be awfully embarrassed. I don't know whether it will be you or me. Gentlemen, we don't have too much time left, and as I say, you do have planes to take, trains to take, and what not, and I'm sorry that there's little time left. We're going to cut this part short, because we want our business session and we want to get out of here. I hate to cut this part short. I realize that some of you--not all of you, thank goodness--but some of you, a few of you, I'll put it that way, feel that you are primarily game managers. That's your job, game and fish managers. John over here talks about being young and young-looking. I used to be that way about, about eight years ago, the first time I met with you fellows. Now, I'm a nervous wreck, grey-headed and I don't know. It happens to all of us. In fact, it shocked me, John, to all of a sudden classify myself and find I couldn't put myself in your group any more. I'm in this grey-headed group, but I've got a lot of company. And that is that. I personally feel that game management certainly is our assignment, but human management to me--and the older I get and the more I watch it--is becoming almost as much a part of the picture. Human management. We won't have many problems, we'll have plenty of game, if we just take care of that human element, so all of you--and we're not going to have time to go the rounds--but all of you are doing all these various things. Radio - I understand some of you are now going into television, all of the various vehicles that you use for education. You go out to your wildlife clubs, old grey-heads like us, not very many like John. You can't do anything for them. As you know, I have long been and have always been a companion of--as Roy Owen calls it, and I have adopted the phrase--the freckle-nose. I think one of the most important things that you can do--if I'm not careful, I'm going to be giving a speech, so I'm going to cut myself off right now--is take care of that freckle-nose. You're not going to win politically or personally by it. You're not going to profit particularly by it because the results of what you're doing in gradually building up that freckle-nose won't show until you're an old man and he's a young man, but somewhere, someplace along the way, I think we'll be happy that our returns in old age

are coming not from monetary rabble that we've left behind, but from fine stalwart young men that are so trained and so educated that they can handle and manage themselves and outdoor America. We've got a man right over here, and he doesn't have the slightest idea that he would ever be called on, but I think he--next to our friend Scotty up in Wyoming who's doing a wonderful job and that committee is really functioning--come out of the corner, will you? Come clear out. This man has taken our freckle-noses by the hand. He's an S.C.S. man. We've had an awful lot of things represented here, but Adrian Fox--he's working through many states here with you--Adrian, summarize in just three or four minutes what we're doing here, in conservation--I don't mean in Nebraska, I mean here in the Midwest.

FOX — Well, it may not take me that long to summarize it. At one time I was Field Biologist for the Soil Conservation Service and I have been shelved, I believe, to some extent from field activities. I'm now engaged in educational work. We're attempting to get conservation into the school curriculum, in hopes that the children will learn something about conservation. The more I work with it, the more I'm convinced that that is the solution for many of the problems that you commissioners are faced with, both in enforcement and management and other phases of conservation work. I have learned a lot about this educational work as I go along, as I think, naturally, anyone would do in a new job. I find that working with educational administrators is probably one of the slowest and most difficult things one could get mixed up with. I haven't yet discovered why. No one will say that conservation education in public schools is the wrong approach, and they'll all agree that it is the only approach, but to get it into the school curriculum is another thing. Bud Morgan's state has put in a compulsory conservation educational law. It went into effect in 1943 and like many things in North Dakota, which happens to be my home state, it had no teeth in it and nothing was done about it until within the past year. Now, they have the teaching material which the teachers should have had six years ago when the law became effective. I was talking to Bud about it last night. The teacher training institutions still in North Dakota do not have the teacher training program that trains teachers to teach conservation. Just how that will be overcome, I don't know. Possibly, Bud will have a solution for that. We've worked with Paul Gilbert here in Nebraska on a number of conservation programs and as always have found him very cooperative. The solution to the conservation program out in Montana is taking a little different approach. I don't believe you have a Montana representative here. They have set up a State Conservation Council with representatives from farm organizations, conservation groups, the Game Commission, the educational field and so on. I think they're going to accomplish many things out there when they get going. Here in Nebraska, we have one County Superintendent of Schools who has done an outstanding job, and Dr. Kennedy this past year awarded his Conservation Trophy to that particular Superintendent. There are many phases to this conservation education program. I think that it should receive greater support than it is receiving. I think all conservation groups should be back of the effort. I think Conservation Commissions should especially be supporting it. I know some states are, and the extent of the work that they do in the educational field is very extensive. I'm thinking

especially of Missouri right now. Just how they do it, I don't know, but I think it's unfortunate other states can't go into the program as extensively as they are doing. Briefly, Paul, that—

GILBERT — Do you have any questions of Mr. Fox, or any statements you want to make regarding conservation education? I can't spend much time on it, unfortunately.

RIDER — Yes, Paul. We spend a lot of money. I think we pioneered this thing. I think we---if you know Ollie Fink, I think he wrote the first Teachers' Training Manual, we established the first Teachers' Laboratory, we subsidized that. We---about ten years ago, the department of education had no money and we pay up to the tune of \$4000 a year for conservation aid down there who makes the high schools and the grade schools. We put up \$6000 every year that the 4-H clubs might have a camp in the State of Ohio. This thing costs us about \$150,000 now. It can't go on, gentlemen, forever. That's the alarming thing to me. I have said for the last twenty-five years—and I'm in a better position to say so now than ever before—that the great all-consuming major need in conservation in America is an educated public. Now, I had the job of starting in about January to read the Hoover Report and I read about 7,000 pages and I came to the conclusion when I read the final report that it was about the dumbest damn thing that I ever laid my eyes on. It indicates to me that even men of the calibre of intelligence as Herbert Hoover—and I think he's outstanding in the world—after all, have a very slight knowledge of the problems involved in conservation. But the thing that worries me is this, that we folks can't continue forever to carry the cost of conservation education out of the poor devil's fees who loves to hunt and fish. In all this work we do in Ohio, I don't believe that there's ever so much as an hour spent on fish and game. We've carried the ball for soil conservation; we've carried the ball for forestry; we've carried the ball for water; in other words, the poor devil who hunts and fishes in Ohio—it's his money that is educating the children of Ohio and the adults if you please, in not fish and game conservation, but in the conservation of the basic natural resources of this land. I, for one, don't think—I think about this a lot—that we can continue to carry this load. I believe the manufacturer has a place in this situation. Hell, we're preaching water conservation in Ohio, not for fish that's in—that's rather insignificant, but water for industry, water for agriculture, water for municipal purpose, water for domestic use, if you please. It seems to me that the taxpayer generally has a place in this thing. We ought to be spending a part of his money. We teach soil conservation, not for the sake of game, or for the sake of fish, but for the sake of a perpetual prosperous agriculture that will be able to feed Ohio and help feed America. It seems to me that again the men of agriculture should be spending some of their money in this thing. I don't believe, gentlemen, that we folks who are supported by fish and game money only, can continue to carry this ball. I believe sooner or later we've got to, somehow, someway, arrive at a solution which at least tosses this ball to those folks who have even a greater responsibility in this whole problem than do we have. I mean agriculture, I mean industry, the general taxpayer. Now, that's my feeling. We've carried a terrific load, Paul. We've—we have a Conservation Extension—Wildlife Conservation Extension set-up. We

publish a magazine. If you read it, there's not too much about game in it. That costs us \$70,000 a year--60,000 subscribers and still we put in \$70,000 of hunting and fishing money.

GILBERT -- There's been no gradual trend away from you into the education channel?

RIDER -- No. There hasn't been in this nation. We've been following this thing, and I think it's high time that a group like this direct it's attention to ways and means. I'm all for this matter. I think that is all important, but I think it's high time that we direct our attention to ways and means to get some help and cooperation on this scheme of things, because I don't believe that we, in the Ohio Division, can continue now--about a million five hundred thousand dollars we've put into conservation education, not fish, not wildlife conservation education. Most of it's conservation of the soil, conservation of the water, forests, minerals. It's just not right, and I think that's the point we've got to come to. We should direct our attention to action that would at least put this responsibility where it belongs, not on just the poor devil who hunts or fishes, but on the taxpayer of America, the general taxpayer, particularly, those men in agriculture whose very living depends upon that top soil and those men in industry whose wealth and riches come from water, minerals. It's high time they realized their responsibilities in this thing.

GILBERT -- Adrian, would you like to make a comment on Ohio? Ohio has done a grand job. They've probably had as much experience as anybody, none more.

FOX -- I just wonder if this gentleman might have gotten the wrong impression from my statement when I said that I thought the state game commissions should support this conservation education idea for children. I didn't mean that they should support it financially entirely. I meant that they should give their moral support and attempt to get the educational people to assume their obligation. I think that the educational work should be supported by general taxation.

RIDER -- Oh no, Sir. You and I have - I hope I didn't give you the wrong impression. I'm in absolute agreement, we're in agreement, but I want to arouse, if I can, this group, the International, and Game Commissioners, Game and Fish Commissioners and Game and Fish Commissions, to the fact that we can't, gentlemen, that is, ethically, morally, and rightfully, continue to subsidize conservation education down through the years. That is, I know we can't--I think a million and a half over the last ten years has gone into that thing, and we haven't received one iota of help from anybody. Now, I think some-way we've got to do this thing, and I think it's high time that we Game Commissioners think of ways that we can pass this ball on a little, see? That's the point.

RUHL -- I'm surprised at you, Buck.

FOX -- Many educators, administrators and teachers both, in small areas and large areas, are making use of educational resources and going to both the resources of the State Game Commission, the Federal

Agencies and others and drawing upon those resources for teaching aid, teaching materials, and for taking their classes right out in the field to study conservation. I don't think conservation can be taught successfully out of a book in back of a desk. I think the kids have to get out in the field and see it. They can read about terraces and gullies; when they have to walk over them and see them and study them, I think they have a better idea of what they're all about. I think the educational people should make full use of all resources that are available to them, whether it's the Extension Service, Soil Conservation Service or even a game enforcement officer, out here in the field. I think they've all got a great contribution to make if the teachers and educators would only make use of it.

GILBERT -- Thanks, Adrian.

RUHL -- Mr. Chairman?

GILBERT -- Yes.

RUHL -- I want to encourage Buck. The tide is turning, I think, in Michigan, so that the teachers, superintendents, and the school boards are beginning to assume more of what is their rightful responsibility. In other words, they have not had time to sell their people, to sell their school boards, and they are moving in the right direction. We're being bedeviled by more requests for help than we can give. We've told them we've primed the pump, we've shown them where the waters run, and they've got to get in there and pitch. We've still got a lot of help to give them and we should, but I think that's the main thing.

GILBERT -- Mr. Scott is educational director, I believe, from Wisconsin.

SCOTT -- I want to second what Mr. Ruhl just said. I think there is hope, and I think the tide is turning. It seems like a hopeless situation, and I certainly don't want to stand here and indicate that things are going along fine. I think we're way behind the times, and what we ought to be doing is conservation education, but there is hope, and I think we're making strides. We're being paid now for things that we did ten years ago that didn't seem to pay dividends. We've had a compulsory education law in Wisconsin since about 1935. It took a long time to take hold, and even now you can find a million faults with it, but it is starting to take hold to the extent that the Milwaukee School Board buys a school forest and hires a man to just take the kids out and show them the trees. We are now getting somewhere. As to industry in Wisconsin, there seems to be indication of hope. Our forest industries have established the trees for the Morrow camp and for several years now have done teaching programs in camps. Our College of Agriculture in regard to forestry has its extension courses, and contacts, field trips, demonstrations, so darn many of them I can't keep track of them all, and they take the young farmers out and train them how to handle things on the land. I think there is hope and I know our forest industries anyhow in Wisconsin are starting to pay attention to their part. We've had 4-H work through our College of Agriculture for ten or twelve years. It's done very nicely over the radio and it's paying dividends in the youngsters. I want to call attention to one thing, our State Teachers

College—with a course which teaches teachers to teach conservation, a full four-year course teaching teachers. Now they think they're one of the first in the country doing this, and I think they are too. It is something that should be in every state probably. We maybe should have a couple of schools like that, but they are turning out teachers. In fact, they turned out more teachers last year than they could put into teaching positions. There's a long way to go yet.

RIDER — Right. Pardon me, may I interrupt you there? Now, have they instigated in their course — is this girl who's going to take a two-year normal course and then be qualified to teach in the third or fourth grade, is there a course there that that teacher can integrate that subject in teaching that elementary division?

SCOTT — That's right. Wisconsin's entire conservation teaching set-up is built on the theory that conservation is to be integrated in the courses,...

RIDER — That's right—

SCOTT — ...and we've had that all the way through, even in the high school, but the most recent manual—

RIDER — Of course, I think we all have got to agree there that, my God, we can't get any more courses, outright courses, into high schools or grade schools or even colleges. My God, their curriculum is overburdened now.

SCOTT — I was going to mention that the most recent guide for teaching conservation that came out in Wisconsin was just published the other day and there is a copy at the desk that you can look at. Mr. Smekley, Professor Smekley of Central State, is on Thomas Scott's committee. He recommended the possibility of a separate conservation course in high school level. It might be interesting to read what he had to say, but anyhow, those booklets are there. If you want one, you can get it. Paul, I want to say, though, I disagree with you just a little bit on one thing. Just because a man has grey hair doesn't say he can't change his mind or can't learn and I have seen—

GILBERT — Did I say that?

SCOTT — You indicated it.

GILBERT — I'm still learning.

SCOTT — I think there is hope. I say that, because through constant education we have changed some people's minds—

RIDER — There's room for everybody, but the bald-headed guys like Ruhl.

SCOTT — The men who are old veteran deer hunters have turned around and seen the light, and I think that we shouldn't give up the idea of trying to deal with our adults as well as the youngsters.

GILBERT — We're not giving up, but I'll take the freckle-nose everytime.

When I get past the grey-haired stage and get like some people are in this room, then we can look--we're talking about the black-heads and the grey-heads, there's still another one left you know.

SCOTT -- Bald-heads.

GILBERT -- When we look back upon those freckle-noses, we want to be able to say we've done something for them. Our time's gone. We can't spend any more on it, and I'm happy to say that finally conservation education is more and more being injected into our various wildlife programs. At North American last time, she was in there. There weren't very many game people. There were quite a few educators, but that was all right. Just keep whooping it on up to more importance, so instead of being last on the schedule, it's first. And now we must come to our business meeting because I'm trying to stay on schedule.

PETERSON -- Paul, just a moment. Are you going to give Dan a chance to discuss that waterfowl -- I had something I wanted to bring before the meeting in connection with that if you're going to give him a few minutes' time.

GILBERT -- I just practically forgot it. Get up, get going.

JANZEN -- Well, this will just take a minute. As you know about three years ago we started a series of waterfowl meetings to be held in the spring of the year preliminary to deciding on what our regulations might be, and we held, I think, about sixteen what we called regional waterfowl meetings over the country. That number has held about consistent--there is some variation over three years--and has been supplemented, however, in the last year with a series of what we call statewide meetings. Now, the reason I'm bringing this thing up is because of a resolution introduced at the International Commissioners' Meeting. I'm going to read the resolution. It's short. "Resolution Number Three. Resolved", and so forth and so forth, "that we commend the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service for holding regional waterfowl meetings and urge that the Service continue the holding of such meetings and extend the same into a greater number of localities throughout the United States." That last sentence, that last phrase "extend the same into a greater number of localities throughout the United States" is what I want to discuss. We have been feeling in the Service for some time that maybe we should cut down the number of Regional meetings, as such, but if we do an expansion, it would be in what we would call statewide meetings. There probably wouldn't be an expansion in the middlewest because every state here in the middlewest had a statewide meeting last year, that is in this region, the region in which I operate. It takes a lot of work to prepare for these meetings, especially these regional meetings at which a representative, either Director Day or his assistant, Assistant Director attends and usually handles the meeting. It takes a lot of work. There has been an inclination in the Washington office to see if they couldn't cut down that work. We have been encouraged by the Director to try to see if we cannot handle our meetings at a state level in conjunction with statewide federation meetings, or like Wisconsin, Wisconsin Conservation Congress. In Michigan last year, we held it in connection with the Michigan sportsmen--Statewide

Federation of Sportsmen. In some states, that isn't practical, because if you have two or three federations somebody's mad if it isn't held at his particular meeting, and so it is better that it be held as a special meeting. Now, I wanted to throw this into the discussion, because next year, as far as I'm concerned, every state here, each State Game Commission will get a letter like they did last year and ask, do you want a state waterfowl meeting this year? Also, how about regional meetings? Can we get by with one regional meeting here for the Middlewest instead of two. Last year at the Washington level, we considered we had three regional meetings, one at Chicago, Minneapolis, and Lincoln, but really the Lincoln meeting was a state meeting, handled by a Washington representative. There were only two regional meetings in the middlewest. Now, that's all I have to say. I would like to have discussion on that.

GILBERT -- All right, we'll lead off right here from Nebraska with a statement on that. I think, probably, ultimately, as far as we're concerned, the regional meetings will be very satisfactory, but I think next year we would like to have another state meeting. Now, what would some of you -- let's go right around. Morgan? What do you think?

MORGAN -- I'm very much in favor of it.

GILBERT -- Of what?

MORGAN -- The state meeting.

GILBERT -- Ruhl.

RUHL -- Yes, I think that's satisfactory.

RIDER -- Well, we--

GILBERT -- Rider.

RIDER -- We've always had a regional meeting at Columbus, and I'd hate very much to see that disturbed because it's been helpful, very helpful.

GILBERT -- Ruhl.

RUHL -- Yes.

GILBERT -- Scott.

SCOTT -- We've had state discussions with the Fish and Wildlife Service, and we'd like to continue them.

GILBERT -- Pete.

PETERSON -- As I recall, in connection with these meetings, I mentioned it briefly when we were down at Winnipeg. I'd like to see one regional meeting for state administrators only, for state departments. Some of us have commissions. I generally think members of the commission too. Then have state meetings. I believe that we should

~~confine~~ our regional meeting to the state departments for this reason. There are many things to be discussed there that may be of interest particularly for administrators. Some of the details, maybe we wouldn't like to air them publicly, and I know that we attended a meeting last year in Minneapolis that really was a meeting of the Minnesota waterfowl hunters. I believe that should have been a separate meeting. We had one in South Dakota for our waterfowl hunters. I believe that the state administrators would get more out of it if we had one central meeting in the region. Now, it's not too particular where it's held for most of us. Chicago would be, perhaps, as advantageous as any. If you hold it somewhere else, that's all right, but the point I want to make is that as far as we're concerned, we would like to see one meeting, a regional meeting for state administrators, and later on, a meeting in the individual states with your local people.

GILBERT -- How many of you other states would favor a meeting of the administrators first and then your state meetings? Let's have hands on that. Well, I think that answers that question. Now, Starkweather, what's Minnesota's desires as far as a regional meeting or a state meeting's concerned for wildlife hearings.

STARKWEATHER -- Well, I don't think I'd want to speak for the commissioner or Frank on that.

GILBERT -- All right.

PETERSON -- Paul?

GILBERT -- Yes.

PETERSON -- I want to make myself clear here. I don't criticize the Minnesota meeting at all. That was called as a joint meeting, which I understand was a regional meeting, but there were only three or four states there and naturally that was the only opportunity at which the Minnesota waterfowlers could be heard, but naturally there were many more of those people represented than state administrators and the net result is that most of the time was taken up with discussion of local problems, and we had one for that very purpose. I think they should have one for that purpose in Minnesota.

GILBERT -- Cottingham?

COTTINGHAM -- There's no demand for a state meeting in Indiana, so a regional meeting would be very satisfactory with us.

GILBERT -- Mel, I hate -- Steen. Mel (whistle) Mel, I hate to interrupt, but we're just taking a poll of states here. What would Missouri's desire be as to a state Federal Waterfowl Hearing as compared to a regional one?

STEEN -- Well, I believe Mr. Morrow is better qualified to answer that question than I am. I suggest you call on him.

GILBERT -- Morrow.

MORROW — Well, we would favor the state meeting, the state level.

GILBERT — Feast. Feast, you've been doing a very lot of commendable work on this waterfowl business. What's your opinion here, just to help Dan along, unofficially?

FEAST — State meeting, Paul.

GILBERT — Dan, does that answer your questions?

JANZEN — Well, I know what Pete — what's bothering Pete. We've had — it happened at every one of our so-called regional meetings. We draw heavily as far as the bulk of the audience is concerned from a — from probably a fifty-mile radius. It's advertised as a regional meeting and there probably are representatives from five, six states. We have a feeling we are much more representative at the state meeting, and especially when they're held in conjunction with a federated sportsmen's group. I think we get a much better idea of what the people want. We'll continue this by correspondence, because I'm not going to have the say of this because Director Day has started something — he has started something here and we can't probably make a radical change immediately, but there has been some discussion on cutting it down to one regional meeting just for the sake of cutting down on the time involved, and whether that should be a wide open meeting, or a meeting of the administrators, or a combination. We have done that. We have had an open all-day hearing advertised as a regional meeting for the whole region and an evening meeting confined to administrators. We have tried out that combination, but not in this region. I'd have to talk to somebody else in the Service to find out how that worked out, so there's all this different possibility, but I'd like to have you think about it, because you're all going to get a letter probably within the next three months.

GILBERT — Thank you, Dan. Are you ready for the business session? We'll have the Secretary-Treasurer's report.

VANCE — Mr. Chairman and members of the Association. At the 1948 Put-in-Bay, Ohio meeting of this Association, as Secretary-Treasurer, Mr. Edward Wickliff made a progress report on dues; all twelve states had paid their 1948 dues. The Province of Ontario remitted to your present Secretary \$10.00 on November 3, 1948, for payment of the 1949 dues as new members of the Association. Invitations to membership were made to Manitoba and to Kentucky. Manitoba accepted membership in the Association. Dues were not received. Kentucky did not see fit at the time to become a member of the Midwest. There are now twelve states and two province members of this Association. The call for 1949 dues did not go out to member states and provinces until just before this present annual meeting. Kansas remitted \$10.00 on July 5, 1949. Indiana has a voucher in progress for payment, at the present time, as has Nebraska. A check in the amount of \$293.50 was received from the former Secretary-Treasurer and deposited in the First National Bank of Lincoln, Nebraska. The check from Ontario was deposited at the same bank, making a total deposit at the present time of \$303.50. There is a check in the amount of \$10.00 on hand not deposited. There have been no disbursements from the fund. A bill in the amount of \$2.08 is outstanding for postage due on records supplied to your present Secretary from his predecessor.

GILBERT — Now, following the Secretary's report, we'd better have the Auditor's report, with any motions he cares to make.

LEAHY — Mr. President, the auditing of that account is a very simple matter I must say. We found — we audited his books — I think he had three items there, and we found it just as he states it here, but we have found this too, that there are no records back of this account. They seem to be scattered, so we talked over here with the Directors today, and it's been decided that we're going to start over again, with this audit and with these figures. The Secretary-Treasurer is to get a ledger and keep this stuff in a ledger, so we can audit it next year and I move the adoption of this report, Sir.

GILBERT — You've heard the motion. Is there a second?

RIDER — I second the motion.

GILBERT — Have to look at this thing. I forget. All right, are there any questions? Discussion? Question? All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

AUDIENCE — Aye.

GILBERT — Those opposed by the same sign. Buck, I'm following your manual right to the key here, so if I make any mistakes, it's all your fault. This time I think we will have the report of the Resolutions Committee, the Chairman of which is Buck Rider.

RIDER — Mr. President. Gentlemen of the Association. We've tried to simplify these resolutions in conformity with the wishes of the President and others, and we start off in this fashion. "Whereas a group of resolutions was passed by the recent International Convention of Game and Fish Commissioners held in Winnipeg, Canada, and, whereas these resolutions were the product of careful consideration of men who are engaged in the same field of endeavor, and who are striving toward the same goal that we strive toward, therefore, be it resolved that these resolutions receive the endorsement of this body and that we especially urge the Congress to implement the provision of Resolution No. 5, which resolution provides that moneys now a part of the surplus funds, accruing from the excise tax on fire arms and ammunition be made available to the several states within the next five years. Whereas, it is anticipated that within the next few years a considerable sum of money will be made available to the several states through the functioning of the Pittman-Robertson Act; and, whereas, these moneys play an important part in the programs of many of the state wildlife conservation activities, and, whereas, under the law established, presently existing, these moneys cannot be spent for wildlife extension education, and, whereas, extension education is recognized as of utmost importance to the long-range conservation program of our country, if our people are to be brought to a proper realization of the value of wildlife conservation, before many species and public hunting disappear, therefore, be it resolved that the Congress be urged to take immediate action to amend the Pittman-Robertson Act to the end that funds made available to the several states from and through this act may be spent for wildlife extension education. Whereas, the cause of conservation has lost

important friends and advisors during the period since we last met, and whereas, we recognize this important loss and deeply regret the same, therefore, be it resolved by this body that we mourn the passing of Ben Morgan, Commissioner of Florida; Bill Adams, Commissioner of New York; Aldo Leopold and Senator Walcott. Whereas, we are about to complete the Convention of the Midwest Game and Fish Commissioners, being held in the City of Lincoln, State of Nebraska, and under the supervision of the Nebraska Conservation Department, and, whereas, this Convention has been carried out in a most orderly and efficient manner, and, whereas, the President of our organization, Mr. Paul Gilbert, has conducted this Convention in a rather new and unique manner, in that it was comprised of general discussions in which all might participate, and, whereas, we feel that largely because of his efforts and plans, it has been the huge success that we have experienced, therefore, be it resolved by this body that this resolution be a token of our sincere appreciation and gratitude for all the courtesy and kindness extended to those of us, who are visitors in attendance." Mr. President, that, respectfully, is the report of your Resolutions Committee. In order that we might have discussion, I move, Sir, it's adoption.

GILBERT — Is there a second? Scott. Discussion?

RUHL — Mr. Chairman. There is a question. I wasn't quite sure—the fund—what I want to raise a question about is the extension education with P-R funds. I think, as far as I'm concerned, it's a desirable activity. I think there isn't any argument. The question is whether we want to amend the P-R Act, and the second question, whether we want to tie it down more specifically. I thought your resolution did, so that it goes and ties in directly with our part of the program, rather than the general extension education program. Maybe your wording covered it, I didn't know. Will you—

RIDER — Yeah.

GILBERT — I think so. You want to read that part again, Buck?

RIDER — Yes. "Whereas, it is anticipated that within the next few years a considerable sum of money will be made available to the several states through the functioning of the Pittman-Robertson Act, and, whereas, these moneys play an important part in the programs of many of the state wildlife conservation activities, and, whereas, under the law established presently existing, these moneys cannot be spent for wildlife extension education, and, whereas, extension education is recognized as of utmost importance to the long-range conservation program of our country, if our people are to be brought to a proper realization of the value of wildlife conservation before many species and public hunting disappear, therefore, be it resolved that the Congress be urged to take immediate action to amend the Pittman-Robertson Act to the end that funds made available to the several states from and through this Act may be spent for wildlife extension education."

RUHL — Did they put wildlife in there? Tie it down? You see what I'm getting at?

RIDER — Yes, I'm in agreement there and that was, that was the, I think,

that was the meaning all right.

STARKWEATHER -- Amending the resolution, I think, Mr. Ruhl, what you're asking, making the language that says it's to be made available to the states,...

RUHL -- No, I was thinking about not available for general extension education.

STARKWEATHER -- ...but for wildlife.

RUHL -- The particular part that we're interested in --

STARKWEATHER -- That's right. That's right.

RIDER -- That's right. That's right. Why, the only place that your resolution, Harry, shows the intent of the committee, is where it mentions "before many species of game disappear".

RUHL -- I'd like to add wildlife extension.

RIDER -- But I believe that's good. I believe that's a good idea.

RUHL -- It means more specific. I don't see any objections to that,

RIDER -- There's no objection to that and we'll insert wildlife conservation ahead. You remember at Atlantic City, I had a knock-down, drag-out fight with my very good friend and pal, I. C. Quinn. Well, I thought at that time that it was, and I still think that I was right at that time on repeating that it would have been a very dangerous proposition to attempt to amend the P-R Bill, but I think we're over the hump. I was worried about whether or not we were going to get this same appropriation year after year, that is, get the full amount. I think, I hope we're going to get it. I don't think that there's any fear of that. I think since that's established and seems to be from now on customary, that we wouldn't take any chance if we did attempt to amend that bill, do you?

RUHL -- I don't know. I'm not sure in my own mind. It seems to me the most important thing is to get the thirteen million cut,...

RIDER -- Oh, that's true.

RUHL -- ...and sometimes you'd better go after a single bird, and get him, than try for two. I don't know if this is one of these times or not. Now, I'm for a conservation education program, and it's just a matter of strategy, that's all.

RIDER -- Well, at least I'm willing to take a chance. I think we're in a better position now, since it seems to be just accepted that they're going to give us that money. I don't believe we're going to have too much trouble in getting this thirteen and a half million, unless the Government goes broke between the time --

RUHL -- I think if all the states want it, we'll get it.

RIDER -- But if we get that amount of money, it will make the money available, and I think these Federal men can tell us that there are some states that might have a tough time spending and matching, and this would certainly give them a reasonable beneficial way to spend some of that additional money. I'm in agreement with that wildlife specification. I spoke for that, you know, a little while ago. I'd like to get these farmers and manufacturers carrying their own ball, and realizing their own responsibility in this natural resources education.

GILBERT -- Further discussion? Any further discussion? Are you ready for the question?

???? -- Right.

GILBERT -- You've heard the resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

AUDIENCE -- Aye.

GILBERT -- Opposed by the same sign. We've got a little new business coming up. Kentucky, as the Secretary has told you, has not as yet accepted invitation to join this group. We have with us supposedly a guest--we don't treat him like a guest--we treat him like anything but a guest--but Cleland Feast has seen fit to take his time and money to come here to attend this meeting and he has certainly exemplified a great deal of interest and participated to our benefit in it. I do not know officially whether Cleland would care to be a part of this organization, but I am wondering if anybody would care to make that invitation or discuss it.

MORGAN -- Mr. President.

GILBERT -- Mr. Morgan.

MORGAN -- I feel that Mr. Feast has an immoral effect upon the Resolutions Committee!

GILBERT -- Well, do you want to tie that down just to the Resolution Committee? Mr. Feast!!

PETERSON -- I don't know anything about his effect upon the Resolutions Committee, but I do feel that the State of Colorado has common interests with these states here. We have a lot of things in common, and I'd like to move that we extend an invitation to the State of Colorado to become a member of this Association.

GILBERT -- You've heard the motion. Is there a second?

MORGAN -- Second the motion.

GILBERT -- It's been moved and seconded that Colorado be extended an invitation to join this fine group of men. All--any discussion? Are you ready for the question?

RUHL -- That's if he wants to join.

GILBERT -- Well, the letter will probably be---this is unofficial. This isn't the way it should be done. You're supposed to be extended a letter. Do you want to join?

PETERSON -- The vote first.

RIDER -- Question.

GILBERT -- Are you ready for the question? All those signify by saying "Aye".

AUDIENCE -- Aye.

GILBERT -- Opposed, "No".

RIDER -- Come up and pay your ten dollars; that's what we're after.

GILBERT -- That was a rather close vote, but I think the chair will rule that it was in favor of Feast. Did you want to say something, Mr. Feast?

FEAST -- Mr. Chairman and members. I accept the invitation officially with pleasure, and with honor, and I will so notify you officially upon my return to Denver.

GILBERT -- I might say, seriously, because we do chide him a lot, but, frankly, I am personally more than glad to have Cleland with us. I've worked with him on this Basin business for several years, and he's the best help in the world. You can put him on any committee and he'll get the job done.

RIDER -- Mr. President.

GILBERT -- Yes, Sir.

RIDER -- I believe that if Kentucky hasn't seen fit to join this organization that the resolution to withdraw that invitation to Kentucky might be in order, and I'll submit such a resolution.

GILBERT -- You make that in the form of a motion?

RIDER -- I do.

GILBERT -- Is there a second? Is there a second?

STARKWEATHER -- Well, is the membership of the Association limited? I raise the question for what purpose does it serve to withdraw. If they don't accept, they're just not a member.

GILBERT -- That's right, if they don't accept.

RIDER -- Well, it's probably so. That's right. That resolution --

GILBERT -- It might be a little more gentlemanly than saying, "No you can't".

STARKWEATHER -- If that resolution were or did become an official part of the minutes of this meeting, and, for some reason or other, there's been something holding Kentucky back, and then here comes along they're going to want to --

RIDER -- Of course, I feel they've got long enough and I'd be happy to notify Earl Wallace that the invitation no longer exists. I'd call him on the telephone and tell him that.

GILBERT -- We have a motion. Is there a second?

RIDER -- I withdraw that motion, Mr. President.

GILBERT -- The motion is withdrawn. I will now appoint and this - this - I've put quite a bit of time in on it -- this so-called committee, and I hope they name themselves, because I keep wanting to call them something and there's nothing to call them. Maybe afterwards, we'll find plenty to call them. It's an important committee, and, fellows, your're being loaded with something, but something important, and a lot depends on how well you carry it out. Those that I have appointed are as follows: Chairman, Buck Rider of Ohio, and his neighbor, Harry Ruhl. When we first talked to you about this, we mentioned the fact that we were going to pick three neighbors. I haven't talked to anybody particularly about this, but the more I think of it, we westerners are obviously more uncouth than our friends here from the east. Somebody should represent we wild westerners, and I have talked with one of our fine colleagues, and he tells me that he will be able to make the long journeys whenever you want him to, to meet with him, and, therefore, I'm very happy to appoint our friend, Mr. Morgan, from North Dakota.

RIDER -- Fine. I'm damn glad you didn't appoint that Feast to drink my whiskey.

GILBERT -- All right now, Mr. Vance - where'd he go? The last bit of new business that I have, and then we'll see what you have, is the changes, of course, in the By-laws. Do you want to present that story? I think most of them have copies.

VANCE -- Do you all have copies of the proposed revision of the Constitution and By-laws?

GILBERT -- I think they were sent to them, weren't they?

VANCE -- Copies were sent. Copies are available at the table. If you do not have them, we can make a copy available to you immediately. Dave, will you pick up copies of the revised Constitution and By-laws at the back table and circulate through the group? At the meeting last year in Ohio, the motion was put before the group that the Committee of the Directors of the Association be appointed to revise the Constitution and By-laws. Our friend, Harry, made the facetious remark at the time that that committee's work would probably fall on one; it wasn't facetious. It worked out that way, but taking the suggestions made at that time by the Association, I took the present copy of the Constitution and By-laws, which was formulated, I believe, at the original meeting in 1934, and revised at

some later date. That revised copy of the Constitution and By-laws has never been found, which accounts for this revision. We do not know what year the revision formerly took place, but in order to bring our organization up to date, this suggested change has been made. Should I read this?

GILBERT -- How many of you have read it? Or let me do it the other way, how many of you want it read? I think they're acquainted with it.

VANCE -- The old Constitution and By-laws as written has the words stricken out--that is, a line where we suggest omitting, and then the words that are in parenthesis are the suggested additions.

RUHL -- I have a question. On the bottom of the second page, I don't think it's very important, but I thought you ought to broaden that last line "coop to extension program beneficial to waterfowl and fisheries". We should include more than waterfowl and fisheries.

VANCE -- Where'd you say that was, Harry?

RUHL -- On the second page, last line.

VANCE -- Maybe we've got two different sheets here.

RUHL -- This is the one you sent me, anyhow.

GILBERT -- East state, huh?

RUHL -- All right, maybe it's all fixed then.

VANCE -- No, it isn't.

RUHL -- Well, this is in the preamble. It's the last--

VANCE -- Oh, the last sentence in the first paragraph?

RUHL -- Well, it's different here. Maybe it's all right.

GILBERT -- I believe that these were mailed out and your corrections sent in, so they should be fairly accurate.

RUHL -- Well, this is all right as it is now.

VANCE -- Yeah, it's all right on the revised --

RUHL -- I think so, yeah.

VANCE -- There's a question I have in that same preamble, in the second change where we insert the United States Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife Service and Dominion Wildlife Service. I'm not sure of the terminology that should be used there in relation to Canadian Provinces. Is this right?

MOSBAUGH -- Well, the Dominion Wildlife Service would be the equivalent of the Fish and Wildlife Service here.

VANCE -- Fish and Wildlife Service.

MOSBAUGH -- In Canada, the Provincial Game Departments of the various provinces would be equivalent to the State Game Departments.

VANCE -- The question I had, of course, was our tying the Fish and Wildlife Service with the United States Department of the Interior. Would we tie the Dominion Wildlife Service with another overall dominion agency?

GILBERT -- They were sent copies of this, weren't they? They didn't object to that, did they?

RUHL -- I'll bet half of them do next year.

GILBERT -- If they don't object, why should we? What are your desires regarding the changes in the By-laws?

???? -- Approve it's adoption.

GILBERT -- Is there a second?

SCOTT -- I'll second it.

GILBERT -- We have a second. Any discussion?

RIDER -- Question?

GILBERT -- Question? All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

AUDIENCE -- Aye.

GILBERT -- Opposed same sign. The motion is carried. Now, before we have the report of the Nominating Committee, do you have any new business you want brought up? Any old business? Any anything? If not, we will have the report of the Nominating Committee.

RUHL -- As you know, it's been the custom to have the President in the state where the meeting is to be held, and the Vice-president to be the person in the state which it is anticipated would have the meeting the second year. We tried to go back through the records and be sure that everybody was getting their chance in order, or nearly so, and with that in mind, we're making the following recommendations. For President, Ernie Swift of Wisconsin; Vice-President, Dave Leahy of Kansas; Secretary-Treasurer, Walter Scott of Wisconsin. Going to handle all these at once?

GILBERT -- Well, we'll give them a chance to make nominations from the floor.

RUHL -- Do you want the Board of Directors at the same time?

GILBERT -- Go ahead and read them all.

RUHL -- Board of Directors, of course, are one person from each state not represented on the list of officer, and the recommendations

are as follows: Iowa, Bruce Stiles; Missouri, M. O. Steen; Minnesota, Chester Wilson; Illinois, Leonard Swartz; North Dakota, H. R. Morgan; Indiana, Ken Kunkel; South Dakota, Elmer Peterson; Michigan, H. B. Ruhl; Ohio, H. A. Rider; Nebraska, Paul Gilbert; Manitoba, G. W. Malliger; Ontario, Harknett. I believe it's Lester, isn't it?

GILBERT -- I think so.

RIDER -- Yeah.

GILBERT -- I think it's Lester. Sounds familiar.

PETERSON -- Mr. Chairman?

GILBERT -- Mr. Peterson.

PETERSON -- As a member of this Nominating Committee, with Mr. Cottingham's permission, I think we should add Colorado there to the Board of Directors. It might simplify everything by doing it now.

RIDER -- That's right.

PETERSON -- I propose Cleland Feast.

COTTINGHAM -- Add it. Colorado. Feast.

???? -- Charles?

???? -- Cleland.

GILBERT -- You've heard the report of the Nominating Committee, and, of course, it is the privilege of anybody here to offer nominations for any of these positions. Rather than go to the time and effort of taking them all, I'm going to ask if anybody has any nominations that they want to make in any one of these categories, we'll break it down to the regular routine of individual positions. If not, what is your wish?

RIDER -- I move, Sir, that the nominations be closed, and that the President cast a unanimous ballot for the report of the Nominating Committee.

GILBERT -- Is there a second?

PETERSON -- I'll second the motion.

GILBERT -- Peterson, South Dakota.

RUHL -- Mr. Chairman?

GILBERT -- Yes?

RUHL -- You notice we left out Kentucky. I assume that's all right.

GILBERT -- That's right. Any discussion? Are you ready for the question? All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

AUDIENCE -- Aye

GILBERT -- Opposed by the same sign. Gentlemen, I appreciate the kind words regarding our Commission and myself in your resolutions. It's been more than a pleasure to have you here. We've really enjoyed it. We've looked forward to it. I've had this thing on my desk in the times when duck hearings were tough, and the legislature, and I sat there and played with it just like this. Frankly, I kind of hate to let the darned old thing go, but it's a pleasure to let it go to such a fine colleague as Ernie Swift and such a fine state as Wisconsin. You're not going to have another speech, but I do challenge you again. Remember, there's only a few of us fighting this Game Management-Human Management battle. We're all carrying a cross and we've got to carry it together. If you see a brother over here in another state having trouble, don't pride yourself in the fact that you're not, but see what you can do for him. If you know something that might help him, let him have it. If you've got something he needs, let him have it. Professional unity all the way. Gentlemen, I now come down from the level of the Presidency of this roster and Mr. Scott, will you please come forward. Will you carry this gavel to my friend, Ernie, and give him our best wishes? Thank you.

SCOTT -- Well, speaking of challenges, I think that Wisconsin has a challenge for next year to hold as good a meeting of this organization in our fair state as we had here in Nebraska, and I want Paul Gilbert and his staff to know that I, for one, consider it a very difficult challenge. We'll do our best, however, to give you people a fine meeting in Wisconsin next year. I hope you all can be there, and I hereby call this meeting officially adjourned.