PROCEEDINGS

of

19TH ANNUAL MEETING

of

ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND GAME COMMISSIONERS

HELD AT HOTEL FORT DES MOINES,

DES MOINES IOWA

August 15 & 16, 1952

LIBRARY COPY
KANSAS FORESTRY, FISH
AND GAME COMMISSION
No.

P R O C E E D I N G S

O F

19th ANNUAL MEETING

Of

ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND GAME COMMISSIONERS

Held at Hotel Fort Des Moines, Des Moines Iowa

August 15 & 16, 1952

First Session, Friday A.M. Aug. 15

Meeting was called to order by the president, Bruce F. Stiles of Iowa at 9:40 A.M.

Pres. Stiles: The eighteen years that this organization has been in existence have probably seen the development of most of the practices that we now refer to as modern conservation. I am sure that this organization has contributed more than its fair share of progressive ideas to form that pattern.

Eighteen years ago conservation as we think of it now was primarily supported by a few professionals in that field, and that handful of private citizens who were interested in promoting it. Today I am sure that conservation has widespread and general support, and it is even receiving good support from some of the highest positions in government.

The first of this month we had a celebration at Clear Lake, Iowa, known as Governor's Day. They have about three days of celebration there and it is climaxed by a speech by the Governor of the State, and I am sure that it is of more than passing interest to know that the Governor of the state of Iowa at that time devoted his speech to conservation. I believe two years ago he was one of the principal speakers on the program of the national meeting of the Izaak Walton League, so that in Iowa we feel that we have been fortunate in having a Chief Executive who has been a conservationist in his own right and who was a member of a conservation organization and active in it before he became Governor.

When I asked the Governor if he would come down this morning and address this group he said he would be very delighted to do so, and up to twenty minutes ago he had expected to be here. He had a flight planned, leaving the city at 10:15 in a National Guard plane, which is not equipped for all weather flying, and the National Guard at the airport called him and told him because of low visibility that was expected to settle in around ten o'clock it would be necessary that they leave at 9:15, so he called me and said he very much regretted that he would have to go because of the weather conditions.

However, we have a good pinch hitter, and the chairman of our Commission has consented to act for the Governor in giving you a little talk of welcome.

I might tell you that he didn't take it very gracefully, but I finally prevailed upon him. He is now serving his second term on the Commission. Our terms are for six years, and I believe Mr. Trost has served about seven years on the Commission. He has been re-elected chairman, I believe this is his fourth term.

It gives me a lot of pleasure to introduce Mr.

Ewald Trost, the chairman of the Iowa Conservation Commission Mr. Trost. (Applause)

Mr. Trost: Director Stiles, ladies and gentlemen: Of course, as Bruce indicated, it is a rather tough spot to be in to step into the shoes of the Governor who would welcome you to our state and a man who is interested in conservation. I wish that you did have the pleasure of hearing our Governor because he has always fostered everything that is good for conservation. As Bruce has indicated to you, I have been a member of the Iowa Commission for a number of years, and it has been intensely interesting. I am sure all of you who have had a hand in shaping the destinies of conservation within your own states and nationwide find that there have been tremendous changes. Just yesterday morning a number of my fellow commissioners and I had the occasion to visit a few minutes with "Ding" Darling, and Ding described some of the conditions that prevail today and in the days when he started in conservation work within the state of Iowa, and I know that we have come a long way.

One thing that a commissioner finds difficult at times is to resist the pressure groups that for selfish reasons wish something done that to them alone is the prime issue and does not take into consideration the over-all picture and good of all the people of the state, and it is most difficult to assure those people that the decisions that are being made are in the interests of all the people, and I am sure that you have those same problems back in your states but besides that, meetings such as these, of which I have attended a number, certainly do help clarify the air and to show problems in their true light and to tackle those problems.

I know this, in my short span as a member of the Conservation Commission, that I have seen the picture change rather radically in seven years and that today most people accept conservation in its truest sense, and we still have a job of selling to do, and I am sure that you people in meetings such as this find some of the problems solved that others have and are helpful to you in your own communities.

Iowa does not claim to have the best conservation department, but we do feel that we have made wonderful strides, and certainly it is a privilege and pleasure to serve as a member of the Commission, especially so when you have a staff that is competent and is doing everything within its power to further the interests of conservation in their own state.

So on behalf of the State of Iowa, let me welcome you to our state, and I certainly know that your 19th meeting will be successful. If there is anything that we can do to help make it more pleasant, won't you please let us know. Thank you a lot.
(Applause)

Pres. Stiles: Thank you, Mr. Trost. The secretary will now call the roll of the membership. I am sure

that you are all acquainted with Lester Faber, our Superintendent of Federal Aid Section, who is secretary of this organization. Mr. Faber.

Secy. Faber: Fortunately this is only a roll call of membership and there is no issue involved so we won't have to be concerned with polling any delegation. Will the representative of each state, or province, answer for that state or province as I call the names?

The following states and provinces were represented: Colorado, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Missouri, North Dakota, Ohio, Ontario, Wisconsin. Either as guests or speakers the following agencies are represented: Illinois Natural History Survey, United States Forest Service, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Iowa State College, Wildlife Management Institute. I believe there won't be anybody here from the Illinois Department or South Dakota Department. Probably there won't be anybody here from Manitoba.

Pres. Stiles: (Made routine announcements of banquet, etc.)

I feel that everyone in this organization has been very much interested in the work that the Committee on Coordination has been doing, and at the last meeting they appointed again a Study Committee on Coordination, the chairman of which is Mr. H.R. Morgan, Commissioner of North Dakota, who will now give us a report on that. Mr. Morgan.

Mr. Morgan: Mr. Chairman, members of the Midwest: Prior to reading this report this morning I would like to say that my fellow members on the committee are exonerated for anything that may be in this report. We are rather widely scattered, both Mr. Ruhl and Mr. Steen have been more than willing to cooperate, but it has been a little bit hard to get together, and as last year, again this year I took the bull by the horns and went ahead and sent out questionnaires which were indicated by the desires for subjects to be discussed which were sent in by several of you. In fact, we got quite a long list of suggested topics that might be studied, and in looking them over I had to screen them, due to the fact that we had so recently worked on some of them.

I have indicated in this paper, copies of which I have to be distributed to member states, several discussions. I think maybe we have been just a little bit lax in going ahead and compiling data on these various subjects we are interested in, without giving proper thought and proper consideration to some of the things we might learn from them and implementing certain truths that are brought out in them. So I will read this paper, with your permission, and as we come to those we may have a short discussion on certain phases of questionnaire answers that have been brought out in the past.

R E P O R T

H. R. MORGAN

(Chairman, Committee on Standardization of Practices)

Commissioner, Game and Fish Department
Bismarck, North Dakota

Given at the Meeting of the Association of Midwest Game and Fish Commissioners Held in DesMoines, Iowa August 15 and 16, 1952, on the Questionnaire which was circulated to all Members of the Association.

Some of the States and Provinces may have been confused regarding the first two questions on this year's questionnaire. They may have included funds spent for fisheries work under "Game Management" and "Research". If this be true, it has been the fault of Yours Truly in that I was not careful enough in wording the questions.

Regardless of this fact, however, answers to the questionnaires should show a trend in Department spending of certain funds which we have to administer and thus show what functions are taking precedent in the Midwest.

A summary of answers received from eleven states (South Dakota in too late to be included) and one Province (Manitoba) show the following:

The average portion of the fund for carrying on a program in the interest of wildlife spent for game management by states and provinces who answered questionnaires was 21.8 percent. The state reporting the lowest amount spent for Game Management during the five year period covered by this questionnaire showed an average expenditure of 4.06. The highest average amount spent by any state showed an expenditure of 42.5. Eight of the twelve states reporting showed expenditures of from 19 to 42 percent of their funds spent for game management.

The lowest amount spent for research was 1.4, the highest 8.6 percent with an average for the nine states reporting of 3.8 percent.

For enforcement with eleven reporting, we find that the lowest State reported 11.2 percent of their fund spent on enforcement. The highest reported was 34 percent with an average for the nine states of 19.5 percent.

For Education with ten states reporting, we find that the lowest state reported .02 of their fund spent for education. The highest reported was 10 percent with an average of 3.3 percent spent for education.

For fire suppression we find only six states reporting on this. The lowest figure reported is .65 percent, the highest 21.3 percent with an average of 8.1 percent

spent for fire suppression. This, of course, varies with the percent of each state's timbered areas and means little to us.

GAME MANAGEMENT

COLORADO	Has	spent	an	average	of	4.06+	of	her	fund	(Tendency down)
ILLINOIS	"	"	"	"	"	20.7	"	"	"	(Tendency up)
INDIANA	"	"	"	"	"	26.0 +	"	"	"	"
IOWA	"	"	"	"	"	19.0 +	"	"	"	"
MANITOBA	"	"	"	"	"	36.1 +	"	"	"	(Tendency down)
MICHIGAN	"	"	"	"	"	7.8	"	"	"	(Tendency up)
MINNESOTA	"	"	"	"	"	12.6	"	"	"	(Level)
MISSOURI	"	"	"	"	"	42.5	"	"	"	"
NORTH DAKOTA	"	"	"	"	"	39.5	"	"	"	(Tendency Up)
OHIO	"	"	"	"	"	24.0+	"	"	"	(Level)
SOUTH DAKOTA										
WISCONSIN	"	"	"	"	"	7.1+	"	"	"	(Tendency down)

RESEARCH

COLORADO	Has	spent	an	average	of		of	her	fund	
ILLINOIS	"	"	"	"	"	8.6+	"	"	"	(Tendency down)
INDIANA	"	"	"	"	"	3.6	"	"	"	
IOWA	"	"	"	"	"	1.4	"	"	"	"
MANITOBA	"	"	"	"	"	7.0+	"	"	"	
MICHIGAN	"	"	"	"	"	2.0	"	"	"	(Tendency Up)
MINNESOTA	"	"	"	"	"	2.2+	"	"	"	"
MISSOURI	"	"	"	"	"	(Included in game management)				
NORTH DAKOTA	"	"	"	"	"	4.6	"	"	"	(Tendency down)
OHIO	"	"	"	"	"	2.0	"	"	"	
SOUTH DAKOTA										
WISCONSIN	"	"	"	"	"	3.1+	"	"	"	(Tendency Up)

* * * * (Insert 1)

ENFORCEMENT

COLORADO	has	spent	an	average	of	14.0+	of	her	entire	fund	(Trend about level)
ILLINOIS	"	"	"	"	"	30.0+	"	"	"	"	" slight down)
INDIANA	"	"	"	"	"	34.0+	"	"	"	"	" "
IOWA	"	"	"	"	"	16.7	"	"	"	"	" "
MANITOBA	"	"	"	"	"	16.0+	"	"	"	"	" down)
MICHIGAN	"	"	"	"	"	12.5	"	"	"	"	" about level)
MINNESOTA	"	"	"	"	"	22.7	"	"	"	"	" down)
MISSOURI	"	"	"	"	"	17.7	"	"	"	"	" about level since 1947)
NORTH DAKOTA	"	"	"	"	"	21.5	"	"	"	"	" slight down)
OHIO	"	"	"	"	"	20.0	"	"	"	"	" level)
SOUTH DAKOTA											
WISCONSIN	"	"	"	"	"	11.2+	"	"	"	"	" slight down)

EDUCATION

COLORADO	has	spent	an	average	of	1.4+	of	her	entire	fund	(Trend slight up)
ILLINOIS	"	"	"	"	"	6.7	"	"	"	"	" level)
INDIANA											
IOWA	"	"	"	"	"	4.3	"	"	"	"	" ")
MANITOBA	"	"	"	"	"	.8	"	"	"	"	" down)
MICHIGAN	"	"	"	"	"	2.5	"	"	"	"	" level)
MINNESOTA	"	"	"	"	"	.02+	"	"	"	"	" ")
MISSOURI	"	"	"	"	"	.48	"	"	"	"	" ")
NORTH DAKOTA	"	"	"	"	"	7.1	"	"	"	"	" slight up)
OHIO	"	"	"	"	"	.10	"	"	"	"	" ")
SOUTH DAKOTA											
WISCONSIN	"	"	"	"	"	1.6	"	"	"	"	" up)

FIRE SUPPRESSION

COLORADO	has	spent	an	average	of		of	her	entire	fund	(Trend	)
ILLINOIS	"	"	"	"	"	21.3"	"	"	"			
INDIANA												
IOWA	"	"	"	"	"	.65"	"	"	"		" down	)
MANITOBA												
MICHIGAN	"	"	"	"	"	13.1"	"	"	"		" "	)
MINNESOTA												
MISSOURI	"	"	"	"	"	.15"	"	"	"		" level	
NORTH DAKOTA												
OHIO	"	"	"	"	"	6 %"	"	"	"		" "	
SOUTH DAKOTA												
WISCONSIN	"	"	"	"	"	8 %"	"	"	"			

Because suggestions covered questionnaires already circulated an attempt is made in this paper to analyze results of former questionnaires dealing with suggested topics, and simple short form questionnaires have been used for additional data suggested by the member states.

I have attempted to analyze results of questionnaires (previously circulated on accepted programs.

A. Enforcement

1. Wardens combine educational work with enforcement (time spent on education varies from 10 to 50 percent -- Average approximately 1/3 of time) Included are attending meetings, personal contacts while patroling, visiting schools, youth groups, etc.

2. Majority of states furnish their Wardens with (a) Uniforms (b) Radio (c) Boats and Motors

3. Majority of States use aircraft in enforcement. (Insert 2)

B. Public Relations

1. Twelve states have special division of public relations. Ten have both education and public relations under one head. Average size of such divisions is 6.8 persons (not including clerical help).

2. Most of the states publish their magazine monthly. Some thought might be given to standard size of magazine for filing etc. Five Midwest states now have an 8½ x 11" magazine. Four 6 x 9". (Insert 3)

3. (Juanita Mahafey Report) given before the National Association of Conservation Education and Publicity in 1951 shows the following: (Insert 4)

   Twenty-three conservation magazines are issued free of charge
   Eighteen charge subscriptions (Two of the twenty-three were contemplating going on a paid basis at the time of her survey.
   Only one state was making its subscriptions pay the cost of publishing. The average showed a 49% return from subscriptions.
   Those states charging subscriptions send an average of 16.4 percent of their total issue free to select groups.
   The majority of states publish their magazine monthly.
   The average size of magazines on conservation is 8½ X 11". The average number of pages, 38.

   Few of these magazines are carrying paid advertising. (Insert 5)

Use of the addressograph or similar equipment direct from the Conservation Department is valuable in keeping mailing lists up to date and insuring prompt mailing. (Insert 6)

Listing game violations and printing pictures of limit kills is becoming less popular (Insert 7)

Twenty-six of the thirty-eight states reporting show one full time helper in addition to the magazine editor, with thirty-seven showing other part time help. The average being 3.16 including the editor.

I recommend a discussion on the part of this body as a whole on some points which have been brought out. I further recommend that a vote be taken, following such discussion, and that points receiving a majority vote of the members of this Association be accepted as standards toward which we shall all continuously strive to attain within our own organizations. (Insert 8)

Topics of discussion:

1. Do you favor publication of the Conservation Magazine on a monthly basis?

   VOTE Yes
   No

2. Do you favor standardizing the size of such magazines to the now popular 8½ X 11"?

   VOTE Yes
   No

3. Do you favor free distribution of the Conservation Magazine as against charged subscriptions?

   VOTE Yes
   No

4. Do you believe in conservation magazines carrying paid advertising?

   VOTE Yes
   No

5. Do you believe in printing game violations and pictures of limit kills?

   VOTE Yes
   No

C. <u>Bounty</u>

Twelve states have it. Of these, only three favor it.

D. <u>Refuges</u>

Vote was thirteen to one for migratory waterfowl.

E. Stocking(Game)

Three to eight opposed to stocking for the gun.

F. Stocking (Fish)

Fourteen for it. Primarily for new waters, new species and for control of balance.

G. Public Hunting

Eight states purchasing public hunting areas. This seems to be the answer of the majority.

H. Who sets seasons?

Ten states have the control either in directors or Commissions -

2 Legislators.

(Insert 1. 2nd page) I am not going to take your time by reading the delineated report here from various states on the questionnaire that was sent out. It is included in the printed report which you will receive and can be used for reference if and when it becomes necessary by any of you.

(Insert 2.) I don't know that we are warranted in spending any more time on that particular phase this morning, gentlemen, I think we are all agreed that a large part of the duty of an enforcement officer, if he is to properly serve the public as well as Game, is that of apprising the public of the program we have in mind, the objectives of that program, so they in turn will have a more direct interest in what we are doing for them for wildlife, and as a result, the cooperation which the Conservation Department gets is going to be that much greater.

Right along with that topic comes your public relations or education work in the various departments, and a former questionnaire with data I have been able to compile shows. (Read B)

(Insert 3 follows 2 under B) I don't know whether that is particularly important or not, we have just begun putting our magazine on newstands to find out whether we will be able to increase our circulation through that medium, haven't been doing it long enough to draw any conclusions on that, but if all of our magazines were of uniform size they might be more readily recognized, if we intend to use that medium of circulation at all.

(Insert 4, follows 3 under B) We have never tried that in North Dakota, we are publishing the magazine and selling annual subscriptions for fifty cents, which is a little less than half the cost of printing the magazine, we are making it available to schools through the medium of County Superintendents. We feel that the old method we used some years ago of sending these magazines out directly to the teachers was not getting the results we had in mind, there were too many teachers that changed residence during the school year or took the magazine, maybe glanced at it, and tossed it aside and it would never get to the school where we wanted it to get, so last year we sent out magazines to various county superintendents asking them if they would be willing to take upon themselves the responsibility of seeing that those magazines got into the various classrooms in the state provided we sent them to them, and we got a 100 percent response from them, and in checking back during the school year we found out they were going through their commitments and that the magazine was getting several-fold the use it had been getting under the old system.

(Insert 5 at close of 3 under B) We are just beginning that, been very careful of the kind of ads we are taking and confining it to one or two paid advertisers at the present time. We find we do need finance and have had some attractive offers, and maybe a year from now we will have something to report on that that might be of interest

to you.

(Insert 6) In North Dakota we have used the addressograph for two years, make up our own list of addresses, send them to the offset printer who does our printing, and that way we know that those addresses are right, that the circulation is kept up to date, our cancellations are taken care when supposed to be, and new subscriptions are taken care of immediately. Under the old system they used to run addresses on boilerplate, cut them into strips, and I think probably three or four months sometimes went by before they would run a new list of addresses, and we got a lot of criticism on that from subscribers, and some old subscribers that were dropped off would also let us know about it.

(Insert 7) We stopped it several years ago, I feel it is a move in the right direction.

(Insert 8) Going back, I would like to have an expression from someone other than myself on the basis of this report, on the importance of the game warden or conservation enforcement officer being something other than just purely an enforcement officer.

In North Dakota - I hate to be talking about my own state all the time, but naturally one speaks of the thing he is most familiar with - we have a peculiar law which I am trying to get broadened at this coming session of the legislature which limits me to hiring 18 full-time fully enforcement officers. We have realized for a long while that that was inadequate, and we have the money to have more of that type of personnel in the field, but I questioned the advisability of asking the legislature to increase that force. I am not interested in having a lot of men in the field, but in having some high class men that are properly equipped, and I realized a long while ago that whether it was 18, 118, or 1800 enforcement officers we had in North Dakota, we would never get the job done we had set out to do, never would attain our goal in proper management, unless and until we had the full, whole-hearted cooperation of the public that apparently was rather cold to the job that we were trying to do. And as a consequence I am again stressing the fact that in getting these men we are going to have to devote a good deal of time to education in that field, and after carrying on a program of that sort for two years I find it is definitely paying off.

We have proof of that fact, and our public relations, not only with the public we are serving, but with other enforcement agencies such as county sheriffs, highway patrolmen, policemen in some of the smaller towns, and our county judges and states attorney, have stepped up I think at least 150 percent during the time that we have been using this new approach.

Today the North Dakota warden's first job is that of educating for the purpose of bringing more cooperation to the department and to himself. His second job is that of enforcement, and in approaching the second job we

have stressed in the last two years that only those cases that will meet with the public acceptance that we want, are taken into court and prosecuted. There was a time in North Dakota, not long ago, during my administration when we had allowed our enforcement officers to get case hungry to the point where they were bringing in a lot of technical, borderline cases, and the thing got so bad that when I went before the legislative assembly to request an appropriation for the coming biennium I was just lucky to get anything, to say nothing of the cooperation that I felt I was warranted in asking for. That picture has changed, and now without taking up any more of your time I would like to hear from one or two of the other administrators to see whether or not I am on the right track in this thing and to give the rest of you fellows the thinking that maybe only a few of us have and a chance to compare our thinking.

Mr. Dambach, Ohio: We have a program scheduled from two to four and I wondered if we couldn't postpone discussion on this until this afternoon.

Mr. Morgan: I will be happy to. Have we anything under Public Relations that will steal anybody's thunder? Let's see what we can find there to discuss and argue about. Is there anyone in the Midwest at the present time that is giving free circulation to their magazine? (Four hands) Do you feel, gentlemen, those of you that are doing that, that it is warranted, do you feel you are getting additional circulation which is worth the cost of free publication, do you want to say something?

Ernest Swift, Wisconsin: It is due to the peculiarity of the law under which we operate. We can put out a magazine in Wisconsin on an educational basis, but the minute we charge for it it cannot be subsidized by any conservation funds, it has to be self-sustaining absolutely.

Now, there are some states like you were talking about, Mr. Morgan, that can make a nominal charge, yet it doesn't cover the entire cost of the publication, and we have met resistance legislatively in charging, so there are aspects there beyond the control of the Commission itself, and we have gone along on this matter of issuing this and bearing the burden and cost due to those particular factors.

Mr. Morgan: Do you accept paid advertising?

Mr. Swift: No, we can't. We could if we were to set it up from the standpoint of charging for it, but there again we have met legislative resistance on that type of thing.

Mr. Dave Leahy, Kansas: With respect to the question of advertisements, our law and constitution require that wehave all our printing done through the state printing plant, consequently we can't have advertisements, but the proposition of charging for it is just like Ernest's there, we have so much opposition to it we haven't done it.

Mr. Bode: We have had a little experience that might be interesting. We originally years ago started publishing our magazine and distributing it without charge, then we thought we ought to be able to cover part of the cost so we put a 25¢ a year fee on it to cover the cost of mailing. Before that went into effect our circulation was about 11,000 a month in the early days of the Commission. The first month that we put the 25¢ fee on, the circulation dropped to a little over 2,000. During the next year it never went up again over about 4,000 to 5,000. We went back on the basis of distributing it without charge, and at the present time our circulation, I think I am right about this, is about 60,000 or 65,000 a month. It costs us around $30,000 to $35,000 a year, but now against that cost we feel that we can charge off a certain amount because that magazine takes the place of a lot of other information and bulletin material that we would have to publish as separate material, and we think that through the channels of the magazine we are getting distribution of that material in a much more effective way than we would if we issued it as separate bulletin material, so as near as we can see the picture, even though quite an expense, our circulation is quite heavy, we think it is quite worth while.

We make our own plates in the office, have a stamping machine, and address all of our magazines right in the office. In order to keep that list clear, in the first place we will not send magazines to sportsmen's groups whose secretaries write in and say, "Will you send your magazine to our membership if we send you a list?" We say no, ännouce it to your members, and if it is worth anything, it is worth their mailing individual cards to us and requesting it." That cuts out a lot of promiscuous distribution. That card is put on the mailing list, and each month that list is gone over, and if his year's subscription has expired we send a card which says, "If you want the magazine continued another year please detach this card and mail it back in." If we don't get it, that name goes off the mailing list.

Mr. Morgan: Frank Blair of Minnesota, do you want to make any remarks?

Mr. Blair: In Minnesota we have had various experiences. Back in the early days we had a free magazine. Back in 1931 when we had a Conservation Commission we started with a magazine and charged for it and accepted advertising. Within ten years we got into a lot of difficulties, a lot of these boys that went out to get the advertising went a little bad on the department, resulting in the whole thing being discontinued, and for the past ten years we have been putting out a small magazine known as the Conservation Volunteer, without charge and no advertising. We have at the present time, I think, a circulation of about 20,000, maybe 22,000, and we find that the magazine that is put out at the present time, we are more successful in reaching the people we want to reach than we were under the old system when there was a charge for the magazine.

Our magazine goes to all the schools, most of the public officials in the various counties, as well as the

representative sportsmen, or rather to the secretaries and presidents of the various clubs over the state, and we feel that we are doing much better work with the present type of magazine than we were with the old type where we charged for it and accepted advertising.

Than I think, too, a little is saved in the matter of postal rates where you have a magazine of that type.

Mr. Morgan: Frank, how do you go about compiling your circulation list - the same as Missouri?

Mr. Blair: We use a similar system, like these sportsmen's clubs, frequently, all of these clubs have cards, we send them to them every few months so that they can send in the change in the officers, then we have one individual that does nothing else but keep tab on the circulation and changes in names and addresses.

Mr. Morgan: You don't find yourself with a lot of copies going out to people who have moved or changed addresses?

Mr. Blair: We have run into some of that.

Mr. Morgan: Anyone else care to be heard?

Mr. Dambach: Ohio: We charge. We have had a system of charging $1.00 for subscription and special club rates where conservation clubs were given the bulletin at fifty cents and they charge the members $1.00 to get income. We changed that to 75 cents for club rate, with the understanding this year it is one dollar for everyone. Our subscriptions have gone up as the number has gone up from 35,000 two years ago to 50,000 now. I think that is more due to improving the quality of the magazine, dressing it up, more than anything else. We are pretty well satisfied with the idea of paying more for it, we are approaching the place where it will be self sufficient. I think if we can get it up to 60,000 it willbe.

I would like to comment on something else, though. We have also decided that on things like special maps, maps of hunting and fishing areas, special maps of lakes with particular information on them, they should be charged for and we are charging ten cents apiece for them.

Also we put out a special bulletin called "Where and How to Catch Fish in Ohio", we charge 35 cents for it, and we are putting out one of comparable nature on hunting, going to charge for that, and the interesting thing to me is that that has paid a profit for us. Last spring when the "Where and How to Catch Fish in Ohio" came out we sold 30,000 copies in six weeks' time, and the demand is terrific. We had to have four reprints, including some from other states, too.

Basically the thing we are after though is that we used to give out maps and so forth, and I observed people would come in, reach for a handful, walk off with them, and

you would find them down the street, in streetcars, and so forth, and we feel in this way people are making good use of them if they take them at a price.

Mr. Morgan: The one dollar that you are charging for the magazine now, the entire dollar is going to the department is it?

Mr. Dambach: Yes.

Mr. Morgan: In spite of the fact that you have been stepping up the cost of subscriptions your circulation is going up?

Mr. Dambach: That is entirely due I believe to increasing quality of the publication.

Mr. Blair: I think the type of magazine that is going out has a lot to do with the results that we receive. I notice that a lot of magazines carry a lot of news about the clubs of the state, but in our magazine we don't run that kind of material in the magazine. It consists primarily of articles by certain individuals in certain lines of conservation work and does not carry any news items.

Mr. Morgan: I am inclined to agree with you, Frank, in that. You start carrying too much club news which is definitely local in scope, you are not going to get the reader interest you would if you have something of interest to everyone.

Chairman Stiles wanted me to ask how many of you were asking enforcing officers to go out and sell the magazine.

Mr. Dambach: We do two things, we not only ask them to go out and sell them, but we have inaugurated a colorplate on our bulletin, and each month we have something different, either an original painting by the staff artist or a kodachrome picture, then we take those large originals of paintings and use them as awards of merit for employees. Each year one of them is for an employee that has gotten the most subscriptions for the bulletin. That has stimulated interest.

Another thing that has brought in a lot of subscriptions was going to the State Board of Barbers and getting a list of all the barbers in the state and circularizing them. I believe we got 3500 subscriptions from putting them in good places.

Mr. Morgan: We started doing that with the barbershops two years ago with our newsletter that comes out twice a week, and it is surprising the amount of people that get a chance to see it through that medium than otherwise would. Let's get expressions from others. Mr. Bode, Missouri: No.

Dave Leahy: We don't ask them to. Our problem is to keep that list from mushrooming so fast we can't take

care of it. We don't put on any particular sales campaign at all, just a sort of word of mouth proposition from one person to another, one school teacher to another, so we don't put on any selling campaign of any kind, and in spite of it we have an extra 3000 or 4000 a month on our mailing list. So our concern is to keep that within bounds where we can handle it rather than to sell it.

Mr. Morgan: Mr. Stiles, we have Missouri and Kansas that are not asking their men to sell it, we have Mr. Dambach who is. I wonder if you would mind calling the roll here and marking them?

Pres. Stiles: All right, this is the question, do you ask your conservation officers to sell your conservation magazine or not. Will you answer yes or no. As long as Iowa is at the top of the list on the back of the program here I will say yes we do.

Iowa	Yes
Ontario	No
Colorado	Yes
Illinois	Absent
Indiana	No
Manitoba	Absent
Michigan	No
Minnesota	No (Magazine free, have waiting list)
Missouri	No
Nebraska	Absent
North Dakota	Yes
Ohio	Yes
South Dakota	Absent
Wisconsin	No

So out of, I believe, 13 members we have three that are not represented from which we cannot get the information, and four that ask their officers to sell the magazine and six who do not.

Mr. Morgan: Apparently the thing that should be determined first is whether it is a smart policy to circularize the magazine for free.

There were two or three other things here that I thought you might be interested in that have been the result of past questionnaires: Twelve of the states in the Midwest have a Bounty System, and of these only three of them favor it.

On Refuges, what the feeling was regarding them, the vote was 13 to 1 for migratory fowl refuges. Stocking (game) three to eight opposed to stocking for the gun; stocking (fish) fourteen were for it, primarily for new waters, new species and for control of balance.

Public hunting grounds, eight states are purchasing public hunting areas. This seems to be the answer of the majority. I might say now with North Dakota having started a purchase program for public hunting grounds, we will make that 9.

The question of who sets the seasons, have the control, etc., in their directors or commissioners, two still at the time of this questionnaire a year ago had their seasons and regulations set by the state legislatures.

Having plenty of time, I think it would be a helpful thing to get something on record here on some of these questions, and if Mr. Stiles will keep track here I am going to call the roll on this one - Do you favor publication of the Conservation magazine on a monthly basis.

Iowa	Yes
Ontario	Indifferent
Colorado	Yes
Illinois	Absent
Indiana	Yes
Kansas	No
Manitoba	Absent
Michigan	Yes or no, all depends on circumstances.

Minnesota Yes - would qualify by saying that in any state like ours where you are issuing a free publication you have to give consideration to your circulation and in order to broaden your circulation within the appropriation allowed to cover the expenses of issuing the free magazine. We changed from a monthly publication to a bi-monthly publication several years ago for the reason that we haven't been able to get the budget item for publication of the magazine increased in proportion to the increased circulation.

If we could get the legislature to increase that item so we could take care of circulation demands we would go back to monthly, but we are publishing by-monthly and our subscribers have become accustomed to that so I think we are serving the field quite well with the bi-monthly.

Missouri	Yes
Nebraska	Absent
North Dakota	Yes
Ohio	Yes
South Dakota	Absent
Wisconsin	Yes

Pres. Stiles: I have 8 yes, one definite no, two apparently doubtful.

Mr. Morgan: Another question - Do you favor standardizing the size of the magazine? We will carry that a little farther to what is now the popular size, apparently 8½ X 11.

Iowa	Ours happens to be that size which would indicate we favor that size.
Ontario	Not particularly concerned
Colorado	8½ X 11
Illinois	Absent
Indiana	8½ X 11
Kansas	8½ X 11

Manitoba	Absent
Michigan	Readers Digest size
Minnesota	Readers Digest size - very popular, can be stuck in the pocket, think our subscribers would pretty generally favor adherence to that size.
	I think this is still an open question, I don't believe that the merits of the $8\frac{1}{2}$ X 11 size are conclusively established by the fact that a majority happen to be publishing in that size. The Readers Digest has been demonstrated as to popularity, I think we have a lot to learn from that.

Mr. Morgan: This does get out ideas, though you may think it is foolish.

Minnesota	I believe Ontario also publishes Readers Digest size.
Missouri	I wouldn't want to vote to standardize it, but ours is $8\frac{1}{2}$ X 11. It is up to the individual state.
Ohio	Very much as Missouri, we like $8\frac{1}{2}$ X 11 because of the freedom it gives us with our work, but with other states that wouldn't be the case, I can see.
Wisconsin	We favor something a little smaller than $8\frac{1}{2}$ X 11, but we have a state printing board that attempts to standardize certain of these things in the state's work among the departments so we have to conform within reason to some of their wishes.
No. Dakota	
Mr. Morgan:	Frankly I don't know why we are publishing on $8\frac{1}{2}$ X 11 basis, but I believe has something to do with offset printing and cheapness of getting the thing compiled.
Ohio	That is one reason we are sticking by, is because we intend to put out a lot of publications in that size and would like to standardize all.

Mr. Morgan: You can put North Dakota down as B & D - bad and doubtful, or just doubtful.

Let's have the results now.

Secy. Faber: Three no, four yes, four didn't desire to make a statement.

Mr. Morgan: Another which I would like to be

clarified on, do you believe in conservation magazines carrying paid advertising? Some of you, I know because of your set-up it would be impossible, but do you like the idea of having your conservation magazine carrying paid advertising? I am going to call the roll on that.

Iowa	No. I might say that as a matter of economy we have not used a cover on our bulletin, we have adopted 8½ X 11 with no cover and we have felt that we wanted to pack it full of interesting information, and we have never accepted advertising, been opposed, so the answer is no.
Ontario	I don't think we could or would want to.
Colorado	Definitely not, it detracts from reader interest.
Indiana	No.
Kansas	No, we can't do it because of our laws.
Michigan	No.
Minnesota	No.
Missouri	No.
North Dakota	We are just trying it.
Ohio	No.
Wisconsin	No

All no except North Dakota.

Mr. Morgan: One other question I am going to ask you - do you believe in printing violations of limit kills?

Iowa	No
Ontario	We publish the information about violations, but not the names and we try not to give illustrations to draw attention. We leave the names out.
Colorado	No
Indiana	No
Kansas	We do
Michigan	Generally no - we don't in the magazine, but we have on some occasions on special types of violations, through other sources.
Missouri	No
Minnesota	No - and in that connection I might say that just recently one of our large city newspapers got the idea of publishing the names of violators on a statewide basis periodically, and we

decided, because they request it, we would issue it on a uniform basis to all newspapers that asked for it, so we are now periodically tabulating on a weekly or monthly basis as the newspapers want it. Most of them ask for it weekly, the names of convictions reported by our Game Wardens. Some of the newspapers are publishing them and some not, but we do not believe in emphasizing that through publication in our magazine.

North Dakota — So far as we are concerned I think we are all over a barrel; those are public records and any time the newspaper wants them we are forced to supply them with the information, and we have newspapers up there that make it a point of coming around every two or three days during peak seasons and getting those records and publishing them, but we do not make a policy of publishing them, in our monthly magazine.

Ohio — No

Wisconsin — Tradition has something to do with some of these things. Years ago, for 15 years I guess at least, we published arrests and convictions in our magazine, and it got to be a debate in the Commission as to whether it was advisable or not and whether there couldn't be some other form of term put in there that was more to the point in conservation, and it got to be quite a state issue, believe it or not. You know it is easy to get a state issue in anything on conservation. So the Commission debated for four years before they decided to eliminate it, and we do now, as Mr. Wilson said, put out a special mimeographed form in the newspapers that want that, but it is not in the magazine any more. That was a compromise, you might say.

Mr. Blair, Minnesota: We found that back in those days wardens would compare their records each month, and the fellow that didn't make such a good record would make more arrests next month, with the result, as you mentioned a while ago, of a lot of borderline cases and technical cases, would arrest anybody, with the result that it was discontinued.

Now, what Commissioner Wilson said about issuing this to newspapers when they asked for it, one of our city papers in Minneapolis, we give them the name of the violators, that is, those convicted, we don't mention the number of arrests, the fines imposed, and on the right-hand side of the list we mention the justice of peace or the judge. We are trying to get some of these judges into line, especially in northern Minnesota where they don't want to convict local people, but will hit those from the outside harder. By getting that into the city newspapers we hope we may get all these judges to do a little better job. We don't get the names of the wardens in those.

Mr. Morgan: I think Frank brought out something there that might be worthy of consideration, I think we all have the problem of trying to get some of our local judges into line and maybe giving them publicity will get us farther than giving the violator publicity.

That completes my report and I move that the committee be discharged. (No second)

Pres. Stiles: Sounds as if the group was at least not too anxious.

Mr. Blair: I would like to amend that motion that the report be accepted, the committee dismissed, and that the report be published so that each state may get a copy. (Seconded by Mr. Swift.)

Mr. Swift: I second with the proviso that they be commended for their work. (Acceptable to mover, and amendment carried.)

Pres. Stiles: Now the motion that the committee be discharged, are you ready for the question. (Carried) The committee is discharged and I want to personally commend you, Mr. Morgan, for having done a very excellent job. I had thought, in fact, I was going to mention that the work of this committee had been of such interest to the organization that it might be well to carry it on over a considerable period of time as a standing committee. Possibly their group has done such work that they deserve because of the effort they have put into it, to be relieved of it, but what would be your expression about continuing with this type of committee, possibly appointing new members?

Mr. Morgan: I believe that the idea of the committee has a lot of merit and I believe it should be continued, however, I have felt in the last three years I have served on the committee that I possibly was a little bit handicapped in not having in mind the ideas that we were trying to work toward, and I will not only be very happy to be relieved of my responsibility as one member of the committee, in fact, I would absolutely refuse to accept it for the fourth term, I think I have served for three terms on it, but I do believe that the underlying idea here is fundamental with this organization, it is the thing that we are organized for primarily, to try to standardize trying to get together

on a high plane, doing the best job and approaching our objectives in the best way we possibly can.

Now, then, I would move that before this convention adjourns some further thought be given to re-establishing a committee of this nature and to very definitely point up the functions of that committee so they will have a pattern toward which to work and something to guide them. (Seconded by Mr. Wilson, Minnesota and carried).

Pres. Stiles: Was it your thought that we bring the matter up for discussion again or that we go ahead with discussion now, or that the chair be authorized to appoint a committee?

Mr. Blair: I move that it be made a standing committee of the association. (Seconded by Mr. Morgan and carried.)

Pres. Stiles: I believe that we had another committee, I don't know whether they are ready to make a report or not, is there anyone here to report on the In-Service Training Committee? There was a committee I believe on in-service training. Apparently no one is ready to make a report on it. I don't recall the personnel of that committee now.

Are there any other special committees ready to make reports at this time?

Mr. Blair: I would like to know how many of the states do have in-service training.

Pres. Stiles: We will take a roll call on it. I might answer for Iowa first, we have a rather limited program of in-service training and it is usually consisting of a three-day program once a year of in-service training. We have given considerable thought to enlarging that.

Iowa	Limited
Ontario	Absent
Colorado	Yes
Illinois	Absent
Indiana	Yes
Kansas	Just started one
Manitoba	Absent
Michigan	Yes
Minnesota	Yes
Missouri	Yes
Nebraska	Absent
North Dakota	Yes
Ohio	Yes
South Dakota	Absent
Wisconsin	Yes

I believe all the states and provinces here do have some in-service training. Is there any further discussion?

Mr. Wilson: I think it would be interesting equally to call the roll on the question of pre-service training, how many of the jurisdictions have any systematic

provision for pre-service training before putting men on regular duty as game wardens or conservation officers or in other positions?

Pres. Stiles: Is that your general wish? I think it would be of interesting. Answering for

Iowa	I might say that our pre-service training is also somewhat limited, that we do have about a three-day school that our candidates are called in to before they go to work. Following that we send them out with one of our district officers, supervisors, for varying lengths of time for experience and training.
Ontario	Absent
Colorado	We would like to, but again this matter of law enters into it. We cannot employ one unless he comes off the civil service list, and he has to be the number one man, and then we have to put him to work and put him on the payroll, so we don't have the opportunity to do it even though we would like to.
Pres. Stiles:	I might add to the remarks that I made, this three-day school is at the expense of the candidate for the position and that the training with the district supervisor is after he goes on the payroll but before he is assigned to regular service.
Indiana	Yes
Kansas	No
Michigan	Yes, we have three things, I think one is something that may help Tom get around his problem. For example, we set up an examination for conservation officer, get a list, take them into our training school and give them training on the work of the department and then after that grading, from that intensive training, their rank is determined. If they flunk they are out. Then if we take a class of 40 and come through 35, those are off the top of the civil service register, and on the adjusted rating they are held and as vacancies occur they are filled from that list. For example, if 30 or 35 go through the school, that may be replacements for a year and a half or two years, then we hold another recruit school, handled under civil service, and

the proportion of the final rating is determined by school effort, is fixed, and in department hands, but if they flunk, don't pass training school requirements they are out, then we have a choice.

Colorado — In our state it is different because the civil service is a separate entity from the Game and Fish Department, and they give the examinations ahead of time, and when they have a man on the certified list he is supposed to be the best man, so they say, and we must take him, and once he is certified we accept him; even though we give him a year's training and don't think he is too good we still can't get rid of him except by filing charges.

Michigan — We sold civil service on the idea that this is the way to recruit - their chance to take our school is by taking the examination.

Colorado — It isn't a question of selling civil service in our state, it is in a constitutional amendment, the Commission does not have authority to change.

Michigan — We have two types of things, we have problems of people working for doctors usually where they are under contract to do a piece of research and they have no assurance that they can continue on the state service after that period is up, but in practice they get their in-service training and they usually take competitive examinations.

Then we have in addition to that part-time people at the university and college working on assignments, which is a good pre-service training. Most of these people show up on full-time examination. So we use all three.

Minnesota — We have a standard civil service system, and our position is much the same as Colorado, we have no provision for pre-service training in the true sense. All we can do is appoint a man, put him on the regular payroll as warden or any other position off the civil service list with due regard for veterans preference

and other qualifications. Then we have a six months' probationary period during which he may be dismissed without a hearing, but have recently, through Mr. Blair, Director of our Division of Game and Fish, made a request to the Department of Civil Service for setting up a new classification of Game Warden Trainees at a lower grade than that of regular Game Warden, and that request is now awaiting decision by civil service. If we get a favorable decision we will then be in a position to set up a group of men in the position of Game Warden Trainee and give them some pre-service training before they receive regular appointments as game wardens. And in that event we will be in much the same position as has been described by Harry Ruhl of Michigan.

Missouri — I am not prepared to vote one way or the other on the question as put.

Pres. Stiles: This was just an expression as to whether you do have or do not have pre-service training.

Missouri — My comment on that is we have many pre-service qualifications which involve many of the things that Harry Ruhl spoke about, then we have a very definite system of training at the beginning of service, but whether that is pre-service training or in-service training I am not so sure.

I think maybe one of the first things we ought to do is to make some sort of study to determine just what we consider pre-service training and where in-service training starts, then maybe we could arrive at a little clearer definition.

Colorado - Mr. Kimball: I took it to mean that pre-service meant before a man went on the payroll as a certified employee. Maybe I was wrong in that.
Immediately a man is certified to a position he starts in-service training. We just don't put him out on the job without any training at all.

Pres. Stiles: My understanding of it was, before

he received a regular assignment. Mr. Wilson, I believe, asked the question about pre-service training - did you mean before the man was put on the payroll or before he was given an actual assignment?

Mr. Wilson: I think that would have to be qualified by saying that pre-service training would apply to any training that was given to a man before he was put on the payroll in a regular position. I think in order to have effective pre-service training it is necessary to compensate the men to some extent for the time put in. I don't think you can expect candidates generally to quit regular jobs and enter a period of pre-service training without compensation, but I would say that the term pre-service training should apply to any training given to man either at a lower grade of compensation than that of the regular grade or at no compensation before he is given an appointment in the regular grade.

North Dakota — No. The fact of the matter is, so far as our enforcement officers are concerned we don't have civil service in North Dakota, but we do hire on a basis of competitive examination and we try to hold those competitive examinations proper to the time of our annual Wardens School, and on the basis of the marks those people win in the competitive examinations we pick the top few that we are in need of and have them attend the Wardens School. They are on the payroll, however, at that time, they are being paid although they are not assigned to any particular district or job.
Then after that, as rapidly as we can assimilate them, we take them into the office, we try to keep each one of those men in the office or working out of the headquarters office for a period of at least four weeks prior to the time they are assigned to any particular district.

Ohio — We have a recruiting and pre-service program which has been in effect now the second year about as follows:

First of all we have a personnel committee within the Division that has the responsibility of screening applicants for our training program, they go over all applications and grant acceptance on the basis of background, experience, and training, then they choose those that seemingly have the best background, bring

them in for oral interviews, and those selected are given the opportunity of taking a three months' training program that has been worked in cooperation with the state Civil Service Commission, appointed to the position of Wildlife Management Trainee, which has a service period of 3 months, pays $210 a month.
The training consists of two weeks of what we call intensive school sessions in training camp, followed by three weeks field experience in the field of fish and game management, enforcement under supervisors, and one week which you might call catch-all for public relations and similar work.

We have worked out arrangements with the Civil Service Commission whereby at the termination of that program Civil Service gives a regular examination for those positions. That examination is open to anyone in the state, but on the basis of being comparable with the state Highway Patrol. About anyone who can pass is someone who has gone through training school, and when they pass they are eligible to permanent appointment. But under our law he is appointed for three months, at termination of which he either becomes an employee or is fired.

So we have six months during which a man is under probation,and we use that six months for that purpose.

Mr. Wilson: It is something along the line of the Ohio program we have been aiming at in Minnesota in the proposition we have put up to our Civil Service.

Wisconsin

It seems to me we are trying to define terminology as to what in-service training and pre-service training are.

In Wisconsin we have about the same situation that Mr. Wilson described. We have a very strong civil service or personnel board which operates independently of all state departments, and if we want to fill a vacancy, after they have given the examination they certify three names, one of which we can choose. We have to put the man on the pay-

roll, and probably, according to the discussion here, he is getting in-service training when he goes on the payroll, although he is on probation for four months and we can dismiss him without formal cause if we don't think he has measured up, but within that six months naturally we give him a lot of training so it would probably be considered in-service, and we don't give pre-service because we have to have him in the payroll before we can work with him.

Pres. Stiles: Is there any further discussion on pre-service or in-service training?

Mr. Blair: This might settle that question of pre-service or in-service. I look at it that where you are giving pre-service training you are training people who are training for certain conservation positions in your department, but where there is no position immediately available. They are training for one, but will not receive one until there is a vacancy.

Mr. Kimball: I think maybe we should have another poll on this question because it is important, because the way I understood it at the beginning, pre-service meant before he was actually certified to the position. Now, taking it the other way, that he immediately begins in-service training when hired, then I think Colorado would say certainly we have a pre-service training, so I think it is important that we have that definition, and I think perhaps all of the states on that basis could answer, "Certainly, we have a pre-service training."

Pres. Stiles: How would you want to present the question for the roll call - do the states have pre-service training, considering pre-service training to be that training before they are given a regular assignment? (Consent) That will be the basis upon which we will take the roll call.

Iowa	Yes
Ontario	Absent

Mr. Wilson: I wonder if that is quite clear yet. I think we ought to have definite understanding as to whether the training a man gets under civil service during the six months is to be considered pre-service or in-service. According to my understanding when I first submitted that question for roll call, I did not have in mind that that would be considered as true pre-service training because technically when a man is selected off the civil service list and put on the payroll he is a regular officer on the job. It is true that he is subject to discharge without cause during that probationary period, but what I had in mind in the nature of the pre-service was the training of candidates for positions before they are actually put on the payroll in a regular grade, and I think we could take it for granted that all men who are first put on the payroll for any job are given some training right away and they become appren-

tices naturally and inevitably, and it was not that type of training that I had in mind, and I think we should call the roll on this proposition with a clear line of distinction between training that is given before a man is put on the payroll, either subject to probation or not in the regular grade.

In other words, do we have pre-service training of candidates for positions as distinguished from what they may get after they are put on the payroll?

Pres. Stiles: I think, as Mr. Kimball said, it is quite evident that most of the states provide some training before a man is actually assigned to a job.

Mr. Dambach: I was going to suggest there are two separate questions. It seems to me we ought to take a poll on both these questions - one pre-service training or indoctrination of candidates; the other, training program for new employees.

Mr. Blair: Let's put it this way. Suppose I have 150 game wardens, that's my limit; I am putting on a training program for ten candidates to train for one year, they don't get a position until there is a vacancy. That is what I call pre-service training.

Pres. Stiles: I think the suggestion of Mr. Dambach is good. I will hear from Mr. Bode of Missouri.

Mr. Bode: I don't want to be stubborn about this thing at all, but it seems to me that every bit of discussion brings out the fact that we are not ready for a poll, don't know enough. The question of Mr. Blair, this matter of drawing the line at the point whether a man starts receiving compensation or not, there comes into my mind, what are you going to consider pre-service - only that training that the department puts on or that in which the department is cooperating with somebody like the university or somebody else to get the men ready, from whom they draw the men. It is important, and I think important enough that this association ought to dig into it deeper before we attempt to find out what the states are doing.

Mr. Wilson: I don't think there needs to be confusion on that point at all. I think the question that should be answered, if we are going to take another poll is whether or not the department itself is giving systematic training to candidates for positions with or without pay before they are appointed to positions in the regular grade.

Pres. Stiles: I believe that I will arbitrarily take a poll on both. The first poll will be - do you provide training before a man is assigned to a definite work, even though he may be on your payroll? That will be the first. I will answer for Iowa.

Iowa	Yes
Colorado	Yes
Indiana	Yes

Kansas	No
Michigan	Yes
Minnesota	Yes
Missouri	Yes
No. Dakota	Yes
Ohio	Yes
Wisconsin	Yes

Apparently all states except Kansas provide that kind of training.

Now the question, do you provide pre-service training to candidates before they are hired or put on the payroll?

Iowa	No
Colorado	I am going to get a little technical again on this and say, if you consider money paid into, let's say, a co-operative unit at the university, then technically I can say yes, but if you say, does the department itself solely and with its own money do that, I would have to say no.

Pres. Stiles: This would have to relate to the department itself because I am sure every state has some facilities for training people in almost every field.

Colorado	No, then.
Indiana	Yes
Kansas	No. My other vote should be yes and this no.
Michigan	Yes
Minnesota	No
Missouri	I don't know, put me down as not voting.
No. Dakota	No
Ohio	Yes
Wisconsin	No

We have three yes, one undecided.

We still have quite a little time, are still ahead of schedule, is there any further discussion?

Mr. Wilson: If you want another hot potato I would like to propose that a poll be taken with the right of any member to stand on his constitutional privilege to refuse to answer if the answer will incriminate him, on this question: Do you or do you not allow veterans preference on promotion, in-service promotions? I assume that everyone has veterans preference for original appointments, that practice is almost universal, has been for many years, but do you or do you not have the requirements under the law for veterans preference, law or regulation, on promotions? That doesn't bind anybody to say what they think.

Pres. Stiles: I will answer for

Iowa	No

The question is, do you or do you not provide for veterans preference for in-service promotion?

Colorado	No
Indiana	No
Michigan	No
Minnesota	Yes
Missouri	No
No. Dakota	No
Ohio	No
Wisconsin	Yes - it is a requirement of the civil service laws of Wisconsin

Two "Yes", Minnesota and Wisconsin.

Mr. Blair: I might in ours, veterans preference on written examination they get five points, disabled veterans ten points, then another part provides whereby the one with disability, where he passes, goes to the top of the list.

Mr. Wilson: We have veterans preference in the most extreme form under our civil service law, and I guess Wisconsin has the same on both initial appointment and promotion.

Pres. Stiles: I might ask this, if anybody cares to comment on it, do you find veterans preference to be an advantage to your organization or a disadvantage? Does anyone care to comment?

Mr. Swift:(Wisconsin) I don't believe in it, but if you are going to have it, it isn't too bad in the initial examination, but when it comes to internal promotions I am definitely against it.

Mr. Wilson: I will concur one thousand percent. I used to be a Legion Post service officer and fought the battles for the rights of veterans, but I have never favored veterans preference on promotions. I have served on committees of state department heads where they were trying to get the law changed. Most of our department heads are war veterans, and I think without exception they are all opposed to veterans preference on promotion. They feel it is unfair, and in these days when we have so many more veterans I believe some of the veterans themselves are appreciating it is reacting to their own disadvantage. I have had war veterans come up to me and complain about the disadvantages to which they were put because other veterans who had gotten ahead of them by reason of disability, without real merit, had been put up above them on the examination lists, and I feel that this provision whereby privileges are given to war veterans on promotions is a very definite disadvantage. It creates a feeling of discrimination and unfairness in the ranks, and I think that it is a very definite handicap

to efficiency and good service.

Mr. Swift: Let's hear from the Federal Government on that, that's a good question to ask them.

Dan Janzen: Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Minneapolis. We, of course, under civil service regulations are required to recognize the veterans preference with disabled going to the top of the list, but we are not required to recognize veterans preference in our promotion schedule.

Pres. Stiles: Is there any other comment on that?

Mr. Ruhl: Do you have to take him if you can reasonably show that the disability actually is a handicap on the job?

Mr. Wilson: If he is disqualified by disability we wouldn't have to take him, but we have a great many men who get a disability rating without disqualification, and that automatically puts them at the top of the list and we have no alternative.

Mr. Janzen: Davis here struggles daily with that question so far as enforcement men in the field are concerned, I know he did recently, he might like to make a comment.

Mr. Davis: I wouldn't have much more to say. We have this ten points for veterans, any veteran that has a ten point preference - one that has been disabled or wounded or has a purple heart - that gives him ten points preference, and when the lists are certified to us the ten point veterans all float to the top regardless of what grade, and they have to be considered before you can start on any regular veterans with five points preference. If a man is not qualified physically, by virtue of the fact that he has this ten points preference, for the position and would be a hazard to himself or to fellow employees we don't have to take him. We can ask the medical officer to take him off the list, and the medical officer will then review the case and determine whether he feels the man is physically disabled, and if he feels he is, would be a hazard and wouldn't be able to qualify physically for the job, he will remove his name from the register. Other than that I think Mr. Janzen covered it well.

Pres. Stiles: Any further comment on that? We still have time, is there any other discussion?

Mr. Swift: I don't know whether this is the proper time to ask Dr. Dambach and Mr. Morgan to report on the meeting in Washington with the Fish and Wildlife Service or not from the standpoint of flyways, or does that come later?

Pres. Stiles: I feel this would be the ideal time. Dr. Dambach, will you come up here?

Dr. Dambach: I believe all of you are familiar with the organization of the Flyway Councils and many of you here particularly with the Mississippi Flyway Council, know we held an organizational meeting at St. Louis on January 24 of this year, which was followed by a meeting on July 15th of this year to get our heads together and agree on principles and information that we wanted to present as a part of the National Flyway Council of Fish and Wildlife Service.

Subsequently, through the efforts of Mr. Davis, president of International, arrangements were made for the representatives from all four flyways to meet with Fish and Wildlife Service on the 6th of August just ahead of the service establishing regulations for waterfowl for this fall. Arrangements were also made through the courtesy of Mr. Day for the National Flyway Council to meet in Mr. Day's office on the previous day.

So all day on the 5th of August the National Flyway Council met, I should say all day and all night because we met in two sessions during the day and a third session that evening, to talk over our programs and our objective, keeping in mind we are thinking not just about immediate regulations, but a long range cooperative program of waterfowl management in all the flyways and on the basis of cooperation between the states and Fish and Wildlife Service.

I think I can give you a better picture of the accomplishments of the council by reading to you the statement which was formulated by the council and presented to the Fish and Wildlife Service on the Sixth of August during the meeting of the services committee and its Waterfowl Advisory Committee of which the Council was a part.

Incidentally, for the benefit of all you folks of the Mississippi Flyway, the minutes of the meeting at St. Louis, both of council and technicians, have been prepared, also the statement which I am now about to read has been prepared and will be sent out to you probably sometime next week, so you will all get a copy of that, but I would like to read this statement of the National Waterfowl Council, etc.

Statement of the
National Waterfowl Council to the
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Waterfowl
Advisory Committee
August 6, 1952.

Following a resolution passed by the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners at the Conference held in Rochester, New York, in September 1951, four Flyway Councils and a National Waterfowl Council have been formed, the purpose of the formation of such Council and Councils being to cause the separate States to accept a more direct responsibility in the study and management of our waterfowl resources.

The objective of these Flyway Councils and the National Waterfowl Council representing them at the National level is simply the improvement of waterfowl management to the end that the largest possible waterfowl crop will be available to annual harvest by our people.

To be attained, this requires the full utilization of the qualified manpower and the vast resources of the 48 States with those of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in a coordinated effort to reach this common end.

We recognize the responsibility for waterfowl regulations belongs to the Fish and Wildlife Service. Our only desire is to contribute the best ideas of our administrators and our technicians to the development of these regulations so that they will insure the most sound management possible in the approach to our common objective. By such participation, our States will be made to feel a more close partnership in the development and enforcement of these regulations.

The principle of regulation by flyway has our unqualified endorsement. We further recognize that there cannot be uniformity between flyways and we urge that there be no limit on liberalization for one flyway for fear of its effect upon the development of regulations in other flyways.

We believe however that the further manipulation of regulations within the flyways has not yet been sufficiently explored and developed to meet the needs of waterfowl management. Present season regulations, based upon state lines with insufficient regard to waterfowl movement, and the type of options offered have resulted in an unsatisfactory patchwork pattern, acceptable to few and inadequate in its contribution to better management.

The members of the National Waterfowl Council are convinced there is a positive need for a complete new approach to the regulatory problem within the Flyways - an approach which

1 Gives primary consideration to the behaviour of waterfowl within each Flyway

2 Provide for regulations on the basis of harvest areas, developed on the analysis of waterfowl behavior without regard to state lines

3 Concerns itself with the earliest date of the opening which is detrimental to local breeding populations

4 Makes certain that an adequate supply of birds will be left on the wintering grounds to return to the breeding range the next spring

5 Provides realistically for adequate harvest of populations within these bounds, thus solving conflicts with agricultural interests.

We, therefore, urge the Service to inaugurate the studies necessary to develop such an improved approach to regulations for consideration as the pattern of the hunting regulations for 1953. We further offer the facilities and assistance of waterfowl personnel of our respective States to help the Service get the answer to this problem in the most effective way it can suggest.

We respectfully request an opportunity to meet with the Fish and Wildlife Service to discuss the details of such a new approach and the manner in which the studies involved will be carried out.

A meeting at Dallas in September is being planned and all members of the National Advisory Waterfowl Council members are urged to attend if possible. A tentative date of September 11th has been agreed to by Mr. Albert Day.

We further urge that any phases which the Service feels can be tested during the coming hunting season be incorporated in current regulations.

I might point out that the Council took the point of view that we were aiming at long range objectives, we weren't approaching this problem with the idea we were coming to Washington trying to exert heavy pressure to adopt this or that regulation, although we did, on the part of each flyway, present the recommendations that were adopted and argued strongly for each of them, but the primary objective was to try to set in motion machinery looking toward a better cooperative approach to waterfowl regulatory problems.

A number of folks have asked me, "How were you received, were you received with a cold shoulder or with open arms and so forth?" Well, I will just give you my own analysis, and Mr. Morgan is in better position to comment, naturally the Fish and Wildlife Service was on guard, so were we on guard, but I think it must be said that they treated us fairly, they treated us cordially, they treated us firmly, and I think we did exactly the same. We were very well pleased at the pattern of meetings which was this: On the 5th the service's own personnel met all day to discuss regulations, to discuss us, too, but we were meeting to discuss them, that was quite all right.

We met to discuss our common problems and the best approach to this problem. The approach is that which has been outlined to you here.

On the following day we met with the Service together with what is called the Advisory Committee which has been modified considerably. I don't know who was on that committee in the past, but the Director dropped quite a few persons from it and named a new committee, of which the members of Flyway Council became a part or were added to it. I jotted down a few of the names I recall, some of you may be able to add to the list. To begin with, the Councils were well represented, every Council had full attendance there.

(Gave list of council representatives and those representing other agencies. See Secy's file for this)

The last named persons, together with the Council members constituted the Advisory Committee which Mr. Day invited to meet with the Service.

Following a brief period of giving us the results of the Service's Waterfowl Inventory Survey, the group broke up and this Advisory committee met in session. We more or less agreed not to form a permanent organization, no officers were chosen, we took the point of view that the National Waterfowl Council was there more or less as a group and that the other persons were there representing the various organizations that they represented, so we don't function as a committee, but rather as an advisory group of persons.

Then in the afternoon the Service presented its recommendations, and those were discussed by all the members present. It was at that time that different points of view were expressed and each regulation was discussed. I think

I can say with all humbleness that the Flyway Councils conduct themselves in a fine manner and very ably represented the states. There may be some question about that, but speaking at least for Ohio, we are pretty well satisfied the way things turned out, and I gathered that most states felt the same way about it.

That constitutes the report, Mr. Chairman. (Applause)

Pres. Stiles: Thank you, Dr. Dambach, for your very excellent report.

Mr. Morgan I believe was chairman of the Central Flyway Committee, would you care to give us a report on your experience there?

Mr. Morgan: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: There is very little that I can add to my colleague's report. I went down there as a neophite, I wouldn't have missed the trip for a lot. There is one thing that I think should be brought out, that is the fact that we were unanimous as flyway delegates in that any liberalization that might be warranted this year was to be expressed in the longer season rather than greater bags. We had two or three other points we were in agreement on not as important, and we made these recommendations. We went as a group uninstructed, we had no way of knowing just what our functions were to be, and the first day was given over to trying to establish what these functions might consist of and to setting up the statement that was read to you by the doctor, pointing up a pattern that we thought could be followed for the good of everyone and the future of migratory waterfowl in the continental flyways.

The thing that appealed to me probably more strongly than anything else was the unselfishness that was expressed by not only the delegates, but the individuals that were in attendance at that meeting. I think it was not only a surprise to me, but a surprise to a lot of other folks.

In going into the meeting that the doctor told you about on the morning of the second day when Director Day asked us to organize and get together in the hour or so that remained of the morning session I felt that the feeling on the part of the members of the old National Flyway Committee was that "we have a bunch of fellows down here that are going to be in batting for their own selfish rights and they are going to be a little bit hard to deal with". Our strategy during that morning session was to keep quiet and listen. We lost a little time in doing that, but we went into the afternoon's meeting knowing about what the feeling of the older members of the Flyway Advisory Council was, and immediately after lunch Bill Davis got up and read this prepared statement that the doctor read to you a minute ago. The entire feeling of that group, including I believe the personnel of the Fish and Wildlife Service who were present, did an entire flip-flop when they found out that we were as a new committee approaching this thing with the long-time objectives that were brought out in that statement and bringing into this advisory committee the help that can come from administrative

minds that are dealing with the same problems in our own individual states that the Fish and Wildlife Service is forced to deal with on a continental basis.

From then on the meeting ran rather smoothly. We went in there feeling that maybe the skids would be greased for us the first day we were in, maybe we would get a pretty rapid and complete brushoff, and I was very happy and I know that other members of the delegation were, when immediately after Bill Davis got through reading this statement Mr. Day got up and said, "Gentlemen, I am tickled to death, this is just the thing I had been hoping for."

We were very generously accepted, and our ideas apparently are going to be given full consideration, and with the follow-up meeting to be held in Texas next November I believe we will be able to implement some of the ideas on a long-time management basis that are going to be revolutionary and will result in ironing out a lot of the little wrinkles that have bothered areas within flyways ever since we have flyway management of waterfowl. That is all I have to report. (Applause)

Pres. Stiles: Thank you, Mr. Morgan. I am sure that report was very interesting to all of us.

I think probably we better not have any further discussion on that because it may conflict with the part of the program that is going to be taken by Dan Janzen tomorrow.

I want now to announce the appointment of regular committees. First the Nominating Committee: H.D. Ruhl, Ernest Swift, and Dr. Charles Dambach.

Resolutions: I.T. Bode, Dave Leahy, and Dr. C.H.D. Clarke
Auditing: Thos. L. Kimball, Paul Gilbert, and Millard Davis.

I had planned on appointing a committee on time and place, and the reason for that was the difficulty that I got into in corresponding with the executive committee which is composed of a member from every state, in arranging for the time, but after going over the constitution of the organization I find that the constitution provides that the executive committee shall determine the time and the place, so I will have to skip that. I would suggest to the organization, however, some consideration of the thought that the constitution might be revised to provide for a time and place committee. It might be a little easier for us to arrange our programs as to time and place.

It is now about twelve minutes to twelve, so we will have intermission at this time, and let's meet back in this room this afternoon at 1:30. You can meet in committees in the Arizona Room on the 11th floor.

Mr. Wilson: I wonder if the resolutions committee contemplates meeting at the noon hour, I know they often interfere with regular sessions. If arrangements could be

made at noon hour they could give resolutions that are ready preliminary screening and expedite the work and probably avoid the necessity for members interested in resolutions taking their time off from the regular sessions. That is particularly important in a small group of this kind where we are all interested in what goes on in the regular program, and if there are resolutions to be considered it would be desirable to have them taken up with the committee and by the committee with the least possible interference.

Mr. Bode: We will meet here at the piano then decide on plans. Anybody who anything by way of suggestions for resolutions will have to get it to us, I know, by this evening, or we can't accept it; have them in immediately if possible. I think you have all had time to think it over and should be able to get them to us right away.

Pres. Stiles: Is it the wish of the group that at this time I appoint a standing committee on Coordination? I believe that I will appoint that committee, and I am going to appoint Chester Wilson as chairman, Ray Beckman of Iowa, and because of the excellent work Mr. Morgan has done on that maybe he would consent to serve again on the committee. (Announced in re banquet tickets, etc.)

With that we will stand adjourned until 1:30 P.M.

(Meeting adjourned at 12:00 noon.)

Second Session Friday P.M. Aug. 15th

The meeting was called to order by President Stiles at 1:40 P.M.

Pres. Stiles: We are going to start the program this afternoon by talking about Forestry, and I presume that the interest in forestry is to a great extent related to the forest areas of the various states and provinces, but I am sure that even in the prairie states we have some forests and that the interest in that field is general.

The principal item of discussion will be "Forest Service Wildlife Policies" to be presented by Lloyd W. Swift, Chief of the Division of Wildlife Management, U.S. Forest Service, Washington. D.C. Mr. Swift.

Mr. Swift: Thank you, Bruce. With two Swifts on this panel here today we ought to be able to wind this up in a hurry.

I appreciate the opportunity to be with the Midwest Association and discuss programs and policies of the Forest Service.

As a background to considering the programs and policies of the Forest Service in the field of Wildlife Management, it would probably be well to consider some of the

national forest conditions in your area. 8.5 million acres of the 181 million acres of national forest land are in what we designate as the North Central Region of the Forest Service. Headquarters are at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and Regional Forester Jay Price and his staff are concerned with the supervision of the eleven forests situated in the eight States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Missouri.

Estimates show that last year these Federal forests had 2,722,000 recreational user visits of which 1,060,000 were for hunting and fishing. The big game hunters harvested 51,000 deer and the fishermen enjoyed their favorite sport on 8,400 miles of streams and over 3/4 million acres of lakes and impoundments on the national forests. All of the national forest areas are open to the public. Hunting and fishing are enjoyed under the prevailing State fish and game regulations.

With so much public use it is obvious that the national forests have an important part in providing outdoor recreation, including hunting and fishing. It follows that there is a responsibility to maintain and improve the wildlife habitat on these lands.

My spot on this program springs from the fact that we have just completed a revision of the Wildlife Section of the Forest Service Manual. It has been approved and is now being processed. According to our time schedule it will reach the field offices, including each District Ranger, some time this Fall.

A copy of the tentative revision had been sent to your President, and to the Presidents of the other Regional Associations of State Fish and Game Commissioners, as well as the International Association. In each case the review and comments were sought, since a large part of the Manual relates to cooperative programs with the States. After some correspondence with Bruce it was concluded that it would be desirable for me to tell you something about the Forest Service' objectives, policies, and plans. Therefore, the remainder of my talk will be devoted to these aspects.

The Division of Wildlife Management in the Washington Office of the Forest Service was activated in 1936. Dr. Homer Shantz, well-known and liked by members of the Midwest Association, was appointed Chief of the Division. One of the first projects Dr. Shantz started was the preparation of a Wildlife Management Section for the Forest Service Manual. This was issued in 1941. It was well done and has provided a forward-looking guide during the past eleven years. But wildlife management has been moving ahead so rapidly that it seemed desirable to revise the Manual so that it would keep abreast of these new developments.

One of the first statements in the new Manual has to do with objectives and policies. The objective has been stated in this manner:

"The Forest Service objective in wildlife manage-

ment on the national forests will be to manage habitat so that wildlife populations, including non-game species, will be maintained at a level consistent with the requirements for other services of the land, and in accordance with their recreational and related public uses and values."

To implement the objective, certain policies are set forth, of which the following appear to be the more important:

1. To cooperate with State and other agencies involved in wildlife management;

2. Maintain and develop suitable environment for wildlife by coordination with the management of other national forest resources, and directly by specific projects;

3. To encourage proper utilization of the wildlife resources on a sustained yield basis through licensed hunting, fishing, and trapping under State laws and regulations;

4. In all land use planning to consider wildlife and to give high priority to wildlife management on the areas especially designated for intensive wildlife management and on key areas such as winter range which limit production of wildlife.

The importance of cooperative work brought out in the policies just cited is continued, in fact is emphasized, in the Manual proper. Chapter 2 on "Cooperative Relations and Responsibilities" is the largest of nine chapters, and sets the tone for the whole Manual. Three regulations emphasize the cooperative approach; the first having to do with wildlife protection, and the third with placing Federal Refuges administered by the Forest Service under cooperative management. I shall not speak further of the first and third regulations, since I think for our discussion the second regulation, commonly known as "W-2", is the more important. It provides the basis for cooperative wildlife management with the States. I think it is of sufficient importance for me to read in full:

> "The Chief of the Forest Service, through the Regional Foresters and Forest Supervisors, shall determine the extent to which national forests or portions thereof may be devoted to wildlife production in combination with other uses and services of the national forests, and, in cooperation with the Fish and Game Department or other constituted authority of the State concerned, he will formulate plans for securing and maintaining desirable populations of wildlife species, and he may enter into such general or specific cooperative agreements with appropriate State officials as are necessary and desirable for such purposes. Officials of the Forest Service will cooperate with State Game officials in the

> planned and orderly removal in accordance with the requirements of State laws of the crop of game, fish, furbearers, and other wildlife on national forest lands."

It is pertinent to recall at this point that Regulation W-2 was worked out with the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners and promulgated in 1941. No doubt some men in this room had a hand in its drafting. I mention these things because they emphasize the fact that this important Federal regulation was considered with and accepted by the States before it was issued.

A paragraph from the new Manual summarizes the guiding position of Regulation W-2 as follows:

> "This Regulation is the basic guide to wildlife management on the national forests. It brings together the land or habitat phase, and the regulatory phase of game management. It emphasizes Forest Service responsibility for determining the extent of wildlife use on the national forests. It directs forest officers to cooperate with the States in both planning and action stages of management. It stipulates that the harvesting of wildlife will be in accordance with State laws. These are foundations upon which national forest wildlife management is predicated."

To implement cooperative relations, the Forest Service has worked with the States in perfecting cooperative agreements. These agreements seek to outline the major responsibilities and methods of operating in a mutually beneficial manner. The agreements are adapted to individual State conditions and therefore vary in detail from State to State. Agreements are now in effect in all States where national forests are located. Some were entered into in the early days of the Forest Service and have been several times revised. So far as I know, no Forest Service-State cooperative agreement has ever been cancelled, which is a mighty good record.

The remainder of my talk could be devoted to the cooperative aspects of the job, but I should also like to develop the role of the Forest Service in wildlife management. To start with, the national forests possess certain advantages: (1) Under public ownership, they are open to hunting, fishing, and trapping under State fish and game laws; (2) facilities, such as camp grounds, picnic areas, and other developments, are provided for the convenience of the public; (3) wildlife is recognized as one of the resources on the national forest lands and it is considered in connection with the multiple-use plan of management; (4) the national forests are handled under a stable plan of management, making it possible to develop and carry out long-time programs.

In the revised Manual there will be instructions which we hope will further stimulate the habitat work on the

national forests. In brief, each forest will be required to prepare a plan that may include four sections: (1) The place of wildlife in the multiple-use management program; (2) coordination steps to maintain and improve wildlife habitat; (3) direct projects to improve water, food, and cover conditions, and (4) surveys and related, usually recurrent, fact-finding jobs.

This plan will serve as a permanent reference and guide for all wildlife work on the forest. A very important feature will be that as planning and programs for timber management and other activities are considered, the wildlife plan will be consulted to see what coordination steps are involved. Where these coordination steps apply, they will be written into the timber management and other plans and specifications and thus become a part of the action plans controlling these activities. In this manner coordination will be readily applied and made effective by being part of the day-to-day action programs on the forest.

A consideration of the coordination steps in timber management which could have application on the national forests included in the States embraced by the Midwest Association might be (1) provision for unplanted openings, strips, or borders in large forest plantations; (2) no planting of small openings, except to provide food and cover, such as conifers in a dominantly hardwood area; (3) seeding of skidways, logging roads, and other disturbed areas with clover or other plants that improve habitat; (4) reservation of den trees in areas where such species as squirrel and raccoon are important; (5) retention and encouragement of mast producing trees where needed and where this can be done through stand improvement and selective cutting; (6) a no-cutting strip along streams where advisable; (7) location of roads, skid roads, etc., so that streams are protected and erosion prevented; (8) where clear-cutting is silviculturally desirable, apply it to small blocks.

These coordination actions are not spectacular, but I believe they are the substantial part of the habitat job which the Forest Service is able to do at present. The first requirement in wildlife management is a place to produce the animals, namely, land area where food, water, and cover are found. The second requirement is good overall management so that there will be conservation of the soil, and the plants and animals that live upon it. The third is to apply skills for coordination to provide improved conditions of food, water, and cover. It is in these ways that the Forest Service can, and I think does, make substantial contributions to wildlife production in your States. This in turn creates worthwhile outdoor recreation opportunities for the people who are your license holders.

This last thought brings us back to our cooperative interests. It is necessary in wise management of the national forests to integrate the wildlife program into all of the other services of the land. This also implies consideration of many ideas and interests. It naturally follows that the Forest Service will consider suggestions coming from the State agencies in attempting to further our mutual

interests. In this connection I hope you will spend more time with the Forest Service people, both in the field and about the conference table. This will give more opportunity to understand each other's problems and responsibilities, and in considering these do a more effective job in the public interest.

Pres. Stiles: Thank you, Lloyd. The discussion will be led by Ernest Swift, Director from Wisconsin, whom you all know.

Mr. Ernest Swift: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Swift, members of the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, fellow Conservationists: Mr. Stiles, in reciting a little of the history of this association, mentioned that this was the 19th annual meeting. Its organizational meeting was in Des Moines here in 1934, and there are very few people left who were at that meeting. One of them is Mr. I.T. Bode. Mr. Willard of Minnesota and MacKenzie were here, and maybe Frank Blair. Why I make mention of that is that among other things in those days was the matter of relationships between Forest Service and the states, of which some of the older members will remember, and there was a Department of Agriculture order or regulation, a very innocent number was attributed to it, G 28, but that order was the basis for more vigorous debate of this group than any other single discussion I think it ever had down through the years. I participated in some of the discussions and listened to a great many of them. I can't say they were always intellectual, but always vigorous. I see a smile on I.T's face.

When I was talking with Lloyd Swift this morning, I was wondering whether everybody had just worn themselves out discussing that subject or whether we had grown up maybe, and I feel maybe we have grown up, because we have come a long ways to this regulation W2 (Check this number) which has been worked out in conjunction with the states, and I am sure that quite a few states have developed cooperative agreements with the Forest Service. I know Wisconsin has. Possibly it would be well for somebody to get up and give their experiences or the degree of success they have had.

The amount of acreage of federal forests in the various states varies. You take Colorado, they have tremendous acreage, Minnesota has more than Wisconsin, we have slightly less than two million acres, so the relationship there and the importance of a working agreement in one sense depend on the amount of acreage within a state controlled by the Forest Service that is involved.

Does anybody wish to discuss W-2 and how it is working and its development within their various states? How about you, Mr. Kimball?

Mr. Kimball: Colorado: Mr. Chairman: I think, of course, that W-2 is the proper approach to the relationship between the Forest Service and the Game and Fish Departments in managing the resource, the wildlife resource. The cooperation in my opinion is absolutely essential, since the Forest Service has the responsibility of being the land

manager and the states have the legal authority to manage the wildlife.

Now, I came to Colorado from Arizona, which is another state that has a great deal of national forest land. My experience in both of those states has been that the cooperation between the Forest Service and the State Game and Fish Departments has been on a very high plane. We have had many serious problems come up, we have been able to sit down around the table and discuss them and mutually agree on the methods whereby they may be solved, and I personally think that the Forest Service should be commended for doing an excellent job of land management. In my opinion they are doing the best of any federal agency, and as long as we have that proper land management we are not going to have any trouble insofar as managing wildlife resource is concerned.

Mr. Ernest Swift: Have you a formal agreement?

Mr. Kimball: Yes, we do have, have had in both states.

Mr. Ernest Swift: Mr. Bode, I mentioned your experience down through the years, I would like to hear you comment on the transition of cooperation.

Mr. Bode: I doubt if there is anything I can add to the comments that have been made. I agree there has been a tremendous transition and completely new understanding. We don't have such a large area of national forest land in our state, but do have some, have no difficulty in handling wildlife on them.

Mr. Ruhl: We have an agreement and no real problems, but I am concerned, and this is not directed at the people in the Forest Service who are responsible for the wildlife management, but I am concerned in this respect: I think that the proportion of trained personnel in the Forest Service who have wildlife training and background in relationship to the number who have training in wood production is woefully weak. That is probably the Association's fault as much as anybody's else, and I don't believe that the Forest Service can be expected, the supervisor of the Forest Service, be expected to do all of the things that the land might justify in wildlife management unless he has adequate personnel and appropriation to do the job, and I for one am reluctant to let them say, "Well, we will lean on the Fish and Game Agency, they have lots of money". That is perhaps true, perhaps it isn't, but I believe that the Forest Service should have personnel facilities and appropriation for wildlife in proportion to the job on the forest service because, after all, the agency that has charge of the land is in better position to do that than the state agency even though the relationship is entirely healthy, cooperative, and all that.

So I think that we have a job to do to get proper recognition, proper finances, and I don't know what that is. I am sure when you talk of $150,000 or $250,000 you are

talking about peanuts, but I do think that is a big job, think it ought to be done. I don't think we should lay it in Lloyd's lap and say, "Why don't you get it?" We should get it for him, let him do a good job, give him heck if he doesn't.

Mr. Blair: We have no difficulty whatever in Minnesota these days with the Service. I am of the opinion that the U.S. Forest Service has an excellent organization from the beginning, trained in forestry, have done an excellent job. I do disagree somewhat with some of the others as to the organization within the Forest Service. I mean by that, in the old days when they first had this regulation, and you remember that, they had a lot of trouble in the states and that is what brought about this better cooperation, because in those early days the Forest Service wanted to control the game life in these state forests, but that has all been changed, and I believe that the men in the Forest Service who have charge of the game management work are as high type as you will find in any of the organizations, whether in state or Division of Wildlife Service.

However, I do look at it in the light that the Forest Service is primarily in business for the forestry work and management of the forests, and I look at it in the light that these men should be in the Fish and Wildlife Service to manage the game life of these forests in cooperation with the state rather than have two agencies that have to do with wildlife management. That is not saying anything against any of these people who are in that work because I think they are very high type, and with the amount of money they have had available to take care of game management work in the United States forests they have done an excellent job. It is either a case, as Mr. Ruhl says, of the Forest Service having sufficient money to go into the game management work in a big way or else permit the Fish and Wildlife Service to handle all of it.

Pres. Stiles: I feel quite alone in this, in hearing statements from other states on cooperation. I will say that as far as Iowa is concerned, our experience has been both good and bad. Certainly we have gotten along very nicely with the Division of Wildlife Management in the Forest Service and with most of the various divisions of the Forest Service, but we have had our troubles. Whether those troubles are all the fault of the Forest Service or not I can't say. Probably we are partly at fault, but we have had some troubles even in a prairie state like Iowa that has comparatively small amount of forest.

Mr. Kaufhanger: I think that the fault in lack of coordination and cooperation is twofold. I think that the Forest Service is guilty and I think the state agencies are also guilty. I think that the Forest Service is still embedded in an age where they still look too much upon trees from the standpoint of feed. I don't think they have recognized the contribution that fauna makes to forests and from the standpoint of the conservation departments in the individual states, and also those that have control through the several agencies of the federal government I don't think that

they have recognized the importance of trees from the standpoint of fundamentals to conservation and indirectly to the conservation of wildlife.

I think there is a very happy situation developing in this country, not only in the various states, but also in the wildlife service, namely, that more and more trained people in vegetated cover are becoming administrators of conservation, and that, it seems to me, through a period, will close up the gap there has been between so-called foresters of the old school and so-called gamekeepers of the old school. In other words, the solution to the whole thing as I see it is a new approach to conservation, the interrelationship between the complex soil, plant, wildlife, and water, and I think that our argument is futile, but I think it will resolve itself through better understanding, through such mediums as this, and through recognition of the people of this type of organization in the fundamentals of conservation. Thank you.

Mr. Swift: Thank you, Mr. Kauphanger. Now, there are Indiana, Ohio, the Dakotas, and Kansas, I am not acquainted with the extent of federal forests in there, I will have to admit to my ignorance.

Dr. Dambach: Ohio. What little we do have is exceedingly important to us because we have so little public land available to the public. Taking all the land would only give the licensed hunter an average of an acre of public land, so we are anxious that every acre is intensely managed, and every failure to have that managed would be on our part, not on the part of the Forest Service, they have been very cooperative.

Mr. Swift: I don't want to miss any state, but will have to rely on you as to the importance of this subject to your own state. So far as Wisconsin is concerned I would like to have Mr. Cramer discuss it a moment because he in conjunction with Jay Price developed a cooperative agreement wherein we are injecting Pitman-Robertson management on forest service land. Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Cramer: The first inkling that we in Wisconsin had that there was something amiss in our relations with the Forest Service was when the Forest Service quite a few years ago surprised us with a request for reduction of deer herd on the national forest. They asked us to support a reduction of some 15,000 to 18,000 deer, I think those were the figures. So we began to look into our respective relationships, and we have been getting much closer together since that time and have worked more closely together. At the present time we are working together with the Forest Service under an agreement that we have arrived at, and under this agreement we even provide experienced biologists that work with the Forest Service on the two national forests in the state, work with them on plans for the management of the various species of game, and I think it is working out very well.

Referring to Mr. Ruhl's and Mr. Blair's state-

ments with regard to the propriety of the state managing the game on a national forest, I personally feel this way: Since the state has the actual ownership of the game in its name, it seems only proper that the state at least actively participate in the management of this national resource, but it should be done in practically the same manner that we do it with the private land owners. The private land owners own the land, but we don't ask them to manage the game for us, we try to do that by regulations and other things, and I think the same relationships can exist between other agencies and the state in the management of game on their lands, except maybe where the game is primarily game that is under protection of the federal authorities. I guess that is all I have to say.

Mr. Swift: Is there anyone else that wants to bring up any different aspects of this particular subject? I feel we should reiterate the stand we have previously taken on the Tackett bill, and I was going to talk to the chairman of the resolutions committee on that, because due to the pressure of electing people to public office it didn't get too much consideration at this particular time.

Mr. Kimball: I would like to bring up again a point that Harry made about the lack of formally trained people in forest service insofar as wildlife is concerned. This afternoon, I think following this discussion, we are going to talk about the role of the conservation officer in our own departments and what part he should play in representing the department in all functions, and I am wondering whether or not that same discussion might apply to the framework of the forest service. They have various specialists within their framework, that is, they have timber management men, range men, watershed men, and all the various functions of land management, the individuals of which are more or less specialized in their field. I am wondering whether or not an in-service training program and the education of all those specialists in the field of wildlife management might do as much as having an additional number of specialists in wildlife management.

Mr. Kauphanger: That gentleman has touched upon what I consider the fundamental approach. You people are in the conservation departments, are intelligent, but you fail to apply coordination, understanding from thestandpoint of the public in the treatment of conservation fundamentally through divorcing your field men from the whole complex. You still designate representatives of your organizations as game wardens; you still designate representatives of your organizations as ranger. Why don't you designate them as Conservation Officers? You are arriving at a point where you are getting people who are trained in the fundamentals of conservation, why should we as citizens who are interested in conservation, who are interested in helping you men promote conservation, have to indulge in practices like asking for a determination of what should be seasons open and closed for game? Why should we have to ask people and legislators through the medium of a game and fish committee, a forestry committee, and a soil conservation committee, when it should be a general conservation committee? You men are

the leaders, and you fail us when you don't ask that conservation be treated from the standpoint of the whole, a total conservation program. Why shouldn't we have in our legislatures a general conservation committee with various subcommittees treating the different problems? But you are still concerned with game and fish.

In Minnesota four years ago we appropriated five million dollars for game and fish, we appropriated $22,000 for soil conservation, $250,000 for forests, and our waters had to depend upon what they could get from the department from the Division of Game and Fish. I live on Lake Minnetonka. Our problems are not to determine how many fish a man has caught, but dredging, pollution, irregular run-off, lack of vegetative cover, and destruction of the lake through utilization of the lake bottom to create new land. We have created over 2000 acres in the past 40 years, and yet the only representative that we had of the conservation department is the game warden, and through law and through regulation it is mandatory on his part to give 99.9 percent of his time to fish enforcement.

Five years ago the fallacy of arresting a man for catching 16 fish when he should catch only 15, and pollution destroying as it is on Lake Minnetonka millions, for God's sake, gentlemen, please let's get down to fundamentals, and you in the conservation departments have got to interest yourselves and demand and insist thatit should be soil, vegetative cover, water, and wildlife. Let's quit arguing about saving a marsh in order to save ducks; let's save the marsh to conserve water, and we will save the ducks.

Mr. Leahy: Kansas. I think the Conservation Commissions are doing most of the things you advocate there, but I can't understand what is the advantage in calling a game warden something else than what he is or a conservation officer something else than what he is.

Mr. Kimball: I still would like to have Mr. Swift answer my question.

Mr. Swift: You will have to repeat it. You mean Lloyd here?

Mr. Kimball: Yes.

Mr. Lloyd Swift: Well, Tommy, I think you know the situation in forest service almost as well as I do, and sure, it would be highly desirable to have a training program and carry it over to all members of the Forest Service, the skills of coordination, habitat, and so on, and we tried to do that in a limited way, but I don't think that would strike at the basic problem as I see it.

Now, we can in the Forest Service finance pretty well for two types of things, the things of which the people are frightened like fire, they can see that and will provide finances to fight fire; they can see that there is return to the treasury of the sale of timber and having the land

for grazing, and those will be financed, but for the things which directly add to the public enjoyment of these public lands like recreational use, they are very difficult to finance, no return to the treasury and no one frightened about the problem that arises.

So, then, carrying that through another step, we have all the work we can do, in fact more, on the national forests with our present number of personnel, that is, the personnel has remained about the same and the job has grown. So, then, it comes back to the situation where we do the things for which we are financed, the other things go by the board. That is the reason our campgrounds are in such horrible shape, as you know.

The situation has been explained time and again to the appropriations committee and Budget Bureau. without follow-through in increased appropriations for the recreation and wildlife work, so in the report of the secretary of Agriculture to the House Agriculture Committee in respect to the Tackett Bill, HR565, which would take 10 percent of national forests receipts and make them available for recreation and wildlife work, he said in effect that we have brought this situation to the attention of congress for a series of years with no response and, therefore, would we think that some other approach ought to be considered now, and the secretary then said that we would like to have Congress give consideration to this other type plan, namely one percent of national forest receipts. That is kind of going the long way around, but is to your point.

Mr. Ernest Swift: I think I have taken more time than allotted to me, thank you, gentlemen.

Pres. Stiles: I want to thank you, Ernie and Lloyd, I think the time was very well put in.

I think in the next part of the program we are going to get down to fundamentals, and the next is a Symposium on the "Role of the Conservation Officer". The leader is Dr. Dambach of Ohio, and I am sure this will be interesting and provocative of a lot of discussion, something that is basic to all of us, and I will turn this part of the program over to Dr. Dambach.

Dr. Dambach: I had a speech all set to give you, but I think the interest in this subject already evident this morning and this afternoon is such that I shouldn't take any time in a preamble, but I think I should present to you some of the questions that have occurred to the panel and myself as the basis for discussion, I want to present to you some of those questions before we get into the panel so you may be thinking of them as the panel members present their comments.

The title of this is "Role of the Conservation Officer". I would like to pose these questions for consideration by the panel and other questions which they may wish to bring up.

1. Should the conservation officer be restricted to enforcement activities.

2. If so, can't the position be considered a full-time job? Can you justify hiring a man for nothing but enforcement.

3. Should the conservation officer be assigned other activities than enforcement? If so, what, for example, game management, fish management, public relations, pollution abatement, soil conservation, and other things?

4. Is it possible to find in one individual a man capable of fulfilling all of those responsibilities?

5. If it is not possible to find a man that can fulfill all of those responsibilities, does it take a team of technicians and officers to do the job?

6. If it does take a team of conservation officers and technicians, which member of that team should be the official department representative to the public, is it going to be the technician or the conservation officer?

7. Can men trained in enforcement effectively represent a department in all branches?

8. Assuming that it is desirable for the conservation officer to be the representative in the department and assuming lack of training in those areas, how can such training be attained?

I think if we have the answer to each one of those we will have accomplished something here this afternoon. I would like to call first on Director Bode to comment. Mr. Bode.

Mr. Bode: Mr. Chairman, members, friends of the Midwest Association.

I recognize that there are many viewpoints regarding the functioning of the conservation officer or enforcement officer or warden or whatever you choose to call him. There is little doubt but that all of them are legitimate. And perhaps there is just as little doubt that there is no one pattern which will fit all states.

In relating our own viewpoint in Missouri, I would be the last to assume that it is the answer which should have universal application. I can only give you our reasoning and experience for whatever it may be worth.

It is important to note that increasingly the designation of this group of workers seems to be turning to some terminology such as conservation officer, field agent, wildlife agent, conservation agent, etc., connoting a functioning beyond that of police and law enforcement duty. What significance this has I do not know.

When the Missouri program was initiated, a

serious effort was made to evaluate the various activites to be carried on by the Commission and especially to adapt the functioning of all departments to human relationships and reactions. It seemed obvious to us as we studied this field, not only in our own state but in others, that, no matter how this group was designated, the people turned to them for the answers to their questions about the department. They went to them with their troubles. They turned their wrath on them if things didn't go right. They were in actuality standing as the first line of contact between the people and the central administration. The people felt they represented the department whether we so recognized it or not. This is very natural because this group contains that segment of nearly any organization with which the people make the most frequent daily contacts.

After long consideration, therefore, the Missouri Conservation Commission at a meeting held on September 27, 1941, adopted the following policy statement:

"This is a preliminary announcement and reflects the thing we have been building toward during the past year, and which has been discussed with the staff and field force. There will, of course, still be machinery to set up in order to get the plan functioning in its entirety, and the field men will receive instructions through their respective chiefs as plans develop. The effect of this action of the Commission is to make the plan an official order of the Commission.

" 'The development and expansion of the Commission's program and activities since the date of its creation has necessitated, from time to time, adjustments in the functions of the members of the staff and the respective divisions and sections. Increased public interest and participation, and the coordinated activities of other agencies have afforded opportunities for increased service to the public and for a larger contribution to a well-rounded program of conservation based upon land use and upon the public interest.

" 'The Commission commends the staff for the thoughtful consideration and efficient attention which it has given to the development of the program. It views with special approval the recommendation of the Director, the chiefs of the several divisions and sections, as well as of the entire staff, <u>for the designation of the Conservation Agents as the official representatives of the Commission in connection with all of its activities in their respective districts</u>. This plan, which has been developed by the staff through a series of several conferences, is regarded by the Commission as providing the means of rendering a continually expanding service with the maximum of efficiency.

" 'In view of the satisfactory manner in which the staff has dealt with the problem involved in the

progressive development of sound conservation service, and of its approval of the recommendations made for the broader responsibilities and duties of Conservation Agents, the Commission hereby expresses its approval and official adoption of the plan and calls upon all members of the staff to lend their full cooperation to its successful application and operation.

" 'The Commission recognizes that the wider and more varied services which will henceforth be required of Conservation Agents involve considerations of leadership, ability to cooperate with co-workers, and administrative capacity beyond those which would ordinarily attach to the functions of pure law enforcement. It feels confident that the members of the Protection Section will recognize these considerations and that they will measure up to the responsibilities as well as the opportunities of this broader service. The Commission declares its intention of recognizing, within the limits of its available resources, by advancement and by increased compensation the development of the leadership and administrative qualities of the members of the Protection Section.'"

Subsequent to this decision in policy the protection work and our program of "field service" was consolidated into what we now designate as the "Field Division".

The "serving as representative for the Commission for all of its activities" as we conceive of it must be rightly understood. It does not mean that the conservation agent becomes a regional or district manager or director. It does not mean that he is expected to be a specialist in all branches of our work. It does not mean that he himself must carry on all the project and field work. It does not establish the evaluation or placement of this employee in the organizational qualification or salary schedules of the department. It is a functional designation. He <u>represents</u> the Commission. He becomes the contact man. He <u>serves</u> liaison in both directions (from the Commission to the people --from the people to the Commission). He must know what the program is and must be in a position, not to <u>render every service</u> requested, but to know how and where to obtain that service.

To accomplish this has necessitated careful coordination effort between all parts of the department.

In our opinion it has strengthened rather than lessened law enforcement. It has raised the standard of this group. It has made them more nearly an integral part of the working force. It has avoided most of the conflict, duplication and confusion which could arise from many different work areas being thrust on the people by different groups and sections of workers operating without coordination. It has brought to the administrative and technical phases the tempering influence of public reaction. It has broadened the potential working force on all field programs.

This is a very sketchy picture of our approach. The details of its operation would require more time than is here allotted.

We think that, for us, it is working very well.

Dr. Dambach: I think we ought to establish a few rules about this panel. One rule is that we give each panel member an opportunity to present his views; at the conclusion we give them opportunity to question one another on respective views, and throw the discussion open to the floor.

I would like to turn now to Mr. Millard Davis who is supervisor of Conservation Officers, Division of Fish and Game of the State of Indiana.

Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners. I am substituting in the place of Mr. H. P. Cottingham, Director of Division of Fish and Game in Indiana. As his Assistant and Superintendent of the Conservation Officers, I am glad to participate in this meeting for Mr. Cottingham on "The Role of the Conservation Officer."

As a group, the conservation officers are a unifying element around which the efforts of various Departments or Divisions within are usually centered. I am sure whatever else in conservation is important, no one can overlook the fact that the backbone of the conservation program is law enforcement. I feel that the importance of a conservation officer, to some extent at least, has been neglected and perhaps should have been brought to the attention of this Association and other wildlife conferences long ago. Perhaps the non-uniformity of existing laws in the various states has had a tendency of not bringing to the fore-front the important role that an officer plays in any conservation program. Seldom do conservation officers get their name in a wildlife journal or a fisheries publication or any other conservation publication. But, on the other hand he must know so many things that are necessary in the operation of a fish and game division and yet does not get his name titled or attached to conservation articles, so he still remains what you might call him in some states just a common old "game warden", whether he is called a conservation officer, game management agent, game inspector, game protector, state ranger or what-not. He now is, has been in the past and will be in the future a game warden, unless some uniform designation in this respect is adopted by all the states.

The conservation officer of today is not restricted to law enforcement alone. His duties are many - as a public relation's officer, he is the Conservation Department's direct representative to the public at large. In education the officer has an important job attending and arranging conservation club meetings and programs. He must be able to speak before and show them the importance of conservation and management of all of our natural resources. He must be courteous - neat appearing and have the confidence and respect of the people in his district. He must be a walking information bureau and jack of all trades, so to speak, and he is

usually trained by expert personnel in all phases of conservation, and this is very important.

Conservation Officers, with a practical back ground in conservation, have furnished valuable and sound information in drafting laws pertaining to conservation to be presented for new legislation and today we have reached the point whereby we, as administrators, have become very much concerned with game management problems, and should look to the conservation officer, who has had a number of years of practical experience to help solve some of our present day problems. The conservation officers should know better than any body else the job that has to be done, because they know the things as they used to be, as they are in the field every day and it is their business to be out in the fields, in the woods and along the streams and they know what it would mean to their area or district if the streams were once again pure and free of industrial and agriculture wastes. They know what it means to be out in the early hours of the morning and enjoy the communion with nature that man receives at dawn in the forest. They know what it means on a cold, blustry day to hunt birds in the beautiful fall of the year, and they know the thrill that man gets in the cold weather hunting ducks. They know what it means better than anyone else to have the silent tranquillity of fishing on a beautiful stream, or in a boat on a beautiful lake. They know what those things ought to be, and they know that something should be done to make them as they should be. They know better than anyone else they cannot continue the practices that our forefathers maintained in our country in not practicing the conservation of our natural resources. They not only know the duties of nature, but they know wildlife generally is a natural resource of the land. They know what it means to be out in all kinds of weather trying to apprehend some one violating the law. They know what it means for the violator to ask for a jury trial and the jury returns a verdict of not guilty and then have all the work and planning to apprehend this violator go for naught. They know better than anyone else how to carry the message of conservation to the people in their district. They know better than anyone else how public relations brings results. Therefore, the conservation officers should be consulted - and we do in Indiana - by calling them into conference with our Fish and Game technicians in order that a good sound, satisfactory solution is decided upon before Discretionary Orders, Rules or Regulations are adopted. We think this policy is a conservation wise method that assures the public of expert decision.

Methods and policies adopted in any conservation administration necessitate an adequately trained staff to enforce all laws and regulations. Without law enforcement these laws and regulations are useless as a method of maintaining wildlife population. I might add one of the most important factors in the accomplishment of any program is public support, and the best way to accomplish this is through the wide and complete coverage that a conservation officer has through his personal contacts in checking fishing and hunting licenses throughout his district in his daily routine work. He has the opportunity to advise these persons of changes in a law or a regulation, and at the same

time gets their views on matters that could be beneficial to a Department. He also has the opportunity to advise conservation club members when attending their meetings to explain to them the purpose for which a regulation was adopted far better than any newspaper or news release that might be sent out from the main office.

Furthermore, I might add, as it is the opinion of a lot of successful law enforcement officials, that a period of at least 5 years is required for a law enforcement officer to become efficient, and, of course his efficiency improves over a longer period. Therefore, no one is more qualified to present a conservation program than the conservation officer, as the training in dealing with the public has qualified him to present such a program, in such a way as not to offend any disgruntled or misinformed groups that are not favorable to a program. In other words, with this background he is capable of explaining laws and regulations to conservation clubs, sportsmen and organizations better than anyone else.

We feel that public support is necessary, not only in law enforcement programs, but in all other programs that a Conservation Department would wish to carry out, such as Game Management, Fish Management, Forestry Management, etc. I can't help but feel we have failed in the past to recognize the importance of the actual need of the support of the Public, particularly the people that are interested in the outdoors. A law enforcement officer feels that if the Public is informed and understands any program, the program will succeed. But, without this knowledge properly presented, any or all programs are doomed to failure. Information regarding proper game management that is understood by the general public, as well as by people who hunt and fish, has a tendency to create support for any conservation program presented to the Legislature.

As there is no Conservation Department bigger than its force of officers, perhaps we should take an inventory of the accomplishments that the law enforcement section renders to a Conservation Department. In doing so sometimes the conservation officer has the unpleasant task or embarrassment on different occasions of explaining to the Public the intent of the law passed by members of the Legislature who do not understand the purposes of that law. Thus, has been brought forth many different interpretations and opinions that have created unfortunate situations and problems whereby law violations have been hard to enforce in certain areas throughout the State. I will use Indiana as an example: For instance our conservation officers have charge of the distribution of fish and game from the game farms and fish hatcheries; egg distribution from the game farms to the club members; delivering hunting and fishing licenses to our county clerks and agents throughout the state; checking licenses out at the end of the year, returning stubs and unsold licenses to the office of Fish and Game Division; posting all rules, regulations and Discretionary Orders that are required by law to be posted in each township in the State of Indiana; enforcing the game laws as well as policing all State Properties; contacting farmers in cooperation

with all Pittman-Robertson projects; securing game habitats, restoration areas; investigating firearm accidents; teaching and administering First Aid; making inspections of game breeders and holders of pet permits before licenses are issued; investigating fur-buyers and checking their furs; delivering and attaching net tags for commercial fishing; participating in all Pittman-Robertson and Dingle-Johnson work by cooperating with them in the roadside game count; the whistling quail count, and, just recently, making a deer survey in anticipation of an open deer season again this fall. They participate in sportsmen's questionnaires to determine game killed each season. They post accident prevention placards. The conservation officer further cooperates with the U.S. Game Management Agents in helping them in the enforcement of all Federal laws and regulations. All in all according to our fiscal year's report, our conservation officers appeared before 2200 conservation clubs, attended by 104,763 members and were constantly attempting to create better farmer-sportsman relationship. These are some of the many activities in which our conservation officers are engaged.

Now that I have mentioned a few of the many activities and problems that confront a conservation officer from time to time, it is hoped the discussion that follows will bring out the part that law enforcement plays in the overall conservation program, and in doing so, no doubt, will accomplish something that we are endeavoring to do here today, and that is to get the most out of this meeting that would be beneficial to the proper management of our natural resources.

Realizing the important part that a conservation officer plays in a conservation program, and in order to improve that efficiency, if I may I would like to present to you part of a committee report that was submitted and adopted at the 1952 meeting of the Association of the Midwest Fish and Game Law Enforcement Officers held in Indiana at which time I was Association president.

1. That the term "Game Warden" be discontinued in identifying conservation enforcement personnel and their positions be classified as Conservation Officers, Conservation Agent Game Protector, or the like.

2. That the selection of enforcement personnel be made on the basis of open competitive examinations - the latter not limited in scope to knowledge of fish and game laws.

3. That the following minimum qualifications be required of all applicants;

Age - Not less than 23 nor more than 29 years
Height - Not less than 69" nor more than 76"
Weight - Not less than 150 pounds (stripped), with height and weight in proportion in accordance with accepted medical standards.
Vision - Not less than 20/50 either eye, corrected 20/20

Hearing - 20/20 as determined by audiophone
Education - Graduation from 12th grade - diploma required.
U. S. Army High School Intelligence Quotient Certificate acceptable.

Candidate must possess good moral character, emotional stability, resourcefulness, tact, alertness, must be well developed physically, free from any chronic disease, organic or functional condition or physical defect or deformity which might tend to impair efficient performance of an enforcement officer's duties, and shall be required to unconditionally pass a rigid physical examination given by a physician designated by the enforcement administrator.

4. That the enforcement administrator or a qualified representative make a thorough personal investigation of applicant's home life, home conditions, character, standing in community, credit rating, etc., prior to his being accepted. Whenever possible, applicant's school superintendent or principal, teachers, etc. should be interviewed to determine candidates background and behavior in younger life.

5. That an adequate training program be provided which the candidate must successfully complete before being assigned to actual field duty. Included in any basic training program should be thorough schooling in the organization and administration of the agency which the officer will represent in the field, the aims and concepts of his department in its administration of natural resources, instruction in the knowledge of what might be called "Police Courtesy" or "Public Relations", the fundamentals of general criminal law including search and seizure, modern methods of investigation and interrogation, evidence, court procedure and the ecology of game and fish.

It goes without saying that the officer must, in addition, have a most thorough knowledge of the conservation laws he will be enforcing.

The committee strongly represents that his preliminary training is of the utmost importance. To expose the recruit officer to the demands of his job without his being first thoroughly schooled in and understanding them can but result in a deterioriation of public interest and respect for our enforcement personnel.

In closing, I would like to say that it has not been my intention to promote or play down the effectiveness of any Department or any group or conservation officers, game technicians or any one else. In presenting this paper the thought has always been in my mind that something constructive would come from the discussion that is to follow. I know that conservation officers and you gentlemen as administrators are proud of the work in which you are engaged. I know that I am and always have been ever since I become connected with the Department of Conservation in Indiana. When I was a conservation officer I use to day-dream on many occasions out along the streams in an attempt to visualize

what the future had in store for the up and coming generation. If by our efforts the generations of the future may have the opportunity to fish in streams that are clear of pollution, or on a beautiful lake in your state, or if they will have an opportunity to hunt and enjoy the thrill and benefits of all of this, we have accomplished something worthwhile, as by our efforts we have instilled in citizens of our locality and state, the desire to enjoy the beauties of nature and the desire to enjoy wildlife as we would like to see it, I believe we all have made a definite and honourable contribution, not only to our state but to our country as well.

Dr. Dambach: Thank you very much, Mr. Davis.

Now we turn to the young man who has just taken on a big job and has most of these problems before him, Tom Kimball from Colorado.

Mr. Kimball: Mr. Chairman: I must apologize first for not preparing a written paper, but I prefer to approach this problem by answering the questions as proposed by our discussion leader. Like Mr. Bode, I do not presume to infer that the solutions that I propose are the final answers to all of the states represented here today, but they do represent the approach that we are taking to this problem in Colorado.

The first question - should the conservation officer be restricted to enforcement activities - I might pose that question in just a little different light by asking, can we afford to restrict the conservation officer to enforcement activities? I think it is recognized by all present that in the early days of fish and game departments the enforcement division formed the background of the department. I think that was principally because the need was there. The departments, as time went by, required specialists and specific divisions statewide were created to handle specific problems.

As an example, when the need for intensive game regulations and rules arrived, technical personnel were employed to seek out the information and to furnish it to the appropriate authorities for action. The same might be said of the other divisions in most game and fish departments - fisheries research, fisheries production, and distribution, public relations and education, game research; and I find in looking over the organizational charts of most of the states that a good number of them have divisions staffed statewide on those specialties.

The second question, if so, can the position be considered a full-time job, and what qualifications are necessary? Again I feel that the conservation officer should be no specialist. He should be able to represent the department not only in law enforcement, but have some knowledge of the game management, fish management, and especially the fundamentals of public relations.

Third - should the conservation officer be

assigned to other activities than enforcement? I definitely feel that should his time be required in the surveys and investigations of the wildlife resource that are necessary for the setting of seasons and bag limits, he should be required to participate in that activity. Should he be required to assist in the proper fish distribution, planning, and management, he should be required to devote some time to that activity.

I have heard it said, and I believe it strongly, that the most effective public relations job is done by the conservation officer. I know in our state in one month the enforcement officers contacted over 20,000 holders of fishing licenses. Many of those sportsmen in the field do not know the director, the commissioner or officers of the department personally. The opinion of the department, its effectiveness, the type of personnel is received from the impression that is given by the field contact, and so it is definitely one of the most important jobs of the conservation officer to know the fundamentals of good public relations.

Fourth - is it possible to find one man who can effectively fulfill all of these responsibilities, as Shakespeare would say, "Aye, there's the rub." It is very difficult to find a multi-purpose man who can do all of these jobs well. I would say that you would have to set up qualifications that would attract that type of personnel to begin with, and of course that means that you have to have pay of equal amount to other positions in the department. I think that is the first step. The second should be that you must give enough prestige to that particular job so that persons seeking employment would be interested. Fulfilling those two commitments I do think it is possible to effectively fill those positions with men who are qualified to do the job.

The next question, if one man cannot fulfill all of these responsibilities, does it take a team of conservation officers and technicians? Certainly in the field of research it is not possible to have a multi-purpose individual. Some of the research problems in which we are engaged take the full time and effort not only for a series of months, but maybe even a series of years, to get the proper information, and certainly without the proper information we cannot do the job of proper wildlife administration. So I would say that it would definitely take a team of conservation officers and research individuals to do the job.

The next question, if it takes a team of conservation officers and technicians, which member of the team should be the official department representative to the public? That poses an interesting problem. Just a few days ago we had an in-service training school in which a number of our department personnel were present representing various divisions within the department. So I asked one of the conservation officers, "Joe, what is the most important job in the Game and Fish Department?" He said, "Why, the law enforcement is most important. Without that we wouldn't have any game to manage."

I turned to one of the game managers, and I said, "Lew, what is the most important job in the Fish and Game Department?" He said, "Manager; if we didn't manage the game the law enforcement officer wouldn't have any job at all". So it appears to be just what division you are representing within a department.

From my own standpoint I feel that all members of the department should be the department's official representatives, that it is a team, and when we start defining which of the jobs is the most important I think we not only get into trouble, but I think it is immaterial. We must all realize that all of those divisions are essential. It has been proved so throughout time, and that working together as a team is the only way to accomplish the desired results.

Next question, can a man trained in enforcement effectively represent a department in all branches? That poses another very interesting problem in that I am sure all departments have within their enforcement divisions many individuals who more or less grew up with the department, they were employed in the early days as enforcement officers, they had such large territories and there were so many poachers that that was just about all they got done was traveling their territories and hauling the culprits off to court. However, I have found that in-service training does a considerable now in providing the information whereby an individual of that type can represent the department in most of the branches. After all, he must know something about it before he can pass it on to the general public.

The final question, assuming that it is desirable for the conservation officer to be a representative of the department and assuming lack of training in these areas, how can such training be obtained? I perhaps have already answered that, and I feel that the most positive approach to that is an intensive in-service program.

In Colorado we have three a year consisting of two weeks each. We are attempting to train the law enforcement division in the game management procedures and policies, the best approaches to the sportsmen in the field from the standpoint of public relations, we are attempting to train all of our other department personnel in the field of law enforcement in order that when they are out in the field carrying on their particular duties, should they run across any violations of the law they will have the necessary tools to bring the culprit to justice and see that the proper decisions are rendered in that respect.

I am sorry that I didn't understand that these papers were to be prepared, and I hope that I have contributed something to the discussion. Thank you. (Applause)

Dr. Dambach: I am sure you have contributed a lot to the discussion. By the analysis of those questions it is evident to the group that he is just getting under way in Colorado.

I would like to call on Ray Beckman who has been working on this problem quite sometime and has some knowledge as to whether the approaches suggested by Mr. Kimball will work. Mr. Beckman.

Mr. Beckman: Mr. Chairman, members of the Association: I don't want to imply that our system is the only system that will work, I merely want to tell you the success of the role of a conservation officer as it functions in Iowa.

When the name Game Warden was first given as the title for men employed to enforce Fish and Game laws, there were very few if any duties assigned to him other than those connected with enforcement. This was not in any sense unusual, but perfectly natural for the simple reason that in those days it was a foregone conclusion, that with sufficient law enforcement there would be plenty of fish and game for everybody.

We are all aware of the changes that have taken place in the thinking and practical application of wildlife management programs and policies. With this change in programs and policies came a change in the duties connected with the position of conservation officers, as he is now referred to in many states. Not only was there a complete change in the thinking and duties of the officers but as these duties changed so did the men employed in these positions. This new and different approach in the field of wildlife management interested an entirely new group of people in this field of work.

Now what is the role of the present day conservation officer. Let us analyze some of his qualifications and duties.

1. The modern day conservation officer should not be restricted to enforcement activities. True this is an age of specialization, but often the officer is the sole representative, or "front man", of the Commission in his territory, and for this reason he must be well versed in all field of conservation endeavor. The public of Iowa no longer regards the Iowa Conservation Officer as a policeman, but expect him to take part in public relations activities and all departmental action programs.

2. This position is a full-time job, and requires a man of considerable ability. First and foremost, he should have a tremendous interest in the conservation program. Not only in the field of wildlife management but in the entire field of conservation. He must have a thorough understanding not only of wildlife itself, but of all of our natural resources. He must have a good knowledge of soil and water conservation, of its relationship to wildlife and mankind. Above all he must have a thorough knowledge of human nature and the ability to talk intelligently and fluently with people. He must be a leader, a person that is recognized as such by the public and one that can conduct himself in such a manner as to standout as a leader in a natural way. In other words, a good officer can't be so far

ahead of people that he loses them. He must keep them with him at all times and keep them going in the direction which has been outlined for him in the policies and program of the organization which he represents. He should be intelligent, energetic, loyal, resourceful and courageous. Although higher education is not specifically required, it is advantageous in the work and highly desirable but does not replace any of the other attributes of character mentioned. To perform the work required of them, the officers must be in excellent physical condition. A pleasing personality and the ability to meet and speak to the public is of prime importance. Needless to say the officer should possess high moral standards and conduct himself as a gentlemen at all times.

3. Iowa conservation officers are assigned many activities other than enforcement. This is done for three primary purposes. To begin with, in a state where finances and personnel are limited, it is necessary to utilize every man to the best possible advantage. Additional assignments are helpful to the officer in that it familiarizes him with the major fish and game programs. Once the officer is familiar with the programs of the Commission, it becomes much easier for him to pass this information on to the public.

Let us take a look at how the system works in Iowa. Our biology department is a small unit, comprised of eight technically trained men and a superintendent. It would be a physical impossibility for this department to census the game birds and mammals of the state with their own personnel. Methods of census are carefully worked out by these technicians, detailed instructions for doing the work are passed on to the conservation officers, and when the surveys are completed the results are carefully analyzed and interpreted by the biology department and passed on to the Commission and all departmental personnel. Each officer has a keen interest in these technical programs, for he has had an active part in their development. The results are translated into plain, simple facts that he easily understands and can pass on to the general public. Since this work is a part of his job, there is no reason for him to feel he is being abused or doing someone else a favor. Instead he feels he is a part of the entire organization, working toward a common goal. Perhaps it is because the organization is smaller than some states, but what ever the reason, there is unity between all departments, and the conservation officer, field men and office personnel are cognizant of what the other fellow is doing, and why he is doing it.

The biology section is not the only outside activity of the conservation officer. He assists the fish management department in fish rescue work, stocking, public relations, rough fish removal and many other fields. He takes an active part in the game management program, particularly in sportsmens cooperative activities including the bird-rearing and habitat improvement work. He works cooperatively with the Federal Aid section in many of their action programs. One of his most important duties is to keep his public locally informed on the over-all programs of the Commission. He does this through personal contact, the press, radio and his numerous conservation clubs.

4. It would be virtually impossible to find a man that could completely fulfill all of the responsibilites assigned to the Iowa conservation officer. Some men naturally more nearly approach the ideal than others. The officers are selected by competitive examination, and every effort is made to select those best suited for the job. An effort is made during the one year probationary period and thereafter, to train the officers for their position. Statewide and sectional schools provide a medium of education. We feel that a man with a good background and personality can be trained to carry out an effective program. Much of his work is outlined by the central office personnel and his supervisors, but the accomplishments must be made by the officer himself.

5. Since one man cannot fulfill all of the responsibilities vested in the conservation officer, the work is actually divided among many. The officers are directly responsible to their immediate supervisors, but the entire staff in the Fish and Game Division have a part in their work. Each department head, with the aid of his technicians, is responsible for setting up a program for the officer to follow. Team work is the key-note to success.

6. The conservation officer is the "front man" or official department representative to the public. He accomplishes this through his clubs, organizations and local publicity. Although the technicians are instructed to appear before the public on occasion, and prepare both popular and scientific materials, they are, by and large "the men behind the scenes". Their primary job is to collect and interpret data, but the job of passing it on to the public rests primarily with the officer and public relations department.

7. A man in enforcement can effectively represent the department in all branches provided he obtains and transmits the information received from authentic sources.

8. Conservation officer training has received far too little attention in many states. In-service training of officers usually consists of a short course of a few days or weeks duration, after which the officer is assigned to work with an experienced man for a month or two. While this type of training is good, it is insufficient to give him the basic background needed in his work. If he is expected to work with all departments, he should receive basic training in them to learn the fundamental principles of each organization. Perhaps the ideal situation would be an in-service training course of one year duration. In addition to his formal education in short courses of conservation, he could receive training by actually working with field men and work crews in the various departments. Permanent assignments could then be made, and he would be more familiar with the work he is expected to do.

It is not my intention to minimize the importance of law enforcement in this paper. It is still an important part of the officers duties and I am sure will always remain so.

The Conservation Officer of today must know, understand and practice the theory that conservation laws are not designed to deprive people of their right to fish and hunt, but are designed to equalize the harvest and better manage our fish and game resources. The conservation officer of today knows the people want good law enforcement. But he is also aware that they want more than enforcement, they want an officer in their territory who represents the Commission in all its activities, an officer who has a personal interest in providing better hunting and fishing for the entire community. Yes, even beyond that the top notch officer of today is one that is exerting his effort and influence to make his community a better place in which to live.

Every administrator in the field of wildlife management is aware that one of the most difficult hurdles to overcome and a constant problem, is the problem of managing people. It is my humble opinion that the first and most effective step in solving this problem is by having Conservation Officers act in the capacity of multiple assignments of duties. The result will be a better informed and better satisfied public.

Dr. Dambach: Thank you very much, Mr. Beckman. It is obvious that there is a core of unity running through the presentations of all four gentlemen on the panel, but before throwing this open to general discussion I would like to give the panel members an opportunity to question one another if they wish to present questions.

Mr. Davis: I don't believe I have questions - I am perfectly in accord with these gentlemen, think the views have been pretty well presented.

Mr. Bode: I would rather hear what the folks out there have to say.

Mr. Kimball: I would like to ask Mr. Davis one question - do you feel that individuals with college degrees would be a handicap as the law enforcement officers? Would that be an asset or handicap?

Mr. Davis: I don't think that would be a handicap to them.

Mr. Kimball: The reason I brought that up is that within our own department there is a feeling that law enforcement officers are born, not made, and that individuals who do the best at that particular type of work are those who have a particular liking for enforcement work and that it cannot be instilled in them through training, and if any of the other members of the panel have comments on that I would appreciate hearing them.

Mr. Davis: I might add this, that sure, I think the college graduate has his place in this law enforcement program because the training that he has in college fits him for that assignment. However, after all, there is a certain amount of good judgment, horse sense in other words, as we

call it back in Indiana, that is to be applied in law enforcement regardless of how much education one might have.

Dr. Dambach: Anyone else care to comment?

Mr. Beckman: I don't believe I do, I see these other gentlemen are anxious to get in.

Mr. Kauphanger: By the way you and your game wardens in conversation with Steinmetz, Napoleon, and myself would like to ask for 65 rather than 69. You gentlemen, one of the things you hear in the field, and I happen to be on the outside trying to look in, I am for you men in the state game department, am not seeking ajob, have never sought a job, we are getting places, we have a geologist in Michigan as Conservation Commissioner and director, we have a forester in Wisconsin, we have a damned good attorney in Minnesota, we are going places in conservation, we are getting fundamentals. The only test that there should be for a man in the field is whether or not he is a potential conservation, and that includes education, including understanding of enforcement, common sense, selling a program of conservation. This is a wonderful discussion, a discussion I have been waiting for for thirty years.

I went to a meeting last Sunday with the director of our division of Game and Fish, it was a reproduction of meeting I attended in 1951, that is how far back they are, they are still talking about who is going to be game warden, so and so caught many such and such, we don't like this and don't like that. Now, listen, you men, you have gone a long ways in conservation, but you are going to have to become totally conservation minded, and in order to become so you are going to have to have field representatives that represent the department and instill in the minds of the public that you are not only interested in enforcement, but interested in the fundamentals of conservation, and unless you do that you are never going to get any place, and you have been getting no place fast. Let's get that and get it now.

One more thing, the damndest thing in the states, and you haven't got the guts to even talk about it, it is civil service, it protects the inefficient by providing him with a pension and weekly stipend as long as he doesnt commit murder - nuts!

Mr. Leahy: The gentleman just said that he paid us a compliment by saying we have gone a long ways in 20 years, then winds up by saying we are getting no place fast, but to Tom's question there, I have one fellow in my warden force - and that is the result of 25 years, we changed to game protector a few years ago - who is the world's worst speller, the world's worst penman, but still has a master's degree in education, he is doing a crack-up job for me. I have another fellow that has a master's degree in business administration, he is making a very good game protector. What we are doing in Kansas on this thing is, I am putting college men in on those jobs as fast as I can hire them. I have come to this conclusion in Missouri, Kansas, and Colorado the Wildlife classes are turning out technicians,

there is no room for them, and it strikes me that the place to start those fellows is in the field as law enforcement officers and in other work that the director may want to assign to them. They have no other place to go, and in respect to this question this morning of pre-training I am working out a deal now with the Kansas State College in their Wildlife Course where they are going to teach a man law enforcement work and the other work that we ordinarily expect a law enforcement officer to do, and I will say definitely that there is a place for the college man. They don't want to do it, but they work into it.

In all this discussion here today we talk about the extra work for the law enforcement officer, but how about the extra work for the game technicians? It seems to me while we assign this other work, at the same time we should assign the enforcement of law to other men.

Mr. Kimball: That is one of the things that came up in our in-service program, we were trying to get conservation officers indoctrinated in doing this other work. They say, "We have been doing that all along, but we would like help in our enforcement work from the other divisions", so that is why I mentioned it in our in-service program. There is also the problem of teaching fish men, game managers, educational men and so forth how to go about law enforcement work.

Dr. Dambach: We send technicians, as well as other men through the same training school. Secondly, we require all technicians during the peak enforcement period to share in the enforcement of the law, and they travel together which helps to break down that barrier.

Mr. Blair: As I listen to this discussion, after listening to a lot in the past, I want to go back first to what Mr. Ernest Swift said about this organization being started in 1934 but it succeeded a previous one known as Northwest, organized in 1922, and then later in the early 30's we organized Northwest; this was changed to Midwest, and game wardens of the old days, some have gone a long ways, many of them are commissioners today and directors of divisions of game and fish, in fact, Kauphanger over here got his first training as game warden. It looks to me today as though whatever you call them, game protectors, conservation officers, or game wardens - I like conservation officers best as a name for fieldmen, but the duties have been changed, as have the duties of all. All of them must be trained in the all round picture of conservation. It isn't a question of game and fish today. We have $4,500,000 a year for game and fish work in Minnesota and $100,000 a year for soil conservation. As the population increases, more and more people are interested in fish and game. They have to have a place to live, and we find more and more places that at one time were habitat for wildlife are now covered with steel, wood, and concrete. We are losing a lot of waters through drainage and a lot of places drying up, so we have less land for game, less water for fish, and the only way this problem can be solved is to teach the people what this all round picture means, and all of our personnel has to learn about the entire

picture of conservation if we are going to do the big job of getting people interested to save what we have and try to perpetuate for the future.

Mr. Ernest Swift: You said, Mr. Chairman, there was a common core of understanding, but I think there are still some basic differences among the papers. Incidentally, this morning I thought maybe this meeting would be kind of stuffy, but I think we can pull it out of that and get some good debate here.

I recall about fifteen years ago giving a paper before this group on the job of the game warden, as he was called at that time, very much like that which the man from Indiana gave. I was a warden in the field during the time when he was lord and master of all he surveyed, when there were no foresters, at least in Wisconsin, forest protection or research, or anything of that type. I am going to be like the lawyer today, I am going to try to throw a little confusion into this debate here.

Again referring to the paper that the gentlemen from Indiana gave, I question whether we can find a man with all the attributes that he spoke of. I believe more as Mr. Kimball and some of the others, that we will have to break the job down. However, I do believe that the police powers of a state or the federal government are the keystone of the arch of conservation, just the same as you have to have that keystone if you are going to hold the arch up.

In my state we have wardens, game managers, and research men in game management; we have rangers who are non-technical, and then we have graduate foresters, fish managers, and fish research men, adding up to some 700 field personnel with various types of responsibility, and in that group there are about 100 wardens, so you have some 600 other people in the field that also have a place in public relations.

But I think one of the things that we never stress in any of these meetings is the business of the economic welfare of our various states or our nation. We talk too much about the recreational aspects, assuming we are going to be prosperous enough to afford that recreation. Take the state of Iowa for example in which we are now. Its economy is based on agriculture, and in the agricultural practices which I noticed coming through the state yesterday is the matter of eliminating soil erosion and use of strip cropping, in our state we are using that for a basis of better wildlife habitat, so you have a coordination there, but people from Iowa don't go to Minnesota or Wisconsin or Michigan or out to the Black Hills if they are not prosperous, so it is the agricultural development and prosperity of Iowa that allows people to afford such things, and we don't talk about that enough because our recreation, the thing we are talking about, is premised on basic economy, and they can all be blended in.

In my own state, and I know it is true in Minnesota and Michigan, we have a forest economy as well as

agricultural economy. Wisconsin is third in the United States so far as paper making is concerned and gross sales of forest products there exceed 300 million dollars a year. Now when you talk about an officer knowing all of these things I think we should as administrators start to implant in him some of the economic philosophy of these things as well as just the recreational aspects, and if you are going to have one man in the field you can call him conservation officer if he is going to know all civil culture practices, land purposes, research, insect control, he is going to be quite a boy. You are going to have to break it down because some states have all of thoseproblems.

I remember back when we started to have trouble with our deer, there were some wardens that saw the problems, many others didn't. We got men that were technically trained in that proposition to work with the warden and teach him, some accepted it some were very slow in accepting it, it was the matter of the man himself. Some of our rangers wouldn't accept it. A good many of our foresters didn't see the problem of deer management because they were looking up into the trees from the standpoint of how many logs or how much pulp was there and couldn't see there was no reproduction. So we break it down into some of these ideas of specialization, not only in warden practice, but in other types of practice, and you can't get a man who wants to plant trees in northern Wisconsin to go to the warden and have him test the soil and tell him whether red pine or white pine should grow on a particular type of soil, so you have to have specialization there. But the main thing, as Mr. Kimball talked about, is teamwork with each group respecting each other's job, and if they do that by study they will absorb the general philosophy of what is being attempted to be put across by any individual department and they should not only have it on a state basis, but should know it on a national basis, what is the general philosophy of what is being attempted to be put across by any individual department and they should not only have it on a state basis, but should know it on a national basis, what is the general philosophy of conservation, should know we are a have-not nation instead of a have nation, and we are losing a lot of these resources that make us prosperous. I think generally as administrators we do not emphasize the fact that we are not going to have these recreational things that we talk about unless we have a strong basic economy, and that is based on the resources that produce it, because everything comes from the soil. You ask a child in the streets here today where food comes from and he will tell you a grocery store; ask him where oil comes from, he says it comes from the filling station; where lumber comes from, and he says from a lumberyard. That is the conception too many people in the United States have today, and there isn't anything we utilize but what it comes from our soil, and that is our basic strength.

We have the philosophy also that collectively we could be a strong nation, but unless we are strong individuals we are not going to be a strong nation. (Applause)

Dr. Dambach: I dare say some soul-searching on the question posed by Ernest Swift would find many of us

wanting. I am not going to ask for a poll on this question, but suggest that all of us search our souls on this question - do our conservation officers or our technicians have the philosophy he speaks of and do they present that philosophy to the public; and if they don't have that philosophy how can we expect the public to ever get it.

Harry Ruhl, I know you have some ideas on this subject because we have kicked them around. Would you care to comment further on it?

Mr. Ruhl: I quite agree we are new, because we are a little bit more complicated as an organization and have more variety of responsibilities perhaps than do some others; because we have geology, we appraise the mines for taxation, we tell people how much oil they can take out of the ground, and a few things of that kind just to make it more confusing, and we don't think it is possible for anyone to be the representative of the conservation department on all of the questions that come up, we think we have to specialize and subdivide, think it is advantageous to do so. We do, however, try to have all employees who meet the public understand the broad basic policies and attitudes of the department and we also try to teach them to know their own limitations, that is, the things that they can answer correctly, the things to pass on to the fellow who can. It is awfully nice to know when to do that, but instead of having the officer or any other field representative feel that he is under obligation or is expected to know all the answers to all the questions, we feel that if he knows his own specialty well and the general concept well and knows where to direct the person to get the proper answer, that is all we can expect, and we spend plenty of time, I think as much probably as anyone, in trying to train all personnel who meet the public in these various aspects.

It is a continuing job and one that takes a great deal of time of the staff not only in getting of policies, but seeing that they get down to the fieldmen. We think of the conservation officer as a representative of the department, not the representative; we feel the forester should be a representative of the department, too, and the fish man and the game man and the geologist, with limitations, of course.

Dr. Dambach: Mr. Wilson, you haven't said much.

Mr. Wilson: I have been listening with tremendous interest to this discussion, I think it is one of the most fruitful numbers we have had on our programs, I am also looking for things on which we can agree and questions which deserve further discussion in an effort to reach an agreement.

I think we can all agree with our friend Mr. Kauphanger from Minnesota on the fundamental objectives of our whole program which must be geared to the conservation of basic resources - the soil, water, and forests as the source of all life, and I think that when we approach this problem of the role of the conservation officer or any other employee or officer in the conservation service that they

must be grounded in those fundamentals - in thefundamental objectives of the conservation program and must understand their own relationship thereto. I am sure we can all agree on that, but then when we get along a little farther as to the particular functions of these different members of our team we are likely to get into a little confusion, and I think there has been a little confusion in some of this discussion that has gone on here.

To clarify that I would like to ask this question and then answer it myself. Is there anyone here so naive as to think that our basic conservation program could succeed without law enforcement, human nature being what it is? Well, of course, everyone will answer that question as I must answer it from a lifetime experience with law enforcement, emphatically NO! Unfortunately we have enough lawless individuals in society so that those who are willing to be law abiding must take steps to protect our property and our public interest.

Now that, I think, should clarify the further question as to the primary role of the conservation officer, if you are going to use that name for the functionary who used to be called, and in Minnesota and other states still is called, the game warden. We believe that the primary function of the conservation officer must be to secure observance of the law. It is common to call it law enforcement, and that term is so commonly used I suppose we may as well stick to it. The cat has been let out of the bag here by the mention by Mr. Kauphanger that I was an attorney, that is what I used to be, did that before I reformed and became an active conservationist, try to live down my dark past by doing something constructive for society, but I have had a lifetime experience in law enforcement and in connection with early practice was county attorney, or called district attorney in some states, the principal frontline prosecuting officer of the state, and used to handle the business of the game warden when he didn't do anything else, and was a most unpopular man and everybody was trying to dodge him and outsmart him, and that was thirty years ago, and in that period I have seen that job grow in breadth and dignity until now in Minnesota I can still say the game warden who still goes by that name is one of the most respected elements in our society, and we haven't had to change his name to bring that about, but we still tell our game wardens their primary job is law enforcement, and if they are going to accomplish that job successfully, the job of protecting the gains we are making through all the other activities, through soil conservation, forest conservation, habitat improvement, research, and all the other things that we put our hands to, if we are going to make those gains available to the public we must have effective law enforcement and that is their job, and we are not trying to nickelplate that job or minimize it, cover it up, or sugarcoat it, we are trying to build it up and dignify it and make them feel it is tremendously important. And I think they do feel that.

At the same time they also appreciate the importance of all these other things that have been discussed here today; they appreciate the fact that by the very nature of

their assignments, the fact that they are often the only immediate representative of the conservation department available to the people, the fact that more people come in contact with them than with any of our other people that they must be proficient in public relations, must cooperate in educational work and must know something about these other activities, whether it is taking game census or whatever it may be and cooperate in that to whatever extent may be required, I am sure we are requiring our game wardens to do just as much of these auxiliary duties as is imposed upon them in any other state, but still we impress them and impress the public with the fact that their primary duty is law enforcement, and as I have said before, we have not changed their name and see no need for doing so. I refer to the saying that a rose by any other name would smell as sweet. I don't think you would gain anything by calling him a conservation officer. It has become an honored name in Minnesota by virtue of the fact these men have sold themselves to the public and their work has been broadened in importance, and you are getting into confusion when you call a game warden a conservation officer because, as others have already pointed out, isn't a forest ranger just as much entitled to be called a conservation officer? We, too, have equal breadth of work in Minnesota, we have a tremendous volume of state mines that we actually own, lease, and supervise, in addition to supervising activities of a lot of people on private holdings. Mining engineers are also conservation officers, we protect waters of the state, so are not hydraulic engineers also conservation officers? So I stand with Ernie Swift and Harry Ruhl on that proposition, I agree there are different ways of reaching the same objective, and I wouldn't quarrel with I.T. Bode about the strength of their program, undoubtedly they have attained good results, but it strikes me you are getting a little too far when you try to put your finger on the game warden as the chief representative of the department and are playing down the responsibility of other men who should be equally entitled to have a place in thatpicture.

So I think if we can tie ourselves into the idea that a conservation officer or game warden should be grounded in the fundamentals and understand his relationship thereto, but that he should have primary responsibility for his specialty, which is just as specialized and just as technical as the biologist's, enforcing the law, and doing these other things, because they contribute to successful law enforcement and successful conservation, then we will have a picture of the successful role of the conservation officer.

Mr. Kimball: As administrator, had you the choice of choosing between two candidates for the office of game warden, one of which had a college degree or background in wildlife management and had no particular affinity for law enforcement, and another individual who had a background in law enforcement and liked it, with no particular background in wildlife management, which would you choose?

Mr. Wilson: They say it is a Yankee habit to answer one question by asking another. If you were required to pick out a biologist and you had one man who had four years

of academic training and two years of postgraduate work in biology and game management, and another man who had gone up through the ranks of the game warden's force and whose training was largely in the practical end of law enforcement and a smattering of general knowledge of wildlife in the field, which would you choose for a biologist?

I would pick the man best qualified for law enforcement for game warden, then give him what additional training he might need in order to relate his job to other things he must know about.

Mr. Kauphanger: First of all I would like to have it strictly understood that my reference to Mr. Wilson as an attorney was in glowing terms, not derogatory. Number 2, I think that Mr. Wilson and others of his kind who are arguing this point of maintaining the designation of the so-called field officer as game and fish commissioner are failing to appreciate the psychology of the proposition, namely this, that too many people in this country think of conservation only in terms of one of the end details, namely game and fish and as a result it is most difficult for us to get a consideration of fundamental conservation in the legislatures and in congress. It is not a question here that you are arguing of eliminating the duties of a game warden, it is a question of giving the proper name.

Dr. Dambach: I am sorry, but the time has run out on us, I think this discussion could go on for the rest of the day with the interest that is evidenced in it. I don't believe we have arrived at any clearcut conclusions. It is evident from the discussion both from the floor and panel that we are not absolutely in accord on some of these points, although as I indicated earlier, there is to a degree a common core of thinking. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if it wouldn't be well if this same topic be investigated by the committee or put on the program for another year to carry on with it further?

Pres. Stiles: I think that is an excellent suggestion, Dr. Dambach.

I want to thank Dr. Dambach and the members of this panel for a very interesting and instructive contribution to the program; in fact, I think we had a pretty good debate started there, I rather felt inclined to get on my feet myself and express some thoughts that I had, and as I came up here Mr. Bode said, "Well, I am sorry I didn't have a chance to say a little more", so maybe Dr. Dambach's suggestion that we might carry this on to some future meeting is a good one. I think it is always good to have a little argument anyway.

The next part of the program might well be as controversial as the one that we just discussed, "Research - Its Place in Conservation", and this will be presented by Dr. C.H.D. Clarke, Superintendent Wildlife Management, Division of Fish and Wildlife, Department of Lands and Forests, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. And Dr. Leedy, would you come up to the platform also? Dr. Leedy is going to lead the

discussion, who is Biologist in Charge, Cooperative Wildlife Research Units, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C. Dr. Clarke.

Dr. Clarke: Mr. Chairman, gentlemen: I am afraid I accepted this assignment without understanding what sort of background might have attended this agenda. I have attended only one meeting of this Association, and I don't recall any particular discussion as to Research, so without any real knowledge as to what you might be thinking about, I was compelled to put down my own thoughts briefly on this subject.

When a title like this is placed in agenda one realizes at once that there must be some doubt or difference of opinion about it. There is only one safe place to go in such a situation, and that is to a shelf full of dictionaries. Conservation has been defined from the first as the wise use of natural resources. We all have that one off by heart - but what is research?

There is only one answer - research is, or should be, the careful and critical search for facts, and appraisal of assertions, whether newly put forth or accepted for centuries. This is a composite definition, but it contains as much as the authorities on our language will allow.

Obviously research is basic to conservation, for how can we use resources wisely unless we have facts to go on, or in plainer words, unless we know what we are doing? Surely we have had enough of administration, which as A.L. Pritchard points out, (Fisheries Research Board of Canada, Proc. 5th Meeting Canadian Committee on Freshwater Fisheries Research 1952), is a word synonymous with management, based on premises uncritically accepted.

Having flushed this definition and brought it fairly to hand, I realize that I am expected to carry on, having actually discovered only what I am supposed to find - some more facts.

Research is, then, fundamental. May I suggest that we have tried to make it something less. We have attempted to compartmentalize it, perhaps I should say departmentalize, as if we could take it out of our daily lives, the way people do nowadays with religion, making it a matter of obeisance on Sunday forenoons and an appropriate financial contribution. We forget that the facts significant to our practice of conservation are those we try to live up to, just as we maintain principles only by living them and not by taking off our hats to them.

Research men are not to blame for their segregation any more than the rest of us. It is a convenient routine into which we have all fallen, arising from the time when popular prejudice rather than fact-finding was the basis of management. There still existed plenty of biological research in the best scientific tradition, almost all of it under grants or in fulfillment of requirements for degrees. The grants, of course, demand a nicely set-up project, and the degrees

a discreet problem. Even the scientist can forget that there are no discreet problems in nature, where interdependence and interrelationship are the rule. There are many advantages of convenience to the neatly packaged program, with the great disadvantage that it is easily pigeonholed and may never be translated into action. (Insert 1) I should like to be able to see when research is completed that these are the facts that we want now, issue instructions to the field staff and see that they are carried out. If the project has been farmed out to some chap who is merely stopping over at the university for two years and who goes on Heaven knows where, you can't very well do that. Therefore, pigeonholing sometimes happens.

We can with safety departmentalize only if we never allow ourselves to forget that there is no natural cleavage between management and research, or between research problems or types of problems.

In the daily routine of the administrator most questions are answered by facts at hand. It is the scientific attitude, "that imponderable combination of curiosity, skepticism and objectivity", as Aldo Leopold called it, that distinguishes the research-conscious administrator. Many other questions require facts readily obtained without out-of-pocket expenditure. Here the library, the service laboratory, and the trained field staff of the modern conservation department show to good advantage. We do not even designate their work as research, but they place within our reach facts which were unattainable a few years ago. Still other questions require special expenditure. It is these, principally, that are designated research in our departmentalized vocabulary, and which are first in our minds when the issue of research in conservation is raised.

Let us say, then, that the place of research in conservation is firstly in the make-up of the administrator and secondly in the make-up of his working organization, and then go on to look for the place of compartmentalized research.

What are these questions that remain unanswered without a special effort?

If we are to utilize a crop of wildlife on a sustained-yield basis, good management requires that we maintain as large a capital stock as the area will reasonably hold, and harvest each year the available surplus. In order to do this we have to know the stock, the increment, the available surplus and the harvest. Hardly anywhere is our knowledge on these points adequate, and even then the means of getting it are imperfect. We can expect improvement for years to come in censuses and estimates of all types, and harvest returns. Accuracy must be balanced against ease and cost, and needs cannot be expected to be the same from year to year. Each technique, each modification, must be tried and tested.

Once we have this information, often before, we should set about improvement. We can increase either the

stock, the increment, the available surplus, or any two or all of them. For the two latter, careful analysis of all factors of production and mortality are needed. It must extend into the life-histories of parasites, predators and competitors. We are as yet a long way from doing much about wildlife diseases and the cyclic rise and fall of many species remains almost as much of a mystery as ever. If we are to increase our stocks we must increase the carrying capacity of the land. We have our Lespedezas and our multiflora rose, but there is still a vast field for experiment and fact-finding. The place of artificial stocking still has to be determined for many areas. It is not a matter that can be safely dealt with in sweeping generalizations. Each land unit has its own conditions and each administration must face its own facts. I think it likely that Michigan and Wisconsin are both right. The introduction of new species can be handled only on a research basis.

Not all important wildlife species are harvested. We must determine the place of the interesting and useful species that never get into the bag. We also must protect the rare and rescue the vanishing. We must have facts about all of them, and we must learn the effect of our parks and preserves on wildlife and vegetation. We should also study the wilderness while it is still with us and record ecological changes while they are in process.

Fisheries problems are in essence very similar to wildlife problems. Research concerns itself chiefly with population dynamics. The interrelation of various harvest methods is more important here, and so is marketing of products. Entering into this are some parasites which have no strictly biological importance at all, but which may make fish unusable. Questions of carrying capacity, of artificial propagation and of potential new species and valuable hybrids also enter into the fisheries picture.

Forestry may be outside our field here, but it is worth mentioning that the same basic pattern of biological problems appears with a shifting emphasis. Forest protection is of enormous importance, whether from fire, insects or diseases. Forest fire is a problem in both fisheries and wildlife management, but it cannot be said to have a parallel in either. Looking into the future of forestry research, one can see a great field for tree breeding and tree crops. The former can provide strains for reforestation that are resistent to insects and diseases, and more productive than those now used. The latter can cover soils that should not be exposed.

Forests, fish and wildlife all benefit when soils are improved and suffer when they deteriorate, or erode. Therefore, the problems of improving the land, in all their variety, are part and parcel of conservation. In most of them there is a great need for fact-finding.

Finally there is a group of problems caused by the impact of different forms of land use on each other and of human activity on all. Power developments, irrigation, drainage, flood control, the disposal of sewage and indus-

trial waste, crop sprays, road building and management and other developments that you could add, are all potent forces in our modern life, that have impeded, destroyed, or less often, helped resource conservation programs. The fact-finding of the conservation administration will be devoted to measuring their actual or potential impact on resources and devising ways and means to salvage or improve where possible. We are all vitally interested in any research on the structure and functioning of our modern world in which it has taken into account that we are what our natural resources have made us, and our children will be what the resources we leave them will let them be.

It would be possible to line up an imposing list of projects that still need to be carried out, but without going any farther we can see that there is more to be found out in all the main branches of conservation, and no phase of our knowledge is complete. Will it not always be so? Some of us, at least, believe that if we are ever satisfied with either knowledge or performance we might as well be dead. There are times when we can afford to be pleased, but when pleasure gives way to complacency there develops around us the musty atmosphere of the whitewashed tomb. The function of research is not likely to change at all. The only changing balance is that between project research and the service laboratory and field staff.

We must recognize also that fact-finding and its translation into action should balance each other in any organization. In this balance all research is on one side, not just project research, and all performance on the other. The relative position between projects and other fact-finding facilities is something that will vary from agency to agency and from year to year, as we have already noted. Weight, too, is not necessarily a matter of money or manpower, or equipment. One man in Ontario may be able to solve an important problem, but the application of the newly-acquired knowledge to 400,000 square miles may require an effort on the part of the field staff equivalent to the labour of several men.

Furthermore, and this is very important, the same piece of research properly slanted may yield results applicable throughout the range of a species or the limits of a major plant formation, or even throughout the world. Because we can never hope to get all the knowledge we need, we should, if possible, correlate our efforts on the largest possible scale, so that each project will serve as many people and as much area as we can bring it to serve, knowing that our losses in extra expense on one of our own projects may be made up fifty times over in extra effort made by someone else to enlarge a project so that it meets our needs. The need for correlation of research is obvious and it is not entirely met by application of the principle of correlation by United States Federal agencies. There is still much project research done without their aid - for instance in Canada. Let us be content with pointing out this need and say, in summary, that research and the use of its results should balance, and we should correlate our total research effort to give it the greatest possible weight.

Research projects produce, in addition to facts, a by-product that we cannot do without and that is the research-minded administrator. Here I am back again on the dictionary definition of research. The scientific point of view, as Leopold described it, is not innate. It is acquired through training. There may be exceptions. There may be dogs born steady to wing and shot, but I should hate to take a chance on it. The instinct of the dog is to get in after the bird, and in the human, emotions come into play first. Unless the man is trained to look for his facts, he may be counted on to react emotionally to any situation. That is the only word for it. When the research man enters the administrative set-up, he still needs, usually, one more course of training, and that is on how to deal with untrained, emotionally-oriented people above him. In some organizations you have to go quite a long way up, but even in the best you can still find them at the very top, because we are nearly all public servants in a democracy and the people our bosses, are not likely to acquire the scientific point of view for a long time to come.

Pres. Stiles: Thank you, Dr. Clarke, for a very interesting and informative paper, and I feel there should be some interesting discussion following it. The leader of the discussion is a man whom I am sure most of you know, Dr. Leedy, Biologist in charge of the Cooperative Wildlife Research Units for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C., Dr. Leedy.

Dr. Leedy: Mr. Chairman, Dr. Clarke, members of the Association: I hope today on this very important subject of research you will have so much to say I won't get a word in edgewise. I think Dr. Clarke has brought out some interesting and important points in his brief paper, and I am sure you must have some questions to raise. Who is going to be first? Merrill Steen, I believe as administrator of many years' experience, anyway acquainted with technicians and research people, you must have comments to make here.

Mr. Steen: I don't know that I can add much to this discussion. It seems to me the field has been well covered, I think I shall have to agree with Dr. Clarke in his assertion that research is basic to all the things we do. I was somewhat amused during the previous discussion at the suggestions or the comment that there was a difference of opinion between law enforcement and game management and which was the most important. I was amused at that because it is tantamount to saying that law enforcement is more important than law enforcement. After all, which is law enforcement? It is management, it is that function which makes effective the regulations we find it necessary to impost upon the people in order to hold harvests to safe proportions. I don't think there is any function within the modern conservation agency that is all important nor that is unimportant. I don't think we can have effective law enforcement without research because if we do we are back in the days when they were managed by guess and by gosh, when we imposed restrictions upon the people that were totally unnecessary to protection and perpetuation of species

and failed to impose those that were necessary.

I don't think we can have education without facts, because, after all, facts are all that education has to sell, that is all there is to education, conveying of facts. I don't think we can have management - the production end of the game - without facts. I don't think we can have administration or at least sound administration without facts, therefore, I support Dr. Clarke in his contention that research is basic. But I want to repeat that all these functions are important, that you can't have a motor that will take you places without having a carburetor, valves, manifold, pistons, rings, connecting rods, main bearings, crank shaft, and so on and so forth. We need a motor - let's build a motor, get behind it and go places.

Dr. Leedy: Thank you, Mr. Steen. Now, Mr. Kimball.

Mr. Kimball: I agree with Dr. Clarke and Mel that research is basic, but I think the difficulty lies in selling research to the game and fish commissioner and to the public in general. Too often I think time is spent in conducting research problems which do not have immediate application, and that has more or less soured some of our commission members on the research program. Sometimes it is not too well presented to them so they understand it, which doesn't help matters either. As an example, we had one of our commissioners wanting to know why we wanted a certain amount of money to conduct a research problem on pheasants. Most of you are familiar with the cock crowing method used in conducting pheasant surveys, but it had not been explained too well to him, and he was of the opinion that we were attempting to determine the type of feed that would make pheasants crow more, and couldn't see the practical application. So I think it behooves the research men to make sure that their program has practical application.

I think they should come to the administrator and say, "What problems are bothering you, what are the facts that you need?" and that way set up a research program that will have a practical application which everyone can get behind.

Mr. Kauphanger: Whenever knowledge becomes too great for acceptance, said Dr. Isaiah Bowman, you are lost. You have game wardens, I see it in Minnesota and other states - there is a sort of test for biological data because we have not yet acceptance in the departments of conservation of the intelligent. We are producing approximately 400 graduates a year in wildlife courses and they can't get a job. Something for you fellows to think about. No less a personage than Dr. Bennett five years ago said this, that enforcement of the future is to enforce the private individual to practice soil conservation. In other words we are beckoning back to the old adage that we are only living here borrowing, lending if you please, the opportunity to survive and to leave it in such a way that those who come after us can continue. Now, if that is a breach of democracy, there is coming a time, and it is here now, when people who have been

told over our land must be subjected to rules and regulations that will promote that land in the future. That is a new type of enforcement and again another argument for the right type of conservation officer.

Dr. Leedy: I will have to disagree with some of your figures and facts there anyway - the statement that the graduates of the conservation schools weren't obtaining jobs. That has been a part of the work of the committees of the Wildlife Society for the past several years.

Mr. Kauphanger: I think I have some of the figures on that pretty good.

Dr. Leedy: Our figures would indicate three fourths of the Bachelors degree men have obtained jobs, about 80 percent of the Masters degree men, and over 90 percent of those receiving PhD's. It would be my contention that that is a pretty fair average, although the problem does exist of the graduates obtaining positions in the field, and with the increasing number of those who graduate it will probably mean keener competition. Do we have any more discussion?

Mr. Cramer: I think the need for research was recognized several centuries ago. Wasn't it Francis Bacon that said, "Man understands nature only to such a degree as his observation of nature will permit him to do." In other words, research is needed for understanding, and research is nothing but making observations and drawing the proper inferences. Isn't that correct?

Dr. Leedy: I think that would be correct. The speaker listed several of the needs of research, and another committee of the Wildlife Society has been engaged in a study of those needs. Dr. Harlow B. Mills of Illinois, Natural History Survey, last year was chairman of that committee, and I think he might have something to say along that line, the needs of wildlife research to fit in with those that Dr. Clarke mentioned, or add to them. Dr. Mills.

Dr. Mills: There have been three or four things that have occurred to me since this discussion started. This discussion has been good and worth while, there are a few things that I would take exception to, as one might expect.

There are two types of research which cannot be separated from each other. I think that is rather obvious. There is the applied type of research, that which can be done rather quickly and in which you can reach certain conclusions in a fairly short length of time. Then there is the more abstruse type of research which is hard for many people to understand, but which is more fundamental and important often than short-time research.

I would be the last one to say that we should eliminate either type in favor of the other; I think that both are essential. Administrators often are faced with problems which are immediate, with answers which they need immediately, can't wait for ten years to get. However, I

do think that a certain amount of, if you want to call it that, visionary research is essential, or we will make no progress. It is upon this visionary type of research that the short-time projects are based, it is what makes those projects worth while.

Now there is another point. Dr. Clarke said that management and research were the same, if I understood it. I think it is pretty hard to draw the line and tell just where management begins and where research leaves off, but fundamentally I think they are different. We may learn that certain crop rotations are the proper thing through research, but it is the management of the farm that produces because of these crop rotations.

As to this abstruse type of research that I mentioned, I would like to leave this with all of you, I hope you don't disregard it, I hope you don't discourage it, there isn't going to be very much of it done, I will tell you that, it takes a peculiar combination of mentality, native ability, of sympathy on the part of the administrators above this person, of support over a long period of time, there isn't going to be very much of it done, and I feel a great deal should be, but just in the nature of things it isn't going to be done, and I hope you consider that and when you set up projects there should be allowance made for certain types of research for which you can see no use at all at the present time, but which may deal with the animals in which we are interested.

One other point, the matter of difficulty of selling research to the public, I have a personal feeling that that has been overplayed, that the public has never been so interested in research as it is now, the public has never been so willing to accept research or so conscious of the importance of research as it is at the present time. If it is difficult to sell research to the public then I think it is purely a matter of salesmanship on our part, and I would say a whole lot of that is salesmanship on the part of the research man, he is not doing the best job himself.

I would say in closing that this fundamental long-time type of research which we need and which we need badly, has got to go on, I think, if we make progress has to go on, but will go on in small quantities and only here and there. I don't think it can be done everywhere. If you use four quarts of flour and a cake of yeast to make a batch of bread, it surely would be tough bread if you used four quarts of yeast and a cake of flour, wouldn't work that way.

That is my own honest and sincere feeling. I think that we need short-time research, we have pointed that out in the committee report, but we need along the line research for which we can't see immediate use andwhich may go on for ten, fifteen, or twenty years.

Mr. Wilson: Right on that point that Dr. Mills commented on, I agree with him, I take a more optimistic view than some do about the acceptance of necessity for research, I think the public is pretty well sold, I am sure

every administrator here is sold on the absolute necessity especially of applied research, which is getting answers to questions that he has to act on in planning his program and working up his budget and so forth, and I think that research will gain greater acceptance as the research men themselves gain a clearer conception of the necessity of making themselves understood by the administrators, as Mr. Kimball said, and also as they gain a clearer conception of the relationship of research to the operative functions of their agencies.

Now on this problem of abstruse or abstract research that Dr. Mills referred to, that is tremendously important, the big industries all have research departments now and they do support a considerable amount of abstract research where they employ high grade scientists and then turn them loose, tell them to find out what they think ought to be found out and take the chances on the results.

Now, administrators who are directly responsible to the public cannot go very far in supporting that type of research, and that brings us to a problem to which I think we should address ourselves. I question whether conservation or game and fish departments should ever be expected to support much in the way of abstruse research. It appears to me that is more the function of our educational institutions where the research scientist can be given a much greater degree of freedom to choose his own lines of investigation than is possible within the limitations of public administration, so if that type of research is to have adequate support it should be through appropriations to the educational institutions, and unquestionably the funds of conservation and game and fish should make a proportionate contribution to that effort because in the long run you are certainly going to benefit by it.

I was greatly impressed by Dr. Clarke's paper, I think he has given us one of the clearest and most significant views that we have had at any of our programs of the problems of research, and I think this whole discussion has been very helpful.

Dr. Clarke: May I say I should be very distressed indeed if any remarks I made could be construed in criticism of long-time research. I feel sure the reason why we have not made sufficient progress in some of the lines I have mentioned is because we haven't had adequate long-term research programs. Some of the things I mentioned in the paper I know you will recognize as problems that involve that type of research. I think some of the deficiencies are inherent in university graduate programs. After a research man has been around five years people get the feeling he is there long enough, so the line should be drawn and he should be paraded before the proper authorities, given a degree and turned loose, but the need for carrying on the problem which he probably has just started still exists.

Dr. Leedy: The time has expired here, but I think it should be pointed out, too though, that one of the best examples of long-time research applies right here in Iowa

where Mr. Errington (?) has worked for almost 20 years on the muskrat problem. I hate to bring this discussion to a close, but I guess it is in order. Thank you very much for your attention and contributions. (Applause)

Pres. Stiles: Thank you, Dr. Clarke and Dr. Leedy, for a very interesting contribution to the program. We will now adjourn, see you in the meeting at 9:30 in the morning.

(Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.)

Saturday Morning Session, Aug. 16th

The session was called to order by President Stiles at 9:42 A.M.

Pres. Stiles: The first thing on the program this morning will be "Migratory Waterfowl Regulations" by Dan Janzen of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Regional Director, Minneapolis. Dan. (Applause)

Mr. Janzen: To talk about waterfowl regulations is a little like serving you warmed up fried chicken after you have been on a chicken diet for about three days. Practically all the directors here, or others interested in waterfowl management, have sat in at one of the waterfowl council meetings held in June in Bismarck or in July here and St. Louis, and some of you have attended the National Advisory Council meeting, and all have had copies of proposed regulations and spent the last week talking about them, so I am not going to talk about the 1952 proposed waterfowl regulations for one good reason - they were sent confidentially and I can't talk about them - but there is one regulation I am going to discuss. I hope Bud Morgan and Charley Dambach are in the room. This particular regulation was not discussed in Washington at the Advisory Council meeting, it was overlooked, but mainly involves an interpretation, and I don't think there will be any question, it has to do with the regulation governing the taking of waterfowl by motorboat.

As you know, the legal interpretation of this motorboat regulation has been that a boat to which an outboard motor is attached is a motorboat, and you can't shoot from that whether in a blind or otherwise as long as that motor is attached. We know there has been some discretion used in some localities, by others in other localities strictly enforced. We didn't discuss that in Washington, and if it comes out it will come out cold. The intent was to prevent the taking of birds by motorboat while it was under power, prevent people from racing into a large flock of birds and taking birds by that means. So we are proposing - and remember what I say so far as these regulations are concerned remains within the room because I don't know whether this regulation will have effect - but it is to modify that regulation so it will read something like this: "Such birds may be taken during the open season with the aid of a dog and from land or water, including a blind or a boat or other craft not under tow, but not including a sailboat, motorboat,

or other craft having an outboard motor attached" and this is the change -"unless such craft is fastened within or tied immediately alongside of a stationary blind", which means in effect that a man can go out and shoot from a blind, run a boat in and leave the motor on the boat as long as anchored within a blind, fastened or in heavy cover where it constitutes a blind, and can shoot from such a boat.

We think that will clarify the interpretation of that regulation, and I don't think the fact that it was not brought up will be considered a serious omission. That is the only one I am going to discuss as such, but I am going to talk a little about what is behind the present regulations with which we are all familiar. In other words, I am going to give a run-down on the production picture. You got some data which said that there were increases or may be, and so forth, but I don't believe that there were sent to you maps showing in detail how we arrived at those conclusions, so lastweek while I was in Washington I hurriedly had a few slides taken of those maps that had just been prepared and we are going to use those this morning. First I want to say this year I think probably we had better coverage than before. Of course, you who are in the research field, if you have much more coverage for us, newer techniques, some of this cannot be used because it cannot be compared with the previous year so there is always a little lag. As we improve, of course, each year we expect the coverage will be better.

This year the Canadian authorities and Fish and Wildlife Service, and a couple of biologists in Ducks Unlimited met in January in Minneapolis and worked out an over-all program for all the Canadian provinces, reorganized complete coverage equipment and everything, a blueprint for action. This meant 17 men in Canada, the Service had 6 planes which flew 45,000 miles, and this summer Canada had two additional planes, four additional planes and13 men in Alaska.

The states had much better coverage than ever before. Twenty-six states reported to us mainly on breeding pairs, on breeding ground, and in some cases production. They used 17 aircraft and 200 men. A total of 34 planes all together flew about an equivalent of three times around the world. That is a lot of looking, a lot of hazards were involved. Two of our planes cracked up, one on the return, one on the landing field on a high storm. Fortunately nobody has been hurt, I don't believe, so far on the Canadian work, but we are certainly looking for someone to get his on the job. It is hazardous work, but it is a job we are going to have to continue on a bigger and better scale.

With that preliminary on breeding ground surveys I would like to start with the slides. (Slides shown here and discussed, but no report made)

I do want to say, and I suppose you will have a copy of this statement given by the eight state directors at the National Advisory Council meeting, that if you will study this thing you will realize what I was talking about

in migration, it is brought out clearly.

There is no question in my mind where we are not adequately harvesting our population of birds flyway within flyways, if you want to call it that, we have to know for sure where those birds come from and where they go in order that we don't make the mistake of reducing the population where there is depradation and then finding out we have seriously affected the hunting in states to the north or south, so we have to be on the conservative side.

With this kind of habitat the thing is going to become more complicated all the time; if wintering grounds and brooding grounds are reduced, the season will have to be reduced. It is the unsolved problem and I don't know how to tackle it. We have been tackling it on the basis of trying to throw public limelight on the situation. To be frank, we have two problems facing us in trying to handle this waterfowl habitat loss. One, first of all, is trying to compete with the public program, that is encouraging the loss of these waterfowl areas through subsidy of federal funds under our national agricultural program, and it is difficult to work out a program by one governmental agency that bucks encouragement on another federal agency, and that is what we are trying to do. If we lick that problem, though, we still have the next problem of offering something to the agricultural interests that will encourage them to leave these water areas. You will have to solve the first before you can get anywhere with the second one. I think with that I will close. (Applause)

Pres. Stiles: Thank you, Dan, for a very interesting presentation. I am sure that this will provoke some very worth-while discussion, and Dr. Harlow Mills, Chief of Illinois Natural History Survey, has consented to lead the discussion. Dr. Mills.

Dr. Mills: The job of discussion leader is a very easy one, sort of like the interlocutor in a minstrel show, any problems that arise in your mind you can address to me and I will pass them on to Dan here.

I think we face the whole waterfowl problem with mixed emotions. It is very easy to get emotions involved about waterfowl, and mixed emotions are well illustrated by the story of the man whose mother-in-law drove his new Cadillac over the cliff.

Now, we generally accept the fact that regulation is necessary in waterfowl, we have for a great many years accepted it as normal that there must be some regulation. Certainly that is true. When we regulate we make two assumptions, number one, that regulation is necessary, that something is wrong with the population; and number two, that regulation will do some good. It is when we get into interpreting data that we get into our real problems.

Now and then we read in the papers where someone has said that the waterfowl regulations are going to be lib-

eralized, which is just the way it should go, or that the season has been restricted, which is a rotten deal for everybody. Such statements are usually incomplete, not right, they should always be evaluated with relation to the resources, should be within the limits of the resource.

One of the things we have not stressed in any of the meetings I have attended sufficiently is this - this resource limit is different for different kinds of ducks, we are likely to lump them all together with too great facility, and when we want to stay within a resource limit it may not be the same for ducks; if they happen to be all redheads, it means something; if mallards, means something else.

When we deal with populations of animals we are not dealing with actual measurements at any time. We know these populations only within fairly large limits of error, and usually the figures we come up with are indices which are comparable from one year to another, but only indices, not censuses, and I don't believe any of the census source would lay claim to the fact that they are. We can do calculating with the imperfect data we have right now, it is possible to do that, but we end with only the best estimate of conditions as they actually exist, and besides, there are a lot of complicating factors which Dan has touched on this morning. There are probably quite a number we don't have any knowledge of right now, but I think that the general outlook on the part of everyone, that is, all of the administrators, as far as our waterfowl problems go, is an extremely healthy one at the present time. It is a good outlook. I do think this, that we are going to have to wake up, some of us, to the fact that there are some things which are actually more important than a concern as to whether we have four or six ducks in a bag or whether the season is 30 or 40 days long. Such things as habitat deterioration should give us considerably more pause than some of these other things which in past years have concerned us considerably.

I think if there is any core to the whole waterfowl problem as Dan has presented it here, it is this general idea that we must stay within the resource, we have to stay within the resource when recommendations are made. If there is going to be any error it had better be an error on the conservative side; and that we must consider that all ducks are not the same and that we will have to manage not only on a flyway basis, but on a species basis.

Now we have some optimistic things, this year reports from the breeding grounds are more optimistic than they have been for a little while. There has been a new latitude allowed in the setting of state regulations, we have these fine recommendations from Charley Dambach's group which seem to be highly important and highly acceptable not only to the states, but to the federal service, and if there is any one thing which I would add, which Dan hasn't added, I will repeat for the third time I think we must consider the whole problem of species, of the relationship of species to the population within your flyway.

With that introduction now, the meeting is open for any questions you would like to ask.

Pres. Stiles: I would like to have Mr. Janzen read again that new proposed regulation, and I ask that for a wholly selfish reason, to see if I can get under the wire in the way I hunt or want to hunt.

Mr. Janzen: I rather suspected that would be the case, the main reason I brought it up was that it was not part of the proposed regulation sent, and this may not be drafted yet the way it is going to be finally, but we did get this information a day or two ago and there are bugs in it, of course. (Read)

The thing we are trying to avoid there is that they can't run into a batch of birds with a highpowered motor, turn off the motor, and shoot because the motor is not in operation, but still permit people to shoot the ordinary way they would shoot, out of a boat without having to lift that motor in and out when they start shooting. People have been hurt by doing it, have lost motors; but we still would permit them to shoot out of the boat to which a motor is attached as long as attached in the ordinary manner.

Pres. Stiles: The point I wanted to make, in Iowa in our public shooting ground we don't allow permanent blinds, and the practice is, take your boat back into the bushes, camouflage and make a blind out of your boat, usually they are back in, and in order to make them stable a lot of them put poles down around their boat, so for all practical purposes it is like a blind.

Mr. Janzen: My interpretation of that would be it is anchored and in rushes like that is part of a blind.

Another: The intent of this new wording was to take care of the situation Mr. Stiles described.

Mr. Janzen: It doesn't say permanent, it says stationary.

Mr. Steen: A blind to me is a bunch of rushes in which you conceal your boat.

Mr. Janzen: That is our interpretation of it.

Another: Any sort of camouflage, natural or artificial or stationary, that would take care of the situation. This revision or amendment was brought about by a situation that exists in Wisconsin particularly where over on some of those large lakes they have large motorboats, large boats with large motors, they go up the lake several miles, do their hunting, pull off into the rushes, do their hunting out of natural vegetation, yet they have to remove this motor, and if the wind is blowing and the water rough and an amount of deep water to where they are going to do this hunting, it is a dangerous practice. We don't have in mind anyone killing more ducks, but a safety standpoint. (Reporter couldn't get name of this speaker.)

Mr. Ruhl: Is this situation taken care of, I am not sure on some of our flat lake marshes where some of the boys go with a small pump boat andhave a very small motor, they sometimes get winds where the birds drift along a long way when they are crippled, and the practice has been with them to have attached their motor, go out beyond the duck crippled, take the motor off, put it in the bottom of the boat. Would that still be all right?

Mr. Janzen: I don't believe it would - O, you say it is taken off? I thought you meant they were shooting cripples out of the boat to which the motor was attached.

Mr. Ruhl: We have a high wind, they drift a long ways, those boats are small, it gets dangerous sometimes because their boats are well loaded in the first place, there is a temptation to not take the motor off because time is of the essence there.

Mr. Janzen: There is just one point, - that shooting of cripples from a motorboat or a boat to which an outboard motor is attached causes a lot of discussion, but every time the boys catch a guy out there in the middle they always say there is a cripple out there and all the hunters are mad as well as the game warden. If they are going to shoot out of it, it has to be detached, if it isn't anchored, has to be detached to shoot out of, unless anchored within a blind.

Mr. Bode: This is only a suggestion, we have that same problem though not on the Great Lakes, and I think it is going to be a problem you are going to have to give more attention to for this reason: The Army Engineers are coming in, building these larger impoundments, and you are going to have many more of those in Missouri and Arkansas, and that immediately is going to draw in more duck shooting, and that problem of retrieving those cripples on those lakes is quite a problem.

I have done a good deal of duck shooting in situations of that kind, and many, many days more than not the weather and waves are such that you cannot go out there and get a duck unless you have a motor.

Mr. Janzen: You can retrieve, not shoot.

Mr. Bode: Many ducks are lost because of that time element of detaching and putting that motor back on. I recognize the problem, but I hope you won't just pass it over as having been satisfactorily solved in a cursory way, because with the increase in development of impoundments in many states, that problem will be an increasing one.

Mr. Janzen: That increases especially on the coasts where they are shooting on coastal waters. More than one person has left the blind and never got back, had the motor on the rack, he couldn't pull against the wind, and landed on an island.

Mr. Ruhl: I am only asking this question, supposing he would shoot a bird crippled, he takes the motor, goes downwind from it a half mile, cuts the motor, throws out the anchor, can he shoot the bird then, they will ask that question?

Mr. Davis: The answer is no.

Mr. Wilson: That brings up the point that I wanted to make here, I certainly think that all these questions that have been raised here today should be passed on to whomever is going to have the final say in drafting this regulation, with the suggestion that the language be clarified so as to answer these questions and leave no room for argument. It is better to make sure your language is clear and to anticipate these questions and eliminate the possibility of argument than to wait until doubtful cases arise and your game warden calls the man into court and some smart lawyer beats the case as to whether your regulation is applicable to the case. In order to facilitate action along that line I would like to ask what is the objective of this regulation with reference to two points:

First, is it the objective to require that the boat shall be fastened in some place of concealment, or is it the objective simply to require that it shall be tied to some fixed object? Of what importance is the concealment in connection with this regulation?

Mr. Janzen: It says specifically unless such craft is fastened within or tied immediately alongside of a stationary blind, so if there is no blind there it is not legal, or no concealment. A blind is any place of concealment that gives you some protection from the vision of a duck. That is the way I would define it offhand.

Mr. Wilson: We have that same problem in our Minnesota law in shooting in the open water where we have language that ducks may be shot only within some concealment of vegetation sufficient to wholly or partially conceal the hunter. Even there there is some room for argument, but that language has been successfully interpreted and applied.

As I understand it, then, the factor of concealment is considered to be an important element in this regulation, but from what was said here, it makes no difference whether the concealment is natural or artificial.

Mr. Janzen: That is right, as long as it is anchored. Am I not right, Davis?

Mr. Wilson: I certainly think you ought to clarify that language.

Mr. Janzen: But we are going to be faced with the situation that anything we write it is subject to interpretation. You can't write a law on this concealment without some interpretation because there is a point where there is a dividing line between one side and the other.

Mr. Wilson: But you have opportunity to clarify what is a blind, an artificial structure or natural vegetation which furnishes concealment in your definition of a blind. If that is broad enough to include natural vegetation you are O.K., but you are admitting if a boat is run into natural vegetation and there tied to something, I don't know whether just anchoring a boat will pass or not. Would that pass?

Mr. Davis: If within vegetation secured immediately alongside or within. You could build a concrete structure out in the middle of the lake.

Mr. Wilson: Suppose you do what has been suggested, you have a tall growth of vegetation in the water, you run in, drop the anchor, will that pass?

Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Wilson: You ought to say so in exact language, should include that anchorage in your regulation, not leave it with this requirement for fastening it to a blind then leave it to the arguments of some lawyer or justice as to whether or not anchoring of a boat in natural vegetation is proper. As I understood it, you are going to require that there shall be some concealment. O.K., hang on to that, keep that in your regulation, but so far as the fastening of the boat is concerned, that should be clearly defined, what kind of fastening is going to be permissible. You said here just now it would be O.K. if they dropped their anchor within concealment of vegetation, your regulation doesn't permit, it says it must be tied to a blind. Dropping an anchor isn't tieing a boat to a blind.

Mr. Davis: Would be if you throw it over the loop of the blind.

Mr. Wilson: You wouldn't have any place to throw it over in natural vegetation.

Mr. Kimball: I would suggest you two take a week and argue this out, but I would like to talk a little bit about production because without that we won't have anything to hunt. I would like to ask Dan a specific question that has been bothering me and that I have heard, that the Bureau of Reclamation, Army Engineers, and PMA payments to farmers for drainage have provided the means for draining more marsh lands that have been available for duck production in one year than the fish and wildlife service has been able to restore in four years in the way of producing duck marshes. Is that statement true, do you have any figures on that? And I would also like to ask another question along with that, how much money has the Fish and Wildlife Service spent of the duck stamp money in the purchase of these duck producing marshes?

Mr. Janzen: Answering your first one, I don't think I could tell you whether that is true or not that those three agencies have been responsible for draining as much as we have restored in four years, but would say off-

hand absolutely true. Tom Schrader has been in the middle of this, he might have a comment to make - well, he has gone, but we know it is being destroyed much faster than we can restore it. They are spending a lot of money on habitat restoration work, but I don't know if it is four times as much, but it is big. Mr. Kimball has just said that the program of the Army Engineers either was resulting in destruction of as much waterfowl habitat in one year as we could restore in four years, I wasn't prepared to say that that was right, but we are losing it fast.

Mr. Kimball: It is being destroyed a lot faster than that. This report that we have prepared as the result of the two years of investigation in the three states - North and South Dakota and western Minnesota - has shown that it is in excess of 16 percent of the wheat lands in that area has been drained in the five year period 1946 to 1951, in excess of 16 percent. The very intensive study we made on that in 21 counties in Minnesota showed 16 percent loss in that area, then we made some extensive surveys in North and South Dakota which showed that there it was in excess of that, but our studies there were so extensive that we don't know how much worse it is, but in these 22 counties there was 16 percent loss. What percentage have you spent of your duck stamp money?

Mr. Janzen: You mean on individual small areas?

Mr. Kimball: I mean on any marsh purchase.

Mr. Janzen: I would have to do some figuring, but I will say this, that Minnesota right now is in the middle of a program trying to figure out how to save the small areas and they are finding out what a complicated job that is when you start buying a short term or a long term lease and get the hunting rights to even make a dent in that kind of program, requires a big initial expenditure, and secondly the farmer doesn't want to have his farm cut up that way, and thirdly, if the Federal Service went with that kind of program it wouldn't be too long before the overhead of seeing to it that those areas remain in that state would be eating up the duck stamp. They have fieldmen in every county to see that a given area isn't being drained, but we would have to set up an organization like that, so we have been a little afraid to go into a project that does that. We did it in North Dakota to a degree of something like 75 easement areas up there that required a lot of checking, and in many cases we don't know how much it has been worth, know it has been worth a lot, but not how much. If we get that to individual potholes on one to five acres on which ducks are raised you have a terrific job of administration unless you have a field job.

Mr. Kimball: Couldn't you buy it and turn it over to states to police? I believe the wording on that duck stamp money says that is the way it should be spent. The reason I brought the question up is that I have heard a considerable amount of comment from states that there was too much of that money being spent in maintenance and overhead and not enough going into maintaining production areas.

Mr. Wilson: I would like to say that is vain hope, the cost would be prohibitive because most of this drainage is going on in valuable production land, and you could spend all your money and buy only a small fraction of these water areas being drained.

This program started in Minnesota, we think it is the first definite effort to get at this problem at the grass roots, it is a question of getting down to individual cases. Farmers are going to go ahead on their own hook even they don't get PMA or get help, and drain their land in order to increase their production under the pressure of increasing demands of population and larger needs for agricultural products. You just can't stop it, we are trying to get at that at the bottom and we have set up this system this year which we consider an important effort along that line. We have reached an agreement with U.S. Soil Conservation Service and endorsed by our soil district supervisors whereby they have agreed to report to our Division of Game and Fish through the nearest available fieldman or through the headquarters office every drainage project that comes to their attention, but that includes only a small fraction of the drainage projects, only those that are undertaken for the purpose of PMA benefits. Those are now required to be submitted for technical advice to U.S. Soil Conservation Service, so we get notice, but we will not get notice of all that is going on through the county or initiative of the farmers themselves, and as you mentioned here, one of those was being carried on by the farmer without federal subsidy, and there are lots of them.

So in addition to that, Frank Blair here, our director of Game and Fish has sent out circulars to all field personnel, game wardens, game managers, and sportsmen's clubs, soliciting cooperation in setting up a county survey system whereby a committee will be formed to divide up land in every county farm by farm and have each man watch his area of the county and report all drainage that is undertaken in those areas, then just as soon as our Pitman-Robertson staff gets those reports they send a man out to interview the farmer and see if they can't persuade him that his farm will be better off in the long run if he leaves that area undrained. If you can't persuade them to do it, then the only other way to save the area is to either pay them for an easement or purchase the area. That we consider the last resort because if you do it extensively the cost will be prohibitive. But at any rate this is a practical effort to get down to cases. We think it is the best that can be done and we are throwing out the idea for trial by anybody else that wants to undertake it. We won't know until the close of the season how successful we are, but are doing our best to carry it out.

Mr. Mills: This discussion could go on with considerable profit for two hours more, but there is another part of the program which is coming up before noon. It is with considerable reluctance that we close this discussion right now, but I believe it is going to be necessary to do it.

Pres. Stiles: Thank you, Mr. Janzen and Dr. Mills. I am sure that that was very interesting, and I agree with Dr. Mills it could go on with considerable benefit for some time.

We are now going to talk about the role or organized sportsmanship, "Organized Sportsmen and Their Relationship to the Conservation Program", and this Symposium will be led by Chester Wilson, Commissioner of Conservation, Department of Conservation, St. Paul, Minnesota, Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. President, members of the Association, and guests: I think we will all agree that all of the previous numbers on this program have dealt with subjects of very great importance and that the discussion on all these subjects has been very fruitful, and we are now about to close the main part of the program of the convention with a subject that all of us appreciate is that these sportsmen's organizations, and by that I think we may include all organizations that are interested in the conservation of wildlife and related natural resources, represent the public for whom we work. They have a right to sound off and make demands and give us advice, good or bad, whether we like it or not. That is an essential element of our democracy or free way of life, and thank Heaven, it is that way, and we had better listen to it whether it is right or wrong and do our best to take it with good grace and deal with it, and get the minds of these sportsmen's organizations and others on the right track by processes of education and cooperation to get them to support our programs, because that brings us to the second reason why this is an important subject, and that is, under our form of government there can be no progress in conservation or any other activity involving public agencies without the support of the public. These organizations represent the public, we have to have their support in getting funds and legal authority for what we do, and we have to have their cooperation in observing regulations and in carrying out local conservation projects, and without that kind of support we won't get anywhere.

And the third and final reason is that the test of success of all of our work is measured by the long range public benefits. I like the idea that was brought out by the speaker at the banquet last evening, Senator Maytag, when he defined that in terms of satisfaction. After all, that is the ultimate objective of all of our work, the satisfaction of the public. So, for these reasons this is an important subject, and the president and those who have assisted him in lining up the program have assigned the discussion of this subject to three members of this family whom all of us will recognize as men that are well qualified to deal with it.

This is a subject in which all of us here can more or less claim to be experts because we are dealing with it and are having experience with it all the time, but we have here on this panel three men of exceptional qualifications to talk about this matter of relations with sportsmen's clubs. As you will notice, they are all big men in one way or another and they are all men of long experience. Referring again to Shakespeare whom somebody quoted here yesterday,

in their respective departments they can look back to many years during which they have survived "the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune" and are still going strong. So I think we are going to listen to them with a lot of interest giving their views, then we are going to take enough time before noon to throw this thing open for general discussion so we may all get the benefit of each other's experiences in this tremendously important field.

So first we will call on Harry Ruhl, Chief of the Game Division of Michigan, to give us his views on the subject, Mr. Ruhl.

Mr. Ruhl: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: I think the thing is that the sportsmen's organizations are with us, we are going to have to live with them, and so the question is how to do that, how to use them and let them use us to the best interests of conservation.

In the first place I would like to say that what I am going to discuss is not the result of basic research, in this field, I believe that there is just as much opportunity for basic research in this field as in wildlife management, forestry, or law enforcement, or any others, so these are what you might call opinions or beliefs or hopes or judgments, whatever you prefer. I have broken these down into five aspects just to get hold of them a little bit, you could do it many other ways.

The first one is, developing leadership, background, long term policy viewpoint, and sound attitudes among sportsmen through the programs of organized clubs.

The second one is developing sympathy and appreciation of research and the research point of view. In other words, let's get the facts.

The third, using sportsmen's clubs and membership to gather basic data on game populations, testing projects, and making surveys.

Fourth, individual work programs for clubs, such as habitat improvement, law enforcement, and fish rescue.

Fifth, selling ideas through clubs and influencing legislators and administrative offices, local, state, and federal.

Now, in the organization of sportsmen's clubs, I think the people who have ability, interest, and a flair for promotion naturally become officers sooner or later. In working with these officers in the clubs and their committees we find an excellent opportunity to give them factual background, tell them why certain administrative decisions were made, and teach them things that are going on in the organization. It is also an opportunity for them to point out some things which you may have overlooked. I could name some cases where this mechanism was used for training prospective commissioners and legislators, all of which is, I

think, entirely legitimate and useful. It requires, of course, a personnel that has been there long enough to sell themselves and the ideas which they represent.

The challenge between the leadership in the clubs and in the conservation agency I think works both ways to keep them on their toes and looking forward and trying to keep abreast of all of the advancements in this field.

Now, if you have an opportunity where various clubs come together systematically to discuss these problems, there is a further advantage in that they tend to educate themselves and to stimulate each other to achieve what is sound and useful, and if you can get a wide spread in that interest, that is, if you can get not only people who hunt and fish, but garden clubs, Audubon clubs, rifle clubs, camera fans, nature lovers, and so forth, together I think you then can get an over-all point of view and through that group do a lot of good for the work with which you are concerned.

I want to speak about research because there was quite a lot said yesterday and I have some other ideas how this relates to sportsmen's clubs and similar organizations. Too many people feel that research is some complicated thing occurring in some laboratory without any very clear connection with the practical problems they have in the field. Too many of the scientists, I am afraid, evade explaining what they are doing, some feeling that in some mysterious way it demeans them as researchers, others perhaps that they get their line of thought derailed, and some may be a little bit uncertain as to how to sell what they are doing. I think that is a mistake. I believe, and I think there is ample evidence to show, that if you have researchers who are able, confident of their own ability, dedicated to working practical problems and are willing and anxious to show well-meaning sportsmen and laymen what they are doing, if they have confidence it is going to produce results, I think the sportsmen then will become the best backers researchers have, and I think they will be much less inclined to take stock in the information which is secured from the memory of some backwoods characters.

The solution of this problem I think begins in selecting enough research people who are able to sell, illustrate, and demonstrate. There are some people by interest, inclination, personality, and type of problem they are working on that can be more or less secluded, but I believe someone or ones must be familiar enough with that work to front for them if you are going to get the best approach and best support for research through the organized sportsmen.

Now the sportsman can understand that in baseball if you are a 300 hitter you are pretty good. They expect a lot of foul balls and some people fanning out and hitting in double plays, and I think we should approach research in that same spirit, from that standpoint, there are going to be blind alleys, failures, and misjudgments, but it is the batting average that counts, and I think too often researchers have felt if they miss the boat on one project they are sunk.

I think the program that hits 300 percentage is pretty good, I would be satisfied if that were true.

The third thing, gathering basic information through sportsmen's clubs, is rather limited and not too fruitful because so much of the information you want is of a character that they are not able to give to you. While it is not so important perhaps from that aspect, it is important to have them go through the process so they will understand it is not a simple and easy thing to go out and get this information, it takes manpower, takes judgment, and perseverence, and once a club officer or officers have tried to use their membership to get such information they have a lot more sympathy, understanding, and tolerance for the official agencies. So I would be willing and have on occasion suggested, certain programs which gave some information which was useful, but the main thing was education of the leaders of the group. Individual work programs which are simple and which tie into their specific projects of their clubs, perhaps on their club grounds and things of that kind are in the same category, although in that particular case they can, I think, produce more which is useful and lasting.

The leadership of the clubs, however, is going to be pretty much taken up with running the clubs if they do a good job, but I would promote such programs for the good they do, for the educational effort, and for the chance and opportunity to discuss long-range programs on a reoccurring systematic basis. By the nature of sportsmen's clubs and their memberships I think they are perhaps best fitted to sell sound ideas to administrative agencies and legislative groups. I think their thinking and mode of operating are more or less similar to the political groups. I think this becomes more important as the staff becomes perhaps older, more stable, been there longer, they naturally begin to think of the problems in relation to facts and not to feeling they may actually become so factual and technical about the scientific; perhaps that they grow away from and perhaps lose some of their influence so far as the political leaders are concerned, technically those who are new and haven't yet had too much opportunity to learn how complicated some of these problems are.

So I think the use of outside agencies, and perhaps I shouldn't say "use", development of that responsibility in the clubs becomes more and more important as your personnel becomes more and more stable, more and more technical, and more and more factual.

Now in doing all these things I think you have to make some careful decisions. I think it would be a mistake for either the conservation agency or sportsmen's organizations to lose their independence. They need to be an independent entity who can and will frankly agree with the state agency on the basis of facts as they see them. Doesn't mean you have to fight with them if you disagree, and in the same manner the state agency should not be a rubber-stamp for the sportsmen's organization. For that reason I think it is always a problem as to how far you will go in working on

the committees holding offices, or having personnel in your department do that. I think it is better to remain independent but thoroughly cooperative agency.

I don't know as I have helped you much, but those are some of the ideas I have, I think they can be demonstrated as being workable.

The other essential thing which I think is quite important is that there is utter frankness, straight-forward talking at the time the question comes up. Sometimes you have to dodge and temporize and do a little thinking, but I am convinced that an aggressive, frank discussion at the time on the basis of facts as you see them will in the long run produce a reaction on their part of confidence and of sympathy, and they will often go along even though they still have doubts about the decision.

We have had a long history of open commission meetings with members of sportsmen's organizations, their representatives, and the press. We have been embarrassed a few times. So I think frank, honest, open discussion is best,-nothing builds a story like hush-hush - it is better to bring things out in the open, discover a mistake, or point out and highlight maybe the honest difference of opinion, because if you don't it goes by the grapevine, doesn't get any better. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Wilson: Thank you, Harry Ruhl, for a fine coverage of essentials and helping us gain two minutes. Next Dave Leahy, Director Kansas Forestry, Fish and Game Commission, Pratt, Kansas. Dave.

Mr. Leahy: Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen of the Panel, Ladies and Gentlemen:

This panel discussion, if I have judged rightly President Stiles intentions, has a two-fold purpose.

First, to determine the position of the organized sportsmen in relation to the states conservation program and to the administrators of that program.

Secondly, to seek through resolutions and appropriate national organizations, the formulation of some sort of plan that would tend to define more definitely this relationship.

We, in Kansas, have had a wide and varied experience with many types of sportsmen organizations. Many of these experiences were happy and gratifying. Many others, we would like to forget.

In this paper, therefore, I shall recite some of those experiences, briefly outline the character of these organizations, and express some of the conclusions that we have reached, because of these experiences.

Twice within the past 40 years, we were compelled

by the State Legislature to organize one or more sportsmens group in each of our 105 counties. The legislative intent was good and noble, in that it conceived an organized citizenry, enthusiastically respecting and enforcing the state fish and game laws and in working tirelessly in performing the tasks required of that day.

These county clubs, being denied because of circumstances, technical guidance, drifted into the political field and, in that endeavor became very forceful factors. Their contribution to the states conservation program, however, was nil.

At the present time, we have one chapter of the Isaak Walton League of America, in Kansas, that maintains some sort of semi-official contact with the parent organization. The state organization passed from the Kansas scene 20 or 25 years ago, as a result of dissension within the group.

And, we now have 4 or 5 local clubs that are affiliated with the National Wildlife Federation. There is regretably a spirit of strife now developing within this very small group, because of politics and the ill-advised zeal on the part of its organizers.

This represents the extent of our experiences with the national organizations. Kansas has no fuss with the League or with the Federation.

The, forty or more, unaffiliated local clubs now functioning in Kansas can be grouped within three classifications.

There is the Belly Club. This is that type of club which holds an annual barbecue, beer bust and general shindig, to which all are most cordially invited. The fee paid for this gala day of entertainment, entitles one to a full membership in the sponsoring club and elevates the ticket buyer to the dignity of a sportsman and conservationist. I certainly am not opposed to barbecues, beer busts and general shindigs, nor do I deny sportsmen and conservationists the right to a little clean fun, but I am doubtful of the worth of this type of an organization to a states conservation program, as most of its members are attracted to it, because of its social aspects and give little thought to conservation matters until the next years fun day rolls around.

Then, we have that type of sportsman clubs familiar to all administrators and commissioners. I am referring to the Pressure Group. The administrator of a conservation program, if he be a conscientious administrator, and they all are, can't be a confirmed "Yes" man or assume the role of being all things to all men. Sometimes, for the good of his department and the well being of his constituents, he must utter an emphatic "no" and stay with it. This notable trait and act, regretably, brings together and into being a Pressure Group type of sportsmen who wants to "Switch Legs" and force more favorable decisions from the administrator

and the Commission.

The third group and one that is near and dear to the administrators heart, is that group which works closely with the Commission in all matters of mutual interest. This type of club, although sometimes critical of our actions and decisions, in setting seasons, bag Limits and so forth, utters its criticism in a spirit of forgiveness. This type of club insists that its members and others respect the fish and game laws. They see that worthy conservation programs are presented to the schools of their community at appropriate times and intervals. In the work of its committees, it looks to its conservation department for advice and leadership. This, in our way of thinking, is the Successful sportsman club, the preferred type of club.

Now, as a result of these experiences, we have reached many conclusions. We are very mindful of the fact, that game surveys need to be made, that game fields should be replanted to game bird cover, that fishing waters should be improved, that fish life in our lakes should be brought in to a more equitable scientific balance. These tasks, however, are beyond the capabilities of the average sportsmen, however, willing they are to assume them and are responsible tasks which should be entrusted only to the game technicians.

And therein lies the cause for club failures. Membership discontent and final disbandment.

Far too many sportsmens groups, including those which enjoy national sponsorship were too well and too delicately organized. Their suggested programs are far too elaborate--the duties of their many committees, although important, are too involved to be successfully carried out by the otherwise busy members.

We will, I firmly believe, establish a perfect relationship between organized sportsmen and the states conservation programs, when clubs are organized by men of good will--and which are selflessly dedicated to the carrying out of programs designed for the common good, which looks to the conservation departments for advice, counsel and technical leadership. Which is mindful of the manifold problem of its conservation agency and of the responsibility of that agency to the law, to posterity, and the citizens of the state.

This type of organization we would like to have in Kansas. If its good for Kansas, like Ike, its good for the nation.

Mr. Wilson: Thank you very much as a member of fish and game, and now I am calling on the final member of this team Paul Gilbert, Executive Secretary of the Nebraska Game, Forestation and Parks Commission, from Lincoln, Nebraska, Paul.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Chairman, members and guests: Obviously there is little, possibly nothing, that I can add. You have had two wonderful reports here and a darned good

Bob Burns act, you can't help but love that guy the more you know him.

I think the clicking of this machine here (meaning the stenotype) is like the television camera at conventions, I know we have done it for years and I am not criticising you, but some individuals who want to be sure the folks at home know where they are use up the necessary time to make sure they have a dissertation and some appearances on the thing, while on the other side of the picture you may have some serious-minded individuals that don't want kicked around what they discuss because the minute it goes on paper it goes back to the commission, so they keep quite. I am in the position of being in the middle. When you talk about folks that pay your salaries you have to be careful. The folks that buy the permits are the ones who pay my salary. Those people incidentally you have to work with, and I am going to use a different approach, I didn't write a speech, am going to talk about you in relation to the wildlife clubs, reverse the thing a bit.

In the first place I guess maybe I am getting old, will be 42 next month, and was amazed to find myself among about four or five of us that started ten years ago. Where are the others? A few have passed away, but very few. The others have been crucified one way or another upon the political cross, which ended their professional career. I think probably there are few people that have as many bosses, as many different kinds of bosses as game directors - the governor, legislature, the people, the game commissioner, and their consciences, and I don't know what manner of man it takes to satisfy all those things. The only reason I have been around ten years is because I have been lucky, but let me tell you, don't ever get any degree of over-confidence in your job or you won't be there so far as these wildlife clubs are concerned. They are wonderful, am glad we have there a field to be cultivated, some may have weeds in them such as pressure groups.

We have our national groups, we have our state groups, county groups and little local beerbust boys. You have got to love them all, you have to realize that you are not a dictator telling them what they can do or what they cannot do, you have to realize you are in no position to do that. If you know human psychology, to go out and insist they accept this or that type of program, you have to be a traveling emissary with a smile, I think, approaching them in a spirit of humility, of a public servant, and still maintain the necessary prestige and integrity, which you can do by being friendly with them, honest and sincere with them, and so far as I am concerned, the minute you lose your temper in working with them you are sunk.

I think you as a director should let some of your other work go in order that you may personally, and brother, this is an order, it is tough to do, try to contact as many of those clubs as possible each year. You have no idea if you have not done it, how much it pays off in dividends. They get to know you by your first name, you sit down and break bread with them. Sure, it will mean 60 or even 100

speeches in six months, which some of us have already done, but I wonder if you ever stopped to think that maybe if you would watch the portals at home a little closer, I think we all have a tendency to think how nice it would be if we could be an officer in one of the conservation organizations, if we could hold the presidency, perhaps, in watching others and participating myself to a degree, you do not realize how much time it takes to put on a convention such as this, so I think that rather than seeking office we should almost have to be drafted; I think we should stay at home more and take care of the problems we have in our local wildlife clubs, they want us, need us, are asking for us.

Yes, how many conventions are we going to go to each of us? I figured up last night there are 13 conventions and I may have missed some, that I personally should have attended some place around the country this year. My friends, we have gradually grown, we have put out amoeba and are reaching out in many directions. I remember when we gave birth to Midwest Law Enforcement Association. Since then we have the Wildlife, Midwest Wildlife Institute, and now we have our Great Plains Conferences, it just keeps growing and growing, we have invited some of you down to it. You go to the Governor, he shakes his head and wonders what is going on, your wildlife clubs wonder just the same thing, they call up, "Where is Gilbert?" "He is in Washington, Canada, or Mexico", so immediately they start turning and you have lost some of the best friends you had.

I think somebody should get wise and put six or eight of these conventions together we will attend in one week, all go to them, bring along our research men, let them have a day; bring along our conservation officers, set them in this room, let them have their meeting; we will have our administrative meeting, then get together for the cream of the crop. It might be a four-ring circus, but would save us money and save us loss of friends, and more of us would be able to meet with each other.

I think we have to establish grass roots with our wildlife clubs. I agree with Dave you are going into your wildlife clubs, sure we will plant all these trees, we will sail on all these lakes and seine in all of them, and what happens, you get a seining crew and two old men to watch them, but the desire and love are there and they need cultivation, and it is up to you and the kind of personality you have whether you can be sincere or whether you have to be influenced by political inserity which will result in decadence and loss of your prestige and you to conservation.

I think no finer tribute can be paid to a man than to watch him stand on his two feet fighting for the conservation we love, for the out-of-doors, in spite of the fact that he may be mowed down by the vicious guns of political intrigue or personal hatreds because certain people didn't get the things they wanted. I wish we could have a Hall of Fame for those swell guys who have stood four-square refusing to be influenced by gifts or political pressures, or any other type of pressures. Some of us have survived, but

because of the maliciousness and some circumstances these fellows went down, and they deserve, in my opinion, a conservation halo if anybody does.

I would like to close by saying that you are going to have to be the damnedest psychologist if you are to continue in your work, you have got to love people no matter how much they hate you, you have to allow yourself to realize that the things you are striving so hard today for and want to fight for and would lose your temper on, you must not, you must just keep moving continually ahead, and when you compare this year with last year you will say, "I didn't get far, they didn't change ideas very much." But when you compare it with ten years, then you realize you have gotten some place. You realize you can use and have the friendly help of these wildlife clubs, small or great though they may be, and you will realize you can take a beer club and make it into the conservation club. It can be done, but you have to have a smile on your face, a song in your heart, and a clear, clean conscience which will never let anybody or any politican bother you, and if you are crucified as some of our friends have been, all you can do is just realize that perhaps by so doing you have won comradeship among your friends that remain, and you certainly have eased the path for those freckled nosed kids that are going to take our places in the future. Thanks, fellows. (Applause)

Mr. Wilson: Thank you very much, Paul, think that is a fine wind-up of the formal part of this symposium. I think we all appreciate how the members of this team have contributed significant ideas to this discussion, and all have kept within their allotted time.

I am going to forego any further comments on my own part because I think the most important thing we can do with the remaining time is to turn this into an experience meeting, and the floor is now open. Let's hear from some of the other brethren who have something to contribute in the way of information about how they have handled what we all realize is our most important problem. Who wants to sound off?

Dave Leahy: I would like to make a statement. I have a very good neighbor and sincerely beloved friend, he referred to me as a dictator, he is a beloved friend. Last night we were discussing what we were going to say today, he asked me, "What is your idea of running a game department? I said, "The best thing I think is do away with your fish and game commissions, your governors, your legislators." He said, "You are not a director, you are a dictator."

Mr. Wilson: Let's hear from some of the others.

Mr. Rees Tuttle, Des Moines of the Tribune: I would just like some information as an officer of a sportsmen's organization and member of the press also, I would like to know how widespread among the various commissions is the practice that Mr. Ruhl spoke of of permitting representatives of sportsmen's organizations and the press to be present at commission deliberations.

Mr. Wilson: We had roll calls here yesterday, let's take a poll on that as to whether or not representatives of sportsmen's clubs and the press and others interested are permitted to sit in on commission sessions. Iowa first.

Mr. Stiles: We haven't particularly encouraged it, we haven't extended invitations, but we have never turned anyone down when they came over. We had a member of the Associated Press in our meeting we had this week. It has some advantages, and as Harry Ruhl said, it has some disadvantages. Many times you have matters involving personnel that you want to discuss, it may be a decision as to whether you discharge an employee, and many times you may want to hold that in abeyance, yet if that news is made public generally it may do quite a little damage, and there are two sides to the question. I can agree with Harry Ruhl fully that if you can have the whole thing open and above-board and everybody knows about it, you stop rumors that may be incorrect, yet there are so many things that may be discussed by a commission that are just in their formative stage there are dangers from that angle. You can also start rumors from it in letting everyone in on things that are then only under consideration. So I would say from my standpoint there are two sides to it, but we have never turned anyone down that wants to come over.

(Ontario absent.)

Colorado, Mr. Kimball: We do much the same as Iowa does, we don't particularly send out invitations, but think the press and sportsmen's clubs know that our commission meetings are always open to the public. We do, however, have executive sessions which we think are desirable to discuss such matters as he mentioned, personnel problems, to discuss maybe some issue that is before the commission on which a definite decision may not have been reached, and on which there may be serious differences of opinion within the department and the commission. We don't care if the press and sportsmen sit in if they would be a bit fair in reporting back to clubs and newspapers the deliberations, but oftentimes you get a newspaper man or club that likes to report sensational sessions and I don't think it does anyone any particular good, so we do have executive sessions, we think they are justified although we are criticised for them by some members of the press and sportsmen's group.

(Illinois absent)

Indiana: The press and conservation clubs or anyone else are welcome at our meetings.

Kansas, Mr. Leahy: Yes, sir, I have a strong affinity for the newspaper profession, they are welcome to attend these meetings of fish and game commission, as well as sportsmen, but I think we may be confusing this thing a little here, I don't think the sportsmen should come to the fish and game commission meetings and try to tell the commission the seasons they should set, because they are not qualified to do it. The technicians have spent a year assembling information. Outside of that we have no objections

to sportsmen or newspaper men.

(Manitoba absent)

Michigan, Mr. Ruhl: There is one exception, we do have occasionally executive sessions on matters of personnel which obviously the press doesn't want to be in on. There is a time for announcements. I am talking about ordinary business, and the press expects, I think, that executive sessions of that kind are necessary and good judgment, but most things can be discussed in the open.

Minnesota: We do not have a commission. The commission administrator is executive and policy-making head of the department, subject to control of the legislature. We have a very liberal policy of close contact with the press and sportsmen's clubs, but we have had no demand on their part to be present when we are having our conferences with the members of our staff regarding the setting of seasons or other hunting and fishing regulations. We invite their comments and particularly invite them to contribute in furnishing information in advance. Widespread questionnaires are sent out to clubs and newspapers and all sources of information inviting them to cooperate with us in obtaining the fullest possible information on conditions in the field, so we have never had any demand on their part to sit around the table when we are adding up the score and working out the conclusions.

We do have in Minnesota an unofficial body called Governor's Conservation Advisory Committee created by appointment by the Governor, and that includes representatives of all leading federated conservation and sportsmen's organizations, as well as representatives of the leading metropolitan newspapers. We always make it a practice of submitting to them before we reach our final decisions the material which we have assembled and the ideas of our staff members about the proposed regulations. That body has set up its own rules about publicity, they do not throw their meetings open to anyone else except the members, and the newspaper men on that body constitute the committee which determines what shall be given out in the way of publicity. It has been very interesting to us that that group through their committee of newspaper men have imposed some rather strict rules on their own publicity. They just give out what this committee thinks is best to give out and they do not admit the general public or representatives of sportsmen's organizations to their sessions.

Missouri, Mr. Bode: Our meetings are not what could be called open meetings. We have set up a plan of getting to the people the information with regard to the actions of the commission through our information section which is headed by a newspaper man, a former newspaper man, which seems to be working very satisfactorily. The press seems to be well contented with the plan that is used. So far as I know no group that has anything they want to take up or discuss with the commission has been refused the opportunity to meet with the commission with any problem they may have.

Also during the year from time to time there are special things that we feel are of special interest at which the groups and public are invited in. Meetings as a whole, however, are not open meetings. We feel a good deal like Iowa does on that.

Nebraska, Mr. Gilbert: In Nebraska we have extended invitations to the press and anybody that wants to to please come in and sit in on our commission meetings and see how they are run. We have had the finest cooperation from the press. There have been times when things weren't quite ripe for printing, would still have made a wonderful story, and we have never been double-crossed by a member of the press, and in extending such invitations you can grossly overdo your familiarity with wildlife clubs in offering them invitations and things like that to the exclusion of the little permit buyer, the farmer out here that doesn't belong to any organization, with the result that you incur the wrath of more people outside of wildlife clubs than in. So we extend the invitation to everybody, particularly farmers, like to have them come in, see how we operate, and they go back and say, "I didn't know you guys were trying so hard to do a good job", It pays dividends.

North Dakota, Mr. Morgan: I might say before I go into this that our position up there is like Minnesota's, we have no commission. The commissioner sets the regulations, determines policy, and one thing and another. Our relationship with both press and sportsmen - and I might say our organized sportsmen in North Dakota are fifty percent farmers, we encourage farmers to become members because we realize the important part the farmer plays in any game program - and farmers have been ideal. I don't know whether I have a particularly good bunch of reporters up in that country, I work closely with A.P. and U.P., like Paul Gilbert I have never been double-crossed by them. They have held up stories that I know they were anxious to bring from time to time when they knew that I preferred to have them held up; in fact they come to me and ask me after they have their stories written to get my particular reaction, and they handle them invariably in the way I want them handled.

I might say when I first took over the job as commissioner in North Dakota the first thing I did was to ask the two groups of organized sportsmen which we have in the state, North Dakota Wildlife Federation, affiliates of the National organization; and the Izaak Walton League, which is a smaller group, to appoint what might be known as an advisory committee that I could call upon to discuss major policy changes and that sort of thing, and once a year we hold what we refer to as an annual Game Conference. Now, everyone who is willing to attend that conference is urged to attend. The individual representatives of sportsmen's groups, press, everybody we can get, particularly farmers and legislators, are all invited, we want to have them there, we want them to have the feeling that they have a part in the regulations under which we harvest our game annually.

Now, that conference for the advisory committee

and so forth hasn't any legal status, when the chips are down, when the final decisions are to be made, they are up to me, but I am happy to be able to report to this group today that as time goes on - and I have watched these sportsmen's groups develop and worked with them - it is gratifying to see the development in thinking that has taken place in their comparatively short time. Four years ago when I walked into one of those conferences I went in with fear and trepidation, never knew what was going to happen, was just a mental strain to go through one. A week ago yesterday we had our annual Game Conference at which seasons and regulations for 1952 were set, we had the biggest attendance from all corners of the state and from all walks of life we have ever had, and this was the ninth or tenth, and I could practically have let that advisory group sit down and write our regulations and have endorsed them. Our relations are fine.

Ohio, Dr. Dambach: Ours are very much like Iowa and Missouri. Actually our council meetings are open to the public and press if they wish to attend, but we enjoy the confidence of the press, and like Missouri, we have a representative from our information office who gets the information, conveys it to the press immediately after the meetings, and further the agenda to be presented to the council is available before the meeting so the press knows what is to transpire, and if they wish to attend for any special reason, they can do so, but we don't make a practice of widely inviting them to attend.

Like some other states, we conduct two open public meetings a year when the public at large is invited to attend, one the annual fish hearing and the other the annual game hearing, and there is considerable give and take between the council and public at that time.

Wisconsin, Mr. Swift: By and large our commission meetings are open to the public, probably 98 percent of the matters that the commission deals with are discussed in front of the public. The 2 percent is very personal, personnel matters. There is no special invitation, but at every meeting, which is monthly, the metropolitan newspapers have representatives there usually. The public can come if they see fit, but if they want to appear they have to write the director ahead of time, and I check with the chairman before they can appear before the commission. I mean they just can't come into a meeting and say, "I want to talk", because the agendas are full and the commission doesn't allow that, but that doesn't mean people can't get an audience.

As you know, we have a Game Congress, of which there is a committee in each county, we have an annual meeting. This Congress has, in turn, a council which meets at least two or three times a year with the commission on regulations, but you can consider them open meetings, and as I say, 98 percent of the commission's business is discussed before the public and the newspapers.

Mr. Wilson: Thank you very much. I think we can all thank Rees Tuttle for having opened up a very interesting

subject for the closing of our discussion.

Mr. Gilbert: There is an interesting point about this open and closed session, before we started some years ago the hue and cry was terrific from the sportsmen and press because they couldn't get in there, they wanted in there. Now after the thing has been opened for a few years we don't have anybody there, you have to beg them practically to come up.

Mr. Wilson: I think that is a very pertinent point just made by Paul Gilbert with which we will all agree.

Now, the time is up, and unless you rule that further time shall be allowed for continuance of the discussion, or unless somebody wants to stay and prolong it, I am going to thank all who have participated and turn the meeting back to you, Mr. President, and if you wish to allow further discussion, that is up to you.

Pres. Stiles: I feel, like many of the other subjects that have been presented here, we could go on for the next hour or two, and it is with reluctance that I feel duty bound to those who have to get lunch and get back to the business meeting and so on to close this, and I want to thank you, Chester Wilson, Mr. Ruhl, Mr. Leahy, and Mr. Gilbert, for a very fine contribution to our program.

So we will adjourn temporarily now until 1:30.

(The session adjourned at 12:02 P.M.)

Fourth Session Saturday P.M. Aug. 16th

The session was called to order by President Stiles at 1:43 P.M.

Pres. Stiles: Is there anything left over from the last meeting we should take up at this time?

If there is not, we will proceed to new business, and is there anything under the heading of new business that we should consider at this time?

Mr. Leahy: Mr. President: We have knocking at our portals another state that would like to have membership in this organization. I refer to the State of Oklahoma. They have been canvassed, and the director of the state of Oklahoma has asked me to suggest to you thatyou invite them to membership, or however the procedure is.

Pres. Stiles: Apparently this seems to be open, and the only thing it says here about membership is that it shall be by states and provinces and representation of each state and province shall be by duly authorized representative. I see nothing that would limit it to any special group of states, and if you would make a motion to that effect, if the group so wishes -

Mr. Blair: Mr. President, I make a motion that Oklahoma be accepted as a member of the Midwest Association. (Seconded by Mr. Morgan)

Mr. Bode: Wouldn't it be better to make it that we invite Oklahoma to become a member? (Moved and seconded accepted the change. Carried unanimously.)

Pres. Stiles: The secretary should be instructed to invite them.

Is there anything else under the heading of new business?

Mr. Bode: What is the official name of this organization, is it that printed on the program?

Pres. Stiles: I believe it is, the Constitution calls it Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners.

Mr. Bode: Then I would like to make a recommendation, I think it is the consensus of the group, that our work is not necessarily limited to fish and game, we have many conservation interests here of a general nature, and I would like to see the incoming group of officers take the necessary steps in the constitution and by-laws to amend them so the name will read "Association of Midwest Fish, Game, and Conservation Commissioners." (Seconded by Mr. Blair.)

Pres. Stiles: I think that is a very fine idea. Now, that name is a part of the constitution, and amendments may be made in this fashion, the constitution and by-laws may be amended at any regular annual meeting by two-thirds vote, provided, however, a written copy of such proposed amendment shall have been received by the president and sent by him to the secretary and members at least seven days before the regular annual meeting or special meeting called for that purpose. I presume that we should follow that, and if that is in the form of a motion -

Mr. Bode: My motion included that the incoming officers take such steps as are necessary under the constitution to bring that change about. (Mr. Blair repeated his second, carried.)

Pres. Stiles: Anything else under new business?

Mr. Morgan: There is something I think should be given serious consideration here today brought out briefly by Mr. Gilbert, I believe, this morning during that session, that is to the effect that we are branching out and getting too many meetings for some like orphans as I am up in the end of the area, to attend. We would like to attend and participate, but it is getting to be quite a burden. I am wondering why we shouldn't give serious consideration here today to this in an endeavor to combine Midwest Peace Officers, Mississippi Flyway meeting and the meeting we are in attendance in now. I think it could be worked out now, I see no reason why it couldn't. It seems to me if the incoming officers could find it possible to establish the date of

the meeting along about the latter part of June it would still be possible for most of us to have our duck data in good shape, we could make some contribution to recommendations of the Fish and Wildlife Service at that time, no reason I can conceive of why the Midwest Peace Officers can't meet any time during the month of June, I believe one of our boys from North Dakota is president and I believe he would have no objections to a meeting of that sort. It might be a three or four-ring circus, but we would all be here together and we could save mileage and time if we would have a combination of that sort, and I mentioned the latter part of June because I believe that flyway meetings should be held early enough so that our recommendations can be handed to Fish and Wildlife Service and still be given some consideration. If we put it off much later than that our gesture will be merely a gesture in making recommendations to them. I make this merely as a suggestion and would like to hear from some of the other members.

Mr. Bode: I am heartily in sympathy with the principle of trying to consolidate some of these meetings, but on that one point of the flyway meeting, I don't know that that would be adequate because only half would be in. The states of Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Alabama probably wouldn't be interested, so I don't know whether we could combine that one, but the general principle I would be in favor of. We might be able to arrange it in conjunction with this except in the flyway group, they have set up a system of selecting presidents and so forth on a divisional basis, and they at Mississippi Flyway voted to make the permanent meeting place St. Louis because it is convenient for everyone to get to.

Mr. Morgan: Would there be any harm in instructing the incoming officers to confer with the officers of the three other oganizations that I mentioned in an attempt to consolidate, Mr. President?

Pres. Stiles: I would entertain a motion to that effect.

Mr. Morgan: I make such a motion. (Seconded by Mr. Swift)

Mr. Blair: That means research group, law enforcement and commissioners?

Mr. Kimball: Could we include that planting conference too?

Mr. Morgan: Don't see any reason why we couldn't. I believe the peace officers' group is The Association of Midwest Fish and Game Law Enforcement Officers, then there is the Midwest Fish, Game, and Conservation Commission Association, and Midwest Wildlife Conference, the Central Flyway Council; the Mississippi Flyway Council, the Great Plains Planting Conference.

Pres. Stiles: It is my understanding, then, that the motion involves that the incoming officers be directed to

contact these other organizations in an effort to provide for a central meeting, is that it?

Mr. Morgan: That is correct. (Calls for question and motion carried with no dissenting vote.)

Pres. Stiles: Do we have anything else under new business?

Mr. Ruhl: You remember a couple of years ago there was a conference on safety which Mr. Harkness headed up, we thought there should be some discussion because most of the states felt that there was work to be done, but not enough to justify a separate meeting. Mr. Harkness, wasn't here, it hasn't been discussed, but I wonder if we shouldn't do something about that. You remember we invited states of the Midwest, New York, and Pennsylvania to talk about fire and safety, and one of the things was a uniform report card. Quite a lot of the states feel there is something yet to be done, the question is how to do it. This organization, it seems to me, would be the one to sort of decide. I believe that was discussed last year to some extent.

Mr. Davis, Indiana: I am heartily in sympathy with Mr. Ruhl from Michigan relative to that uniform hunter casualty report form, and it is my understanding that that uniform hunter casualty report form was adopted by this association, am I right? (Somebody stated it was adopted by Midwest Law Enforcement Association.) We have been using that ever since we had the meeting up in our state some two years ago. There is some valuable information that any commission could compile from that report. However, different states have different methods of investigation, but we think in Indiana that if an uniform effort is made in that direction whereby a life or limb could be saved we have accomplished something as far as the people who like to hunt and fish in our state are concerned. We feel that that is part of our obligation in Indiana. After all, we are working for the sportsmen of our state and that is a service that the conservation officer in his district can investigate and make a report on with his regular work.

Pres. Stiles: How do you propose to dispose of this matter?

Mr. Ruhl: Rose, the fellow who came to that conference to analyze it is flying jet planes and NRA has eight people who are likewise engaged, so they are not in position to handle it, the information is being gathered but not analyzed to be available.

Pres. Stiles: Do you want to have a committee to make a study and bring back recommendations for adoption?

Mr. Kimball: I propose and so recommend that we refer this matter to the International Association meeting in Dallas since it concerns this uniform report, accident report form, and ask them to consider it and make some suggestion as to the analysis, since it is more than just a sectional consideration, that all of the states are involved

in it, and they probably should have some say in determining what should be done.

Pres. Stiles: Should that be in the form of instruction to the incoming officers to so inform the National Association?

Mr. Davis: I will concur with the gentlemen from Colorado in that respect. It is my understanding, of course, I may be wrong, have been a lot of times, that there are some 25 or 30 states using this method of reporting accidents at the present time, and perhaps it would be a good idea for a committee to be appointed to take the matter up at your International.

Pres. Stiles: Would someone want to put that in the form of a motion?

Mr. Kimball: Mr. President, I move that the incoming officers be directed to contact the officers of the International Association and request that the matter of the analysis and consideration of the accident report form be considered at the International.

Mr. Morgan: Mr. President, if I may amend that, I believe that that would be a problem of the executive committee of the International, and I would offer an amendment that the incoming secretary be instructed to contact Mr. Howard Dodson of Texas requesting that consideration be given. (This was acceptable to Mr. Kimball, and so moved. Seconded by Mr. Davis)

Pres. Stiles: The matter was brought up at International at Memphis, don't know how it was disposed of.

Mr. Kimball: It was recommended that we adopt this hunter report form uniformly, I think it was NRA that put it out. They are going to analyze it and then furnish us with the information.
(Calls for question and motion carried.)

Pres. Stiles: Is there anything further under new business? If not, we will hear the report of the secretary-treasurer.

Mr. Faber: Mr. President and Delegates:

Your treasurer received the sum of $538.36 from the preceding secretary-treasurer, Harry F. Lutz of Kansas. To this has been added the sum of $210.00 for payment of 1952 dues from Minnesota, Michigan, North Dakota, Wisconsin, South Dakota, Missouri, Kansas, Illinois, Iowa, Ontario.

The 1952 dues must still be paid by: Colorado, Indiana, Manitoba, Nebraska and Ohio. I have received vouchers from all these states and provinces, indicating that payment is in process.

Two outstanding bills are still to be paid. The first is for the printing of programs. The second is for

the reporter who will record this meeting.

A record of this meeting will be made available to the members of the Association as soon as possible.

The by-laws have been rewritten to amend Article IV, wherein annual dues are increased from $10.00 to $20.00. This change was approved at the 18th annual meeting in 1951. Copies of this revision will be sent to you with the proceedings of the meeting.

It is the treasurer's recommendation that he be permitted to close his books after all states and provinces have paid their dues and after any anticipated outstanding bills have been paid. The remaining funds and records will then be sent to the new Secretary-Treasurer.

It has been a pleasure and an honor to serve this Association as Secretary-Treasurer the past year.

If there are no objections I move the adoption of this report. (Seconded by Mr. Morgan)

Mr. Kimball: I might add there with thanks for the service rendered.

(Motion carried with that addition.)

Pres. Stiles: Mr. Kimball, will you report for the Auditing Committee?

Mr. Kimball: Mr. President, members: Your Auditing Committee has inspected the secretary's report and we find that all of the figures balance and all of the money is accounted for. I move the adoption of the Auditing Committee's report. (Seconded by Mr. Bode and carried.)

Pres. Stiles: We will now hear the report of the Resolutions Committe.

Mr. Bode: Mr. President, your Resolutions Committee begs to submit the following report. I recommend that we take these up one resolution at a time in order to avoid confusion, if that is the will of the group.

I

WHEREAS both the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners and the International Association of Fish, Game and Conservation Commissioners have clearly indicated their support of efforts to use the accumulated surplus of Pittman-Robertson funds for additional allotments to the states; and

WHEREAS Congress has not to date seen fit to adopt measures to that end: Therefore be it

RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners renew its approval of the plan previously

endorsed by the International Association of Fish, Game and Conservation Commissioners and pledge its support to renewed efforts to accomplish through all means this allotment of surplus funds.

I move the adoption of this resolution. (Seconded by Mr. Leahy.)

Mr. Kimball: Harry and I are on that P-R International Committee, and the International, I believe, went on record to provide utilization or subdivision of those funds over a five year period rather than to amend the present law as it now reads relative to federal aid, the thinking being that it might be unwise to tamper with that present appropriation because that automatically appropriates the funds back to the states.

Mr. Bode: I think the resolution is worded in such terms so that the purpose of it becomes not only stimulation of activity, but reassurance to the International Association that this Association is still in favor of it and wants to continue the effort. That is the intent of the resolution, rather than specify any specific method of getting the job done.

Mr. Kimball: I took it from the wording there to stabilize the income meant that you would reword that appropriation, because in the present law, if there was a deficiency, to take it out of the surplus.

Mr. Bode: Doesn't mean that at all, means to accomplish stabilization by whatever means advisable.

Mr. Ruhl: I think a better word than stabilization might be put in there.

Mr. Bode: I am sure the committee is willing to make any modifications that are advisable.

Pres. Stiles: Would it be proper to ask Mr. Ruhl as chairman of the committee of International to make a suggestion for change in the wording?

Mr. Bode: Perfectly acceptable to the committee.

Mr. Ruhl: I am agreeable to backing the decision of International and urging them to do something about it. There was a proposal to put a floor under each annual allotment.

Mr. Kimball: Why not say just appropriate money over a five year period to the states on the same apportionment as federal aid.

Mr. Bode: Put it in for additional allotments to the states. (Motion carried. Mr. Bode read Resolution 2)

II

WHEREAS the Robertson Bill to vest control of wildlife on federal areas in the states, especially on military reservations, failed of passage at the last session of Congress: Therefore be it

RESOLVED by this Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners that we urge the International Association of Fish, Game and Conservation Commissioners to give consideration to the sponsorship and re-introduction of this legislation and that we pledge our active support to all efforts to accomplish passage of same.

Mr. Kimball: I move the adoption of Resolution No. 2. (Seconded by Mr. Morgan and carried.)

(Mr. Bode read No. 3)

III

WHEREAS all recent information regarding the bounty system as a method of dealing with the predator control problem further substantiates the ineffectiveness of this method and further points toward the financial problems created by this method: Therefore be it

RESOLVED by this Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners that it go on record as recognizing this approach to be ineffective and expensive and as urging its discouragement.

Mr. Bode: I move the adoption of Resolution No. 3. (Seconded by Mr. Leahy.)

Mr. Blair: The International Association passes a resolution like this, I think it is a matter that should be left up to individual states, most of these matters, or I mean it is not a matter of conservation departments or fish and game departments, it is a matter of the legislatures in the various states, and some of us may now want to buck our legislatures in matters of that kind where they still want to retain those laws for payment of bounties.

Mr. Leahy: The resolution says it be discouragement.

Pres. Stiles: I don't believe that would in any way require a state to interfere with legislative action. Mr. Bode re-read the resolution)

Mr. Blair: O.K. (Motion carried to adopt resolution 3.)

(Mr. Bode read No. 4)

IV

WHEREAS the friendly cooperation of the Canadian provinces has contributed much to the welfare of this Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners; and

WHEREAS there is invaluable further benefit to be gained by increased attention to such cooperation; and

WHEREAS in spite of the progress made in the coordination of wildlife research there is still no complete listing of research projects; and

WHEREAS the United States Fish and Wildlife Service through its association with Pittman-Robertson and cooperative unit programs has the largest available listing: Therefore be it

RESOLVED that this Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners request the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to obtain and publish each year a list, as complete as possible, of all research projects in progress or contemplated by public and private bodies on this continent, suggesting that the Service call upon each state and provincial administrative agency for a complete listing for its respective territorial unit; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the attention of the American Fisheries Society be drawn to the desirability of a similar listing of fisheries research projects.

Mr. Bode: I might say that that is a resolution suggested by Mr. Clarke of Canada.

Mr. Swift: I move the adoption of resolution 4. (Seconded by Mr. Kimball).

Mr. Steen: I believe the Fish and Wildlife Service tried to do that at one time and abandoned it as being impossible.

Mr. Kimball: Impossible or took a little work?

Mr. Steen: Took too much work.

Mr. Bode: I personally see no harm in cooperating with the Canadian provinces in making the request, nothing mandatory about it, and in courtesy to them seems to me like the least we can do is urge that sort of thing if possible. (Calls for question. Carried to adopt resolution.)

Next No. 5

V

WHEREAS the Natural Resources Council of America has placed before the country for consideration a land and water use policy; and

WHEREAS there now exists no such national policy in spite of the evergrowing overlapping of effort, planning and activity in this field by numerous agencies: Therefore be it

RESOLVED by this Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners that it go on record as endorsing the principles set forth in the policy proposed by the Natural Resources

Council and urge the International Association of Fish, Game and Conservation Commissioners to give major attention to a consideration of same at its annual meeting in September, with a view to participating with other agencies in the work of the Natural Resources Council to the end that the International Association of Fish, Game and Conservation Commissioners may have a share in the drafting of any final policy, more nearly proportionate to its importance and membership.

Mr. Morgan: I move the adoption of resolution No. 5 as read. (Seconded by Mr. Kimball. Carried and so ordered.)

Mr. Bode: Next is number 6. (Read)

VI

WHEREAS management of waterfowl on the flyway basis has become recognized as a sound principle and certain steps have been taken toward unifying effort and outlook as between the flyway groups: Therefore be it

RESOLVED by this Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners that it endorses the resolution of the International Association of Fish, Game and Conservation Commissioners passed at its last annual meeting dealing with flyway management and flyway councils; that it urges the continuance and perfection of flyway councils and management procedures both within the separate flyways and on the national level; and that it sincerely appreciates and heartily commends the efforts and accomplishments of the representatives of the Central and Mississippi Flyway Councils at the recent meeting of the National Flyway Council and the Wildfowl Advisory Committee.

Mr. Blair: I move the adoption of resolution 6. (Seconded by Mr. Swift, carried and so ordered.)

Mr. Bode: Number 7

VII

WHEREAS the need for greater attention to wildlife and recreational interests on our national forests intensifies year by year: Therefore be it

RESOLVED that this Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners regrets the failure of passage of the Tackett Bill during the last session of Congress and strongly urges the International Association of Fish, Game and Conservation Commissioners and other agencies to sponsor similar legislation in the next session of Congress and pledges the support of this Association in aid thereof; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that it urges the Forest Service to search out ways and means of furthering wildlife management regardless of whether or not such legislation as the Tackett Bill is passed by Congress, and that, in the event addition-

al funds become available to the Forest Service, such funds will be used to establish programs that will be coordinated with state programs rather than for setting up separate wildlife management agencies.

Mr. Swift: I move the adoption of resolution 7 as read. (Seconded by Mr. Kimball)

Mr. Kimball: Forest Service isn't going to like that.

Mr. Bode: The last part they maintain they carry out anyway, while they might not like to see it written out in resolution. (Carried.)

VIII

WHEREAS recent United States Fish and Wildlife Service surveys indicate that farm drainage has reduced aquatic habitat for waterfowl and furbearers in the prairie pothole country by 15-20 per cent during the past five years; and

WHEREAS the policies of the Department of Agriculture in providing payment of drainage subsidies, while not the only stimulus to drainage, has encouraged destruction of wildlife habitat, and their elimination is important to development of any program to curtail drainage; and

WHEREAS through a recent press release the Secretary of Agriculture has stated that increased agricultural production has come about largely as the result of higher yields rather than by reclaiming wet lands and that wildlife interests will receive greater consideration in agricultural programs including the possibility of eliminating drainage subsidies; and

WHEREAS the addition to total agricultural production by drainage is insignificant compared to increases which can be achieved by other practices; and

WHEREAS substantial income to the landowner is possible through management of wetlands for wildlife production, particularly furbearers; and

WHEREAS the full results of wholesale drainage upon underground water supplies and run-off rates is not fully understood; and

WHEREAS the saving of breeding grounds for migratory birds is of vital interest not only to the midwest, but to millions of people throughout the United States: Therefore be it

RESOLVED that this Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners commend the Secretary of Agriculture for his increased interest in wildlife problems and that it extend to him its wholehearted support of any attempts to discourage or eliminate payment of federal subsidies for practices which tend to increase private property values at the

expense of the national wildlife resource.

Mr. Blair: I move the adoption of this resolution. (Seconded by Mr. Morgan, carried and so ordered.)

Mr. Bode: I want to give a little word of explanation on this next resolution, it has been written to cover two names, Captain Culler and Jesse Thompson, the idea being to use the same resolution for each gentleman, which will be written as separate resolutions.

IX

WHEREAS the members of the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners are cognizant of the devotion and personal dedication necessary to successfully fulfil a life's endeavor in conscientious professional conservation activity; and

WHEREAS Captain C.F. Culler has unselfishly so dedicated his life to conservation: Therefore be it

RESOLVED THAT by unanimous vote this Association extends its affection, commendation and appreciation to Captain C. F. Culler for his invaluable contribution to the advancement of conservation in all its phases.

IX (a)

WHEREAS the members of the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners are cognizant of the devotion and personal dedication necessary to successfully fulfil a life's endeavor in conscientious professional conservation activity; and

WHEREAS Jesse Thompson has unselfishly so dedicated his life to conservation: Therefore be it

RESOLVED that by unanimous vote this Association extends its affection, commendation and appreciation to Jesse Thompson for his invaluable contribution to the advancement of conservation in all its phases.

Mr. Morgan: I move the resolutions be adopted. (Seconded by Mr. Swift, carried and so ordered)

Mr. Bode: Resolution No. 10

X

WHEREAS the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners recognizes with deep appreciation and high regard the outstanding contribution made to wildlife conservation and conservation in general by Lyle F. Watts throughout his career and especially while serving as Chief of the United States Forest Service; and

WHEREAS the Association recognizes the high integrity of his administration and the genuine spirit of cooperation which ever marked his relationship with the states: Therefore be it

RESOLVED that the Association convey to him its regret over the termination of his administration of the United States Forest Service and its sincerest greetings and wishes for many more years of association in those activities and interests that will bring him the fullest measure of happiness and satisfaction.

Mr. Kimball: I move the adoption of that resolution. (Seconded by Mr. Ruhl, carried and so ordered.)

Mr. Bode: Resolution No. 11

XI

BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners expresses its hearty appreciation to the Iowa Conservation Commission, to the state of Iowa, and to all those persons and agencies contributing to the success of this, the 19th annual meeting;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Iowa Commission be respectfully requested to convey to all those having had a part in the planning and conduct of this meeting the Association's expressions of gratitude and commendation.

Mr. Morgan: I move the adoption of resolution 11. (Seconded by Mr. Swift, carried and so ordered.)

Mr. Bode: In writing the resolutions we did not put an instruction at the end of one for the secretary to convey it to the proper people involved by way of a copy of the resolution, because we take it for granted that that will be done. That is the report of the resolutions committee and the committee asks to be discharged.

Pres. Stiles: Are there any resolutions from the floor? (None heard) Then I would entertain a motion that the resolutions committee be discharged - well, I will discharge it anyway. Thank you. I think we had some very fine resolutions.

The next order of business will be the report of the Nominating Committee, Harry Ruhl.

Mr. Ruhl: The nominating committee wishes to make the following recommendations:

For President, W.J.K. Harkness, Ontario.
For Secretary-Treasurer, Dr. C.H.D. Clarke, Ontario
For Vice President, I. T. Bode of Missouri
Directors to be the same as listed on the program for 1951-52 with the exception of Wisconsin. Mr. Swift has suggested that Mr. H. J. Cramer be the Wisconsin representative. (Check spelling of this name)

If any state wishes to change its representative, we would be glad to concur in it. The committee did not consider Oklahoma, and I would think the proper thing, if the rest of the committee concurs, is to have Oklahoma name

Registered attendence 19th Annual Meeting Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners -- August 1952, Des Moines, Iowa

COLORADO:
Thomas L. Kimball

INDIANA:
M. L. Davis

IOWA
Bruce F. Stiles
Lester F. Faber
E. B. Speaker
R. W. Beckman
K. M. Krezek
K. M. Madden
P. E. Leverton
W. A. Rush
J. R. Harlan
J. Hopkins
Wm. F. Frudeger
C. A. Dinges
Joe Stanton
Mrs. Emmett Hannan
E. G. Trost
R. A. Pierce
F. S. Pearson

KANSAS
Dave Leahy

MICHIGAN
H. D. Ruhl
J. W. Leonard

MINNESOTA
Chester S. Wilson
Frank D. Blair
O. L. Kauphanger

MISSOURI
I. T. Bode
M. O. Steen
Dru L. Pippin
R. B. Clark
G. B. Herndon
Ken Hicks
Joe M. Roberts
Joy Morrow
Gordon H. Smith

NEBRASKA
Paul Gilbert

NORTH DAKOTA
N. R. Morgan

OHIO Charles A. Dambach

ONTARIO:
C. H. D. Clarke

WISCONSIN:
Ernest Swift
N. T. J. Cramer
Frank N. King
Richard F. Harris
S. W. Truax
John Brasch
V. A. Skilling

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
John S. Gottschalk
S. E. Jorgenson
Dan H. Janzen
Daniel L. Leedy
T. A. Schrader
J. P. Linduska
F. H. Davis

FOREST SERVICE
Lloyd W. Swift
Herman F. Olson

WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INST.
Thomas Evans

ILLINOIS NATURAL HISTORY SURVEY
H. B. Mills

IOWA STATE COLLEGE
E. L. Kozicky
Geo. O. Hendrickson
K. D. Carlander
P. L. Errington

the person they choose to fill that position.

There are one or two things I would like to discuss. For example, in looking over the list, Colorado has not had the meeting, neither has Manitoba. Mr. Mallory hasn't been here this year, and we thought we ought to let the gentlemen from Colorado get his feet on the ground a little more, which is merely a matter of explanation.

I move those recommendations, Mr. President.

Pres. Stiles: Before entertaining that motion, are there any nominations from the floor? The chair hears none, so if there is a second we will proceed. (Motion seconded by Mr. Swift.) I presume that would include that the secretary be instructed to cast the unanimous ballot for those nominated. Is there any discussion or question? (None and motion carried unanimously.) The motion is carried and the new officers are declared to have been elected.

I will now tell you that I have enjoyed very much having the opportunity to serve you as president this year. I greatly appreciate your cooperation and the excellent contribution that you have all made to the meeting, and I will figuratively turn the gavel over now to the new president who is absent, through the new vice president, Mr. Bode.

Mr. Bode: Is there any further business to come before the meeting? I believe the regular routine business has been finished. If not, then the weighty duty of the vice president is the adjournment of this 19th annual convention. We stand adjourned.

(Convention adjourned at 2:30 P.M.)