

PROCEEDINGS



OF THE

JUN 1 1965

31st
~~30th~~ ANNIVERSARY MEETING

WS



AUG 6 1965

MILWAUKEE INN
July 12-15, 1964

CALIFORNIA RESOURCES AGENCY LIBRARY
Resources Building, Room 117
1416 9th Street
Sacramento, California
95814





1964 OFFICERS, DIRECTORS AND COMMITTEES OF THE ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND GAME COMMISSIONERS

President -- Lester P. Voigt, Director, Wisconsin Conservation Department
Vice-President -- C. H. D. Clarke, Chief, Fish and Game Branch, Ontario
Secretary-Treasurer -- Walter E. Scott, Administrative Assistant to Director, Wisconsin Conservation Department

DIRECTORS

COLORADO--Harry Woodward, Director, Department of Game, Fish and Parks, Denver

ILLINOIS--William T. Lodge, Director, Illinois Department of Conservation, Springfield

INDIANA--Donald E. Foltz, Director, Department of Conservation, Indianapolis

IOWA--Everett B. Speaker, Director, State Conservation Commission, Des Moines

KANSAS--George C. Moore, Director, Forestry, Fish and Game Commission, Pratt

KENTUCKY--Minor Clark, Commissioner, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Frankfort

MANITOBA--G. W. Malaher, Director, Game Branch, Department of Mines and Natural Resources, Winnipeg

MICHIGAN--Ralph R. MacMullan, Director, Department of Conservation, Lansing

MINNESOTA--James T. Shields, Director, Division of Game and Fish, St. Paul

MISSOURI--William E. Towell, Director, State Conservation Commission, Jefferson City

NEBRASKA--Melvin O. Steen, Director, Game, Forestation and Park Commission, Lincoln

NORTH DAKOTA--Russell Stuart, Commissioner, State Game and Fish Department, Bismarck

OHIO--Fred E. Morr, Director, Department of Natural Resources, Columbus

ONTARIO--C. H. D. Clarke, Chief, Fish and Wildlife Branch, Toronto

SOUTH DAKOTA--Walter J. Fillmore, Director, Department of Game, Fish and Parks, Pierre

WISCONSIN--L. P. Voigt, Director, Conservation Department, Madison

COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

PROGRAM--Ralph A. MacMullan

RESOLUTIONS--Melvin O. Steen

AUDITING--Woodrow Fleming

FEDERAL FARM PROGRAM--Glen G. Powers

NOMINATIONS--Harry D. Ruhl

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS--Wayne H. Olson

FEDERAL AID--Woodrow Fleming

LEGISLATION--Gaylord A. Walker

WETLANDS--Thomas R. Evans

About This Publication

These Proceedings, reported by Mrs. Arlys J. DanBom and edited by retiring Secretary Walter E. Scott, with the assistance of his wife, were published in only 250 copies and distributed to visiting delegates, speakers and agencies represented at the annual meeting. If you do not wish to keep this copy for reference, please send it to some library or return it to the Wisconsin Conservation Department, P. O. Box 450, Madison 53701.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Highlights of 30th Anniversary Meeting	iii
Photo Section on Milwaukee Gathering	iv
Registration of Attendance - 30th Anniversary Meeting	xii
Summary by States and Provinces	xx
Proceedings - Opening Session	1
Welcome by President L. P. Voigt	2
Panel-Problems in Federal Aid to State Conservation Programs	5
(Wayne Olson-Moderator)	
George E. Sprecher	6
Robert R. Elliott	9
Larry R. Gale	12
Discussion: (Messrs. Swift, Bushong, Elliott, Capps, Steen, Stuart, Ruhl, Towell, Evans, MacMullan, Voigt, Marston, James, Foltz, Shields, Burwell, Poole, Koening)	
Federal-State Relations Committee Report (Wayne Olson, Chairman)	27
Presentation by Wetlands for Wildlife, Inc.	29
Wetlands and Waterfowl Committee (Tom Evans, Chairman)	30
Waterfowl Status and Lead Poisoning Report (Arthur S. Hawkins)	34
Mississippi Flyway Business and Problems (William B. Barnes)	40
Midwest Technical Dove Committee Report (Kenneth Sadler).	43
Midwest Pheasant Council Resolutions Submitted (Melvin O. Steen)	45
Welcome Address by Governor John W. Reynolds	48
Discussion on Land and Water Conservation Bill	50
Panel-Relation of Midwest Wildlife Conference to the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners (H. D. Ruhl, Chairman)	51
William E. Towell	52
Edward Schneberger	55
Tony Peterle	60
Discussion: (Messrs. Walker, Ruhl, Sprecher, Whitesell, Steen, Carpenter, Moore, Gale, Elliott, Towell, Voigt, Barnes, Clarke, Rose)	
How to Get Maximum Benefit of Wildlife Practice Under the ACP Program (Roy Melendy, with James T. Shields as Chairman)	69
Federal Aid Committee Report (Woodrow Fleming)	73

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
Federal Farm Program Committee Report (Frank King)	75
Legislation Committee Report and Discussion (Gaylord Walker)	79
Secretary-Treasurer's Report (Walter E. Scott, with D. N. Omand as Chairman)	86
Auditing Committee Report (Woodrow Fleming)	88
Resolutions Committee Reports and Discussion (Melvin O. Steen)	88 114
Statement by President-elect C. H. D. Clarke	113
New Business Session	117

APPENDIX

I - Resolutions Adopted	120
II - Report of the Secretary-Treasurer (July 15, 1964)	131
III - Bill Review - Legislative Committee Report (By Chairman Gaylord Walker)	132
IV - Federal-State Relations Committee (Survey Report by Gordon Charles)	135
V - Report on Lead Poisoning in Waterfowl (By Arthur S. Hawkins)	139
VI - The Pheasant and Cover Requirements - A Plan for Wildlife Benefits Under Federal Farm Programs (By Roy Melendy)	140
VII - Midwest Mourning Dove Committee Report No. 2 (Submitted by Kenneth C. Sadler)	144
VIII - Report of Midwest Pheasant Council Activities (By Victor S. Janson)	155
IX - Constitution, Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners.	161
X - History of Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners (Revised to 1965)	164
XI - Treasurer's Report - 1964 (Walter E. Scott, Secretary-Treasurer).	172
XII - Minutes of Special Meeting, Directors, Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, Bloomington, Indiana, December 7, 1964.	174

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE 30th ANNIVERSARY MEETING

Held at the Milwaukee Inn, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, July 12-15, 1964

The 30th Anniversary Meeting of the Association got underway on Sunday evening, July 12, 1964, at the Milwaukee Inn with a large attendance already present. Before registration was completed (and the original registration book signed by everybody is kept in the Association records) there was a total of 164, both members and guests, registered. This is one of the largest attendances ever, for the Association. The 30th Anniversary Banquet was attended by 128 people. The outstanding program of panels, reports and papers prepared by Conservation Director Ralph MacMullan of Michigan, is reported in the following pages in verbatim form and will speak for itself. The purpose of this summary at the beginning, is to call attention to some of the gemütlichkeit and other forms of enjoyment that was also a part of the program but is not recorded in these pages.

While the men worked in sessions on Monday morning, the ladies enjoyed a luncheon and style show at the Cafe Rouge at the Hotel Pfister and later that day in spite of the rain, a number of them took a shoreline cruise of the Milwaukee harbor and found it very enjoyable. Conservation Wardens were on hand to assist in transportation and other duties, both for these trips and the general hospitality and dinner at the Brown Bottle, compliments of the Schlitz Brewing Company, that evening. The men joined the ladies in this evening of hospitality which will be long remembered by those present.

On Tuesday morning the ladies started out early for a tour of Ugent's Furrier's and in the afternoon everyone joined in for a bus tour of the city which included two busloads of women and children, and also the men, who were glad of the opportunity to get away from the working sessions for a little while. At the Milwaukee Zoo the Director guided the group around many exhibits with special attention being given to both the Primate House and the Aviaries. Another stop of interest was the Greek Orthodox Church which was built on design of Frank Lloyd Wright, and from there the buses went along Milwaukee's beaches and through the Lake Park area to end at the War Memorial Art Center and finally back at the Milwaukee Inn.

Hardly had the buses returned when it was time to dress for the Hospitality Hour which was presented to members by the Kiekhaefer Corporation of Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, the manufacturers of Mercury and Mer Cruiser Motors. After this event, it was time for the 30th Anniversary Banquet to begin, with Miss Wisconsin (Angela Gina Baldi) at the head table, along with the officers and past-presidents, as will be seen in the picture section of this report. It was very fitting that such old-timers as Frank O'Connell of Nebraska, Harold Mosbaugh (now of Montana), Glen Palmer of Illinois, Gerald Eddy of Michigan, and Ernest Swift of Wisconsin should be present. The three earliest past-presidents told brief reminiscences and gifts were presented, including a charm bracelet to Miss Wisconsin. There was entertainment by the Combo and some excellent door prizes distributed with finesse, by Wilbur Stites. Possibly the nicest surprise of the evening was the Mercury motor won by Commissioner Martin Gable of Nebraska.

On Wednesday morning, July 15, some of the ladies went for a tour of the fine Whitnall Park Botanical Gardens and others spent their remaining funds in the city's stores. The meeting adjourned at noon that day but this summary would not be complete without stating that there were exhibits of historic background, including pictures and stories as well as wildlife on display and there also was a very fine representation of literature supplied by the various states and provinces. This feature proved to be very popular and valuable to the participants.

It was a pleasure and honor for Wisconsin to act as host at this 30th Anniversary Meeting and we hope that the memories of it will continue with everyone who participated.

People in the Pictures (Opposite Page) - Left to Right

Upper Left - Wilbur Boldt (North Dakota), William B. Barnes (Indiana), Donald Foltz (Indiana), R. W. Burwell (Minnesota), and George C. Moore (Kansas).

Upper Right - Gerald Eddy (Michigan), Ralph MacMullan (Michigan) and George A. Griffith (Michigan).

Center Left - Panel Session at Table: Tony J. Peterle (Ohio), Harry D. Ruhl (Michigan), James T. Shields (Minnesota), Edw. Schneberger (Wisconsin) and William E. Towell (Missouri).

Center Right - Donald Foltz of Indiana has the floor.

Lower Left - Haskell Noyes, Sr., Officer of Wetlands for Wildlife, Inc., presenting a check to Russell Stuart, Commissioner of North Dakota State Game and Fish Department.

Lower Center - Governor John W. Reynolds presenting "Address of Welcome".

Lower Right - Owen J. Gromme, President of Wetlands for Wildlife, Inc., Russell Stuart and Haskell Noyes, Sr., of Milwaukee.







ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND GAME COMMISSIONERS
1934









People in the Pictures (Opposite Page) - Left to Right

Upper - of President and Past-Presidents at Banquet: Seated - L. P. Voigt, President; C. H. Douglas Clarke, President-Elect and Glen Palmer (Illinois). Standing: William B. Barnes (Indiana), Harrell F. Mosbaugh (Montana), Harry G. Ruhl (Michigan), Ernest F. Swift (Wisconsin), Frank O'Connell (Nebraska), Melvin O. Steen (Nebraska), Gerald Eddy (Michigan), and Hayden Olds (Michigan).

Center - (Panel Discussion): L. P. Voigt (Wisconsin), General Chairman; Robert R. Elliott (Colorado), Wayne H. Olson (Minnesota), Chairman; Larry R. Gale (Missouri), and George E. Sprecher (Wisconsin).

Lower - Of General Group in Attendance.







People in the Pictures (Opposite Page) - Left to Right

Upper Left at Banquet - Mrs. L. P. Voigt, Angela Gina Baldi (Miss Wisconsin), L. P. Voigt, C. H. Douglas Clarke and Frank O'Connell.

Center Left - Harrell F. Mosbaugh (telling his reminiscences), Ernest F. Swift, Mrs. L. P. Voigt, Miss Wisconsin, and L. P. Voigt.

Center Top - Commissioner Martin Gable of Nebraska and Miss Wisconsin with the Mercury Motor he won at banquet.

Upper Right - Miss Wisconsin, C. H. Douglas Clarke (receiving gift), Frank O'Connell, M. O. Steen, and Glen Palmer.

Center Right - Harrell F. Mosbaugh, Ernest F. Swift (telling his reminiscences), Mrs. L. P. Voigt, Miss Wisconsin, and L. P. Voigt.

Lower Left - Harold Jordahl signing registration book.

Lower Center - Miss Wisconsin receiving a free "Sportsmen's License" from Director L. P. Voigt.

Lower Left - Woodrow Fleming (Indiana), Frank O'Connell (Nebraska), and C. H. Douglas Clarke (Ontario), at pick-up table with reporter, Mrs. Arlys DanBom busy at her notes.

















People in the Pictures (Opposite Page) - Left to Right

Speakers on the Program

Upper Row - Robert Elliott (Colorado), Larry Gale (Missouri), Wayne Olson (Minnesota), and William B. Barnes (Indiana).

Center Row - Woodrow Fleming (Indiana), George E. Sprecher (Wisconsin), Douglas N. Omand (Secretary-Treasurer Elect from Ontario), and Arthur Hawkins (Minnesota).

Lower Row - Secretary-Treasurer Walter E. Scott (Wisconsin), Melvin O. Steen (Nebraska), William Towell (Missouri), and Harry G. Ruhl (Michigan).














REGISTRATION OF ATTENDANCE -- DELEGATES AND GUESTS

30th ANNIVERSARY MEETING

1. William H. August, Commissioner, Colorado Game, Fish and Parks Department, Brush, Colorado
2. Angela Gina Baldi, Miss Wisconsin 1964, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
3. William B. Barnes, Assistant Director, Division of Fish and Game, Department of Conservation, Room 605, State Office Building, Indianapolis, Indiana
4. E. T. Baxter, Comptroller, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Box 450, Madison, Wisconsin
5. Donald Beghin, Conservation Pilot, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Box 450, Madison, Wisconsin
6. C. D. Besadny, Research Biologist, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Box 450, Madison, Wisconsin
7. Phyllis Blood, Stenographer, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Box 450, Madison, Wisconsin
8. Ben Boalt, Wetlands for Wildlife, P. O. Box 146, Cedarburg, Wisconsin
9. Wilbur Boldt, Deputy Commissioner, Game and Fish Department, Bismarck, North Dakota
10. John Brasch, Supervisor WC Area, Fish Management Division, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Box 151, Black River Falls, Wisconsin
11. R. W. Burwell, Regional Director, U. S. Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, 1006 West Lake Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota
12. Clayton Bushong, Federal Relations Specialist, Department of Game, Fish and Parks, Pierre, South Dakota
13. Osal B. Capps, State Forester, State Conservation Commission, Farm Bureau Building, Jefferson City, Missouri
14. Forrest Carpenter, Regional Supervisor, Branch Wildlife Refuges, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, 1006 West Lake Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota
15. W. D. Carter, Refuge Manager, Horicon National Wildlife Refuge, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Rt. 2, Mayville, Wisconsin
16. Ben Cash, Commissioner, Missouri State Conservation Commission, Kennett, Missouri
17. Mrs. Ben Cash (Guest), Kennett, Missouri

18. Gordon Charles, Chief, Information and Education, South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks, State Office Building, Pierre, South Dakota

19. C. H. D. Clarke, Chief, Fish and Wildlife Branch, Department of Lands and Forests, Parliament Buildings, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

20. Mrs. C. H. D. Clarke (Guest), Toronto, Ontario, Canada

21. Mary Clarke (Guest), Toronto, Ontario, Canada

22. Rupert Cutler, Managing Editor, National Wildlife Federation, 749 North 2nd Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

23. Harry A. Dunham, Wetlands for Wildlife, 2413 West Orchard, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

24. Gerald Eddy, Chief of Geological Survey, Department of Conservation, Lansing, Michigan

25. Robert Ellington, Supervisor of Education, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Box 450, Madison, Wisconsin

26. Robert Elliott, Assistant Director of Management, Colorado Game, Fish and Parks Department, 6060 North Broadway, Denver, Colorado

27. Mrs. Robert Elliott (Guest), Denver, Colorado

28. Nell Elliott (Guest), Denver, Colorado

29. Steve Elliott (Guest), Denver, Colorado

30. Ron Epp, Pilot, Nebraska Game, Forestation and Park Commission, State Capitol Building, Lincoln, Nebraska

31. Doug Evans, Trout Unlimited, Appleton, Wisconsin

32. Thomas R. Evans, Superintendent, Game Management Division, Illinois Department of Conservation, State Office Building, Springfield, Illinois

33. Fred G. Evenden, Executive Secretary, Wildlife Society, 7805 English Way, Bethesda, Maryland

34. Arthur B. Eustis, Regional Supervisor, Federal Aid, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, 1006 West Lake Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota

35. Art Figgins, Supervisor, Accounts, Division of Federal Aid, Washington, D. C.

36. Sherry R. Fisher, Commissioner, Iowa State Conservation Commission, East 7th and Court Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa

37. Mrs. Sherry R. Fisher (Guest), Des Moines, Iowa

38. Woodrow Fleming, Director, Division of Fish and Game, Department of Conservation, 603 State Office Building, Indianapolis, Indiana

80. Roy L. Melendy, Farmer, 701 Columbine Street, Sterling, Colorado

81. Ginger Meister, Chaperone for Miss Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

82. Ross J. Miller, Recreation Specialist, Soil Conservation Service, 4041 North 35th Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

83. Arnold Mitchell, Director, Division of Game Management, Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources, State Office Building Annex, Frankfort, Kentucky

84. Arthur Molstad, Former Commissioner, 5520 West Philip Place, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

85. George C. Moore, Director, Kansas Forestry, Fish and Game Commission, Box F, Pratt, Kansas

86. H. R. Morgan, Midwestern Field Representative, National Wildlife Federation, 1005 West Sweet Avenue, Bismarck, North Dakota

87. Fred E. Morr, Director, Department of Natural Resources, 1106 Ohio Departments Building, Columbus, Ohio

88. Kenneth Morrison, Regional Supervisor, Branch of Federal Aid, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, 1006 West Lake Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota

89. Harrell F. Mosbaugh, Regional Coordinator, Missouri Basin Field Committee, Box 2530, Department of the Interior, Billings, Montana

90. Russ J. Neugebauer, Assistant Chief, Conservation Education, National Wildlife Federation, 1412 Sixteenth Street, Northwest, Washington, D. C.

91. Arthur Neumann, Trout Unlimited, Saginaw, Michigan

92. Warren Nord, Regional Supervisor, Branch of River Basin Studies, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, 1006 West Lake Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota

93. Haskell Noyes, Jr., Wetlands for Wildlife, 757 North Broadway, Milwaukee Wisconsin

94. Frank O'Connell, Past-President, 1821 F Street, Lincoln, Nebraska

95. D. J. O'Donnell, Coordinator of Watershed Program, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Box 450, Madison, Wisconsin

96. Hayden Olds, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, 2119 Yorktown Drive, Ann Arbor, Michigan

97. Herman Olson, Wildlife and Range Management, U. S. Forest Service, Carpenter Building, 710 North Sixth Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

98. Wayne Olson, Commissioner, Department of Conservation, 301 Centennial Building, 658 Cedar Street, St. Paul, Minnesota

99. D. N. Omand, Supervisor, Wildlife Management, Department of Lands and Forests, Parliament Buildings, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

100. Mrs. D. N. Omand, and two children (Guests), Toronto, Ontario, Canada

101. Louis Oshesky, Supervisor, Southern Area Law Enforcement, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Box 450, Madison, Wisconsin

102. Glen Palmer, Former Director, Illinois Department of Conservation and Past-President of A.M.F.G.C., Yorkville, Illinois

103. Mrs. Glen Palmer (Guest), Yorkville, Illinois

104. Tony J. Peterle, Professor, Ohio State University, 1735 Neil Avenue, Columbus, Ohio

105. D. L. Pippin, Commissioner, State Conservation Commission, Waynesville, Missouri

106. Mrs. D. L. Pippin (Guest), Waynesville, Missouri

107. Daniel A. Poole, Secretary, Wildlife Management Institute, 709 Wire Building, Washington, D. C.

108. Ernest Prometz, Assistant Regional Director, U. S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, 5 Research Drive, Ann Arbor, Michigan

109. Charles Purkett, Chief, Division of Fisheries, State Conservation Commission, Farm Bureau Building, Jefferson City, Missouri

110. Robert E. Radtke, Wildlife Biologist, U. S. Forest Service, Carpenter Building, 710 North Sixth Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

111. John W. Reynolds, Governor, Capitol, Madison, Wisconsin

112. Eugene Roark, Public Information Officer, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Box 450, Madison, Wisconsin

113. Dunbar Robb, Assistant Game Chief, State Conservation Commission, Farm Bureau Building, Jefferson City, Missouri

114. Mrs. Dunbar Robb (Guest), Jefferson City, Missouri

115. Earl T. Rose, Chief, Fish and Game, Iowa State Conservation Commission, East 7th and Court Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa

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

117. Kenneth Sadler, Biologist, State Conservation Commission, Farm Bureau Building, Jefferson City, Missouri

118. Walt Schaefer, Chief, Division of Technical Services, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, U. S. Department of the Interior, 1006 West Lake Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota

119. W. F. Scheibe, Manager, Vacation and Travel Service, Milwaukee Office, Wisconsin Conservation Department, State Office Building, 819 North 6th Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

120. Edward Schneberger, Acting Superintendent, Research and Planning, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Box 450, Madison, Wisconsin

121. Mrs. Edward Schneberger (Guest), Madison, Wisconsin

122. Walter Scott, Administrative Assistant to the Director, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Box 450, Madison, Wisconsin

123. Mrs. Walter Scott (Guest), Madison, Wisconsin

124. James T. Shields, Director, Division of Fish and Game, Department of Conservation, 301 Centennial Building, 658 Cedar Street, St. Paul, Minnesota

125. J. R. Smith, Superintendent, Game Management, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Box 450, Madison, Wisconsin

126. Everett Speaker, Director, Iowa State Conservation Commission, East 7th and Court Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa

127. Mrs. Everett Speaker (Guest), Des Moines, Iowa

128. G. E. Sprecher, Assistant Director, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Box 450, Madison, Wisconsin

129. Mrs. G. E. Sprecher (Guest), Madison, Wisconsin

130. Melvin Steen, Director, Game, Forestation and Park Commission, State Capitol Building, Lincoln, Nebraska

131. Marshall Stinnett, Game Management Agent, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, P. O. Box 3066, Madison, Wisconsin

132. Wilbur Stites, Supervisor, Information and Education, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Box 450, Madison, Wisconsin

133. Rex Stotts, Commissioner, Game, Forestation and Park Commission, Cody, Nebraska

134. Mrs. Rex Stotts (Guest), Cody, Nebraska

135. Russell Stuart, Commissioner, State Game and Fish Department, Bismarck, North Dakota

136. H. A. Svensen, Chief, Division of Recreation, Wildlife and Range Management, Carpenter Building, 710 North 6th Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

137. Mrs. H. A. Svensen (Guest), Milwaukee, Wisconsin

138. Ernest Swift, Conservation Advisor, National Wildlife Federation, Route 2, Box 20, Rice Lake, Wisconsin

139. James W. Taylor, Press Relations Officer, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Box 450, Madison, Wisconsin

140. Bruce Thompson, Agriculturist, Forest City, Iowa

141. Mrs. Bruce Thompson (Guest), Forest City, Iowa

142. Ed Thomsen, Law Enforcement Supervisor, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Friendship, Wisconsin

143. C. W. Threinen, Administrative Assistant, Fish Management, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Box 450, Madison, Wisconsin

144. Leonard Tomczyk, Conservation Warden, Wisconsin Conservation Department, 1157 Lilly Road, Oconomowoc, Wisconsin

145. William Towell, Director, State Conservation Commission, Farm Bureau Building, Jefferson City, Missouri

146. Mrs. William Towell (Guest), Jefferson City, Missouri

147. Dean Tvedt, Photographer, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Box 450, Madison, Wisconsin

148. Wayne Truax, Supervisor EC Area, Game Management, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Box 358, Oshkosh, Wisconsin

149. L. P. Voigt, Director, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Box 450, Madison, Wisconsin

150. Mrs. L. P. Voigt (Guest), Madison, Wisconsin

151. Gaylord Walker, Deputy Director, Services, Department of Conservation, Lansing, Michigan

152. Mrs. Gaylord Walker (Guest), Lansing, Michigan

153. James Walsh, Hatchery Manager, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Lake Mills, Wisconsin

154. Edward Weinheimer, Commissioner, Iowa State Conservation Commission, East 7th and Court Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa

155. Carl R. Welsh, SE Regional Manager, Colorado Game, Fish and Parks Department, 1904 North Circle Drive, Colorado Springs, Colorado

156. Robert Wendt, Supervisor NE Area, Game Management, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Woodruff, Wisconsin

157. Dale E. Whitesell, Chief, Division of Wildlife, Department of Natural Resources, 1106 Ohio Departments Building, Columbus, Ohio

158. C. A. Wistrom, Supervisor NW Area, Fish Management, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Box 309, Spooner, Wisconsin

159. Robert Winnie, Conservation Warden, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Box 173, Kenosha, Wisconsin

160. Norman Wood, Conservation Warden, Wisconsin Conservation Department, 1512 17th Avenue, Monroe, Wisconsin

161. Walter Zelinske, Chief Warden, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Box 450, Madison, Wisconsin

162. Stanley Zuckerman, Executive Secretary to the Governor, Capitol, Madison, Wisconsin

Summary

Number from Each State and Province

State	Number
Colorado	7
District of Columbia	4
Illinois	5
Indiana	3
Iowa	8
Kansas	1
Kentucky	1
Maryland	1
Michigan	13
Minnesota	11
Missouri	15
Montana	1
Nebraska	6
North Dakota	3
Ohio	3
Ontario	5
South Dakota	2
Wisconsin	73

PROCEEDINGS OF

30th ANNIVERSARY MEETING

ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND GAME COMMISSIONERS

Milwaukee Inn - Wisconsin

July 12-15, 1964

Monday Morning Session, July 13

SECRETARY SCOTT: Ladies and gentlemen. With this official gavel of the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, I hereby call this 30th Anniversary Meeting to order. It should be explained that this really is the 31st meeting of the organization since it is counted from the organization meeting, but it is the 30th anniversary meeting because this association is about 30 years old just lacking three months. This is why we call it the 30th anniversary meeting.

The Milwaukee Council of Churches has offered to supply someone to give the invocation at the opening of this meeting and I would now like to call the Reverend J. Harold Gamble, Executive Director of the Milwaukee Council of Churches.

REV. GAMBLE: Our Father, we thank thee that surrounding us daily are manifestations of this great love for us, our children, the beauties of nature, and the opportunities to use this creation. We pray for this blessing upon this agency which means so much to the continuing beauty of our landscape and the continuing usefulness of the resources that thou has given us and put at our hands. Bless their judgments and help them, our Father, to be very mindful of this goodness of this creation. Help us, our Father, when we count up our blessings, our free society of our American way, to be mindful of those who need freedom; as we count up our blessings materially, help us always to be concerned for those who are hungry and ill-clothed and unsheltered and uncomfortable, help us, our Father, to be concerned for the good of all throughout our world. Bless us each in our fellowship and in our delineations and may we feel thy guidance, in Christ's name we pray.

SECRETARY SCOTT: Thank you, sir. The Conservation Director, Mr. L. P. Voigt, will now present a short address of welcome, but before he does this I would like to take a minute to introduce him properly.

I have been working as an administrative assistant since he took on the director's job over ten years ago and learned to respect him in spite of the fact he is a slave driver. This is possibly because he drives himself to the limit and has a great zest for his work. He is a native of Wisconsin and a graduate of its university with two degrees. He began his career as a personnel officer over 17 years ago and subsequently became an administrative officer before becoming director. Other statutory positions he holds in Wisconsin are Executive Officer, State Geographic Board, a member of the Natural Resources Committee of State Agencies, the State Recreation Committee, and the State Soil and Water Conservation Committee. He was appointed by the president to the International Great Lakes Fishery Commission and was its second chairman. He is also a member of the U.S.D.A. Advisory Committee on the use of national forests and first vice-president of the International Association of Fish, Game and Conservation Commissioners.

I give you Lester P. Voigt.

WELCOME TO WISCONSIN

PRESIDENT VOIGT: Thank you, Walter, for that very kind introduction. I didn't realize you and I were such hard workers, Walt, but I am willing to agree if you do.

Ladies and gentlemen and Members of the Association and friends. It is my honor and pleasure to welcome you to Wisconsin, and as Walt explained, this is the 30th Anniversary Meeting of the Fish and Game Commissioners. We are fortunate inasmuch as this is the fourth time that we have been the host to the association. We were the hosts for the third, the sixth and 17th meetings of the association. It has been just 15 years ago since we met last in Wisconsin at the Hotel Wisconsin. At that meeting there were 194 registrations, still the largest meeting for any of our association meetings. It is my hope, however, that at this meeting we will exceed that record.

Wisconsin was one of the eight original states which formed this association and our former Director, H. W. MacKenzie, was one of the original organizers--along with Bode of Iowa, Johnson of South Dakota and Willard of Minnesota. Mac will be with us at the banquet tomorrow as an honored guest, with at least nine other past-presidents. One of these organizers here today is Col. Frank B. O'Connell, who was the fourth president when he was Secretary and Commissioner of the Nebraska Game and Fish Commission. He participated in the organization meeting on October 28, 1934, in Des Moines. I'd like Col. O'Connell to stand up so all of you can see him and give him a hand!

In preparation for the 30th Anniversary Banquet to be held tomorrow night, we attempted to contact every living past-president. Of the 27 individuals in this capacity, we found 10 had passed away -- John R. Foley (Minnesota), Oscar Johnson (South Dakota), M. L. Hutton (Iowa), L. E. Osborne (Illinois), W. J. Lowe (North Dakota), H. A. Rider (Ohio), P. T. Gilbert (Nebraska), B. F. Stiles (Iowa), W. J. K. Harkness (Ontario) and I. G. Bue (North Dakota). With such a high mortality rate, I'm not sure it's a healthy occupation. It is indeed heartening to know that so many of our living past-presidents will be with us at this meeting.

30 Years Ago

Many of you recall the sorry state of our waterfowl back in 1934. It is no wonder that the first subject discussed at the first meeting was the question of an open or closed waterfowl season. One of the reasons given for formation of this organization was "the importance of this part of the country taking a uniform stand on the waterfowl situation". Development of a unified opinion as to what a national fisheries policy should include was another topic discussed. Of interest is the fact that this first meeting also brought up the subject of wildlife research and plans were made for the exchange of ideas and findings.

Over the years much good has been accomplished by our organization through exchange of experiences at these annual meetings and encouragement of worthwhile programs and projects by resolution and promotion of legislative action. Each of you has a copy of the latest revised Constitution and By-Laws in your portfolio and you will note our purpose in the Preamble to that document. It calls for joint effort with other agencies and groups "so that the fullest measure of cooperation may be secured for our citizenry in the protection, preservation and restoration of our wildlife resources". In support of these high goals our member states and provinces have doubled to 16 with the inclusion of Kentucky in 1958.

You will hear more specific historical facts tomorrow from others, so I will leave this subject only with the suggestion our able Secretary, Walter E. Scott, be directed to bring his 1950 historical summary of our association up to date for publication in the Proceedings of this meeting. Some of you no doubt have used this paper prepared when Walt first served as Secretary-Treasurer 14 years ago.

Besides welcoming you to this 30th anniversary meeting and wishing you a beneficial and enjoyable experience, I want to welcome you to this wonderful City of Milwaukee and tell you something about Wisconsin. Fortunately, our Governor, John W. Reynolds, will back me up in this large task with a second welcoming address this afternoon.

So far as the delightful City of Milwaukee is concerned, I'm sure the fine food, gracious hospitality and many things of cultural interest will hold your interest. I urge all of you to participate in the bus tour tomorrow afternoon when you can see for yourselves. If you have a special interest or wish information while you are here, the people at our registration desk will help you in every possible way. The efficient Milwaukee Association of Commerce also is ready to assist you in making your stay here a completely happy experience.

Wisconsin's Natural Resources--

Now, as to our great State of Wisconsin, I'm sure maybe you would appreciate a brief review of its rich heritage of natural resources even though we are typical of most Midwestern States and Provinces you represent. In addition to relatively unpolluted air and extensive high quality soils, one of our most valuable assets is our water supply. We have over 10,000 square miles of water in Lakes Michigan and Superior and about 500 miles of shoreline on these Great Lakes. There are over $1\frac{1}{4}$-million acres of inland surface water including more than 8,700 lakes and 33,000 miles of mapped waterways. Included in this are hundreds of lakes containing trout, and thousands of miles of bass and trout streams.

Our excellent cropland is balanced by over 16 million acres of private commercial forest land which adds to both scenic beauty and outdoor recreation opportunities. Public hunting and fishing, or wildlife management activities, are assured for all time in the future on over five million acres of county, state and federal lands in addition to our public waters. About 700,000 acres of this is under direct control of the Wisconsin Conservation Department in several hundred separate projects while over $2\frac{1}{2}$-million acres of county forest cropland are managed cooperatively under our supervision.

A little over a year ago we made a survey and found that in the state parks, forests and wildlife conservation areas directly under our stewardship, there were almost 1,200 miles of water frontage on lakes and streams. I know that Manitoba, Michigan and Ontario may smile at this figure which they easily might exceed, but we are very proud of this accomplishment in relation to our urban geographical situation and problems.

Because of the adjacent and rapidly growing metropolitan centers of Chicago and Minneapolis-St. Paul, Wisconsin has become known as the "Playground of the Middle West". It is predicted our tourist and recreational industry soon will replace agriculture as second largest following manufacturing. Some authorities estimate this year's travel-recreation industry total income as high as $650-million. Fishing still is one of our primary attractions and for over a decade now we have licensed more nonresident fishermen than any other state. Every governmental unit represented here excels in some kinds of wildlife and we could have some good arguments as to

which had the best population of deer, ducks, pheasants or fish. But Wisconsin's claim to fame is that it has a balanced supply of many species and a fine chance for continued public hunting and fishing into the distant future.

--And Their Future

Speaking of the future, this might be given as the primary reason we are assembled here today. Never in this association's 30-year history has the threat for the survival of wildlife been more serious. What with water and air pollution, deadly pesticides and herbicides and all of the encroachment on wildlife habitat in water and on land by mammoth machines, we have reason to "run scared". Too, there is no stopping the continued rapid population growth with its attendant problems.

All of us have experienced the rapidly growing pressures on public land and waters in the new trend toward more camping, hiking, canoeing, boating and water-skiing. By 1980 we here in Wisconsin, it is predicted, will need to increase facilities for boating by 200%, for hiking by 300%, for camping by 400% and for swimming by 1,200%. We also expect our nonresident fishing pressure to step up by 50% and resident pressure by 25%.

Since it could likely be 1980 before this group meets here again, it might be pardonable if we did a little bragging about our recent accomplishments. I would have liked to summarize the improvements since you were here last time 14 years ago, but such special study was not possible. Last year in Ohio we gave you a report on the accomplishments of our Outdoor Recreation Act Program (ORAP), and you might like to hear the latest report. In the past three years we have purchased under this program over 1,000 parcels of land totaling about 85,000 acres at a cost of about $8-million. All were in fee simple except about 200 conservation easements. Altogether, including results from our regular budget during this same period, we have secured over one-eighth of a million acres at a cost of approximately $10-million.

We are working in many other ways to prepare for the future with aggressive programs of access development, water classification, use zoning, pollution control and management of forests and woodlands, marshes and open areas for wildlife and related uses in addition to their primary use. Possibly one of the most important things we are doing is our efforts to assist private landowners to do a better job in this regard--including the entire field of watershed stabilization and management--to augment our efforts on public lands.

The Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners was organized 30 years ago to help improve the work of all agencies concerned through better understanding of the complex problems and to create a coordinated approach toward their effective solution. We also have had some bitter conflicts. For example, the question of state's rights vs. federal activities to be discussed here today. Nevertheless, through this association we have an opportunity for frank discussion, serious appraisal and sound recommendations. Let us resolve to make the best possible use of this opportunity--as well as to "relax in Wisconsin, where friends and nature meet!"

Welcome to Milwaukee, and to Wisconsin. We tried to provide everything for a good meeting and now its success will depend on your participation.

Let's get to work!

Thank you very much.

SECRETARY SCOTT: Thank you, Les. In the interest of saving time, we shall only call the roll of the 16 states and provinces to see if someone is presently representing the member agencies, and that person should answer the call. An attempt was made to publish an advance registration list and some of you have received a copy of that. Admittedly it was incomplete and inaccurate in some cases and we hope to correct this by noon today, and we should have a more complete and more accurate list of the people present for your information. This will save time in that everyone present won't need a personal introduction.

I shall now call the roll for the record. Colorado, here; Illinois, here; Indiana, here; Iowa, here; Kansas, here; Manitoba--I believe they are the only one absent; Michigan, here; Minnesota, here; Missouri, here; Nebraska, here; North Dakota, here; Ohio--coffee hour for Ohio, well, we will expect them to report later; Ontario, here; South Dakota, here; Wisconsin, here. Well, I am sure Ohio is represented, and I know some people are here already from Ohio, but the official representative, Dale Whitesell, probably isn't here yet but will be here later.

President Les Voigt said let's get to work, and I will turn the gavel over to him so he can start the first discussion and first panel right now. Okay, Les.

PRESIDENT VOIGT: Thank you, Walter. We were very fortunate this year that we had an able program committee headed by Ralph MacMullan from Michigan and there was a lot of correspondence and discussions including a meeting at the North American at Las Vegas. We searched to get a good panel, good topics which were timely and important to our work.

The first panel this morning is one of the highlights of the meeting in my opinion, the panel on the Problems in Federal Aid to State Conservation Programs. I would like to call on Commissioner Wayne Olson of Minnesota to introduce his panel and to get down to work.

PANEL ON PROBLEMS IN FEDERAL AID TO STATE CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

MR. OLSON: This is our first opportunity to get together on a program. I consider it my responsibility as chairman to introduce the members of the panel and to recognize the people from the floor who make comments, and I am going to restrict myself pretty much to that. I would like to emphasize for the benefit of the press and the representatives of the federal agencies that are here that the title of this panel is Problems in Federal Aid to State Conservation Programs so you should not expect too much discussion of anything other than problems, and I think you can probably also expect that if these are problems that the states can do something about, at least these gentlemen will assume that they would have done it. Therefore, I think you also have to expect that when we talk about problems in federal aid, many times we are going to be talking about problems that we think perhaps the federal government should do something about. This does not mean that this is a balanced picture of the feeling of the members of the panel on federal aid programs in any way, but merely that there are some problems that we think ought to be discussed. I think this panel was set up for the purpose of permitting the states to have free and open discussion about any problems that they may have, and I am sure that we will have that; without further ado I would like to introduce the first member of the panel who will talk to you, Assistant Director George Sprecher of Wisconsin.

NEED FOR CONSOLIDATION OF PROGRAMS

MR. SPRECHER: Mr. Chairman and members of the Midwest Association. I think some of you might have a complaint right off the bat that there are too many Wisconsin people speaking first on this program. I shouldn't complain. I happen to be on the program committee so I am partly responsible. But getting down to the problems in federal aid, I would like to start off by saying that we in the Wisconsin Conservation Department have for a great many years enjoyed the cooperation of the established federal agencies. It has been our good fortune and our pleasure to have worked with such men as Al Day, Dr. Clarence Cottam, John Farley, Ira Gabrielson, Dan Janzen, Bob Burwell, and Clarence Pautzke of the Fish and Wildlife Service; also, Lyle F. Watts, Richard E. McArdle, Ed Cliff, Jay H. Price, Art Greeley, and George S. James of the Forest Service. In addition, I could name a great many others of the several other old established federal agencies who have worked with us on a day-to-day basis, and there are many other people in those agencies that are here today that have worked with us on a fine basis. We have developed a high degree rapport in dealing with these agencies. I say developed because back in the early years we went through a costly period of considerable confusion and adjustment out of which came the fine working relationship we enjoy today. We have every reason to believe that it will continue indefinitely.

We find ourselves facing an entirely new situation today--a situation which calls for new decisions and reappraisals of the role the state agencies and the federal agencies are to play in the future. I doubt if any person responsible for the management of a resource has not viewed with genuine concern the rash of new agencies and agencies within agencies which have either appeared on the scene or are standing in the wings awaiting their cue to appear at the proper moment.

Now--why is it that a myriad of agencies and branches within agencies appear to have suddenly become interested in conservation and recreation? In some instances, it is a natural progression and represents the effort of dedicated men. In other cases, it may possibly be a pure case of empire building and especially so where an agency was created for a specific purpose several years ago and the urgency of that purpose no longer exists so that perpetuation becomes paramount.

For some 25 years, we have accomplished great conservation advances through the federal aids available to us from the Pittman-Robertson Act, the Dingell-Johnson Act, the Clarke-McNary Act, Public Law 566, the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, and a few other sources. We, like other states, have set up a separate federal aid office and have been able to comply with the rules and regulations governing the particular type of federal aid received. Now, we are faced with some 33 federal agencies (I), or divisions of agencies, each offering some type of federal aid to conservation either directly or indirectly. Most of them require state matching funds; most require an accounting system different from our state system; each has its own planners, inspectors, auditors, and engineers.

The U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service has a service audit of state expenditures which goes into such detail that it results, in our opinion, in needless and inefficient effort. Each individual voucher drawn which has evidence of an

eligible expenditure under federal aid must be filed, duplicated, and grouped to fit the needs of the particular federal agency. Apparently, the federal auditor for the Fish and Wildlife Service has no alternative than to examine in such minute detail, each and every one of the hundreds of vouchers which the state may process under federal aid. There appears to be no allowance for the exercising of discretion or judgment on the part of the auditor.

The U. S. Forest Service auditor, on the other hand, is allowed to spot-check and to use his judgment as to whether he should follow through in detail or not. After conversation with state officials or on field trips, any particular aspect of the audit which appears to need further investigation is then taken care of by the Forest Service auditor. They may investigate one part of the state records intensively one year and another part may be investigated intensively another year. This, of course, is a direct savings of not only the auditor's time but the time of the state personnel as well. We certainly believe that there is room on the part of all federal agencies to arrive at a standard accounting and auditing procedure so that the states might realize this savings as an indirect federal aid in the pursuit of the various programs.

Field Men Affected

How does all this affect the man in the field? The Game Manager concerned with the development of game habitat has eight possible sources of federal aid: U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Soil Conservation Service, Forest Service, Corps of Engineers, Agricultural Conservation Program, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, and Area Redevelopment Administration.(II) The Fish Manager has nine sources of funds from established federal programs. Water control projects can be processed through nine separate federal agencies. Recreational facilities such as campgrounds, picnic areas, and bathing beaches are eligible for federal aids from ten agencies. Forest Management aids are available from six agencies. Research and Planning can obtain aid from nine agencies.

We must remember that each of these agencies has its own business methods, and the fieldman who wants to obtain federal aids must have a broad education in the rules and regulations that apply to each of the federal agencies that offer financial aids.

Now, where do we go from here? Very briefly my recommendations are:

We should, state and federal, concurrently strive for a coordinated federal policy--a federal policy which recognizes at least a few sovereign rights of the states; a policy of continuity, growth and flexibility; a policy which recognizes the gains of the old frontier as well as the existing agencies' capabilities on the new frontier. The logbook of conservation history is filled with many accomplishments won on the conservation frontier--accomplishments which entitle the older agencies and the states to justifiably play the role of leadership.

I believe we should encourage the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress to examine all federal programs with the purpose in mind to consolidate programs, eliminate useless waste and eliminate higher administrative costs--administrative costs which hit both state and federal agencies and can result in nothing but a reduced potential of program. Someone must decide in <u>firmness</u> and <u>fairness</u>.

Thank you.

Footnotes

I. Agencies:

1. Accelerated Public Works
2. Agricultural Conservation Program
3. Agricultural Research Service
4. Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service
5. Area Redevelopment Administration
6. Bureau of Indian Affairs
7. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation
8. Clarke-McNary Act
9. Corps of Engineers
10. Department of Defense
11. Department of Health, Education & Welfare
    Division of Environmental Engineering and Food Protection
12. Department of Health, Education & Welfare
    Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control
13. Dingell-Johnson Act
14. Economic Research Service
15. Farmers' Home Administration
16. General Services Administration
17. Geological Survey
18. Great Lakes Fishery Commission
19. Lake States Forest Experiment Station, U.S.F.S.
20. Land Use Adjustment Program
21. National Institute of Health
22. The National Science Foundation
23. Pittman-Robertson Act
24. Public Law 566
25. Rural Area Development Program
26. Rural Renewal and Resource Conservation Projects
27. Soil Conservation Service
28. U. S. Coast Guard
29. U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service
30. U. S. Forest Service
31. U. S. Public Health Service
32. U. S. Travel Service
33. U. S. Weather Bureau

II. Game Habitat - Source of Federal Aid:

	Agency	Project
1.	Agricultural Conservation Program	Aids in our cropping program on public hunting grounds
2.	Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service	Planting shrubs and construction of ponds
3.	Bureau of Outdoor Recreation	Planning
4.	Corps of Engineers	Waterfowl and other game species habitat
5.	Forest Service	Land use practices and development of forests for game
6.	Public Law 566	Watershed improvement
7.	Soil Conservation Service	Technical assistance and design work for private landowners and game projects, and also state projects
8.	U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service Accelerated Public Works Pittman-Robertson Act	Public hunting grounds

MR. OLSON: Thank you, Mr. Sprecher. Our next speaker is Assistant Director Robert Elliott of Colorado.

DIVERGENCE AND CONFLICTS ON POLICIES

MR. ELLIOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and fellow members of the association. Walter, and the secretary, I am sorry I don't have the prepared script to give you. I am going to be speaking off the cuff after this. It is a subject I like to speak off the cuff on. Harry Woodward gave me so many duties before I left that I couldn't get around to writing my speech. At any rate, just glancing down the list of some of the federal agencies in Colorado that the Colorado Game, Fish and Parks Department has problems with or rather I should say deals with, there is about--oh, 14 to 15 and I will just run through them quickly. Some of them will be a repitition of what you heard previously. The Forest Service, The Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Reclamation, National Park Service, Corps of Engineers, the ones under the Department of Agriculture, the Soil Conservation, the ASCS, and the Farmers' Home Administration. Some of you might doubt this, but one of them did ask for us to establish some criteria for private fish ponds on which they could base appraisals for loans. The Indian Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and the Bureau of Public Health in cooperation with the State Health Service, the Extension Service, and of course, the Extension Service you know is cooperative and the Bureau of Public Roads through the State Highway Department.

Now that we have defined what we are talking about or who we are talking about, I have listed some of the primary problems and differences of policies and operating procedures. No state has the same policies or procedures and I am sure we all recognize this. Many of them may be similar but quite often these policies vary considerably in application. We often zealously guard these and hold them unassailable and inflexible. We say, "We can't do this because this is against our policy." I think this is probably the wrong attitude.

Specific Problems Cited

Now, I will take a few of these, gentlemen, and outline some of the specific problems and they are also some of the general problems with which we are concerned today, I think. The Forest Service, for instance, we have no real conflict with the basic authority to manage game. Most of the forest officers from the Washington office level on down to the district rangers pretty much feel that their primary responsibility is for what is the best for the management of the land resources itself and the vegetation and the soil and the water and most of them don't attempt to get into the actual game management function. With our new responsibility of parks and recreation, we find that this may be a little area that is not quite so well defined as far as responsibility is concerned and we do have conflict there as to where and which facility should be developed for recreational purposes not associated with hunting and fishing. Of course, we do have some differences with the forest people in removal of vegetation or treatment of vegetation, particularly spraying browse species and willows.

We have encountered a few problems in engineering and construction projects and this is in regard to our specifications on design work of dams and roads, etc. and this must be pretty well thrashed out at both the regional and office level

prior to our obtaining the use permit to go ahead and build the dam or road or whatever the project may be that requires engineering specifications.

Bureau of Land Management. We have primarily some differences in sagebrush spraying. This seems to be a rather constant problem with them. I don't know, here again in getting at the reasons why, I hope that I can sum this up with some general statements at the end here, but this has been a rather constant problem with us in the elimination of big game habitat and also sagebrush habitat where they spray sagebrush in large blocks.

In our application of land withdrawals and public domain in prior years, this has taken a considerable amount of time to process; quite often by the time we get the approval back from the land management, we are outside of the fiscal year the money was budgeted for for that particular project. They also get up their back about marking their lands so they show these public lands are open for hunting and this is also true for access roads for hunters mainly. We differ with them considerably on the grazing permits where the department may purchase base properties. Some of you may know that they have had I presume it is a policy, I am not sure it is in their law that states, that nonuse can be taken on grazing permits only for a period of three years and then it has to be used, regardless of the range readiness or condition. We get into some pretty good discussions also with them about the capacity of ranges, carrying capacities for both livestock and game. This usually gets pretty hot because we don't attempt to establish precise carrying capacity for deer or elk. Some of the other agencies, I think it might be better to lump the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers and to a lesser extent, the National Park Service, together because some of their activities are, as you may know, closely coordinated and they intertwine and dovetail and anything else; sometimes they become confused together on the projects that concern our department.

The Bureau of Reclamation, we basically are opposed to their dam building. I think it boils down, gentlemen, to the rather basic difference between biologists and engineers and we don't seem to see eye to eye a lot. I know that our own chief engineer within our own department, we have a little problem with him occasionally.

We were out looking at a project that we were building with our own funds and they had taken out all of the trees in the bottom of this lake--it wasn't too large a lake--and piled them up and burned them. I said, "Ed, why are you doing that?" He said, "We have to clean it out." I said, "Why don't you leave them piled up?" He said, "Leave them piled up, is that what you want?" I said, "Yes, for fish harbors, otherwise you have to haul rocks in and you could just leave those trees in there." Well, here just within our own department, a pretty basic difference as to how we view what is good engineering and what is good biology.

One of the bureau's projects, and we have several large impoundments under construction, and some on the drawing board for dams, we differ with them where the take line should be, how much land should they buy in order to provide the recreational needs around this lake they are building, or reservior. I speak of the reservior because it fluctuates and the lake doesn't, at least that is the way we view it. I don't think you have too many of those problems up here.

The Division of Plans and Specifications, that will either mitigate the wildlife losses or provide for enhancement of their values and there we run into

many differences like--well, even with the Highway Department in building fills or crossing deer migration patterns to put the fence, the type of fence in on the right-of-way that will permit an antelope to go through or won't hamstring a deer as it goes over it.

When the land is purchased, then the Bureau and the Corps to the lesser extent get into the construction of recreational facilities and we tangled here with the charging of the fees on this land, if we are the administering agency. Along with that comes the National Park Service who is the advisory agency for these federal organizations in matters of outdoor recreation. While we are on the Park Service, most of you realize that we have had sort of a running battle with them along with some of the western states on opening these sacrosanct lands to the public hunting. If Mr. Woodward were here, he could probably spend the rest of the day talking to you about that, but with the Park Service comes the planning recreational development on federal impoundments and right now we are into a little impasse situation; are they going to take it over, are we, is it going to be a national recreation area or a state recreation area? With the Bureau of Sport Fisheries, George has covered the federal aid aspect quite well. I had a pencilled copy of the last auditor's report when they came in and audited us. It doesn't show a lot of gigs on our part. There are the small things--auditors call in everybody in the department and we listen to what they have found, what is wrong with what we have done, such as one birdman was on the check station and wasn't charged out to his project and so we have got to correct that. This man didn't enter any diary, the statement that refers to the project and job description. There are a lot of small things that really don't amount to a whole lot and this business of getting into considerable bookkeeping and finance problems is really not necessary.

While we are speaking of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, we work closely with them on the river basin work and enjoyed good relationships. Here we work with them quite closely on waterfowl recommendations and these are both good and fair. We disagree in certain areas on the waterfowl seasons. Most of the rest of them we have generally good contact with and some very little contact.

In the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation we haven't had a great deal of contact except in filling out the lengthy forms they sent out a few years back.

The Public Health Service cooperates through our state health service in water pollution and outbreaks of disease such as rabies and the plague. We get into it with them in those areas.

Agreements and Better Communications Suggested

Now, what are some of the solutions? I know you gentlemen would rather have your own solutions to some of these problems, some of them might be a little gory, but at least it is a solution. With Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management and the Soil Conservation Service, we have drawn up a memorandum of understanding or cooperative agreement, whatever you would like to call it. These have been in effect; if some of you gentlemen are interested in looking at them probably most of the states have the same type of agreement, but occasionally we have to get together to review and revise these understanding agreements so that they state what they want to do and we state what we feel should be done and then together we jointly agree to do certain things as regards wildlife on their lands, on the lands under administration. These

work out very well although there are some particular areas for disagreement and I have touched on the main ones. This may be an instrument that can be adapted for some type of agreement with some of the other agencies. I don't know. We haven't tried to explore this much further than this, just three agencies.

There is one thing we have done that I think has helped and that is established a planning meeting with particularly the Forest Service and the BLM. once a year and this is usually in the wintertime when our fieldmen and field administrators are free to sit down and do some of this planning, to get with the forest supervisor and his staff and our regional managers and their crew to synchronize particularly budget making. We have found out we were making our budgets about 14 months in advance and Forest Service and BLM were probably 18 months to two years in advance and we weren't always putting the same projects in the same fiscal year so we could pool our funds and get these facilities built together when we have the money to do it with and this again may be a pretty good solution with other agencies. The business of getting more meetings; of course, I am not in favor of that particularly, but then you do come up with some good occasionally from meeting.

Other recommendations can be lumped in the term of better communications. This is the rather broad and vague and all encompassing recommendation, I agree with you, but I think that here again we can't invite these people from the other agencies. I know that many of the federal agencies are here at our meetings every year, but then even on the local basis we should invite them to sit down and get on a better working knowledge and basis with our people in the field.

I think that this panel was set up for a matter of introspection and self analysis as to what we could do. I think it is a good thing to do because it is true we have done quite a bit of complaining of the federal red tape, but there are many things I feel that the states themselves can do to promote a better understanding with the federal agencies.

I am willing, Mr. Chairman, then, to answer questions at the end of the period.

Thank you.

MR. OLSON: Thank you, Mr. Elliott. Right now I would like to introduce the last member of the panel, Assistant Director Larry Gale of Missouri.

PROBLEMS IN FEDERAL AID

MR. GALE: Mr. Chairman and members of the association. One of the difficulties of course of appearing last on one of these panels, it is difficult to bring out anything new, but possibly we can vary the approach somewhat.

The subject of this panel implies that there are serious problems to the state conservation agencies in present federal aid programs. Frankly, I do not consider this to be true in Missouri, although there are several problems of lesser magnitude that are worthy of discussion.

The Clarke-McNary, P-R, and D-J programs are firmly established and working well in Missouri. It would seem that P-R and D-J could be simplified, possibly along the lines suggested by Minnesota. In spite of the many years of experience

with these programs, and the demonstrated capability of the states to establish and carry out sound projects, there seems to be a trend toward ever tighter restrictions and control of minor details. We suspect that this harassment over details is the main reason some states are recommending changes in P-R and D-J procedures.

Matching Funds

One problem faced by every state is that of providing matching funds for participation in the various federal aid programs. This is especially difficult when an emergency program such as Accelerated Public Works is initiated with little or no warning. In the near future the states may be required to find matching money for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the Poor Corps, and similar programs. Many of these vary in the percentage of state matching funds, all the way from zero in the case of some forestry programs to as high as 50 percent. As these federal aid programs increase, it is conceivable that some states may discard those with higher state matching requirements in favor of those with greater federal participation. Some states have received general revenue appropriations for matching special federal grants, especially under APW. Others have earmarked tax revenues that may be available for matching funds in certain programs. Should the states try to provide matching funds from ordinary license revenues, or seek other sources?

Planning

Planning for special and temporary federal aid programs is an important problem. It would be helpful to have a file of sound acquisition and construction projects completely planned and ready to go on short notice. In Missouri, however, the limitations of our engineering staff have forced us to concentrate mostly on high priority projects for which we can foresee reasonably certain financing, and we never have enjoyed the luxury of stockpiling many advance engineering plans. It is questionable whether a state should hire enough engineers to design projects that might be built only if some new federal aid program is enacted. The time available for initiating new projects, the amount of detail required for approval, and the eligible locations all differ among the various federal aid programs and complicate state planning. Certainly some standardizing of these requirements is possible and desirable. In any event, states should plan and develop under federal aid only projects for which there is real justification and which the state would be willing to undertake without federal assistance if necessary.

Federal requirements often constitute a problem, whether established by law, regulation, or interpretation. Sometimes they are highly inconsistent; for example the exclusion of hatchery development from D-J (presumably because of biological infeasibility) while development of federal hatcheries under another program continued at a rapid pace. The constant and unannounced shifts of counties eligible under APW hampered the planning and execution of that program, and we see similar possibilities in the various phases of the "War on Poverty". It seems that a minimum period of eligibility could be established, along with an extended eligibility for declassified areas where construction planning is well advanced.

Too Much Aid

Probably all states acknowledge the substantial benefits of P-R, D-J and Clarke-McNary. Most states also recognize the waste inherent in crash programs

of the APW type, in spite of the benefits received. As more and more federal aid programs come into being, each with its own matching requirements and its own set of controls, it is well for the states to scrutinize each new program very carefully. It is possible for a state to become so dependent on federal aid as to literally lose control of its own conservation program. The only answer is to maintain a reasonable balance of state financed projects and to reject any federal aid program with unreasonable requirements or controls. If a state conservation agency loses its freedom to make decisions regarding the major phases of its operations, it has little reason for existing. Some jobs are best done at the state level, some must be done at the federal level, and some should be done cooperatively.

I think our best safeguard is for all of us to keep in mind where any specific project belongs and to pursue it in that direction.

Thank you.

MR. OLSON: Thank you very much, gentlemen. We have about 45 minutes for discussion from the floor. Before we ask for comments from the floor, do any of you members of the panel have any additional comments you would like to make at this time? Mr. Voigt, do you have anything? Then I would like to ask for any comments from the floor, please. Remember to identify yourself before speaking, as you begin to speak, I should say.

MR. ERNEST SWIFT (Wisconsin National Wildlife Federation Advisor): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen. In listening to these papers I have taken a few notes and I think the discussion basically has been on techniques, but I would like to bring up some other factors that have, I think, a bearing on this federal and state relationship of public programs today. I think we all realize that conservation has suddenly become fashionable in the last few years. A great many people that never though about it prior to his time have suddenly gotten into it and a mantle of great knowledge has fallen on their shoulders. Recreation has become the number one federal mandate in conservation programs today and that is taken in on some of the universities who have suddenly wanted to take over certain state or federal planning, not the responsibility, but just their planning.

Picnic Table Conservation

As Mr. Sprecher said, because of this federal mandate we have some 33 federal agencies and subagencies that are now attempting to shoot this bear. I find that they are all working more or less independently of each other and they all have an impact on the state agencies, but this sudden explosion of activities and development is bound to cause confusion and I think it is going to take a great deal of sensible planning to shake it down so, as Sprecher said, the states won't have to be dealing with all of these agencies separately. But a great deal of this recent upsurge doesn't deal with fundamentals of resources; it is a picnic table type of conservation and I don't think that we are developing a sense of responsibility in the individual that participates.

Now, you take one agency, for example, which is famous for draining most of the wetlands of Minnesota, North and South Dakota, they have suddenly become the shining light with a silk purse in the recreation business with a great deal of money and yet they destroy one of the great resources in the matter of waterfowl. I don't think such an agency can change its attitude on this little lost file overnight. At least they can't make me believe it. That is the last

remaining nesting areas we have in the U. S. and they are responsible in a great measure for their destruction and yet they are in many states today attempting to lead this recreation parade.

Just west of here, for example, we have the American sewer, the Mississippi River, and recently there was a notice in the paper to the effect that the Farm Administration was going to loan some money to make developments along the Mississippi, a half a million dollars for recreation. Some years ago or for the past several years, there has been an advocacy of a national scenic highway from the Gulf to Canada and that is also in the name of recreation. Here we have two examples of dealing with frills and failing to strike at the basic reason of pollution and it seems to me the main effort should be on the basic things. For example, on the Mississippi, to control and diminish pollution before we start on luxury factors of conservation, and I claim this Farm Administration loan is a luxury factor and in a sense your highway is. You're going to put it along, as I say, one of the great sewers of the mid-continent.

Now, in Congress today we have a forest and land act where certain moneys would be raised for land acquisition. Now, I happen to know that the forest industry has been heartily condemned and damned along with other land owners for raising the question on how it may affect the tax base, not only because land is going to be taken off the tax roll, but all these recreation acquisitions are a threat to the longevity of a long tax base for forest industry and forest industry can't be taxed on an annual basis as a lot of other properties are, and survive. It has got to be on a severance tax or something of that nature, and I don't think that that is quite right for you gentlemen or who you represent.

Never in all my years have I heard anybody get up and talk about the impact of recreation on the tax base. Yet you go before Congress or your representatives and give industry hell--which I am not sticking up for--and a lot of their facets because they are defending their position and in all of your deliberations you never figure on what impact your programs may have on the tax base. Actually you have an equity in the state economy as well as in its recreation and you have that obligation. And personally, in some of these issues I would rather debate with a person who had studied the issue and disagreed with me but knows the background, than debate a question with somebody that doesn't know anything about it. I think in all your deliberations in public and this type of picnic table conservation, you have got to take into consideration the tax base and you have to study what it does and what the impact is and you have got to be fair enough to a private industry to realize that they have got a survival interest too, and you can destroy them unless you at least understand their position and work with them and not just call them names.

MR. OLSON: Thank you, Mr. Swift. Do we have other comments from the floor? Please feel free to express yourself. This is your opportunity.

States Not Consulted

MR. BUSHONG (South Dakota): You barely touched upon it, but one of the biggest problems we have in the Department of Fish and Game with some of the federal agencies is merely the fact that we are not consulted from the very inception of these projects. This was touched upon by one member of your panel, but only briefly. We go along and suddenly we are hit with this project and about the time we plant our feet, then we find another one and I think it is the lack of communication. We should have a strong resolution coming out of

this as to the contact made by the federal agencies with the state. I am a little bit alarmed on this proposal to simplify the rules and regulations of P-R and D-J. I have a couple notes on that, roughly, and I am aware of the minor annoyances that we all encounter. That was mentioned awhile ago; some lad did something and he was docked so much money for that. This we are aware of. These are minor annoyances and can get a little bit under the skin, but I wonder if on the other hand if we start simplifying the D-J and P-R program, if we can't simplify this into oblivion, lose identity, the complete loss of identity, and I think I can safely say I don't agree all states have matured to the point where they are capable of spending these funds without supervision from federal agencies.

Thank you.

MR. OLSON: Thank you, Mr. Bushong. Other comments?

MR. ELLIOTT: I would like to comment along that same line. I agree that this business of having to justify every nickel you spend under the federal aid program gets into a lot of long and expensive bookkeeping. I think I brought out about one fellow being docked on this one day's time being spent on something besides what his project said he was supposed to do and this goes even further in our own experience. You just experience the same thing in having to justify your budget request to the joint legislative budget committees and in discussing this with legislators, I asked them, "Why do you want us to justify buying a 4-wheel drive pickup instead of the 2-wheel drive pickup?" I said, "Is it that necessary that you know this; why can't we just justify what we ask for on the basis of how good is our program, are the hunting and fishing or recreational opportunities good in this state?" If they are generally accepted by the people, why do we continually have to come back and go through this business of justification item by item, through every budget. I certainly feel that this is the approach we ought to take in making this pitch to the federal aid authorities, "How good is the overall program?" We ought to be able to talk in benefits of hunting and fishing rather than, did we get this money charged in the proper column on the ledger sheet?

MR. OLSON: Mr. Capps from Missouri.

MR. CAPPS (Missouri): Mr. Chairman. I would like to comment briefly on what the gentleman from South Dakota had to say. In respect to what you're doing and whether you're doing this properly, I don't think this bookkeeper, auditor, can do it at all. I want to give a pat on the back to the Forest Service. They send management experts to look over your program. You take them out and show them what you're doing on the ground. The bookkeeper is not an expert on anything and he is pencil pushing and he checks the details. I think the Forest Service is leading the pack on getting away from the red tape.

We have one financial plan that covers several different programs and several different laws and it is a big improvement over what I see in the fish and game end of it.

MR. OLSON: Thank you. Any other comments?

Cites Complexity of State Regulations

MR. STEEN (Nebraska): I want to comment along the lines of what Mr. Capps said. Frankly, gentlemen, I think we are all more or less guilty of this tendency

to use too much red tape and have too many regulations. We do in our fishing and hunting regulations, for example, all of us do. We make things so complicated that the average public doesn't know when they are within the law or outside of it, and I think it is a tendency that we must all watch and must all fight. I would like to point out the fact that when you make an operation too restrictive, you may take care of the state that is not mature enough to do the job itself, but you also put the brakes on the state that has matured.

I will use a simple illustration in our own case. We have at the present time the most liberal pheasant season throughout the nation. Why? Because even with this season in our state, we still have in the field at the end of the season nearly half of the surplus roosters. I am talking about the birds that are surplus to the production of chicks the following spring. Now, quite a few people in our state, including a good many of our own citizens, go hunting and they don't kill the limit, and they come home disappointed and they think the season should be shortened; there aren't enough birds, etc. All right. We have hunters who couldn't hit the broad side of a barn, so to speak. We have hunters who hunt where the terrain and the environment is almost a habitat of row crops and summer fallow and of course, they don't get a bag limit and therefore the season should be reduced and lowered.

We could make everybody happy by having a seven-day season and one cock a day. That would take care of the hunters, but we would put the brakes on the handicapped and the ball and chain on all our good hunters, the people who are able to get four cocks a day, and we would wind up wasting even more of this resource from the point of view of managing the pheasants, the harvest of the cock in our state itself, the same as the closed season. It has no significance whatsoever in management.

Now, we do the same thing with our regulations. We do the same thing with federal aid, etc. I think it is a tendency that must be watched. I think we are all guilty of it and I think we ought to give the more progressive, the more informed and better state an opportunity to make more profit with less cost and less red tape than they are doing at the present time. If you have a state, if the federal government has states that it is supervising or working with who have progressed to that point, they can be handled on an individual basis by persuasion and by other means. We do it ourselves in our own work. I am sure the federal government can do it. The Forest Service does it. Why can't the federal government do the same thing?

There is much merit, I think, in trying to get rid of some of the excess red tape we have in the program.

MR. OLSON: Thank you, sir. Are there any other states that haven't been heard from?

Corps of Engineers and PL-566 Procedures

MR. STUART (North Dakota): There are two problems that are very severe in North Dakota, dealing with two different federal agencies. One of them is the Corps of Engineers. Of course, as you all know, they have done a pretty good job of damming the Missouri from Montana to Missouri. They have 12 major impoundments in North Dakota and it is apparent now that as Ernie Swift said, they are trying to maintain their position so they are branching off into other phases of activities. One of them, outdoor recreation, is so fashionable they have gone

into developing certain recreational facilities along these major reservoirs; after in some cases, turning the land over to the state game department for management purposes, they have come back in and withdrawn some for some rather elaborate recreational developments.

We feel that they are overstepping their bounds in this. Also because of the fact that the main stem has been taken care of, they are searching for other projects such as drainage, which again we feel we have enough problems with, without getting a major federal agency involved. I would like to see this group take a rather positive stand as to a resolution more or less condemning the Corps of Engineers for invading these fields where they have no business. Then another one that I really think needs scrutiny is Public Law 566 which is the watershed program of the Soil Conservation Service.

As you know, there are supposedly some fish and wildlife benefits attached to these programs, but they also require a rather hefty matching basis from the state or local agencies in order to develop these fish and wildlife areas. But they are traveling at such a speed that in North Dakota it is virtually impossible for the state and local agencies to amass the amount of revenue necessary to include these portions of fish and wildlife benefits in the watershed that is being developed. So we are going to have to tell them we are sorry, we would like to participate but we just don't have the funds and we feel that a lot of this is the interpretation of the law itself. Maybe it will be necessary to amend the law, but we feel that the interpretation of the law is such that in some areas bordering the Red River Valley of North Dakota they will pay 100 percent for channelization, which means rushing the water off the land as far as possible. Of course, this is extremely favorable as far as some of these county commissioners and some of these county flood control boards are concerned because they don't have to put any matching moneys into it. Where actually in most of these projects starting with the development of land treatment, it could be a distinct asset to game and fish enhancement, they are in actuality a loss.

MR. OLSON: Thank you, gentlemen.

MR. RUHL (Michigan): It seems to me that the states are being somewhat accused by the local private interests of doing some things that could be handled on a local or private level. We better look at thattoo. The great problem as I see it is communication, to know what the other fellow is doing and why, and why it affects you and your activity. That is the first thing. Another thing is planning. Is it necessary or are the moneys available to do considerable advanced planning so you have some specific plans to use the money the way you think it ought to be used. This of course means people who are qualified, people who are given time to do the planning--because you don't do good planning between telephone calls, at least I don'tthink you can. You will need to cooperate. You will need to reduce unnecessary red tape. That is a good question--what is unnecessary? And charity, you know, begins at home, I am sure.

Now I am quite sure that there are some places, for example PL-566, the law itself, the law as we interpret it would make a single purpose--our recreational project--eligible. After we submitted some, we got a "no" and the decision was made on the basis that this was agricultural money and this project did not have flood control or agricultural water management involved or it would have been approved. This was an administrative decision and I assume that it can be changed. If we have a good project that ought to be done and is worthy of the money, some actual communications planning is needed. People are probably

the key to the problem and if the state does not occupy an activity or a phase of the activity or responsibility of the state, then we can hardly blame the federal for trying to do something about it.

Some of these come about because they cross state lines of course, but nature abhors a vacuum; it is built in the way it ought to be built and with good people to implement the projects, then we are in a good position to get what we deserve.

MR. OLSON: Thank you, Mr. Ruhl.

Cautions Against Condemnation Resolution

MR. TOWELL (Missouri): I would like to inject just a note of caution into this discussion of P-R and D-J harassment, shall we call it. I think good points have been made, that there is much improvement needed in the procedures of auditing and carrying out the requirements of these two federal aid acts. However, Congress right now is very much interested in all excise tax programs. The House Ways and Means Committee is conducting hearings into all federal excise taxes and they are taking a searching look at all of these programs to find out if they are justified for continuation. In fact, I am going to Washington probably next week to testify in behalf of the International Association in defense of P-R and D-J. I think now is an inopportune time for us to be making a public noise in regard to these programs. Certainly there is much room for improvement in negotiations between us and the Fish and Wildlife Service, but I would hate to see a resolution come out of this convention condemning the procedures or raising a question as to the desirability of these two programs because nothing would please Congress more than to say, here the states and federal government are fighting over this thing and the simplest thing to do is cut it out and Congress doesn't feel too kindly toward excise taxes as a rule. This is a note of caution I think we ought to remember at this time.

MR. OLSON: Thank you, Mr. Towell. Are there other comments from the states?

MR. EVANS (Illinois): I just want to sort of back up the comments that Harry Ruhl made over here relative to communications and this relates primarily to PL-566 program which we all know has come in for a considerable amount of condemnation by state agencies and other wildlife people. I think this is perhaps one of the most important programs that state game and fish agencies could be participating in if we could get it rolling along the lines that the act is actually written. I don't think the situation as it has existed in Illinois is peculiar to Illinois because I believe the action of the Southeastern Association is evidence of this, that there has not been cooperation between the Soil Conservation Service and the State Game and Fish Agencies.

Now, our problem in Illinois has been one of communications, in other words working out a means by which we can get in on the ground floor of potential or impending PL-566 projects. I think we now have the machinery set up through a new memorandum of understanding, or agreement, and at about the same time this memorandum came out from Don Williams to the State Soil Conservation Service offices based on the action of the association. If this line of communication will work so we can get in on the ground floor with the local sponsoring agency and with the SCS personnel, then we can get somewhere. Then it becomes the responsibility of the Fish and Game State Agencies to see that they have the personnel and the funds to carry out their end of the multipurpose project.

MR. OLSON: Thank you, Mr. Evans. Is there another hand?

Suggested Coordinating Complaints

MR. MAC MULLAN (Michigan): I think it is obvious from all our discussion, we have known it for a long time in the past over the generations, as these federal programs build up, it is more and more difficult to keep up with them. There are 50 states to deal with now and we do have a problem here of lack of communication coordination. I think this is self-evident. A solution would be for us as states to get together and try to simplify our own problems and I think again we can't individually as states deal with the federal government and change their programs because they have 50 states to deal with and we as the Midwest have difficulty because they have a policy that has to apply for the most part over the whole nation.

As a suggestion, wouldn't it be proper that we strongly resolve that we study this problem, because Ernie Swift said a while ago if we act in ignorance or in unawareness we can do more harm than good. I suggest we resolve to study this problem and go to the International and recommend to them strongly that we have an International Committee that can look at all of these problems and digest them into simple matters, and then go to the federal government. Then, picking at auditing these things, if they are wrong as Bill suggests, I say Amen, so what. He says these things could be ironed out or put into good cautious language. It seems to me, sitting in from the outside, it is the inopportune time for us to go to the federal people and say, this is bad.

I know the BOR; one of its biggest functions is to try to coordinate these things. I would like to suggest that we might consider at this meeting drawing a suggestion or resolution to the International.

MR. OLSON: I think this should be something that should be submitted to the resolution committee.

PRESIDENT VOIGT: I think it should, and our president did anticipate just exactly what you said, Ralph. Nelson ~~Cook~~ Cox did appoint a committee at Las Vegas and directed them to report, but I like your idea of adding on a specific charge because I happen to be a fellow on that committee headed by Frank Groves and Phil Schneider and Seth Gordon, the assistant general counsel for the International. We have been floundering around trying to find what our assignments should be and you defined it quite succinctly and I endorse that it be a subject of the resolution for the committee and for the present committee or at Atlantic City. Some of it would have nationwide consideration and it is an urgent problem and one in which I think reasonable thinking which is nationwide in its scope could do much to work out these relationship problems with these federal agencies.

It would be to their advantage as well as to the advantage of the 50 states.

MR. OLSON: Thank you, Les. I wonder if there are any other comments right now from the state representatives. There are several representatives here from various federal agencies and I wonder if any of you have any comments that you would like to make on the discussion so far this morning.

Accounting System Being Studied

MR. MARSTON (Washington, D. C.): I am Merwin Marston, Chief of Division of Federal Aid, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and I would just like to say

that as far as simplification of documentation, accounting and auditing, this is something that we have been thinking about--oh, the past ten months, and we have had someone working on it and we put a management trainee on the problem last winter and he worked with some management authorities. He consulted with other agencies in the federal government who have grant-in-aid programs and he has made some recommendations to us in the form of a report which we are now in the process of evaluating.

Now, we are not considering anything that would require any change in the legislation. The legislation, P-R and D-J requires that projects be submitted and that we get detailed statements on each project. I think this is something we need and I doubt if anyone objects to presenting a project justification. We also feel we need to be able to account for our expenditures. We feel that after the projects are over, we need to be able to know where our money went so that we can make proper reports on the programs, how much different things cost and what our accomplishments are. The area that we are looking into is the possibility that we may be able to modernize our system of setting up programs, our method of accounting for the programs. If we can simplify our accounting programs, maybe go into a modern cost accounting system in each of the progressive states that will give us the information that we need, then as a result this auditing thing is going to be solved. I just want to tell you what we are doing about the problem.

MR. OLSON: Thank you very much. Are there any other comments either from other federal agencies or from other states?

MR. JAMES (Milwaukee): I am with the Forest Service here in Milwaukee. We appreciate the expression regarding our conduct of audits and programs and planning in connection with the programs. It is a never-ending process. We must have rules in the department, but the real purpose of my getting up is to interject a new activity which is going to add to the 33 which were already cited and that is that which is going to come about as the result of the Office of Economic Opportunity. As we look at it, it is a job for the program and involves all of these young people who are going to be put out in certain kinds of conservation camps and that legislation at this time still reads 9010 and that is going to be quite a complex organization. It is going to plan and organize and carry through the reporting, but it is just something that you may want to present.

MR. OLSON: Thank you, Mr. James. I am sure if all these people had known you were here, they would have been more cautious of their phrase, door-to-door service. Are there any other comments? Any other federal agencies?

MR. DON FOLTZ (Indiana): I caught a note here. This happens to be the first meeting I attended of the Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners. I catch a note here, there are certain underlying feelings that this thing ought to be simplified. We may be out to review basic principles, but after we got some of these things everybody puts in a note of caution. That is what I find with most federal-state relationships. Everybody gets it off their spleen and you end up having a love feast and you accomplish nothing.

Now, there are a couple of things we can be right honest about. I have had a little bit of time now and I mentioned at breakfast I am in midway seniority. I used to consider myself young. Olson is a good year younger than I; I am going to speak with some experience now.

Recommends Simplifying Back to Original Purpose

Number one--incidentally, I have been convicted of the Hatch Act too, and it qualifies me somewhat in the federal-state relationship--that this business can be simplified and I think most of you have brushed around it. You do it on a project basis or a grant-in-aid. I don't think if that takes an act in Congress we have to have the federal Congress be in agreement with it. If it doesn't, it doesn't make any difference how many of us states speak out, whether we want it on a project basis or grant-in-aid.

Another thing is, I went into the department and I read that Pittman-Robertson was wildlife restoration and Dingell-Johnson was fisheries and I just told Woody Fry I signed one of those sheets that we were asking for reimbursement on three-fourths of a Gravely tractor for a mower. If you could simply file this thing, this would reduce the bureau about half. This is a big problem and he being our friend, I think I can say this.

If he had actually put these two areas of federal moneys into buying land and developing lakes, as was really in the intent of the law in the first place for restoration, we could simplify this thing so much we wouldn't need to be worrying whether we are paying this guy 15 days in this month for that, and the Gravely tractor and the little bit of gravel for the approach and the walk-way bridge. We are all guilty of a lot of hogwash and most of us know it comes back to what Mr. Swift says, we lose the whole point of getting conservationists. We get wrapped up in the technique, how long we will keep the job if we are in civil service, whether we get to be a 16- or 18-year veteran, or whether we get fired for making the wrong decision on the state political level. But I think we can. It takes both the federal agencies and the state agencies, but if we get this thing back down to a general principle, we are dealing in conservation; and secondly, cut out all of this business and if the state can't carry its load enough to do the day-to-day work of carrying it out, I don't know whether we are really deserving of federal funds to pay help and buy equipment and what have you.

I think this whole idea--in the first place we have warped and lost sight of what the goal is. I don't want to leave here today not having had nerve enough to say I don't agree with the problem as it is currently run and let's do something about it, and one of the techniques is simplifying it, and simplifying it to what was the real purpose in the first place.

MR. OLSON: Any other comments?

MR. SHIELDS (Minnesota): Since mine started this ball rolling regarding the simplification of D-J and P-R, I think this matter has been studied. It has been considered. I think we have all had it in mind several years. It is nothing that has just spawned recently. I think we appreciate the accomplishments and some of the simplifications that have been made and the various aspects of the federal aid program.

I think the federal aid people are cognizant of the feelings of the state. On the other hand, I don't particularly feel that the states shouldn't have something to say in this program since we are the agencies that are actually carrying out the work on the land. I think we should work with the Fish and Wildlife Service and the federal aid people in designing what would be a reasonable program to carry out the primary purpose.

The reason that the simplifications were proposed in the form that they presently are is that as we look at the overall picture we find that, to my knowledge, every state in the union is actually spending more money in a profitable type of project than they have apportioned to them. Therefore, it seems to be no longer necessary to go through all of these detailed procedures. We talk about a project. I think these projects can be given a much broader aspect instead of just an individual project, that the statewide project of acquisition is sufficient instead of going into an individual project for each individual piece of land that is purchased under an acquisition program.

A comment on the words of caution. I certainly appreciate Bill Towell's mention of what is coming up at the present time. On the other hand, looking back I can't ever think of any modification or change in a program that has been proposed or considered that hasn't had a word of caution added to it. Perhaps today, this week, this month is not the proper time, but I do think that the state agencies, the Midwest Association and certainly the International Association should take some definite action in their proposals, put it in firm writing and let the world know how they stand.

Whether we do that this day or this week or this month, perhaps we should use some discretion, but I do feel we should act as I understand the Western Association and the Southeastern Association have already passed resolutions in this regard. Is that correct, Bill?

MR. TOWELL: I don't know about the Southeastern.

MR. SHIELDS: I understand their feelings were expressed in support, is that correct?

VOICE: They did have a resolution.

MR. SHIELDS: If the Western has had a resolution, if this is a matter of record, it is available to Congress. Perhaps the Midwest Association then adding a similar type resolution wouldn't cause a problem in Congress that has already been caused.

MR. STEEN: I didn't hear the resolution on this subject. The resolution in effect says the Congress may do what it likes in the excise tax, but please leave Robertson and Dingell-Johnson alone.

MR. OLSON: Are there any other comments, gentlemen?

Obligation of Funds

MR. EVANS: I would like to make one other comment here in regard to this business of the obligating of the federal aid funds. I say this because we have been going through a little period of reappraisal of one of our major projects in Illinois and I can't help but feel this way about the obligating of funds. It may be true that we could very well obligate all of our federal aid moneys on acquisition and development projects. This would be primarily for waterfowl or perhaps for maybe an occasional upland game area.

The act is termed the Federal Aid and Wildlife Restoration Act and I think throughout the eastern half of the U. S. we would all have to recognize that the bulk of the game is produced on private lands. This is a place where

we need to maintain, and we need to restore wildlife habitat, and this is the reason I think we need the type of a project which will have an effect on wildlife on those lands and this is where you get into the complicated projects, the ones which involve a lot of people and a lot of varied activities. This is where you get into the problem of determining whether or not they have actually been working on things which can be reimbursed, but I don't feel that we should get away from the proposition that these funds should not be used on the lands where most of our game is produced and harvested.

MR. OLSON: Do we have other comments from the floor?

MR. BURWELL (Minnesota): Wayne, I wonder, in view of what has been said about the grant-in-aid programs of the Fish and Wildlife Service, if there isn't something we should do out of the regional office here this fall in an effort to standardize, if we can, the audit system within this midwest region at least. That is something we can do on our own.

Suggests Field Conference on Accounting Procedures

What would you think of our tapping three or four or five representatives of the state with our administrator, perhaps from Washington, and meet right out here in the field at some point in September, October, November and see if we can't get down to these specific worrisome details? Streamlining or improved accounting really is just the sum of a lot of little things and I don't know why we can't try to straighten them out. We have had the Forest Service program held up as a good example. Perhaps George would let someone come over from his group and adapt his ideas and perhaps we can come back to you next year with substantially improved or streamlined procedures which wouldn't involve resolutions and a lot of whoop-de-do.

MR. OLSON: Very good.

MR. RUHL: It sounds like a good suggestion to me. Certainly the only way we are going to arrive at an improved procedure that is satisfactory to everyone is to work together and discuss what the specific problems are.

MR. BURWELL: If that is agreeable, we will take it up with the president and take the initiative and see what we can do about that in the next couple months.

PRESIDENT VOIGT: Sounds like a good idea, Bob.

MR. OLSON: Any other comments on that or the discussion itself? It is a little after eleven, but we can keep our committee report fairly short and still be out of here by 11:30 I am sure.

MR. POOLE (Washington, D. C.): Mr. Chairman, I am Daniel Poole, of the Wildlife Institute in Washington and on the subject of excise taxes I would like to make the passing observation that I would think a resolution would have to be very carefully worded, in the sense of the present time and the House and Ways Committee investigation into excise taxes and the general sentiment that prevails thereon. I notice with interest in either today's or yesterday's newspaper what they reported to be the published platform of one of the political parties. I notice in there they urged the abolition of many excise taxes, not specifically, but in general, so it is in a sense for a part of the people, excise taxes would be abolished or at least reduced, Mr. Chairman.

MR. STEEN: The committee will not be one that criticizes this present order of things, but one which says please leave them alone. We are going to ask you to pass on a resolution addressed to the majority and minority leaders in the House and Senate which says in effect that we don't want them to monkey in any way with the excise tax that provides the funds for Robertson and Johnson. That will be the resolution that we will ask you to pass. What you have asked here this morning is more in the order of what Bob Burwell talks about as administrative procedure. I repeat what I said before, we are all guilty of this sort of thing and one of the tendencies is to set up every rule and regulation we can to obviate anything that might possibly be criticized or questioned. I tell you, and I warn you, that when you do this, you also bog your operations down and that the approach to a question of this nature is the approach which says, how can we expedite this thing, how can we simplify this thing without really getting in real trouble, and as long as you have an operation you can defend, you're not in real trouble, but don't be afraid to stand up and defend them. That is one of the things they may want, to make everything so gilt-edged nobody can question it and when you do it, you're slowing up the whole machinery. If you gear your operations to your minimum performance and less-informed member of the organization, then you bog everybody else down and you hold down the standard of operation and you hold the progress down to the minimum rather than allowing it to reach the maximum capability of the members.

MR. OLSON: Thank you. Are there other comments? I suppose we ought to avoid any detailed discussions of the proposed platform of one of the political parties at this meeting. We may want to watch it on television.

Before we close, are there any additional comments from the members of the panel?

MR. GALE: In regard to Public Law 566, Harry mentioned the fact that the Soil Conservation Service had ruled out impoundments that they proposed to be built for recreation because they had no flood control benefits. Now, this may be a ruling by the Soil Conservation Service, but I can assure you from personal experience that it is based on the desires and the expressed will of the House Subcommittee that handles these programs.

We have a project in Missouri which was established as a joint flood control and recreation project and we had some members of that Polk Committee that came to Missouri to inspect the project and tried to work out the details, and it was very clear from what they said and from their questions that they are looking at these things almost exclusively from the standpoint of flood control. They will not approve a project that is strictly recreation and in our situation there is some doubt that they are going to approve a joint recreation-flood control program, so we can't blame this on the Soil Conservation Service. This gets back to Congress. This committee is not willing at least to implement that legislation.

MR. OLSON: Any other discussion?

Quotes Memo from Secretary of Interior

MR. KOENINGS (Midwest Regional Director, BOR): I think a lot of the questions have been resolved, but they are at least looking at it. We have a memorandum that will answer a lot of the questions here. We only found 30 federal agencies and I am glad to learn there are 33 mixed up in this.

We have been working with the state fellows and I am talking in the broad terms of hunting and fishing as well as the picnic tables that Ernie referred to, but you have local communities and cities; everybody has a problem. You take the highway; you go to the Highway Department. You talk about recreation; you have to contact about 50 different public agencies and that is a problem.

Congress has recognized the problem with the federal agencies and the Secretary of Interior has sent this out and it involves the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of Agriculture, but I think I can answer a lot of the questions of what the federal agencies are involved in. In the middle of the memo it says:

"In this connection you are referred to the letter of August 2, 1963, to me from the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget which requests the assistance of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation to concerned federal agencies and to the Bureau of the Budget in an overall analysis of federal recreation programs and budget estimates.

"In furtherance of the authorities and directives of Public Law 88-29 and Executive Order 11017, and in cooperation with the concerned federal agencies, you are directed to examine present and proposed programs, budgets, and operations of the federal agencies concerned with outdoor recreation including fish and wildlife resources. You should include in such examinations not only the land and water managing agencies, but also those other federal agencies whose programs have an impact on outdoor recreation.

"In connection with such examinations, you should pay particular attention to questions of policy including gaps, overlaps, and conflicts, as well as long-range programs and financial needs. Your study should point out areas where policy clarifications are needed, recommend policies which your examinations indicate to be desirable, suggest activities that may be curtailed or where expansion is needed, recommend appropriate sharing of responsibility between federal, state and local governments and private sector, and include recommendations for such legislation as you believe may be needed.

"The overall objective would be to provide the Executive Office of the President, the concerned federal agencies, the Recreation Advisory Council, and the Congress a coordinated look at federal outdoor recreation programs, policies, and expenditures along with recommendations which, if implemented, would result in a coordinated federal approach, with proper attention to outdoor recreation in relation to other resources and financial needs. Your report should clarify the role of the federal government in proper perspective to that of the states and local governments and the private sector."

Then he goes on, this is no small undertaking. If you start monkeying around with the federal government or other federal agencies, you're not going to win a popularity contest. This has started in Washington. This is tied in directly with some other bills that are in Congress--particularly the land and water conservation fund, if passed--where it states the states would be required to make out a state recreation plan. If it is approved by the Secretary of Interior, it calls for money for outdoor recreation. It is likely this money would not be allowed. So there is a movement to settle the federal problems.

We have been working with the states and our forms have been long, I admit, because we do need a lot of information to make a good nationwide plan to get this down to a statewide plan. I think there is a general effort being made to

coordinate some of these programs and if the states work with the federal agencies, a lot of good will be accomplished in the next few years and a lot of the problems that now exist will be coordinated by effort.

MR. OLSON: This might be a good time to terminate the discussion of this part of the program. Thank you all for participation and particularly the members of the panel.

Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT VOIGT: This might be the time to ask Mr. Scott if he had any additional comments before we go into the committee report. (Announcements were made by Secretary Scott).

PRESIDENT VOIGT: Thank you, Walter. The next item directly relates to the panel. It is the Federal-State Relations Committee Report, again by Commissioner Wayne Olson of Minnesota.

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. OLSON: I will keep this very brief. Many of the items that we discussed in our meeting last night were touched on this morning, and I will go through them and give you the general feeling of the committee and any action taken.

There was considerable discussion about the expanding federal programs in the field of recreation and game and fish that require state participation. We are thinking of the BOR operations, programs by the Corps of Engineers, watershed projects, all of which require increasing cooperation by the state agencies and there was a general feeling that in many cases the states are not in a position to provide the necessary personnel to effectively cooperate with the federal government in the development of these programs and the committee has submitted to the resolution committee a resolution urging that wherever possible, when the federal government asks the states or expects the states to participate in these programs, that federal funds also be made available to assist the state in effective participation.

There was some discussion about the loss of employees to the federal government. We reviewed a study, a report of a study by Gordon Charles of South Dakota. Actually this really includes not only loss to the federal government but loss to other states and private industry and the consensus of the committee was this is a serious problem, but it is the responsibility of the states in doing a better job in competing for these top positions. Certainly there was no feeling that we ought to recommend that the federal government should cut back or that in their salary scales or that they should cut back in their search for top personnel, but this is really the responsibility of the states to get themselves in the position to compete for top personnel.

There was some discussion of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Bill which is pending in Congress and here again there was considerable concern about the possibility of development of a balanced recreation program including proper emphasis on game and fish programs under the Land and Water Fund Bill. I think the recommendations of the bill to the states is we also should produce the

preparation of the plans which will be necessary under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Bill and be certain that these plans are balanced and that they do include adequate representation for game and fish facilities as well as other recreation.

We discussed at some length the need for closer working relationships between the game and fish agencies in the states and various federal agencies, particularly those involved in the development of small watershed plans and the Corps of Engineers in their projects, and here again we go back to the first item and really the important point here, I think, which was felt is that it is essential that the state agencies become involved at the beginning of the development of these programs rather than coming in at some later stage when it is really impossible to change the direction that the projects have taken. Again we are handicapped, I think, many of the states are handicapped by the lack of funds and personnel to do the kind of job we think the states ought to do in cooperating with the federal agencies in the development of these projects.

We discussed the wetlands acquisition program and the committee indicates its support of legislation now pending in Congress to liberalize payment in lieu of taxes as a means of speeding up the wetlands acquisition and we then discussed the organization of the committee itself and it was the general feeling of the members of the committee that perhaps it would be desirable for the Federal-State Relations Committee to be combined with the Federal Aid Committee of the association to avoid duplication. Perhaps one committee would be desirable to deal with all of these areas of federal-state relations including federal aid. That is the extent of the report and thank you very much.

PRESIDENT VOIGT: Thank you very much, Wayne. Are there any questions, comments or suggestions for revisions of the report from the floor? Wayne, I think you did a good job and would you like to move for the acceptance of the report.

MR. OLSON: I move its acceptance.

PRESIDENT VOIGT: There is a second?

VOICE: I second it.

PRESIDENT VOIGT: It has been moved and seconded that the federal-state relations report be adopted by the body. Are you ready for the question? All those in favor signify by saying "aye". (all approved) "No's" (none). The report is accepted.

Now, I think we have come to the conclusion of our morning program. It was a very fine program. This morning session is adjourned. We will be back in session at one o'clock.

Monday Afternoon Session, July 13

SECRETARY SCOTT: To start this afternoon off, we have a presentation of money to North Dakota for the purchase of a parcel of land. I will let them speak for themselves. I would first like to introduce the president who will

introduce the person who is going to make the presentation. Owen Gromme of Wetlands for Wildlife.

MR. GROMME (Milwaukee): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen and commissioners. I know you are in a hurry but I want to present the chairman of our Land Acquisition Committee, Mr. Haskell Noyes, who is going to present to the commissioner from North Dakota a check for our second acquisition, actual acquisition of a piece of wetland to be dedicated to the preservation of ducks. I think probably most of you here know what the Wetlands for Wildlife organization is all about. To be very brief, it will give us an opportunity, those of us who are interested in free enterprise, to do something for ourselves without waiting either for the state or the government to do it, so we are going to hand over this check and it is going to actually purchase a trifle in North Dakota.

It gives me great pleasure to introduce Mr. Haskell Noyes.

Check from Wetlands for Wildlife

MR. NOYES (Milwaukee): I am very happy to be here to be able to present to Mr. Stuart, the Director of the North Dakota Department, our check to purchase 169 acres in the northern section of North Dakota. We have made, as Owen said, one purchase here in Wisconsin.

We hope to raise money and buy other pieces of land, and I am very happy to present our check to Mr. Stuart.

MR. STUART (North Dakota): Thank you, Mr. Noyes. It is indeed a pleasure to accept this and I think one of the outstanding things is that a private organization has seen a necessity for entering into a program such as this and I want to say this, that we are proud of our wetlands in North Dakota and being one of the major duck producing states of the Union, and we also have more wetlands available up there so if there is any other organization that has some money, we will be glad to take that.

SECRETARY SCOTT: I would like to now present the general chairman for this afternoon's program, Mr. Melvin Steen, who is a past-president of this organization and whom you all know. I know we will have a good afternoon session with him in the chair. Mel, here is the gavel.

MR. STEEN (Nebraska): Thank you, Mr. Scott. I don't know whether the afternoon will improve or not, Walter, and I might add something else here too. I was very pleased to see the State of North Dakota get $3,000 with which to buy wetlands. I am especially pleased because I was born and reared in that state and I know they have got a lot of good waterfowl areas that need to be in public ownership.

I would like to add, though, something along the line of what Russ Stuart said. We have lots of wetlands in Nebraska; in case you have lots of money, we can get together.

This afternoon's session is devoted primarily to reports by various committees, the first of which is the Wetland Committee. The Committee on Wetlands and Waterfowl matters. The chairman of that committee is Tom Evans of Illinois, whom I am sure you all know, Tom, do you have something interesting for us?

MR. EVANS (Illinois): Thank you, Mel. First off, and this is for the benefit of the recorder, I want to add something at the start of this report. I want to be sure that the Wetlands Committee, and I think the association as a whole, recognizes the work of this organization, the Wetlands for Wildlife, as well as the work of all other similar private organizations, Ducks Unlimited, and any others that may be in the business of trying to raise funds from private sources for this all important business of preserving wetlands. I think perhaps we are inclined to overlook the work of such organizations and talk only of the things which the state and federal agencies are doing and I just want to correct this oversight and to insert this into the record that we certainly do recognize and we do commend these organizations for these efforts.

After several years of working on or sharing the wetlands or migratory bird committees of the Midwest and International Associations, it becomes a little bit difficult to propose something new and something stimulating and interesting. It seems as though we have pretty well exhausted the various approaches that might be available to us in this matter of preserving wetlands. Furthermore, both the states and the Bureau are now pretty well embarked on programs of wetland acquisition which we feel is the number one key to the business of preservation. And with these new ideas and suggestions, a little difficult to come by, the committee felt it was well worthwhile to keep pounding away at the several proposed approaches and that is what this report will revolve around.

WETLANDS COMMITTEE REPORT

The Mississippi Flyway Council, in the first report of its Habitat and Planning Committee dealing with the initiation of the new Duck Stamp Fund Acquisition program, pointed up the need for spending U. S. funds in Canada in the interest of maintaining duck production. It states that, (1), "Criteria, used to establish acquisition priorities, indicate that 80 percent of the Duck Stamp funds should be used to acquire production habitat," (2), "Ways and means must be found to preserve the prime waterfowl production habitat located in Canada and to solve the associated problem of crop depredations," and (3), "Serious consideration be given to establishing a Migratory Bird Commission that would serve as the administrative vehicle to handle waterfowl population and habitat problems within the entire range of the birds."

In this regard, we felt it difficult to improve on recommendations made by the Migratory Bird Committee of the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners at the 1962 association meeting as follows:

1. The Canadian and the United States governments, and particularly the International Migratory Bird Committee give consideration to the possibility of an executive agreement for an international program of waterfowl habitat preservation restricted to the prairie pothole regions of the two countries with particular emphasis in the provinces of Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan and the States of North Dakota, South Dakota and Minnesota.

2. If several years' experience indicates that the $105,000,000 cannot be fully obligated and used in the United States for acquisition, or if further special appropriations can be secured, any future authorization and appropriation bills should provide for:

A. Grants to states for similar acquisition, lease and easement-taking programs on a nonmatching basis.

B. Development of existing or potential wetlands safe from exploitation, to raise their production capacity.

C. Payments to taxing bodies in lieu of taxes.

D. Expenditure of any or all the funds in Canada if and when it is determined that a joint international effort in the prairie provinces is necessary and desired.

E. Incentive payments, as supplements to U.S.D.A. subsidy payments to landowners to retain, restore or create water areas which do or would have value for waterfowl production.

3. That preservation of production areas retain top priority in the use of these special acquisition funds.

Wetlands Acquisition Program

We again point out that the wetlands acquisition program is far from being on schedule, due in large part, to the failure to appropriate the funds as authorized. With fiscal year 1965 about to start, appropriations for the 4th year of the 7-year authorization period are being considered. Appropriations to date from the special fund are as follows: 1962 - none; 1963 - $7,000,000; 1964 - $10,000,000; 1965 (proposed) - $8,000,000. This would make a total of $25,000,000 - less than half of the $60,000,000 authorized for the four years. For the same period, Duck Stamp fund appropriations are: 1962 - $4,038,087; 1963 - $3,436,905; 1964 (estimate) - $4,500,000; 1965 (estimate) - $4,000,000.

Acquisition accomplishments have been increasing, and it would appear that the program may now be geared to utilize increased appropriations. All monies appropriated to date have been spent or obligated.

In Region 3, the key duck production area in the United States, the Bureau reports the following progress. As of June 30, 1964, 70,053 acres (31,343 wetland acres) have been acquired in fee, and 91,198 wetland acres have been acquired in easement in Minnesota, North Dakota and South Dakota. An additional 2,781 acres (1,413 wetland acres) have been acquired in fee in Nebraska under the wetlands program. Total cost in Region 3 to June 30, 1964, will approximate $7,500,000. This includes the small wetland acreage costs plus some 11,555 acres acquired in fee for refuges, plus overhead.

Nationally, through May 31, 1964, the Bureau has acquired in fee or by easement 314,087 acres under the 7-year program. In comparison to this, the State of Minnesota alone, under its wetlands preservation program, has purchased or optioned 131,083 acres at a cost of $4,032,161.00. Thus, the combined acreage in the pothole country is approximately 292,334 acres at a total cost of approximately $11,500,000. Comparative costs for lands acquired in fee are $34.02 per acre for the Bureau and $30.83 per acre for Minnesota.

Based on total appropriations of $17,000,000 from the $105,000,000 through fiscal year 1964, less than half has been spent on the main breeding grounds. The balance has gone into refuge acquisition in other states, some of which will, of course be somewhat productive of ducks.

The goal of the acquisition program under this authorization in the North Central Region is 750,000 acres of small wetlands. As of January 31, 1964, only 6.1 percent of this acreage had been acquired - 3.5 percent in fee and 3.6 percent in easement. With 16+ percent of the authorized fund appropriated - half of 8 percent utilized in the North Central Region - it is all too clear that the program is moving far too slowly.

The big question is, "How fast could it move?" Appropriated funds are being completely utilized either for small wetlands or regular refuge acquisition. With reduced opposition to purchase, and with greatly increased appropriations, could the rate of progress be greatly increased? Certainly increased staffs would be required unless other agencies, such as the states, are brought into the picture. We urgently need to clear up the tax situation and to get all agencies in on the program.

Some further comments of explanation are in order on two of the recommendations.

It is believed virtually impossible at this time to even consider seriously a treaty dealing with overall waterfowl management. However, there is reason to believe that in those provinces comprising the heart of the "big duck factory" where drainage is becoming a problem, an international program could be worked out. It seems to be high time for those in authority to give the idea serious consideration. And as an aside here I just want to say that since getting here, Art Hawkins and I have had some discussions revolving around conflict between our two papers. He reports some new developments in Canada, particularly with reference to the drainage which is developing rapidly up there and he is going to have some comments to make on this and some slides to show.

Incentive payments to landowners, under the U.S.D.A. - ACP program to retain, restore or create water areas has as much, if not more merit, than many ACP practices. Far too many, once productive marshes and lakes which have been drained in the past, have since been retired from crop production, and the taxpayer is, over a period of years, paying the full purchase price of such lands for producing nothing. The same amount of public money could be used to acquire such lands, retire them and make them once again productive of aquatic life.

Public Law 566 and the National Watershed Congress

A final point in this report may not appear at first glance to be especially pertinent to the work of this committee. However, I know of no better place to bring this matter to the attention of this association and it is a well known fact that the Small Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act is an important vehicle in the drainage program.

Tom Kimball, Executive Director, National Wildlife Federation, presented a report of the Committee on Recreation, Fish and Wildlife in Watershed Development at the 11th National Watershed Congress in Little Rock, Arkansas, April 26-29, 1964. The feelings of many game and fish people are well summed up in the following quotation from that report.

"Since 1954, when the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (P.L. 566) was enacted, one of conservation's most satisfying dreams--that of developing a complete conservation program for the most logical geographic unit, a watershed--has been growing and spreading across the land. More and more acres have been involved, more and more people affected by the changes we have wrought on the

landscape, more and more money spent, more and more equipment and materials used.

"But as was pointed out in a speech before the 10th National Watershed Congress last year, "a growing number of those who were most enthusiastic about the possibilities of the watershed approach to complete conservation, particularly those concerned with game and fish resources, have become increasingly alarmed at the sacrifice of these resources." Public statements were made by an eminently qualified observer that it was beginning to appear that "the theory, goal and the hope of complete conservation as originally envisioned, was literally going down the drain." Instead of holding water on the land, the program seemed to be designed to get the water off the land. More and more watershed development projects were being justified strictly on the basis of drainage. An obvious fact was emphasized--it is cheaper to dig a channel than it is to build an impoundment."

Just as the watershed program leaves much to be desired, so does the Annual Watershed Congress, which is so poorly attended by game and fish agency representatives. For this I will let the report of the Wildlife Society representative to the Congress speak for itself.

The Eleventh National Watershed Congress was held at Little Rock, Arkansas, April 26-29, 1964, and again it was disappointing from the standpoint of any display of real interest in the fish, wildlife and recreational phases of watershed development and projects. This, despite the fact that these land and water uses are cited in the Act (Public Law 566 and Amendments) and in the proposed programs.

From its inception, the Small Watershed Development and Flood Prevention Act theoretically has included fish and wildlife values and considerations. Official directives also have stressed these phases. However, when it comes to implementation of the Act in the field, fish and wildlife have received serious consideration in relatively few projects.

At nearly every Watershed Congress the failure of the projects to include fish and wildlife benefits, and the use of the Act to further detrimental drainage work in the prairie pothole country have been cited and discussed. At several of the Congresses specific presentations on fish, wildlife and recreation in watershed projects have been presented. Seldom or never have they been received favorably by the majority in attendance.

There appear to be two primary faults at the bottom of the situation. First, the majority of those who attend the Congress are not sympathetic to fish and wildlife; they refuse to concede that the majority of projects do damage to these values or at least do not benefit them, and they do not take the fish and wildlife resource values seriously.

Unfortunately, those who choose to play down or even "deride" these values controlled the discussion, and only one person had an opportunity to comment favorably on Tom's report. It was not difficult to detect an air of facetiousness running through the audience relative to these uses of our land and water resources. The comment was heard that the speaker apparently had only one friend in attendance.

This leads to the second fault, as I see it. That is the failure of fish and game agencies to attend this Congress. As Tom stated, and as others have who spoke at previous Congresses, the Watershed program is a natural approach to

land and water management. It should offer maximum opportunities to incorporate measures and practices beneficial to fish and wildlife. The Congress is one of the places where this phase could be adequately discussed and strong support demonstrated by those interested. Unfortunately, few attend or speak out when they do. As one who has attended all but two or three of the Congresses, I have been all to aware of the absence of fish and game personnel. The audience has consisted largely of professional agriculturists, soil and water conservation districts supervisors or chamber of commerce representatives.

There are twenty-five organizations listed as sponsoring the Watershed Congress, including the Wildlife Society. Of these, ten are concerned primarily with fish and game, wildlife in general, or conservation in general. These ten organizations are sponsoring a national meeting which they do not attend in any number and which is not furthering the interests they represent. Furthermore, most of them have not been represented at the meetings of these organizations to plan and discuss the Congresses. This was the first year I represented the Society at the meeting to plan the Twelfth Congress, and I want to report that all the foregoing was firmly presented to the Steering Committee. It received considerable serious discussion.

As representative of the Wildlife Society, I make a strong recommendation that all game and fish agencies, and all organizations concerned with these and the related resources attend the next Congress in force, and demonstrate to the agricultural interests that we are behind this program if its full potential is implemented in the interest of all resources.

It seems evident from all the foregoing that we are falling far short of putting forth an all-out effort to preserve wetlands. Until we do decide to fully implement all approaches and use all tools available to us, we will continue to lose wetlands faster than we can save or restore them.

MR. STEEN: Thank you, Tom. The next report on this afternoon's session is one on Waterfowl Status and Lead Poisoning and Mr. Hawkins, who is the representative of U. S. Sport Fisheries and Wildlife Bureau will make that report.

MR. HAWKINS (Flyway Representative, Minneapolis): Gentlemen, you may notice that I am dressed in black today. I wish it weren't true, but I am afraid that the report that I am going to give you is a little on the pessimistic side.

REPORT ON WATERFOWL STATUS

As I stand here talking to you, teams of waterfowl specialists are engaged in aerial and ground surveys to determine the success of the 1964 duck breeding season in North America. By the end of July, reports of their findings are due in Washington and a month from now, waterfowl hunting regulations for the United States will be decided.

But today I can only report on how prospects looked at the end of the May breeding pair survey and what I saw and heard while in Manitoba up to July 4. First, let's look at the data resulting from the Bureau's May survey, picking it apart by regions.

As you experts on wildlife well know, the kind of a duck hunting season we have each fall depends (1) on the size of the breeding population or seed stock

which returns North in the spring and (2) the size of the resulting crop of ducks, geese and coots produced. We have learned through experience that production success is tied very closely to conditions on the prairies of Canada and the United States. Therefore, I shall focus attention first on the May findings for the Prairie Pothole Region.

Prairie Habitat

Alberta -- Water indices for this province hit a new low point in 1964, 27 percent below last year and 24 percent below the long-term average. The survey team regarded the number of water areas in May as "about half" the normal complement. Even so, the breeding pair index this year was up 13 percent over last year's, although still 12 percent below average. Mallards increased about 13 percent but pintails decreased. Blue-winged teal showed improvement but are still below levels prior to 1962.

Saskatchewan -- The pond index this year in May was better than those for 1959, 1961, and 1963 but 17 percent below the 1956-63 average. A small increase (9 percent) in duck populations over 1963 was recorded but breeding stock is still only 51 percent of the average. Mallards dropped 13 percent and pintails showed no gain but blue-winged teal were at the highest level since 1960.

Manitoba -- Ponds were 16 percent more numerous in May of this year than last and 15 percent about the 11-year average, west of Brandon the improvement was considerably greater. However, the duck index was down 5 percent from 1963 and 28 percent from the average. Mallards showed a slight decrease from 1963 and their numbers are still far below normal. Blue-winged teal numbers were only half as great this year as the long-term average.

Tri-State Prairie Areas (Dakotas and Minnesota) -- The pond count was 47 percent under that of 1963 and 17 percent below the average for the past 6 years, despite some areas with excellent conditions. The duck count dropped 37 percent below last year's but still equalled the average. Mallard dropped about the same amount but also equalled the average for the 1959-64 period. Blue-winged teal, on the other hand, held their own and now stand at 44 percent over the average.

Northern Habitat

Alaska -- According to the report "the weather book for Alaska was completely rewritten in May of 1964--conditions were at least a month late."

There was no significant change recorded in duck breeding numbers, nor in any important species except the mallard, which was down. How they make out in view of the extremely cold and late spring is still to be determined but the odds are definitely against a good hatch.

Northern Alberta, Northeastern British Columbia, the Northwest Territories and the Yukon -- As in Alaska a premature warm spell melted the snow and attracted migrating waterfowl into the area "to be caught by the return of winter and the latest breakup in the memory of old timers." Some reverse migration was noted. Floods undoubtedly hurt the nesting effort in both the Athabasca and MacKenzie Deltas but in most of the area habitat conditions were about the same as usual.

Overall, the duck population index was 28 percent higher this year than last, improvements south of the Arctic Circle more than compensating for losses farther north. Mallards were among the species not showing a gain.

Northern Saskatchewan, Northern Manitoba, and Western Ontario -- In this area spring breakup was early, but in late May and early June, winter conditions returned to the point that blue and snow geese were concentrated around Winisk when they should have been in their nesting grounds. This delay could result in a poor hatch of this species. Some of this area, especially north of The Pas, Manitoba, has been plagued with extreme drought and unprecedented forest fire damage.

Duck populations for this big area showed a slight increase over 1963. Mallards also showed a slight increase (under 10 percent).

At this point your guess is probably as good as mine as to what kind of a fall flight of ducks will result from the combination of conditions I have described. But I note on the program that I'm supposed to engage in some "prognostics" so here goes.

Returning to the prairies this spring was a duck population not much different in size than that of 1963. It was higher in some places but lower in others. If you add up the raw data from all the reports, you arrive at a decrease, but raw data fail to take into consideration visibility differences between years. The Bureau conducts special surveys to measure these differences and they are taken into consideration in arriving at final estimates. Although I do not have the data at hand for making these adjustments, I have seen some figures indicating that the aerial crews observed a smaller portion of the population actually present this year as compared with last year. Hence, my conclusion that this year's loss as reflected by the raw data will disappear when visibility corrections are made.

Some parts of the prairies look as good habitat-wise as I have ever seen them but larger parts are still drought-stricken. Consequently I foresee no chance for a bumper duck crop coming from the prairies this year. It may compare favorably with last year's although there is evidence from some areas that the early nesting effort was largely a "bust", perhaps due to the chilly weather about the time the early broods were due to hatch or possibly high predation rates were largely responsible. A great deal hinges on the success of the hatch coming off now or within the next few days.

Northern habitat contains more breeders than a year ago, but production prospects are spotty at best. Late seasons in the far North such as in 1964, usually constitute one strike against the success of nesting waterfowl. Some geese, for example, have almost complete failures when the start of nesting is delayed a week or two. In Alaska actual physical harm was done to early arrivals due to the severe weather. Two major deltas had bad floods which may have reduced nesting success. Drought and fires north of The Pas may have caused some damage to nesting ducks. It is clear that part of this year's increase in the far North is the result of ducks overflying the dry prairies. In the past, displaced birds have done poorly. The resident population of northern habitat may have the usual rate of success but the negative items mentioned leads me to suspect that success per breeding pair will be lower this year than in 1963. However, the higher adult population may more than balance this deficiency in terms of the fall flight from this area.

The odds at this point appear to lean toward a fall flight no greater than last year's through the area represented by the delegates assembled here. There are, of course, missing links in my chain of evidence which the surveys now in

progress and future surveys will provide. But you asked for my "guesstimate" and there it is.

I shall now show you a few slides depicting conditions which I saw two weeks ago in Manitoba. (About 20 slides showing how certain potholes appeared this year in comparison with slides of the same areas during other recent years.)

Prairie Pothole Region Production Area

When I was in Canada two or three weeks ago, I obtained some slides of the conditions in one area. I should tell you a little more about this area because it is somewhat unique. The area I am referring to is actually northwest of Brandon and south of the Hibbing Mountain in Manitoba. It is a relatively small block of about 4,000 square miles, but it is a key block in many ways. For one thing it is recognized for being the best single area for canvasback production known anywhere in North America. It has an unusually fine habitat condition more often than perhaps any other area that I am familiar with. It is the area that you may have seen some fairly glowing reports about in the press this spring pointing out how excellent conditions were there. I will go over it and point it out roughly and also I will show you the area east of it where conditions are relatively good this year and west of which they are relatively poor.

This green area is the Prairie Pothole Region in the three provinces, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. The area I am referring to, I will show you this area on the slides. You can see it is only a spot on the map, but it is a fairly important one. Generally, conditions are very dry on the prairies or grassland area and then as you get farther north into the bush country, they become somewhat better.

Now, to return a little bit to this study area in Manitoba that I am so familiar with because I have been there almost every year since 1946. In 1949, a series of transects was set up in this area to sample the conditions and the duck populations within this block of 4,000 square miles. Along this transect were ten percent of the areas we were studying. There were about 120 different potholes pretty well scattered throughout this whole area. This year we returned to this block 15 years after it was initially set up and I thought you might be interested here in learning something that has happened to that habitat in the period of 15 years. As far as I know, this is the only study area that we have that goes back quite this far and it will give us some interesting sidelights what is happening in habitat destruction south of the border. Now, if we could have the slides, please.

First I want to show you some of the things that happened naturally in a pothole country. You are all familiar with them I suppose, but you may not realize how drastically things can happen in the pothole country, just from natural conditions, not from anything man does. (Slides depicted the potholes, barren land, loss of vegetation, and the return of water with improving results.)

Experiments to Solve Lead Poisoning Problem

I have another topic to give on the matter of lead poisoning and we will spend relatively little time on it even though it is a very important problem.

Back about 1959, the Illinois Natural History Survey came out with a publication by Bellrose, "Lead Poisoning as a Mortality Factor in Waterfowl

Populations", and one of the conclusions that he reached at that time was that in the Mississippi Flyway about four percent of the mallards were being lost every year as the result of lead poisoning and for North America as a whole the annual loss due to lead poisoning was two to three percent. At that time it didn't alarm too many people, two to three percent didn't sound like an awful lot, but during the recent waterfowl shortage the Mississippi Flyway has evaluated this loss and about a year ago they decided this was something deserving of much greater study so during the past year the Mississippi Flyway has been looking into the matter of lead poisoning and have come out so far with two reports on the subject. We don't have time to get into that here. They are available. I don't have many copies here, but if you would like a copy, let me know and I will have one sent to you. Incidentally, those in the Mississippi Flyway will receive them automatically. They were mailed out last Friday (July 10).

Now, you may want to know however some things going on right now in trying to solve this problem. Dow Chemical Company has taken a considerable interest in this problem and they are looking into the possibility of coming up with an alloy which will cause lead shot to disperse, disintegrate rapidly in a matter of a few hours once deposited in water. They have gone through a series of studies already and asked the leading ammunition company to supply them with shot containing the desired quantities of these various alloys. The ammunition company has been cooperative and agreed to furnish this material for them and in a very short time now, these materials will be made and tested.

There are three approaches to this problem; the alloy approach is one. Another approach is the possibility of coating shot with a plastic nylon and something of the sort is also being investigated by the Minnesota Mining Company in Minneapolis, and they are running it through a series of tests and are very active in this research too.

The third possibility is not to use lead shot at all, but to use some other form entirely, such as iron or steel. This is another approach which has already been investigated to a considerable degree in the Mississippi Flyway and is being investigated to an additional extent at the present time.

I wanted to bring this to your attention and if you are interested in getting more information on it, we have some material here that you can read.

Thank you.

(A more detailed statement supplementing Mr. Hawkins' remarks appears in the Appendix because this portion of his presentation was cut short by the impending arrival of the Governor.)

MR. STEEN: Thank you, Mr. Hawkins, for the comprehensive and interesting report.

What happened to Tom Evans? Tom, you asked for a little time to talk about that chart which you apparently forgot to talk about when you were up here and we are running short of time. Tom, we will give you three or four minutes.

Small Wetlands Acquisition Program

MR. EVANS: One thing I want to say, though, in mentioning private organizations active in this field of trying to preserve wetlands, I want to put in a

word for the project which the National Wildlife Federation has been carrying on for several years. They have come up with some data through farmers and land owners in Canada which will lay a real firm foundation for an acquisition program in Canada, if it becomes desirable to start on one up there when they are ready for it. I believe the program under Ross and Morgan provides a further foundation that will be more acceptable than we were able to start here in Illinois.

As to the chart over here, this was made available by the Bureau after we got here and it shows the trend in the small wetlands acquisition program. On the left it shows the number of tracts which have been acquired in fee and in easement. The green shows those acquired in fee. The blue, those acquired by easement. This '61, '62, '63, '64, first two years, there was none of the special funds available and this represents regular duck stamp acquisitions although it includes some small wetlands acquisition. Beginning in '63, the 105 appropriations came into being and here in '64 you see where the program is really beginning to speed up and this is what makes you wonder how fast could this go if the appropriations were being made on the basis of which they have been authorized.

Over here is the acreage of the wetlands actually acquired, a total of 121,000. You can see quite a jump--'64, 121,000 to date.

In the fee acquisition program there are included uplands and ranges as well as the easement program that is on wetlands only so the 121,000 of course would be augmented by some roughly 4,000 acres of uplands making it a total of somewhere around 170,000.

Now, there is a backlog in here. This represents easements taken, not necessarily approved and paid for, represents a backlog for 1965. This gets complicated and I wonder if Walt Schaefer is here and could comment on it.

MR. SCHAEFER (Minnesota): I might say that all of these figures shown here are options and easements that have been actually taken and accepted. The interesting thing about it is that we have 955, about nine less than shown here that are already in the mill. We have the easements. We have not accepted them. We have to go through the title examination before we can accept them so already in '65 if we didn't take another easement, we would just about equal the total of '64 by putting them through the mill. With the federal fee title we have a carry-over of 83 options not accepted by the Bureau. We have taken them, however, and the total wetlands involved in those cases is in the neighborhood of 73,000 acres which would be almost as much as we did in '64. This year should show a substantial increase from '64.

MR. STEEN: Thank you for that interesting presentation and for the briefness of it.

The next subject we are to hear about is that of the Mississippi Flyway business and its problems and I may say that our problems with respect to time were nearly solved during the afternoon because Mr. Bill Barnes was taking off or putting on his glasses and they came apart at the bow. I am going to loan him mine so he can read the paper. Bill Barnes.

MR. BARNES (Indiana): Fellow members of the association. I don't believe that we have discussed the Mississippi Flyway Council at this meeting previously and I would like to point out that actually the member states of the association

also include part of the Central Flyway so what I have to say may be augmented by Russ Stuart for the Central Flyway later on.

MISSISSIPPI FLYWAY BUSINESS & PROBLEMS

The Mississippi Flyway Council was organized on January 24, 1952 at St. Louis, Missouri. This followed the passage of a resolution by the Internation Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners at Rochester, New York on September 11, 1951, setting up a National Flyway Council. Prior to this organization, a group of biologists had been in existence for several years for pooling information and making recommendations regarding migratory birds within the Mississippi Flyway. On July 14, 15, 1952, this previous group was taken into the parent organization as the Technical Section of the Council.

One of the major activities of the Technical Section was the formulation of "A Guide to Mississippi Flyway Waterfowl Management". This Guide was completed in 1958 through major contributions by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and other participating states within the Mississippi Flyway. It should be pointed out that the Wisconsin Conservation Department, in cooperation with the Bureau's Flyway representative, devoted a great deal of time to this project and took the leading role in preparation, publication, and distribution of the Guide. Contributions were also made by the various Canadian agencies.

Since the preparation of the original Guide, important additions have been made in recommendations for quality hunting and the Council has recently prepared "The Forward Look". This report by the 1962 Planning Committee was under the chairmanship of Tom Evans. It was edited and finalized under the chairmanship of R. A. MacMullan. Copies may be obtained by writing to the Michigan Department of Conservation.

The major activity of the 1964 Planning Committee has concerned mortality and waste. Art Hawkins has summarized our efforts in the reduction of losses through lead poisoning.

Considerable attention has been devoted to the proposal for an early teal season within the Mississippi Flyway. The Council, at its August 1963 meeting voted unanimously in favor of a proposed early teal season for the fall of 1964. This recommendation was given to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries & Wildlife at the August 1963 Waterfowl Advisory Committee meeting in Washington, D. C.

At the spring meeting in Las Vegas, Nevada in March 1964, this subject again received major attention. After a motion was lost by a tie vote for requesting an early teal season in 1964, the Council approved a motion that the Technical Committee's report be accepted and that the Technical Committee and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries & Wildlife draw up detailed plans for establishing an early teal season in 1965.

In April 1964, a meeting was held at Jamestown, North Dakota, where details of the evaluation procedure were to be coordinated with the Central Flyway and Bureau personnel. Bob Jessen attended this meeting as a representative of the Technical Section of the Mississippi Flyway. The Bureau of Sport Fisheries & Wildlife informed the group that (1) the proposal had been rejected for holding an experimental teal season as proposed; (2) the Bureau will not issue a limited

number of hunting permits; (3) if they were to be issued in an unlimited supply, there would be no cuttoff date for application; (4) if a teal season were permitted without the Bureau's issuance of permits, that it would be essential to assure the Bureau that the resource would not suffer and that the evaluation feature of such a season would be retained.

As chairman of the Mississippi Flyway Council, I contacted all of the 14 states requesting their comments. Ansers were received from nine states.

(1) Request experimental teal season without restrictions on hunter participation. Kentucky, Missouri, Louisiana, Indiana, Ohio, Iowa.

(2) Restrictions on hunter participation. Minnesota, Michigan.

(3) Teal season in 1965 for Flyway. Kentucky, Missouri, Louisiana, Indiana, Minnesota, Michigan, Ohio, Mississippi, Iowa.

(4) Michigan does not have any suitable areas to allow participation. Minnesota would have many problems and questions season in Minnesota.

Proposals of Federal Bureau

The Bureau of Sports Fisheries & Wildlife, after receiving the above comments, then made the following proposals:

"1. The Bureau would furnish each state with a supply of serially numbered permits before June 1, 1965. The supply would necessarily equal anticipated duck stamp sales since we find no data on which to develop any other acceptable estimate of possible early teal season applicants.

"2. The states would publicize, setting forth the areas in the state which would be open to hunting, the requirement for a special permit, and establishing the dates within which written applications for such a permit would be accepted by the Conservation Department. The cutoff date would necessarily be three or four weeks prior to the opening date of the season.

"3. The Bureau would furnish the states a predetermined number of packets of wing collection envelopes.

"4. Although the state would proceed with the administrative details of preparing permits as applications were received, all permits and all wing collection envelopes would be held for mailing to the hunters immediately following the cutoff date.

"5. On the cutoff date, each state would determine the number of applications received and on the basis of systematic sampling plan, would distribute the wing collection envelope packets to a specific number of applicants. For example, if 5,000 applications were received, and 1,000 wing collection envelope packets were to be distributed, every fifth applicant would receive one.

"6. A minimum of two weeks prior to the opening of the season, each state would supply to the Bureau the names and addresses of those who received special blue-winged teal permits segregated by county of residence, indicating those who had been sent wing collection envelopes. Some method of automatically preparing this information as the permits are filled out should be worked out. This list

would be sampled by the Bureau to obtain names and addresses for use in conducting a kill questionnaire survey immediately following the close of the early teal season and for weighing purposes when analyzing the data. Those receiving wing collection envelopes would not be sent a kill questionnaire.

"We realize that it might be more efficient if the Bureau could assume responsibility for distributing the permits. However, the potential teal hunters equal the number of anticipated duck stamp purchases in all participating states. This could exceed 800,000 of which a substantial number could be expected to be received very close to a cutoff date. We cannot see a way to staff for a peak of this kind nor can we run the risk of being swamped with requests to a degree that hunters who applied might not get their permits back in time for the season. Sharing of this task among the states would alleviate this difficulty and we believe could be shared in this manner without an undue burden on any state."

It would appear that the ball has been thrown back in the lap of the states concerning the teal season and I believe that possibly the teal season should be evaluated as to its importance in the individual states. Actually in Indiana I rather doubt that it would be worth the work that would be involved in the permits.

Now, we may have other comments from the floor regarding the Central Flyway Council on their attitude.

MR. STEEN: Are there any comments from the floor now with respect to any or all of these reports or especially with respect to the last one? We have representatives here from the Central Flyway. Does anyone want to talk about it?

Early Blue-winged Teal Season

MR. STUART: Well, back in August of 1963 at the meeting of the Central Flyway, I think it was unanimous among the 11 states that we petitioned for a blue-winged teal season in 1964. Again in Las Vegas in 1964, because of the fact that many of the states felt that they had not had an opportunity to condition their people and that the Fish and Wildlife Service wasn't ready for it at that time, we postponed it for a year and petitioned to have it in 1965. Now there are a great many states in the Central Flyway that are interested in an early teal season, North Dakota of course, and South Dakota being two that do produce a large number of teal and due to their early migrating tendencies, the bulk of these teal are out of the state by the time the regular duck season opens, so that we feel that it is worth a try. Of course it would be on an experimental basis and we feel that a lot of good could come of having this early season.

MR. STEEN: Thank you, Mr. Stuart. Anyone else?

MR. SHIELDS: I would just like to point out that the technical committees, as I know from the Mississippi Flyway and also from the Central Flyway, have impressed the importance first of all that it is an experimental early teal season. Secondly, the number one condition which the technical committee has set up is that we assure that we don't overharvest these birds during the experimental phase of it. I think this is also one of the conditions that the Bureau placed on it in the latest correspondence, yet in the same correspondence they completely pull the rug out from anyone of protecting an oversevere harvest.

The report of the technical committees of the two Flyways were that not more than 100,000 permits be issued in the combined Mississippi and Central Flyways and

now they speak in terms of 800,000 permits. In Minnesota we can probably expect a very large share of our total duck hunters which in Minnesota is approximately 100,000 which would take advantage of an early teal season and under the proposed system in Minnesota there would be as many teal hunters in an early season as has been recommended by the technical committees for the combined Central and Mississippi Flyways. I just don't see how this Council or Association or how the Bureau can completely ignore all the conditions that the technical committee feels is necessary for an early teal season.

MR. STEEN: Thank you, Mr. Shields.

MR. ROSE (Iowa): I think the Iowa stand is known pretty well through the Mississippi Flyway. We have advocated a special teal season for about six years and constantly run into obstacles from the Bureau, primarily on this unharvested segment of our waterfowl population. We feel very strongly that this could be done and, I think, regulated as prescribed by the technical section and give our people a world of good outdoor recreation and not hurt the resource. But I am just as certain as I am standing here that the cards are stacked against us, that in 1965 we will not have a special teal season in spite of all we do to try to implement this through the Service and in lieu of that, I am going to recommend again the same stand that we took at the Las Vegas meeting--that this proposed program be abandoned and that the Service do more than just consider the possibility of increasing the framework dates of the regular season, so we can include the premigration date of the teal and allow this, a split season, with no penalty. I think that is the stand that our staff feels is something that will certainly fill the bill, allowing us to harvest some of these teal that go through our state and are produced in our state in great numbers and still not hurt the resource.

MR. STEEN: Thank you, Mr. Rose. We have among other things in the Midwest a Dove Committee and it happens that we have the chairman of that technical committee with us, Mr. Kenneth Sadler of Missouri, the Midwest Technical Dove Committee, and I think we ought to hear what that committee has learned and what they recommend and I would also like you, Kenny, to say a few words about the National Conference at Washington and if you will use no more time than necessary.

REPORT OF MIDWEST TECHNICAL DOVE COMMITTEE

MR. SADLER (Missouri): I would like to review for you briefly the substance of the material contained in the report. As I am sure most of you know, the committee was formed in 1961 at the direction of the Midwest Commissioner's Association. Kenneth Johnson of Nebraska was committee chairman during 1962 and 1963; I was elected chairman at the annual meeting in December, 1963.

Since the committee was formed, it has served several important Dove Research needs in the region. Probably the most important has been the providing of a forum where plans and programs of committee members, as well as federally coordinated programs, could be discussed and acted upon. Prior to the formation of the committee, dove researchers at the state, university and federal levels relied on chance meetings at regional or National Wildlife Conferences to discuss projects of mutual interest. Biologists in neighboring states with common interest in Dove Research were often unaware of the other's projects. Fish and Wildlife Service coordinated dove projects were made more difficult too because of the lack of opportunity to meet and counsel with a region-wide group of dove workers.

Coordination of research and management efforts under this disunited approach were difficult at best, and often virtually impossible.

It would be inaccurate to say that the formation of the committee has solved all our our Dove Research problems in the Midwest. The formation of the committee, with its annual meetings has, however, provided the opportunity for advancing a well coordinated regional dove program for a better understanding, and wiser use, of our valuable dove resource.

The Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners is to be commended for its role in establishing and supporting this committee.

It has been the purpose of the committee to focus interest, and encourage action by member states, on three primary points of Dove Research, these are:

1. Utilization by all states of a standardized system of determining annual breeding dove population levels.

2. To expand participation in a program of preseason and postseason dove banding as a means of better assessing the role of hunting as a mortality factor in doves.

3. To encourage participation by member states in a study of the distribution and virulence of the disease trichomoniasis in doves.

The report summarizes the results of work on these studies as well as the results of projects of a specialized nature.

The report was made possible by the forwarding of information by state and federal personnel to the committee chairman. I would like to acknowledge their fine cooperation.

I will say no more about the Midwest Committee report. This is the report. There are some copies in the room. Those of you interested in Dove Research throughout the Midwest are urged to take a copy. Copies have been sent to the individual states.

One further comment that I would like to make on a brief report of the status of the dove within the U. S. This was the subject of a meeting that was held June 25 in Washington, D. C. of this year and this is a summary of this report; the association president received a copy of this a few days ago.

The 1964 mourning dove breeding population index which was obtained from 786 comparable survey routes in the U. S. showed an increase in the dove population of about eight percent over 1963. Changes in the breeding dove population in '63 and '64 by management units or flyways are: Eastern Unit up 10 percent, Central Unit up four percent and Western Unit up 21 percent. The population change that occurred last year was a 1.2 percent decline.

I am sure all of you by now have received the framework for the dove seasons for this year. My understanding is that as a result of this meeting in Washington on June 25, there has been an extension in the seasons and bag limits in all of the three management units. The Eastern Management Unit will enjoy 70 consecutive half days or an option of 70 days with three openings. The hours are the same. The limit will be 12, that is daily, and 24 in possession. The Central Management

Unit will enjoy 70 consecutive full days with an option of three straight openings. The hours will be the same, daily bag limit will be 12 and the possession limit will be 24. The Western Management Unit will enjoy the same general increase from ten last year to 12 this year and the possession limit instead of 20 as it was last year will be 24.

Thank you.

MR. STEEN: Thank you. We also have a technical committee known as the Midwest Pheasant Council which does a considerable amount of work in the field of pheasant management. I don't know that they are represented here. I am sure the chairman isn't here, but they did send in a couple of resolutions which were considered by your resolutions committee with the conclusion that the subject matter was not actually something on which this body should act, but rather something on which a report should be made to the body as is made by all the technical committees we have working in the field of fish and game management. (See Appendix for Pheasant Council Report and proposed resolutions.)

MIDWEST PHEASANT COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS

So I am going to briefly tell you about these four resolutions, but tell you in the nature of a poet as to what the Midwest Pheasant Council recommends.

The first one, of course, revolves around the question of production and it is a well known fact, I think, in the industry, that our problem in wildlife management is not the problem of control of harvest as most people assume, particularly the lay public, but it is a problem of production and of increasing production. No one has ever produced one pheasant and one quail and one buck deer by bagging alone. He has only controlled the harvest of those individuals and those populations which were produced under the environment that exists and the question of production is the big problem in our business, particularly as it relates to farm game. This particular resolution is on the subject of roadside cover and it is true in most of these states that a considerable number of our pheasants are produced on the roadside and in the roadside ditches and that the mowing of these ditches early in the year eliminates or largely eliminates that production so it is the resolution that the mowing of the ditches themselves--not the shoulders, but the ditches themselves--be delayed until later in the year.

Now, in our state we come and ask each year. We circularize or write to each county or road district and to the state road district asking them to delay mowing of the ditches until after the 4th of July in order to give the birds a chance to come on. To give you some indication of the significance of trying to conserve nesting cover for the pheasants in the prime pheasant range of the nation, we had last year completed a nine-year study on production of pheasants in our state, with a net result that the average success of our nesting hens during that period was 39 percent. Sixty-one percent of our hens failed to ever produce a brood for the principal reason that nesting environment or nesting cover was so hazardous they couldn't get the job done and the evidence is very strong that probably our principal problem at least in the Great Plains, in the production of this great game species is our inability--or ability if you want to put it that way--to maintain sufficient acreage, of securing our undisturbed nesting cover for these birds.

The second has to do with the use of this resource and this resolution relates to the harvest of the cock birds. I mentioned this morning what we are doing in Nebraska. I think what we are doing in Nebraska is true throughout the entire Midwest area. The lay public in general assumes that the management of the pheasant is exactly the same problem as the management of any other species and the concept is most common that the only thing that is important in the management of any of these wildlife resources is how long the season is and how big the bag limit is and this is not necessarily true. It is certainly not true in the management of the pheasant as it exists today in this region because, as I pointed out this morning, from management point of view a cock season is approximately as good, if not better, than a closed season. It has nothing to do with the fertility and the production of chicks the following spring and the net result of a restrictive season in terms of length and bag is point one. You handicap your good hunters, as I pointed out this morning, in order to reduce your seasons and bags to the capabilities of your less efficient hunters and in our case instead of sending 40 percent of the cocks down the rat hole, we would be sending 70 percent or 80 percent down the rat hole and this is a sheer waste of harvestable resource because 90 percent of our cocks can be safely harvested and 40 to 70 percent of the hens could be harvested. Today we are harvesting 60 percent of our hens and nothing of the balance of this resource.

SUMMARY OF RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED

Then we have the big question of resolutions and a report by the Resolutions Committee. May I say that we have some 16 or 17 resolutions and more are coming in each day. I will skim through them briefly. If you have any idea with respect to them or if you have something you would like to add, we would like to hear from you.

The first resolution No. One is on water pollution control and supports S. 649 which is the bill that has been in Congress for some time on this subject and which sets up an independent agency, so to speak, in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Two is a resolution on the Firearms Control Legislation. I think this is all old hat to most of you. You're familiar with that problem.

Three has to do with Local Contributions at Federal Reservoirs and I think it is important because it involves legislation which is now in Congress, in the hopper at Congress, specifically H. R. 9032.

Four, a resolution that you will want to consider. It is a resolution which asks the president of this group to recommend to the President of the United States the nomination and appointment of Seth Gordon and Ross Leffler as members of the Federal Public Lands Review Commission. Several of the others, at least one or two of the other regional associations, are already on record. I think the International is already on the record in this respect, but it is proposed that the Midwest also go on record in favor of the appointment of these two gentlemen to that committee.

Five is one you will hear more about. It is a resolution on the subject of chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides. It asks the Secretary of Agriculture to withdraw the registration for the manufacture and sale of chlorinated hydrocarbons as agricultural insecticides.

I might talk briefly to the subject. The truth of the matter is that chlorinated hydrocarbons are poisons which have certain definite characteristics that are highly hazardous to the environment, the American environment, and the life that lives in it, and these characteristics are residual and cumulative. They are long lasting. They are highly stable compounds. I can illustrate how stable by pointing out that very recently a test was made of chlorinated hydrocarbon used in the control of termites around a building foundation where the soil was impregnated with this poison for the purpose of controlling termites, which it does very well. Incidentally, this is one use that I, at least, think is proper for this set of poisons. Fourteen years ago this poison was put in place under test. Very recently there was the determination that as far as could be ascertained that toxin was exactly the same today as when it was put in place 14 years ago. The second thing I want to point out is the cumulative effect of this thing. I remember the case of Big Bear Lake where in the process of going through the food chain, a poison we call--toxothaene I call it, was sprayed at a level of two-tenths of one part per million. It wound up in the plankton at a level of 200 parts per million and incidentally killed them and it wound up in the pelican that ate the fish at 1700 parts per million. This is an accumulation of something like 8500 times. In fact the concentration in the pelican was 8500 times as high as the level at which the poison was put on the environment.

Now, there is a great deal of concern among thinking people and among scientists with respect to this particular group of poisons. It has these characteristics--the poison is uncontrollable and you don't know when they are going to kill nor what they are going to kill. There are plenty of good insecticides on the market which can be used for the control of agricultural pests without incurring this extremely high hazard that we face. It is my personal opinion, gentlemen, that in the case of chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides, at least, that the American environment is being used as a testing lab and that the life that lives in it, including you and me, are the guinea pigs that are being used to determine exactly what will happen and when it will happen with respect to the use of these toxins and I think the time has come to call a halt.

Resolution Six has to do with the subject we discussed this morning which is that of federal aid the the techniques and procedures under which we operate.

Resolution Seven has to do with Predator and Rodent Control and it simply supports the report of the committee on this subject, but asks that there be included in that report also the elimination of the cyanide gun from the devices or control arsenal that is used in the control of predators.

Resolution Nine is on the Wilderness Bill. You are all familiar with that, simply a support of that bill.

Number Ten is a resolution on the subject of Wetland Preservation and particularly on the subject of legislation which attempts to overcome the objection of the state on the ground that land is being taken out of taxation and supports the legislation which gives the county of the state 25 percent of the revenue or three-quarters of one percent of the adjusted value of the land in lieu of taxes.

Number Eleven has to do with the National Watershed Congress which Mr. Evans talked about earlier this afternoon.

Number Twelve is a resolution on mourning doves.

Number Thirteen has to do with channelization of streams and its effect upon the stream bed itself leading to fast drain-off of tributary water, causing elimination of wildlife, and destruction of recreational areas, and recommends that certain action be taken in that field.

Number Fifteen here which has to do with the Dingell-Johnson and Pittman-Robertson programs. I would like to read one paragraph from that. "Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Midwest Association of Fish, Game and Conservation Commissioners hereby express its belief and conviction that the excise taxes which support these important programs should be continued; and Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be wired to the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee."

Then we have a couple of other resolutions which have come in this afternoon and I haven't had a chance nor the committee had a chance to review them and I am not going to present them at this time.

I learned that Governor Reynolds is in the audience right now and it seems expedient and honorable that we hear from him at this time.

If the Governor will come forward, it will be my pleasure.

MR. STEEN: It will be my pleasure to present the Governor of the great State of Wisconsin and I don't know what he is going to talk about, but I am sure it is going to be very interesting and very constructive because the State of Wisconsin has a very, very far-reaching and far-seeing program in this field of ours.

Governor Reynolds.

GOVERNOR JOHN W. REYNOLDS

GOVERNOR REYNOLDS: Thank you, Mr. Steen and friends.

It is indeed a pleasure to welcome you to Wisconsin. I want to especially welcome our friends from Ontario and our friends from Manitoba as well as our sister states. I think one of the great values in a conference of this type is that we can all get together and learn from each other. I have been especially impressed with the work going on in Canada. In many ways I hope you can learn something from Wisconsin, but I think the Canadians have benefitted from some of our mistakes.

Many years ago I drove from Toronto to the North Bay of Ontario. I was impressed with the tremendous highways that were built in Canada, the interstate type of highways going into the resort area. We are still trying to do this in Wisconsin. We haven't quite succeeded yet, but we are working on it and I took a great circular route around Lake Superior and I want my friends from Ontario to know that when I stopped with my wife and family on the shores of Lake Superior, they had not only the kindling wood but even the twigs whittled down for wieners. I don't know if we do it in our parks.

VOICE: We do it, Governor.

GOVERNOR REYNOLDS: So I am sure we all can benefit by an exchange of views and ideas and programs that we in Wisconsin, I hope, that our department is

bringing a contribution. I am personally proud of our Conservation Department. I believe it is one of the best in the country. I won't say it is the best; I don't want to hurt anybody's feelings, but the fact is we have had a Conservation Department for over a half a century and it has been a career department and it is under civil service and I think it has attracted undoubtedly some very high caliber people.

In our state we are doing everything humanly possible to preserve our natural resources. Under Governor Nelson's administration, we passed a program which makes it possible for us to buy lands on a pay-as-you-go basis and we hope to spend about 50 million dollars, not quite 50 million dollars on a ten-year recreational program to preserve the national resources of our state and I assume there has been some discussion on it. If there hasn't been, I am trying to answer questions on it. The program is moving forward. It is a practical matter. One of the problems is that the program isn't moving as forward as rapidly as our population grows so our facilities are being--our present facilities are being overtaxed from the point of use and it is pretty hard to make sure you have enough money to buy the natural resources without developing the ones that you already have and this is a practical problem that we have in Wisconsin and we solve it the best we can. We don't want the whole program to go down the drain, we need further development, but at the same time, we have to provide for the needs of our people.

Our population, which is true of the other states and Canada, has grown very rapidly in a short period of time. The birth rate has gone up from 60,000 babies a year to 100,000 a year and you can see the milk is pretty good. It is a good dairy state in Wisconsin and we have increased our population from three and one-half million to four million in the short period of a decade and that has taxed our Conservation Department as well as our other agencies of the state government.

We have tried to solve the problem by advocating a program of borrowing money to purchase these lands. In Wisconsin we have a prohibition against going into debt, but the lawyers are very ingenious men and they have figured out ways to get around that. I, being a lawyer, I understand what they have done. We have building corporations and we borrow money and that way we don't go into debt. Well, anyway, we don't want to and we have had a program to borrow the money to buy the lands to preserve them.

I feel this is essential because the fact is that during the last six years, the value of land in the Kettle Moraine Forest which is near here, near Milwaukee, has gone up 150 percent in a matter of six year. My ancestors homesteaded up in Door County, which is on the shores of Lake Michigan, and the lands up there since have moved from ten dollars a front foot to thirty-five dollars a front foot on the lake in a relatively short period of time, in 14 years. So we have embarked upon a program which we hope to sell to the Legislature and the people and I hope it will be adopted in the next session whether I am governor or not. I hope they adopt it to make it possible to acquire our natural resources while they are still available.

I think it is true in the United States and Canada we are truly developing an undeveloped nation. I was in the Scandinavian countries a few months ago and Germany a year before. Basically they have a developed society, people having lived there for obviously thousands of years and the forestry and everything is very well developed and you can't help but be impressed about it.

Out here in the United States and Canada we are working on undeveloped land and resources and we, fortunately for our descendants, are in a position to guide

the development of natural resources if we are but willing to make the effort. In Wisconsin we are willing to make the effort and our Conservation Department is leading them and I am proud of them and I hope the Wisconsin people here today (as you sit around and like Miller beer, I do--all politicians in Wisconsin like beer) as you sit around, I hope that the Wisconsin fellows and ladies will talk about our program because I think it is well worth studying and likewise I am sure that we will talk about your programs and I am sure your programs are well worth studying.

In conclusion I want you to know that I do appreciate your coming to our state and if there is anything we can do to make your stay more pleasant than it is, don't hesitate to contact Les Voigt or me or any other fellows. We want you to enjoy yourselves as well as learn a little bit about each other.

Thank you very much.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND BILL

MR. STEEN: Thank you, Governor Reynolds. I would like to call to your attention the fact that certain legislation which is in my opinion at least as important as any legislation that has been enacted since the Dingell-Johnson Acts were passed for the National Congress, a certain piece of legislation known as the Land-Water Conservation Fund Bill, H. R. 3846 and if you don't have that number, please write it down, H. R. 3846, the Land and Water Conservation Bill which is very important to all of us because it provides among other things, grants-in-aid to be used in this program and in all the outdoor recreation efforts of the state. It will be up for very important consideration in the House of Representatives next week. The bill will be debated on the 22nd of July; that is a week from this Wednesday and it will be voted on the 23rd of July, a week from this Thursday and what happens to it in the House next week will decide probably for good and all the fate of this very important measure and I can assure you that if the House passes this bill, we will have no problems in the Senate. I repeat, it is extremely important legislation, the most important legislation I say since the enactment of the Federal Aid Bills and I want to urge strongly that every state, the director of each state or the representative of that state immediately get in touch with each and every congressman, I mean the members of the House of Representatives, and urge them to support this bill without crippling amendments.

There will be efforts made to write in amendments which will cripple it very, very seriously. I would like to urge upon you and ask you to make this a first order of business which is probably the most important thing that this conference can do while it is in session here. If you don't get it done while you're here, for goodness sake do it when you get back home this weekend. Most of your congressmen will be back home this weekend because they are now attending the shindig out in San Francisco and they don't go to work until next Monday and so they will probably be at home this weekend. Get in touch with them by telephone, by telegram, or any means you can and urge upon them the importance of this measure and the reasons why they should support it.

Thank you, gentlemen. You are adjourned.

(Hearing adjourned until July 14)

Tuesday Morning Session, July 14

MR. SCOTT: Good morning, everybody. Now, this morning we have another general chairman, Jim Shields of Minnesota, who has been working with South Dakota. I don't know why he left there, but anyhow one state's loss is another state's gain. I hope to get to know Jim better before this meeting is over. That is one thing these meetings are for.

I would like to turn this meeting over to our general chairman this morning who will announce the panels and call attention to the various parts of the program. Thank you very much, Jim, you take over.

MR. SHIELDS (Minnesota): Thank you, Walt. It is my honor to be serving as chairman today. I know that the people that you are going to be hearing from today have spent a lot of time and effort on their subjects and I know that they are all subjects in which we are vitally interested.

I am going to introduce Harry Ruhl, who needs no introduction, and he will take charge and introduce the other members of the panel. Harry.

PANEL ON RELATION OF MIDWEST WILDLIFE CONFERENCE TO THE ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND GAME COMMISSIONERS

MR. RUHL: I am glad that Mr. Shields confirmed that the other people did a lot of work on this program, and this question has come up before--the relationship of the Midwest Wildlife Conference and the Association--so that various people have had some time to think about it. The members of the Midwest Wildlife Conference were alerted last meeting by Bill Towell so they certainly will have some ideas and I think that the panel pretty well represents a cross-section of the people. It might be interesting.

Now, I think we should go ahead by having each member present the material that he has and save your questions to the last unless you think they are so important that they can't wait; but don't forget them. Now, it seems to me that this question of the relationship of the two organizations does not cover the ground of these other organizations which are of interest to the Association, and where a good many of the people making up those groups are actually employees of the various departments.

For example, the Mississippi Flyway Council is not really a child of this organization, but it is of the International. The Pheasant Council was organized and was a creation of the Association. I don't know that the Association gave a very clear idea of what they expect the council to do except to go and talk about pheasants and tell them what we ought to do. I suppose that is about it. That is good enough. There are some other groups that are of a somewhat similar nature. Some of them are really relationships to the International, such as the Education Association, the people of Information and Education, Law Enforcement, the Dove Conference and many others. It is really a problem as to how to organize all of these and let them go their way if they are going in the right direction. The question is how to get the most out of the money and the manpower and the time--

and what I mean is, most from the lowest technical worker in the organization--I mean the youngest up to the oldest and most feeble administrator. I think I could compete for that title perhaps.

The real question is how to get communications, meeting of the minds, and discussions and decisions in an orderly manner and to see that it is done in such a way that neither the initiative of the most enthusiastic newcomer is dampened nor that they start to pass resolutions and embarrass the administrators. I think it might be all right to embarrass administrators in their presence, but when not here, they might be sensitive about it. That is the real question and it involves more than just the two groups and I think the speakers will cover that situation.

You will notice that Bill Towell is the director. He has been to the meetings a few times at least, but I suspect he usually was not present--you all know Bill.

Ed Schneberger is kind of an in-between here. He has probably been to all the meetings. He probably considers himself one of the moving people in the Wildlife Conference. I think he is, but he is in between the group that is the largest group in that organization and the administrative group.

To me, Tony Peterle is kind of a hybrid. He is young and has got ideas, of course. He started down in research in the state. He has gone up and now is connected with a university and so he is an outsider in a sense. He is not particularly bound by anything that we would do nor would anything we say have any influence anyhow because we don't pay him. We don't have too much to say except in the way of persuasion and we ought to get a viewpoint from the people who are teaching and training the people that the states employ. That might be quite different than the interest or attitude--point of view--of the administrators. Without more comments, I will call on Bill Towell of Missouri who will start off.

MR. TOWELL: Thank you, Harry. I was hoping you would say more with regard to this proposal because in looking over the panel members this morning, I have a hunch that I am the lone proponent of this subject and facing two opponents. I was counting on you, Harry, to give us the balance on the panel so perhaps in your later remarks you can back me up.

MR. SHIELDS: I figured two to one are good odds.

MR. TOWELL: Well, fine.

PROPOSES JOINT MEETINGS

If this is a worn out subject and you are sick of arguing the issue, blame me. I wouldn't let a sleeping dog lie and had to push the controversy into the open again. Last December the Midwest Wildlife Conference was held in St. Louis and in my welcoming speech I had this to say:

". . . As biologists it is your job to furnish facts. Administrators and commissions must apply these facts through information, education and regulation. Both jobs cannot move at the same pace--but both must travel in the same direction.

It is better to make no progress than to go backward. The biologist must be tolerant of the speed with which his ideas become accepted. The administrator may be sold on the biological soundness of a proposal, while recognizing the time as not right for public acceptance or effective application. Although you must accept delay in putting many of your findings into action, you have a right to expect administration not to violate these findings. There is little excuse, not even political pressure, that would justify administrators going contrary to proven biological facts. Each must complement the other, the biologist and the administrator, and neither can stand alone.

"This brings me to a point which I know will be controversial, but which I feel compelled to make. The Midwest Wildlife Conference started out as a biologists' conference and has remained in that condition. (I have been a conservation director for seven years and this is the first one I have attended, the one in St. Louis.) Ed Schneberger, in a paper in 1961 on the 'Origin and Traditions of the Midwest Wildlife Conference,' quotes Dr. Frison of the Illinois Natural History Survey as follows: '. . . This was essentially a fish and game clinic at which scientists from all north central states, without being dominated by administrators or the political type of conservationists, freely discussed wildlife management in an effort to winnow out the chaff from the wheat, to coordinate such researches and to orient scientific studies of wildlife resources in such a way that demonstrable sound management practices would result.'

"Without being dominated by administrators or the political type of conservationists. Fellows, administrators are a necessary evil but we're here to stay. The public is here to stay, too, and don't overlook something: only a single promotion stands between you as a biologist and you as a wildlife administrator. We don't want to dominate but we do have to learn your theories if we are going to apply them. Absence of administrators at your conferences may be your gain in peace of mind, but it's <u>our</u> loss. I think we can sit down together to discuss wildlife without handicap to each other, and with considerable gain in understanding.

"The Midwest Association of Game and Fish Commissioners meets once a year, too. We discuss policies, finances, legislation and all the other facets of getting your programs into operation. We would profit by your being there and you would be welcome.

"So I propose we get together. Let's follow the example of the Western and Southeastern Associations, who both hold conventions as big as the North American or the International. Each group, biologist and administrator, could schedule executive sessions so that exchange of information between those with related responsibilities would continue. I think, too, that it would be advantageous to the Game Law Enforcement officer or the Information and Education man to hear what you have to say about research in wildlife management.

"I realize that this consolidation could be brought about quite easily by directive from some ten or twelve fish and game directors. But this is not how it should be accomplished. We should both realize benefits of the merger and work enthusiastically to make it succeed. Think about it. The idea has merit--perhaps more is to be gained by the administrator than the biologist, but both should profit. I will propose the same idea to the Midwest Association when we meet next summer. . ."

That statement at St. Louis was not intended to include all my arguments for a joint session, but I did want to challenge that group. My efforts must

have been successful or we would not be discussing this topic today. Now that we're into it, let's look at the issue further.

Believes Larger Meeting More Effective

First of all, I think the Midwest Association is missing the boat. We may prefer our small select group discussing vital issues common to us all, but we don't make much noise or attract much attention. The Western and Southeastern Associations make us look rather puny. They attract big name speakers, make news with their sessions and their resolutions, and attract hundreds of people to our dozens. Some of this I have observed firsthand because Missouri officially belongs to the Southeastern and the Midwestern. I have also observed how much more strongly these other regional fish and game associations are organized and how they exert a unified power in the International. Maybe this isn't good, but it's a fact.

What's to keep the biologist or the conservation officer or the administrator from having his own separate session during one big Midwestern meeting? We are not separate entities but all one agency for conservation in each state. A good administrator will not monopolize these sessions involving his own staff specialists. But, he needs to know more about what they are doing and saying. And, frankly, I think some of their sessions may be improved by more administrative direction or influence.

I see two major problems resulting from combined sessions; one is a matter of when to hold the meeting and the other is the likelihood of reduced overall attendance. Personally, I do not care when the meeting is held, but it would not be difficult to improve on either of the present schedules. Mid-July is not the best meeting time of the year, but it certainly beats mid-December, just before the Christmas rush and Yuletide poverty. But, if this stands in the way of integration, I would even vote for December.

The second problem is more difficult. We could hardly justify sending everyone to one big meeting. Somebody has to stay home and run the business. I must admit that fewer persons probably would participate in one session than now regularly attend the Midwest Association, the Midwest Wildlife Conference, and the Midwest Law Enforcement groups. But, maybe we're sending too many people to too many meetings. As public agencies, perhaps it is time we slowed down on out-of-state meetings. It might help for attendance to be harder to come by and maybe even reserved as a reward for good job performance. We may have more people participating in regional resource groups now than we would under a merger, but I believe our sessions would be livelier, more stimulating, attract more attention, and better serve our resource management responsibilities with one big Midwestern meeting instead of the fragmented groups.

Every professional man has two allegiances--one to his profession and another to his job. The two are not the same, yet they cannot be entirely disassociated. If a biologist or a forester or a game warden wants to be associated only with his own group to speak as a professional and not as a representative of his employer, he should participate at his own expense in a professional society. If his employer is paying the bill, perhaps there is some justification for "domination by administrators or the political type of conservationists".

So much for argument. It never solves anything, anyway! I would be neglecting my responsibilities if I did not offer a solution for the problem I

have raised. After all, isn't 99 percent of the administrator's job the application of compromise? Fellow administrators, I propose that we join the biologists. Let's schedule our next session with the Midwest Wildlife Conference. In fact, both the Western and Southeastern Associations hold a separate directors' meeting at about a six-month interval from the annual conference. Once we join forces we can consider altering the dates. But let's start adding emphasis to the Midwestern Wildlife Conference. By all means, each director should go, and in no time at all we'll be integrated. I think it's worth a try.

MR. SHIELDS: The next presentation will be by Ed Schneberger of Wisconsin, and I think it would be best if we hold the questions to the last, but we certainly shouldn't forget them, but write them down. There are some things we ought to challenge or question or approve.

Ed, will you carry on?

MR. SCHNEBERGER: Mr. Chairman and members of the association and guests.

ON THE MATTER OF COMBINED MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION AND MIDWEST WILDLIFE CONFERENCE

The suggestion that the Association and the Midwest Wildlife Conference meetings be merged is one that needs careful analysis and evaluation before conclusions are drawn as to the proper disposal of the question. It is gratifying to note that administrators are desirous of knowing more about the work of the biologists and technicians. After all, the administrator is responsible for the funds to do the work, and subsequently, must make decisions as to the acceptance and application of the findings. However, is a merger of the two meetings the best way to accomplish the desired objective? This question in turn raises other questions:

1. Are the two meetings compatible?

2. What sacrifices will have to be made to accomplish the objective?

3. Will the quality of the program of each be improved or decreased?

4. Will the opportunity for staff members in the lower echelons to attend meetings be improved or decreased?

5. Will administrators be interested in listening to highly technical or detailed reports; and by the same token, will the biologist be interested in discussions of administrative problems?

6. In the adjustment of the joint meeting program to hold the interest of both groups, would the end result be a "watering down" of both programs?

7. Would a merger decrease or encourage academic institutional participation? The Wildlife Conference has in the past, provided an excellent meeting ground for state and federal agencies with university personnel.

Although I have my own personal views on the suggestion, I see no point of making an issue or controversy out of the suggestion. Instead, there should be a

thorough analysis made of each organization, followed by an evaluation of the objectives and accomplishments of each; after which, the available facts should dictate the course of action.

Let us now examine both organizations and attempt to arrive at a clear understanding of each. To facilitate this comparison, I have listed what I consider to be the salient points of each in paralleled columns:

Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners	Midwest Wildlife Conference
Objectives	
1. Uniform game laws	1. Conduct a fish and game clinic
2. Gather and disseminate information	2. Coordinate research
3. Cooperate in research	3. Orient scientific studies to management needs
4. Support U. S. Dept. of Interior in an extension program and cooperate in establishing migratory bird sanctuaries	4. Teach and learn
5. Assist Fish and Wildlife Service in waterfowl regulations	5. Encourage students and recruits
6. Cooperate with fisheries	6. Test new theories and philosophies
7. Encourage and assist conservation organizations (or better public relations)	7. Present new research findings
Membership	
States and provinces (represented by duly authorized representative (s))	No formal membership, but meetings are attended by biologists, technicians, and managers from State Conservation Depts., Universities and Colleges, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service and Corps of Engineers
Officers	
President, Vice-President, Secretary-Treasurer, and Board of Directors (One year terms)	None (Host has the responsibility of arranging the meeting and preparing the program)
Dues	
$35.00 per year by state or province	None

Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners	Midwest Wildlife Conference
Publications	
Proceedings of annual meeting	None (Speakers may distribute mimeographed copies of talks. Host may provide abstracts of papers on program)
Meetings	
Annual	Annual
Special meetings may be called by Board of Directors	No special meetings
Date of Annual Meeting	
Range from June to October (Recently held in July)	Usually early December
Associated Meetings	
	North Central Division of AFS, Wildlife Society, Flyway Council and Great Lakes Committees
Attendance at Annual Meetings	
Usually less than 100	300 - 600
Benefits	
Improves interstate cooperation and better understanding of state problems	In-service training - gives new personnel opportunity to gain experience in presenting reports
Improves national-state relationship	Informal exchange of information and ideas on Fish and Wildlife research
Provides better cooperation on federal programs	Opportunity to interview new graduates of institutions for employment
Assists federal legislation and regulation	Gives workers opportunity to discuss mutual problems with colleagues of other agencies
Provides better understanding of mutual problems and disseminates latest information	
Coordinates activities with International Association	
Merging*	
Advantages	**Disadvantages**
Give administrators and biologists a better opportunity to become acquainted	Reduce attendance - (Would favor the administrator over the biologist)

Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners

Midwest Wildlife Conference

Merging* (Cont.)

Advantages	Disadvantages
Give administrators opportunity to acquire knowledge of work in progress	Reduce time available for discussion
Give administrators opportunity to express needs from research	Might require formalization of Midwest Conference
One less meeting to plan and arrange	Areas (state and provinces) included not identical
	Disrupt sequence of place of meeting
	Time of meeting might be difficult to establish - (In summer administration is usually free of legislative session and other administrative functions demanding presence at home, while biologists are involved with field work)
	Might significantly alter type of program for both

(*The views presented here are entirely those of the author, and are in no way intended to reflect the official opinion of either organization.)

There are a number of other organized groups related to conservation in the Midwest, and it might be well to take a look at these as to their function and objectives. It might be possible that some of the groups would be sufficiently compatible so that some mergers would be advantageous. No attempt has been made by me to analyze or evaluate these groups, and I have no recommendations other than to suggest a review. Neither is the attached list intended to be a complete listing of existing organizations.

Some Other Midwest Conservation Organizations

Conservation Business Management Association
Association of Midwest Fish and Game Law Enforcement Officers
Association of Conservation Engineers
Midwest Pheasant Council
Midwest Benthological Society
Tri-State Fishery Conference
Upper Mississippi River Conservation Committee
Mississippi Flyway Council
National Prairie Grouse Technical Council
Northern Great Lakes Area Council
North Central Division American Fisheries Society
Great Lakes Fishery Commission
Great Lakes Big Game Group
Midwest Technical Mourning Dove Committee
Midwest Section Wildlife Society

A few additional statements on attendance seem to be appropriate. Unfortunately attendance at all meetings or conferences is viewed by some as being a junket, and perhaps there may be some basis for such a view in some instances. However, my association with the Midwest Wildlife Conference convinces me that the participants come to learn and teach, therefore, I believe it is a very hard working Conference. Naturally there is always some occasion for fun, but it is at a minimum. Although I am not as intimately acquainted with the Midwest Association, I am confident that a similar behavior pattern is displayed. At least I have never heard of any reports or rumors to the contrary.

Nevertheless, regardless of the value and importance of either meeting, a problem of authorized attendance to both meetings, be they in-state or out-of-state, is ever present. This problem undoubtedly faces all participating agencies of each group. In Wisconsin, executive approval is necessary if more than one person is to officially attend an out-of-state meeting. This is not always easy to obtain. Even when meetings are held in-state, not every individual desiring to attend gets to do so. This is true of this meeting as it was necessary to limit attendance. Someone has to stay home to tend the store. Our department has, therefore, evolved a plan whereby attendance at meetings is on a somewhat informal rotation basis so that the more deserving employees are given an occasional opportunity to attend meetings, particularly out-of-state meetings. In addition, authorization is frequently granted in recognition of good performance as well as the opportunity for certain individuals to become more proficient in their work. Conversely, denial may be made on the basis of poor performance.

In the case of the Midwest Wildlife Conference, it is common for some people to attend on their own initiative and at their own expense; especially if the Conference is nearby. This, however, does raise other problems in that some employees feel that if they are willing to go at their own expense, they should not be penalized by loss of vacation time and industrial compensation coverage in case of an accident. No doubt each agency faces similar questions and problems peculiar to its own legal authority and regulations. However, I believe that all agencies are faced with the problem of the number of authorized delegates they may send to any given meeting.

Would a merger of the two groups alleviate the problem of the number of authorized delegates to the meeting, or would the problems of attendance be greater? No doubt the situation would differ with each agency, but I suspect that the overall result would be that there would be a general decrease in opportunity for attendance by the biologists and technicians.

In concluding my remarks, I wish to point out that I have attempted to look at both sides of the picture as an administrator as well as a biologist. My training is in biology, but the major part of my professional career has been devoted to administration. Even so, it is very likely that my views and opinions favor the Midwest Wildlife Conference as my association has been greater with this group than with the Association. I do not, however, propose to speak for the Midwest Wildlife Conference as I have had little opportunity to discuss this proposal with representatives of other states. Consequently, if the Association is seriously considering the proposal of merging the two meetings, I offer the following recommendations:

1. A joint committee composed of an equal number of representatives of each group be appointed to further evaluate the work of each and determine if the benefits and advantages of a merger would outweigh the disadvantages.

2. If a merger is deemed to be of benefit, the same joint committee recommend the procedure that should be followed in accomplishing the merger and recommend the format of holding meetings of the combined groups in the future.

3. The joint committee report findings and recommendations at the next annual meeting of each organization.

I think that concludes my remarks.

MR. RUHL: I don't think that the arrangers of the program intend to put the people most interested in the Midwest Wildlife Conference at a disadvantage because often the good things come last. We will now hear from Tony Peterle whom I am sure has very definite and very positive ideas on the subject. At least, I hope he has.

MR. PETERLE: Thank you, Mr. Ruhl. Members of the Association: I was interested in Mr. Ruhl's initial comments and he being an old time administrator made a slip of saying the lowest technician man and I think I will remind him of that as he attends these meetings.

ADVOCATES SEPARATE MEETINGS

To those of you who are seeing clearly this morning, I should appear as a person with two heads, for as the old Indian saying goes, I shall speak with a forked tongue. The question of whether or not to combine this meeting with the Midwest Wildlife Conference deserves considerable thought for the latter is a flourishing institution of nearly 29 years and gives every indication of a long, healthy life. I must admit to considerable prejudice and biases since my experience with the Midwest Wildlife Conference has been longer, while this is only my second Association meeting.

I first participated in the Wildlife Conference as a student, then as a state game biologist, later as an employee of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service and now as a university faculty member. In all these capacities, the meetings were most beneficial and I personally felt them very worthwhile. The quality of the presentations at the Midwest Wildlife Conference has always been very good and there is constant improvement in their technical excellence without loss of the spontaneity that makes the meeting successful. Many of you, I am sure, need no introduction to the Midwest Wildlife Conference, for some have supported the meeting by their attendance for a long time. There might be someone here who attended the first meeting in Illinois nearly 28 years ago.

The informal atmosphere of the Wildlife Conference was mentioned as an important asset by Dr. Schneberger on the occasion of the 25th Anniversary of the conference, but I find it a little frustrating to recall an important biological contribution and then be unable to find a record of the information. Recent innovations by the host states in printing the abstracts in a little booklet is an excellent way of putting a brief resume of the program on record without undue editorial effort and high printing costs. The general willingness of attending members to present and discuss new thoughts and preliminary results also makes the conference stimulating. What I am saying to many of you who already know is that the Midwest Wildlife Conference is a very successful meeting

and I have serious doubts about instituting a change that might alter the components that are so well matched to provide high fidelity discussion with reproductible results for over 25 years.

But, there could be some beneficial aspects of combining the two meetings. Speaking from my vast experience of 1 and 2/3 meetings of the Midwest Association, I feel there would be a certain amount of hybrid vigor produced by a cross fertilization. Many of you should get to know your biologists more informally and there is nothing better as a catalyst than 300 or 400 miles of icy, snowy roads in December to form some sort of camaraderie between the occupants of the same car. It would also be cheaper since more aircraft flights are canceled in the winter and no one wants to stop and sightsee at 20° below. Besides, as many of us have experienced before, Christmas comes on the heels of the Midwest and everyone is short of cash, so trips are kept at a minimum. I would certainly hope that if consideration is given to combining the two meetings that attendance would not be restricted by state regulations, for by pulling rank, the administrators might then dominate the meeting. Frankly this would, in my mind, completely alter the complexion of the Midwest Wildlife Conference and hence for me the value of attending would be decreased. How the matter of attendance could be handled is critical to the consideration of this matter and each agency should evaluate the problems this might entail.

The biologists, who according to Mr. Towell, are tomorrow's administrators, would gain some appreciation of the workings of resolutions committees and how decisions are made. It might also be beneficial to have a biological opinion concerning some of the resolutions that are made by your committees. The field biologist might also feel more inclined to strongly support these resolutions if they were more informed about the complete situation. They might even come up with some ideas of their own, for all are not completely naive about people problems and politics. The step from biologist to administrator might also be smoother with some experience on committees of the Midwest Association.

Speaking as a neophyte member of the academic world, the informality of the Midwest Wildlife Conference allows our students to freely mix with the practicing biologists, permits a place to meet prospective advanced graduate students and by participating in the meeting it keeps our teaching program somewhat in step with actual field conditions. We are training students to be hired by your agencies so a combination of these two meetings might also be beneficial to the university people in attendance. We would like to hear from you about the kinds of employees needed and the academic programs that might produce these people. Suggestions for possible avenues of needed research might also be gleaned from bull sessions over a coffee cup or a mug of beer.

These then are some of the benefits that might accrue if the two meetings are combined. The Midwest Wildlife Conference might very well be of marriageable age but as an interested bystander I would violently object when during the ceremony the preacher says "If any man can show just cause why these two should not be joined let him speak now or forever hold his peace." My objections might be stilled if there was a definite assurance that such a union would not produce a two-headed monster.

Thank you.

MR. RUHL: Well, I hope that these gentlemen have stimulated you and you have some questions or comments. Now is the time.

MR. WALKER (Michigan): I think this has been touched on by both of you, the practical consideration of the number that would be going to that kind of a meeting. At least in our state the controlling agencies frown on more than six or seven going to a meeting at one time. If you combined all of these, I can visualize 25 or 30 and to get approval for that many all at once, I think, would be quite a chore but when you break it up in a number of separate segments for some reason or other they overlook it.

MR. RUHL: I think that is a real problem and I think probably it is more embarrassing or more stringent in some places than in Michigan, but I think that is one of the considerations. Can you get the right people at the right place when they ought to go? Who else has a comment?

MR. SPRECHER: Mr. Chairman and members of the organization, I certainly am in sympathy with Mr. Ruhl in trying to keep down the number of meetings. I think we have far too many, but in this instance I feel that I should point out just a few things.

The Midwest Wildlife Conference ironically was originated by college and university people rather than conservation people. I remember the year before the first meeting which was held in Urbana, Illinois. Dr. Theodore Prisson, Dr. Henry B. Ward and Dr. Davis Thompson, all of Illinois, and I believe Dr. Kirkpatrick from Indiana, called a small group of midwesterners together at their university and suggested the Midwest Wildlife Conference. This was the forerunner of this organization that has grown now to some five or six hundred people. Of course, they had no officers, no dues, no by-laws or publications, but constituted a place where scientists, universities, federal agencies, etc., could get together each year and discuss their problems, and I think that it has fulfilled this purpose admirably. I feel this way, that the regional meeting affords an opportunity for our scientists and field workers to attend the meeting of their own group because most of these people are not provided the opportunity to look in at the national meetings. I think the two groups serve an entirely different purpose. One of them is to discuss field operations and work programs whereas our Association, I believe, is on an administrative level. Certainly there is no objection for the administrator to attend the Wildlife Conference, but our people might infilter their group and it is also possible, if we become too closely associated, we might have them coming over into our camp and I really feel we should give very serious consideration before we change these organizations or combine them.

MR. RUHL: Who is next?

MR. WHITESELL (Ohio): I have made the most of the transition from the one meeting group to that of the other. Some of the things concern me that I have heard. As a biologist I presented a paper at the North American and at some of our conferences held in Ohio. I am concerned on three points we have mentioned here.

First of all, now as an administrator, I am in considerable doubt as to how many people should have to attend various conferences for the benefit to be gained by those of us basically concerned, the biologist and the administrator, in getting a job done at our technical level. I have attended these meetings and know what 90 percent of them result in. I am concerned with the aspect of

people being concerned about joining different camps. Where the Midwest Conference is concerned, the door has always been open to the educators, let's say from the university, and from the federal services. Administrators of the various states have not been as welcome as they might have been and as a result our biologists have come back from those meetings--I have--with a pretty well established indoctrination by the university people and the federal people, and I can not now appreciate it as well as some of them might have had me appreciate it.

The other problem of the personnel being kept out by, let's say, the limit on the number of people who can go to a particular meeting--I covered part of that before. I am concerned in this respect. We have had, it would appear to me, a number of different meetings established over the years so that we could use them as a reward, for instance, to attend these various meetings. Somewhere along the line this breaks down and it usually results in people going to these meetings and reading papers for someone working on them anyway. I don't think we have attained the objective we attempted to attain at that time, but I am concerned with the fact that we have had very little opportunity to get the administrators and the biologists together in the past. Our biologists have been subjected to the thinking which the administrators have a little difficulty in dealing with at different times.

MR. STEEN: Of course I want to speak to this subject and I will start by saying that I line up with Bill Towell. I don't buy the argument that you can't attend these conferences if you consolidate them. I point to the Western and to the Southeastern, both of which I have attended. One Western conference I attended, something over 600 people were in attendance, and if the States of California and Washington and Utah and Oregon convince their governors to send that many people to a conference, I don't know why North Dakota and Minnesota, Iowa, Kentucky, Michigan and Missouri can't do the same thing. I don't think that is a valid argument at all. I do buy what the gentlemen, who just spoke, said. I will buy it because I, too, have been in both camps and I don't think it makes much difference how many technical men attend the meeting, unless the Midwest Wildlife Conference sells their products to their administrators, they are not going anywhere. They are talking to each other.

When I was president of this organization, I tried valiantly to bring together or bring about a consolidation of these two organizations and also the Midwest group. That effort failed largely because the argument which I have just discussed was advanced and because we met in July and the Midwest met in December and the argument was that "We can't give up our conference," and We have it scheduled," etc., but I want to say to you that, as one administrator, I am not too proud to pocket my prerogative and go to the Midwest Conference in December if that is what is necessary to bring about this consolidation. I want to say to you also, as administrator, that I am getting tired of single travel requests at least once a week to attend conferences all over the landscape here in the Midwest.

Most of my people belong to the multiple organizations that have been mentioned here. We are constantly battling. I think we could accomplish a great deal more even if we had to spend another day or two at the conference getting together, working together, talking together, living together, and do a worthwhile job and as far as my state is concerned, we are going to bring that about. If I have to do it administratively, good and well, I prefer to do it peacefully.

MR. RUHL: The voice of experience talking now.

MR. CARPENTER (Minnesota): Mr. Chairman, as a man who doesn't represent either group, I am secretary of the Minnesota Conservation Committee and a consultant for ammunitions, also a member for 15 years of the Conservation Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers. Now, I would like to make an observation here that I think would be--I hope would be of some benefit to both segments. In the first place I don't think that it would be the politic thing for the administrators and their wildlifers to meet jointly. In the first place, let's analyze it from the psychological standpoint. You have got about 600 against 100 and you have got to sell your package to the people and the argument would be that the administrators are too much under the finger of the wildlifers. I have some quarrels with both organizations.

In the first place I think that all research should be composed of all the fundamentals of renewable resources. I think we are too heavy on some phases of it and too weak on others. I think we need strengthening in the fundamentals of soil, in the fundamentals of water, in the fundamentals of vegetation because in the last analysis, those are the three assets for any wildlife program. I can see the attitudes of the administrators--and I appreciate and support them--that there should be a comingling in order to exchange ideas. But I believe this, that each administrator is conversant with his own situation, and in meeting with his immediate neighbors on an area-wide basis certainly can find out whether or not what is happening in his state is in the right direction or in the wrong direction. What is the crying need in this particular region is a combination of states and communities that are dependent upon the water resources of this particular area, or an understanding of those, and approaching it from that standpoint, and the same way with the matter of soil.

I really and truly and sincerely say this to you, that in the closing moments of my activity I think that the only thing that I have gotten out of it is to come into it as a wildlifer on a very, very humble basis and leaving it realizing that we have neglected fundamentals and coordination in all fields.

Thank you.

MR. RUHL: Who is next?

MR. MOORE: Of Kansas.

MR. RUHL: Are you speaking as a wildlifer or as administrator, Mr. Moore?

MR. MOORE: Well, I have been in both, Harry, and I am sure you are going to say that I am prejudiced because in the prerogative of coming to the region I was in a separate wildlife group and we got together and organized one group and as far as I was able to tell it continued to grow and improve.

Now, to start off with, I am agreeing with Bill. I don't know whether I would go this far. There is one question of the arguments that I have heard here. All of the arguments on both sides are good and those arguments to keep them separate certainly have merits. However, they have not, in my opinion, had any adverse effect in any other organization where they have gotten together. Now, the question of whether or not the meeting will be cut in attendance I can't answer. But I will say this--in my state I think that my governor and future governors will come nearer agreeing to let a large group go to one, if he knows he is not going to be faced with one or two every week or so. That

is one thing he has accused me of, sending a request for somebody to go somewhere. Whether he will approve it the other way, I don't know. I personally feel we can sell my governor on the fact that if he will approve a large group to go, then of course we would take the prerogative of selecting that group on merits and many other aspects. I am personally very strong in favor of letting the two get together.

MR. RUHL: Who is next?

MR. GALE: Having been on both sides of this fence, both in this region and in the Southeast, you didn't think I was going to disagree with my boss, did you?

MR. RUHL: You might; this would be an awful good chance.

MR. GALE: Seriously, I know that our biologists are quite concerned about this and I think most of them probably would prefer to keep these meetings separate as they have been, but having seen the way this thing works, I think their fears are mostly ungrounded. They have two major concerns which have been touched on here before. One is the matter of overall attendance and secondly the quality of the technical program. I think it is probably true that overall attendance would be down, but as Mr. Towell mentioned, this possibly is a good thing. In our situation we are fortunate in that our commission decides who travels out of state and who doesn't and I don't think we would have any problem in keeping up a good attendance.

Insofar as the other states are concerned, where you have to get permission from the governor or some other agency, I will have to go back to what George says in that the southeastern states do have good attendance, as well as the Midwest at its technical conference. I don't see any reason why there should be much difference in the attendance. In terms of the overall quality of the technical program, there is no reason at all, in my opinion, why this should suffer. As I would visualize it, the technical group would continue to set up a technical program and if that program suffers it would be their own fault, in my opinion. I think you would have the same quality that we have now. I can see no reason why it should be otherwise.

MR. RUHL: Go ahead.

MR. ELLIOTT: Colorado, I think, belonged to the Midwest and the Western and I have attended some of both and I have enjoyed very much the Midwest over the Western in most instances. Of course, I have worked with the Department for about 14 years or so before I got out of the state anyway and I know that we face the same problems that have been brought up here of getting travel authorizations for many different people. There is one point that may not be covered quite as thoroughly as could be and it isn't a major problem, but in the Western, for instance, the last one I attended was in Salt Lake City--I believe in about '60 or '61--and it is a big organization with 600 people or more attending and that thing is a three- or four-ring circus. By that I mean they break down after general sessions, in the afternoon with about four to six special sessions and those of you that have been there know how these are arranged. They may be solved by proper programming, but you will have a big game session and upland game bird session, a public relation session or Information and Education session and perhaps two or three others. As you look at your program you say, "Now, I would like to go to this one and that one and that one," but you can't do it

because they overlap. Some of them overlap and some of them get late or early and you rush into the session and it is over with so you rush down the hall to the other one and the program has been changed. Also the administrators, as I recall, usually held their session separately. So there are some disadvantages to having a large meeting, because if as many people as can are allowed to participate in the thing, then likely I say it becomes somewhat of a three-ring circus. Personally, I feel that I have gained a great deal more out of the Midwest Association meeting here than I have the Western.

Thank you.

MR. RUHL: I suppose we ought to give members of the panel a chance to say something if they care to now before the time runs out. Bill, have you anything you want to add this time, anything new I mean?

MR. TOWELL: No, except I would like to renew my motion. If you will recall my last suggestion, I think that the integration shall be a gradual process and I would like to recommend very strongly here today that at the next Midwest Wildlife Conference in December that every director in the Midwest Association be present and to insure that they are present I suggest that we hold an annual business meeting or a semiannual business meeting at the time of the Midwestern until such time as we can get further integrated. I think we need to be there and I don't like to make this thing an edict in which we forcibly bring the two organizations together, but we can start attending their sessions and hold an executive session of the administrators at the Midwest Wildlife Conference. I think we can accomplish what we are after.

MR. RUHL: Ed, do you have something on your chest?

MR. STEEN: I would like to make that a motion.

MR. RUHL: Do you have anything? I think there are some questions that I think ought to be thrown in here now and not for the purpose of stopping his motion, but to study it. As far as I can tell, the Midwest Wildlife has been a working group. I don't think they have seriously embarrassed any administrator any more than they would if they had a joint meeting. There is a real problem of reporting, abstracting, publishing and financing the Wildlife Conference which is probably pretty heavy for individual states. I suspect the Association has shirked its duty in doing this.

There is one angle which I think may not be nearly as important now as it was in the beginning, but one of the objectives was to see operations on the ground and the larger the group, the more difficult to get it out in the country where it is available. It is only a minor point.

There is another angle. If there is a reduction in attendance, it is possible to pick up and do some of this getting together perhaps as a chapter of the State Wildlife Society or regional chapters of the Wildlife Society where they talk about their own biological information. It doesn't mean other avenues of contact would be eliminated, it doesn't seem to me. The whole problem, as I see it, is how to train people at all levels to all the information they can get and there is no easy or simple way to do it. It seems to me the three-ring circus would be the thing that you would have and I suspect that the biologists worth their salt would still get off their chest what they are worth if they are there. They wouldn't be worth much if they didn't do it.

MR. VOIGT: Personally, I don't think a motion is in order at this particular juncture of our meeting. That would come up at the business meeting tomorrow morning. We are generating a lot more heat than light at this particular point because I know that all of you, as administrators, wouldn't want to vote on as fuzzy a thing as we have right here. I am inclined to agree with Ed Schneberger; we should have something specific that we are actually talking about rather than saying that we are going to combine. I think we should talk in terms of first, whether it is advisable, and then if it is decided that it is advisable, on what particular terms. I am afraid, like you, Harry, that we might get into a three-ring circus; bigness in itself is not virtue as I look at it, but a small meeting, as we have here, has pleasant memories for me in many respects and also a great deal of gain. I am inclined to go along with Ed Schneberger's suggestion that if it is important to many of us, as it apparently has been expressed this morning, then we should rather carefully think out the steps in which this is done. I am perfectly willing and I agree with Bill we should all attend and acquaint ourselves with what goes on at the Midwest. I have been to five or six of the meetings in the Midwest and our people brought back good reports and much was accomplished. I would hate to jeopardize both of these associations, because they have both been successful, unless I knew more specifically what we plan to do and how this should be done. I think this can be best accomplished by representatives of both groups.

MR. BARNES (Indiana): I want to say that both meetings should be held concurrently. I would rather think it should be at the same period, possibly the Association could meet a day or two ahead of the Midwest, but I can not see combining all of the meetings at one time because anyone who attends a conference has various interests and if you were administrator, I think that you would feel that your allegiance should be to your meetings.

On the other hand there might be a good session going on in the other part of the building that you would like to attend so I can not see holding any three-ring circus. It might be possible to hold the meetings at the same period or within the same week like the International and the American Fisheries Association.

MR. CLARKE (Ontario): May I say that if we should by chance be confronted with the obligation to host either a combined or joint meeting, this would pose no problem. Other than that, I don't know that it would be too much. We have about somewhere between 20 and 30 meetings that we are asked to go to and most of them, more than 20 of them, are outside the province or outside the country. This hasn't raised any real difficulty with us because sometimes in order to go from Toronto to the head office or some parts of Ontario by the most expeditious route, it is necessary for us to pass through Michigan, Wisconsin and Minnesota.

MR. RUHL: That is what you would call the usual discreet Canadian approach.

MR. STEEN: I rise to disagree with my associates from Wisconsin and Indiana. First of all Indiana. I have attended both kinds of conferences and since I became administrator I have as often as possible attended the Midwest Wildlife Conference. I don't think the Western is a three-ring circus. I think it is a lot better meeting than the one we have here. I disagree with my associates from Wisconsin because all that was proposed here was that the administrators meet with the technicians in December and talk about it. This isn't any earth shaking thing; nobody has proposed we terminate either one of these two associations. The motion goes to the effect that the 14 administrators--or 16, if you please--

that are in this Association make an effort to attend the technical group meeting in December, and now I remind you that there is an authority, administrative authority involved in this thing.

I remind you that the thing that the scientists and technicians are trying to do is to value facts and bring them into play to convince his superiors they should be used in the management of wildlife. I remind you that most of you administrators don't have the last word in this thing. I remind you that, after all, your commission has the final work, the final say in all of these things. Coordinated communication between associations is absolutely essential for the best result and you can not get that result--and I think I speak with some experience--you can not get that result if you have got your organization going in seven different directions and never getting together to discover the problems.

We had an illustration of it right here in this meeting of yesterday. I, as administrator, had to report facts which our technical groups wanted to bring to the attention of this group. Why weren't they here to report these facts? Why weren't they present? Well, because of the system we have in operation right now, and I repeat, I don't buy the argument that they can't attend, because they can and they do it in the Western; they do it in the Southeastern. I don't know why they can't do it in the Midwest.

I will ask Mr. Bill Towell again to present his motion and I will second it.

MR. RUHL: I will turn the meeting back to the chairman again.

MR. ROSE: I feel that I must be in favor of the segregation aspect of this problem, having been in both camps, like a lot of people. The Midwest Wildlife Conference is about a three-day meeting and many of the biologists and instructors from the university have a free opportunity to have a full program, three full days, and I am sure that if we were an integrated group, they would not have their opportunity. We have many opportunities to go to the National meeting whereas they are going to be restricted in number, perhaps not to the extent that some of us are a little apprehensive about. This is a three-day meeting. The Midwest is also a three-day meeting and the only way I could feel that I could favor an integrated approach would be to have a nine-day meeting and I don't think any of us can sacrifice that time away from our desks and I think we should all be aware of this situation.

I don't believe that the Midwest Wildlife Conservation people are in favor of this in one iota.

MR. RUHL: I think you have heard most of the arguments pro and con and I am sure the advantages are not all on one side, neither are the disadvantages. The problem of communication, reporting back, is ever increasing in scope and complexity and will continue and I think, to take any action, this should come at the business meeting. Personally, I think that the problem is not simple. There is no simple, easy, quick, absolute answer. I don't think that the Wildlife Conference has hurt us as administrators. Maybe we have neglected some opportunities, but I am sure we have also neglected some others in other fields. We can't go every place at the same time and this is something I think should be worked on and be considered.

I think, however, that the Wildlife Conference itself is getting so large that some more attention in some form is desired from the administrators, if no more than helping out with the publication of the abstracts, because it is getting to be a pretty good sized operation for them to handle. No constitution, no by-laws; it is simple. Maybe that is one of the things in its favor. Personally, I think it is going to be very important to translate from the biological group--their abstracts--and for the administrators to translate to biologists so that they understand what the administrator's problems are, and the question is how to do this. I will turn it back to your chairman; if you want to make motions, that would be up to him.

MR. SHIELDS: I guess that just proves that he is an older administrator than I and more experienced, I should say.

We are privileged to have with us today a man who is not so concerned with administrative problems as he is raising game on the land. I have had an opportunity briefly to meet Mr. Roy Melendy this morning. I think he has some provoking thoughts and perhaps a challenge or two for us as administrators and I give you Roy Melendy. Mr. Melendy is a farmer from the State of Colorado and he is most active in conservation, both on the land and now in proposing something for discussion to you.

MR. MELENDY: Mr. Chairman, you mispronounced my state. You see, in the summertime it is Cool-a-rado, and in the wintertime, it is Colorado.

Members of the Commission and administrators and friends. I come to you with a program, of course. Before I start, maybe I ought to say to you that I believe that there is quite a bit to heredity and if I quit speaking at any time along here for an extended time, you will know it is a case of heredity back to the hills of Vermont where my great, great grandfather got up to make a big speech in a country school. He said, "Ladies and gentlemen, 40 years ago this place where I now stand was a howling wilderness," and sat down. Pretty soon he got up again and repeated that three times. Then he sat down for good. If you see me sit down, don't blame me; it is just a case of heredity from my great, great grandfather.

Let's build a home for the "Queen" that she will "populate the earth" so each sportsman may "fill his bag". Out in Colorado, we farmers instead of leaving places for those pheasants, we farm clear out to the bar pit. We leave that pheasant without a home and something has to happen. On my farm I have five separate shelterbelts to take care of those birds. That isn't quite enough; we need something else. As we see the different administrators come into power and we see the need of our pheasants for cover, we immediately think there should be something done about it. So we started out, four of us farmers, with Bob Elliott back there. He is a pretty good fellow, but let me tell you he is kind of sneaky. (Fishing story told.)

We have good pheasants and we must give them a home; we have to give them a place where they can raise their families. Do you know what we do? We go out into the stubble, we plow under that first nesting. It is too bad. We kill a lot of those birds with a tandem disking. Then they go off and nest again--four, five, six--your biologists can tell how many the second nesting has. So we see these different farm programs--the Republicans want to put it in the Soil Bank, the Democrats want to put it in a shorter duration period, and we come along with this pheasant program for these established, unneeded acres, and

"let's get a cover adequate for these birds." So they both agree we have to take those acres out of production, but what we are trying to do is to approach this from a bipartisan program for the good of the old boy up here. (Points to picture of a pheasant.)

We want to find some way we can get the government on the farm program to take these unneeded acres out and put it into something that is constructive, so we farmers out there--well, we had kind of a state program--they furnished the seeds and we seeded it, but that didn't do the work. On every section we have several plots, from 10 to 30 acres of these unneeded acres that are sown in something that has to give them cover and we found white sweet clover with a mixture of other grasses sown on a three-year rotation is best, but some more will be sown next year, the whole area, the high plains-summer fallow area. That is what I think it is especially adapted to; folks could use the areas for hunting and so the government pays the farmer to put them into this particular cover you want and I want for the benefit of the old bird.

Now, this white sweet clover does one thing. It does give them abundance of cover to protect that bird against the blizzards that are going to come out on the high plains. Thousands of birds every year are killed by hawks and owls that shouldn't be killed if they had abundance of cover. In the second place it furnishes a nesting and rearing site so the hens may go into these acres, lay their eggs, raise their birds and protect them against the hawks and the other predators. If they didn't have this cover, predators would get the birds.

Another thing, when you have birds you have to have some way of harvesting these birds and if you don't have any way of harvesting these birds, the farmer wears himself out--or the hunters do, the sportsman wears himself out hunting those stubbles to try and get that bird, and believe me, after about so many miles, you're just out of luck because we are worn out trotting all those fields to get those birds--but if we have an adequate cover, that tends to bunch these birds into that cover and lends itself somewhat so that the hunter can harvest these birds.

Now, we made our check on the birds and we found a ratio of about one rooster to one hen, whereas one rooster could handle effectively, as biologists tell you, from 10 to 20. We are not harvesting all of those roosters that should be harvested and that is a waste and this cover will enable these birds to get bunched and will enable you to kill more birds and be more successful.

The next thing we had to get was a program that would fit into the farmers' needs. If you don't have something that will fit into the farmers' needs, the farmer isn't going to buy that and consequently he is not going to go with it. In checking the sweet clover program that we suggested, we found out when we got together, three of those farmers in northeast Colorado had experiences with sweet clover and what it will do for the farm and so that is good for the farm. So there we have a combination and some people say, why do you take a specific thing? Well, we picked a specific thing because we wanted something we could put our fingers on, something that the farmers would buy, something that the game men would buy and something that the old pheasant would propagate on and that is the reason we selected it just as we did.

Now, in the next place we checked out and found the people in the Agriculture Department saying we have 50 million acres of land that is unneeded for food and

fiber for America at the present time. So we want to grab our share of that 50 million acres and you people out here as you go further east, you will find a way to use those acres if you just find out the things the farmers will buy and the pheasants will buy. You men of the Southeast who want quail cover, etc., there should be a way of figuring out your program. I had a game management fellow call me up a short time ago and say they are spraying the buck brush and all of that sort of thing, killing off the buck brush which is the quail habitat, and the quail will suffer if they don't have it. What can be done about that? It is private property. You have to find a way, you fellows will, in cementing the program, in taking care of what the people are to do in the way of killing this needed vegetation for this quail. So much for that.

Another thing with the farmer. He will be very reluctant to go along with any kind of a program that he doesn't have complete control over his land, because I am just that way. Now, when we went back to Washington on this program, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture called together the chairmen of seven of the agricultural departments. When we got done with him and presenting our program, John Baker, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, said, "If you put in this program of using these acres, you will have to require that the farmer let the people hunt. Will you?" I answered him by asking, "Do you own your own home?" He said, "Yes." I said, "Does that home of yours include a lawn?" "Yes, sir." I said, "Would you sign any kind of a document to allow everybody to picnic out on your lawn?" He said, "No." I said, "That is just the way the farmers are." If the fellows want to come in there and be decent about it they will let them hunt, but they aren't going to sign up any document or program whereby they are forced to let a hunter go in.

Suppose he is one of those old crabs who doesn't want anybody to hunt. Those pheasants will live there, but he can't corner them. Next year they will spread out over the whole country and furnish the seed that will make a lot of pheasants for all the people around him to hunt them.

The next thing, they said you game managers and you commissioners should furnish half the money it takes to put over this program. There was a problem and if you would start too, you game administrators, you would find that you would say, "I have got all my money earmarked," and that is just what I told them. "These game managers, they have their money earmarked so they can't spend a lot more money, but they can help with this program, not in particularly implementing it, but in getting the farmers to do the thing that should be done to get this program under way." Also you can help through influence in going to Washington with a suggestion and a letter to tell them what they should do. We got that settled, so we got the game departments off the hook.

Now, we have a document over there that we went to the State A.S.C. Committee on and they okayed a program. Then we wanted some way to get that before the Secretary of Agriculture, the document, the way it should be written up for our program, so they suggested we go to the State and the County A.S.C. Committees of the five pilot counties that we want to try this program on. We got them together, with the man from the state office down to help write up the document. He wrote it up the way we thought it should go in--the way we think the farmers will buy it--and we had Bob Elliott down there to help us with the thing, and this is being sent to the Agriculture Department for their consideration. (See Appendix.)

Now when we went back to Washington we were promised that if the budget went through we would at least get a pilot run out there, but what we want, for the good of the game throughout the whole country, is for you people to take charge of the program, to feel that you need those acres, those excess acres that we don't need for feed. If you can use it under your influence in your various states, we want it to be put in that kind of a program and so we came here. That is the reason I camehere, to let you folks know what we are trying to do. Most of us went to Washington at our own expense to get this program put into force. We know it is good. We know we are putting those acres into something that is going to produce pheasants, so we went through that process.

Well, it met with very good reception in Washington by about everybody and I think we overcame all of the objections that were raised, but you know they already pay these farmers for some diverted nonconserving uses. We just recommended that they pay the farmer just the same money for this, just the same money. Well, if he is paid the same money and this is put into clover or whatever you folks down in the East would want, don't you see we are getting conservation put onto this land and it isn't really costing the government anything. This should be considered by you in your influence with the Secretary of Agriculture and the powers--that this game business is a bonus deal--that the city people as well as the country people can all get the good out of this thing and that is the thing we are trying to put over. In your presentation, if you would keep in mind this is a bonus proposition we are working for, we will go a long way in this program. It has the greatest capability in bringing the right kind of cover for our wildlife.

Now, in the way we should appeal to this Secretary of Agriculture, I don't know how you feel it should be done, but I can tell you what we farmers did. We wrote up our own appeal for a conference and we sent this letter, and sent a carbon copy to each one of our legislators in our state and we got response from our legislators. We advanced this on a bipartisan deal because it doesn't matter whether you're a Democrat, Republican or Socialist, you still like to hunt pheasants and that is the way we have got to advance this, from a bipartisan program. No matter whether these legislators were Democrats or Republicans or what, they all backed up our program, every one of them in our state. They said they would do what they could.

If we advance that this way, this is for the good of everybody and it is a program that will really pay off if we really get it implemented. If we come down here and we hear and think it won't do any good, it could be like it was when we met, and one of the fellows in one of the game clubs said, "Do you feel you're big enough to go back to Washington and present this thing to them?" Well, I told him I didn't know whether we were big enough, but, "I can tell you one thing for sure, as long as we sit on our fanny and don't do anything, we sure won't get any progressive consideration. I am willing to spend my money to go back to Washington and show this plan," and they decided to go back to Washington and get something that is needed by everyone.

Each one of you people in this audience have got an influence potential. You can appeal to your Secretary of Agriculture and send a carbon copy to each one of the legislators. It is not enough that we meet, but draw up a resolution and send it in. It should be from each state, too. We should start in with this group. You should draw up a resolution to this effect if you feel it is worthwhile, and I am sure you will, and then when you go home, your state should

draw up a resolution and send it to your state representative in Washington and a carbon copy to the legislators and a letter to Mr. Freeman.

Now, when we go back there, the legislators will say, "We appreciated your sending us a carbon of what you're trying to do," and they become sympathetic because we went through the right channels. You of the Central West will have to go with the farmer. Each state should have a good public relations man that will get out and talk and work with the farmer on this particular program. If we all stand together and we work for this, and when you do write--say that you understand that the State of Colorado is trying for a pilot program to be inaugurated this next year, and that you're favorable toward such a program for your state as time goes on, but you would ask that they support Colorado, Colorado's pilot program they are trying to get for this coming year. We invite you to come out and visit Colorado. I would like to take you out and show you what these plots will actually do because it is good.

Now, you know in the U. S. there is quite a feeling that the city people are not getting returns on all of these different kinds of farm programs that come out and I will say to you, this is one place where the farmer and the city man will get equal fun and recreation from this kind of a program because it is a bonus program.

Now, I appreciate the opportunity of coming and speaking to you, and I appreciate the friendship and courtesy you have shown me and I wish to thank you. I trust that each of you will get behind and help push this ball over for everybody; help us to help you to help this old boy here increase in numbers.

Thank you.

MR. SHIELDS: I want to point out, I think we should all take copies of this program and study and see how we can implement it and see how it can fit in.

(Short recess until 11:10 a.m.)

MR. SHIELDS: The next matter on the program is a report from the Federal Aid Committee by the chairman, Woodrow Fleming.

MR. FLEMING: I feel that this will be very interesting to a number of people because the chief subject is something here we thought was worthy of an important part on our program. Mr. Chairman and members of the Midwest. First, I would like to mention that the Federal Aid Committee discussed several topics that were considered in the report of the Federal-State Relations Committee whose report was given on Monday by Mr. Wayne Olson. As was pointed out, there is considerable overlap in the interests of the two committees and we wish to concur in the report of that committee and the topics which they discussed.

The major portion of the Federal Aid Committee's discussions centered around the program topic for the opening session of this meeting--that was, "Problems in Federal Aid to State Conservation Programs." It is felt by many, not only by those in the Midwest, but also by those throughout the nation, that state fish and game programs have, in most states, passed through the growing-up stages and have made definite advances in their attempts to provide a sound program activated and administered by capable, professional personnel.

It is recognized that the P-R and D-J funds provided to the states and the supervision and guidance provided by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service in the use of those funds have made a tremendous contribution to the progress and upgrading of the fish and wildlife work in the various states. This committee looks very favorably on the P-R, D-J and many other federal programs and those who supervise them at the federal level. However, we are interested in improving a good program by streamlining it and eliminating some of the time-consuming and unessential features. We would emphasize that there need be no change in the P-R and D-J Acts in themselves. Our recommendation concerns only administrative policy so that the original purposes of the Acts can be accomplished more easily.

Many of you are familiar with a resolution concerning administration of P-R and D-J programs that has been submitted to the Grants-in-Aid Committee of the International Association. I would like to read that proposed resolution at this time. This is not a resolution of our committee, but one that has been proposed.

RESOLUTION

Simplification of P-R and D-J Regulations

WHEREAS, the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Acts providing Federal aid in wildlife and fish restoration have been in effect since 1937 and 1950, respectively; and

WHEREAS, the P-R and D-J rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior were designed to ensure that the several states would develop fish and wildlife programs which included activities eligible for financial aid through these Acts; and

WHEREAS, over the years the states have developed operative fish and wildlife programs which include activities that would qualify for funds in excess of the apportionments available to them annually through these Acts; and

WHEREAS, restrictive, detailed and extensive rules and regulations applying to accounting and reporting are no longer necessary to ensure conformance with the provisions of these Acts; and

WHEREAS, compliance with the existing rules and regulations requires, in many cases, extensive and duplicated expenditures in time and money which detract from the accomplishment of fish and wildlife programs;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners request the Secretary of the Interior to simplify the rules, regulations and program requirements documented in the Federal Aid in Fish and Wildlife Restoration Manual to conform in principle to those followed by the state forestry departments participating in the Clarke-McNary Act, and all other related Federal aid programs under the U. S. Department of Agriculture, whereby cost accounting and reimbursements are based on an annual spending plan prepared in sufficient detail to determine the amount of money to be expended in eligible activities; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that if such modification of the rules and regulations is considered to be too extensive to implement at one time for all states, that it be instituted in one or more states on a trial basis beginning July 1, 1965.

The Federal Aid Committee of the Midwest Association of Fish and Game Commissioners recommends that this organization make known its support of this proposed resolution to the chairman of the Grants-in-Aid Committee of the International Association of Fish and Game Commissioners and urge its adoption by that organization.

Should this resolution ultimately be considered by the Secretary of the Interior, we recommend that representative administrators of state fish and game programs be consulted in making any plans to revise the administration of the program.

This concludes the report of the Federal Aid Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I move that it be accepted.

MR. SHIELDS: Is there a second to that motion?

VOICE: I second it.

MR. SHIELDS: It has been moved and seconded that we accept the report of the Federal Aid Committee. Is there a discussion? Are you ready for the question? All those in favor indicate by saying "aye". It has been accepted.

We will move on then to the report from the Federal Farm Program Committee. Mr. Glen Powers, who is chairman of the committee, was not able to be here. One of the members of the committee, Mr. Frank King, will give the report.

MR. KING: In the absence of Chairman Glen Powers and all other members of the committee, I have been asked to give this report. Since it will now be impossible to present a formal report endorsed by the full committee, this will be a presentation of items suggested by individual committee members and others interested in this subject. I hope it contains some items this Midwest Association can advance at present, and perhaps some items for future Farm Program Committees to study.

Now, actually you just heard a very pointed farm program report from Mr. Melendy. Certainly he covered many items that any farm program committee should include and he put the points in a very pointed way and I think it shows some of the things we are to cover here are of practical value in the field, and as he urged, I believe the main emphasis from this committee should be to urge Association members to continue and increase efforts to integrate federal farm programs with our wildlife conservation work. As we heard yesterday, there is a tremendous expansion of conservation interest and activity in many agencies. Now is the time to take advantage of this interest and aid in directing it into the most productive channels. We are all aware too, as Tom Evans reminded us yesterday, that the bulk of our small game is produced and harvested on private lands which, in most of our region, means private farmlands. Therefore we might well put more effort on working with programs affecting large acreages of private lands and not overemphasize our own public land "projects" which are often rather limited in total area affected. Ernie Swift also reminded us to stay with fundamental land-use programs.

We have many federal agencies represented at this meeting, as Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and Forest Service, but a noticeable lack of Farm Program Agencies. I checked the attendance list and found only the name of Ross Miller, Recreation Specialist for the Soil

Conservation Service in this region, who said he had a personal interest in finding out what this meeting was all about. We evidently need better communication here also. We have had good success in Wisconsin the past few years with an interagency farm-game committee examining all aspects of the work such as insects and economics as well as agronomy.

Some more specific recommendations are:

Land-Use Conversion Programs

This Association should reaffirm its resolution no. 1 endorsed at the meeting in Columbus last year (1963). Although I can find no one who claims much knowledge on the shape of new federal farm programs at this time, it appears that some type of cropland conversion program will continue. This resolution I refer to was prepared by your Midwest Pheasant Council and is found on page 58 of your 1963 Proceedings. It was prepared by technicians working in this field and is just as timely now as a year ago. The points in this resolution should be used in recommendations to the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

ACP

Recent wildlife accomplishments appear small alongside of other practices in these reports but now is the time to introduce new practices emphasizing wildlife values. Based on Wisconsin experiences we find good acceptance in adding new practices such as pheasant nesting cover. This is being tried on limited areas this season and consists of 90 percent cost-sharing for establishing legume cover and maintaining it through the nesting season. Cost-sharing is augmented with state funds because of a connected research project now--but it appears that landowners and ASCS interest is high enough to continue this as a new ACP wildlife practice in the future. This wouldn't have been given second thought even a few years ago. Other new practices to be recommended should include the possibility of providing landowners with a "service payment" for maintaining wetlands in cropland areas. Larry Jahn of the Wildlife Management Institute has been developing this proposal and I'm sure he would welcome our support. This would be in the nature of a "Water Bank" as he calls it and I hope he will be able to prepare detailed guides soon for our use. Perhaps he will be able to comment on this later.

We need interchange between states on ACP practices that are found useful and could be used more widely. This does seem the time to try new ideas in ACP. Just now in Wisconsin the state ACP Committee even seems willing to try cost-sharing for burning lands for sharptailed grouse and game production. We'll watch how this progresses.

Incentives for Private Land Game Production

Increase efforts to find incentives for production of wildlife on private lands. We have all talked around this problem for many years but have tended to shy away from it. We always have in mind this conflict of publicly-owned wildlife produced on private land. We are getting closer to facing up to this problem and may as well start learning more, to use in future farm programs. As an example I know at least Missouri and Wisconsin have started farmer surveys to find out just what landowners would need in order to have them intentionally produce game. Is it entirely money, control of hunters or regulations--or what?

I believe an example of incentives is to be found in a resolution you will hear later concerning tax exemptions for private club lands that aid in preserving wildlife habitat.

Watershed Protection PL-566

The effects of some current watershed developments on fish and wildlife are not well known. Research should be encouraged to determine the effects of channels, dams, clearing and other changes due to installation of watershed practices. We all call for better techniques--such as types of impoundment structures on marginal trout streams--but actual criteria are hard to find in the field.

The requirement that 50 percent of the land shall be planned for conservation treatment prior to or concurrent with the construction phase should be reappraised with a view to a requirement that 50 percent or more of the land shall be properly treated before the structural program may be initiated and that proper treatment will include provisions for fish and wildlife habitat.

This committee certainly endorses the increased study of pesticide effects, which also will be the subject of a resolution presented to you.

As far as I know we have never been informed recently on comparable farm programs in Canada. With the increasing impact on duck habitat as shown by Art Hawkins, perhaps this committee should determine if the Association could aid there also. This would be timely with the meeting of this Association planned for Canada next year.

Inasmuch as the next meeting will be held in Toronto, Mr. Chairman, if there is still time, I would like to call on Larry Jahn to fill in a part of this report.

MR. JAHN: Thank you; Mr. Chairman and gentlemen. I consider it a real opportunity to present ideas to you here and the first thing I would like to indicate to you is that the ideas that I have to present are not new.

Many of you will recall in the 1930's, Ding Darling, Thomas Beck and Leopold formed a report on wetland preservation that went to Franklin D. Roosevelt. This is some 30 to 35 years ago. In effect, these people said breeding ground must be preserved for waterfowl and other forms of wildlife and provide recreational opportunities for people. The second thing they said, here is a goal, and it wasn't until recently we picked up the language of this goal and used it in trying to implement programs. Unfortunately, in the implementation project we are only taking one part and drawing attention to the direct application; I am thinking of fee title and the term of easements now being used by state and federal governments. It has been mentioned by Tom Evans that the bulk of the birds we are interested in, the recreational opportunities, are provided on private lands. I think the environment in terms of our society today that, plain and simple, we should be advancing new ACP practices to work into the vehicles we have to reach at the county level and grass roots level within counties.

This can be done. The proposal that I had sent to Frank is very simple and it is nothing more than capitalizing on ideas that have been offered through habitat committees of the Flyway Council for years. It recommends ideas, but we have failed to implement them. It is simply this, in order to preserve existing

key water areas--and by key, I define as a function to the birds themselves, namely waterfowl and I am stressing waterfowl, but not ignore other forms of wildlife in the values to people (and I will explain the reason for that in a moment)--but to preserve these existing key areas, I define it as type three, four and five. This is technical jargon to you. It is nothing more than areas that have surface water in the spring that may go dry in May, which means that the area is fenced primarily for breeding, or they may go dry in July, or they maintain water through the growing season and they may be important for the accommodation of birds throughout the growing season. These are the key areas from the standpoint of production and providing recreational opportunities for people and other values to other forms of wildlife.

The technical jargon of approaching a practice has been our stumbling block. We should think of incentive payments and then subsidy payments. I consider this, in my personal opinion, a gross error. If you are a reader of Reader's Digest, there was a major article on the work "subsidy" and subsidy has a connotation of being a bad word and bad for any approach in our society today. It means the payment for doing nothing.

What is a private landowner doing? A private landowner, if he maintains shallow surface water areas on his property, is maintaining areas attractive to public resource, namely, waterfowl. On his private land he will produce a public crop. This man and all men like him are providing a service to society and he is entitled to a service payment and I think this is exactly what we should label any proposal in attempting to label an ACP practice. It is a payment to individual owners. Now, somebody is going to say, "Fine, but the individual landowners control the hunting rights and they have the bottleneck on what is produced." It is an error, for it is a characteristic of ducks to have a wanderlust and scatter in all directions and the landowners couldn't control those birds if they wanted to.

These birds that have migratory habits disperse themselves. They are attractive to hunters and other people that are interested in seeing them, therefore they become, in effect, the vehicle of providing a service payment on private lands where these water areas are located because they migrate to other areas. They provide recreational opportunities to people and they stimulate the economy in the area where they are present.

One study in Wisconsin recently indicated that these geese at Horicon Marsh stimulate the area to the tune of a half a million dollars a year to different types of restaurants, filling stations, and what have you. Other waterfowl do likewise.

The proposal is simply for a service payment to individual landowners to be handled through the existing agricultural vehicle to reach the grass roots level and it's a direct service payment. That is the proposal that I think is necessary to further complement and supplement the 105-million dollar acquisition program on the federal program and other acquisition programs, as well as the state programs now in progress or being thought about as being implemented in the next five to ten years.

I might mention I was recently in Michigan and I met with the Grange. "This sounds like a great proposal," they said, "and are you willing to come back and talk about it to us. We are sure you can get 1,000 percent if you're interested." I offer these comments to you and I think it would be appropriate

if the idea has any merit of having it backed to the resolution--to go to the Department of Agriculture urging them to consider the proposal.

MR. KING: I urge the adoption of this report which would include the reaffirming of resolution number one of last year and the proposal of Larry Jahn.

MR. SHIELDS: Is there a second to the motion?

VOICE: Motion seconded.

MR. SHIELDS: Are you ready for the question? All those in favor of adopting the report indicate by saying "aye". The report is accepted. We will move on then to the last committee report for this morning and that is the committee on legislation, Mr. Gaylord Walker.

MR. WALKER: Thank you. Mr. Chairman and fellow members. The time is getting late and I will try to move through this very fast with the thought in mind. We will have a detailed report of the Legislative Report up in front and you can pick up a copy.

Your committee on legislation has reviewed various proposals under consideration by the present Congress and recommends the Association of the Midwest Game and Fish Commissioners go on record as supporting 12 proposals. Some of these have been supported previously, but we believe they are sufficiently important to warrant a restatement of support. We also wish to make it clear that the committee has considered only proposals with broad ramifications.

We realize that there are many other measures of local interest that are worthwhile, but can not and possibly should not be considered by the Association in the time allotted.

A summary of the 12 proposals recommended by the committee for favorable consideration follows. Briefly, the report breaks these 12 down into a rather short statement of the legislative proposals. (Explanation of first three items in more detail appears in Appendix.) Here is some background material regarding the proposals and the current status of each proposal. By current status I mean it was current as of the middle of last week and if somebody knows of anything more current than that, please bring it to the attention of the group.

No. 1, this is the one that we feel is all important, most important of any of the 12 in our book, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Bill, H. R. 3846. I will mention that there is opposition, as you know. The present status of the bill is that it has been favorably reported by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and by the House Rules Committee, and the House leadership has scheduled for debate on this bill to begin on July 22, and it is expected that the bill will be voted upon on July 23. Some opposition has been registered on the Senate side over the proposed change in the apportionment formula to the states. It would adversely affect the more heavily populated states in the Midwest and East.

The waterway associations and lumbering interests have actively opposed this bill, and a few representatives have opposed this bill because of alleged diversion of funds from the highway fund and so-called back door financing.

We agree with Mr. Steen that this is a most important piece of legislation

to consider for conservation and recreation under consideration at this time and warrants separate and specific action by the Association. We urge the Association to reiterate its support of H. R. 3846 and the retention of the contribution formula originally proposed. There will be a resolution by the Resolutions Committee tomorrow on this subject.

Two, Public Works Acceleration Act. The purpose of this is to combat unemployment and underemployment with beneficial public works projects. This bill would continue to enlarge the 900-million dollar program started in 1962. Senate Bill 1856 would provide for an additional one and one-half billion dollars in APW projects and H. R. 10805 would authorize an additional 900-million dollars for APW projects.

The status of H. R. 10805 is that it has been referred to the House Committee on Public Works for hearings. Senate Bill 1856 was approved by the Senate Public Works Subcommittee on May 15, 1964. The bill was reported favorably with an amendment on June 1, 1964, by the full Senate Committee for Public Works.

Three, Wilderness Preservation Bill (S. 4 and H. R. 9070). I am sure all of you know the purpose of that one. It has been discussed so many times. The present status is that S. 4 was passed by the Senate on April 9, 1963, and H. R. 9070, one of the 23 wilderness bills before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee received almost unanimous approval by the committee on June 18, 1964. Final floor action is expected in late July after House Rules Committee action. The detailed report goes into the opposition to the bill and possibly you will want to refresh your memory on that too.

Four, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (S. 2642, Poverty Bill).

A. Purpose - The plan as provided in this bill proposes the creation of a job corps, a work training program, and a work study program. Some features of the plan closely parallel a proposed youth conservation corps, the establishment of which has been bottled up in the House after winning Senate approval and Senate committee action. President Johnson has recommended that the job corps bill total an enlistment of 100,000 men. They will be assigned to more than 100 camps, and centers around the country. It is expected that one-half of these young men will work during the first year on special conservation projects to give them education, useful work experience, and to enlarge the natural resources of the country. The cost of the program is estimated at $970-million annually.

B. Status - S. 2642 has been referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. House Bills H. R. 10440 and H. R. 10443 have been referred to the House Committee on Education and Welfare.

A little more recent dope we got after this was presented is that they expect the passage of this bill before the Democratic Convention, before that date. Now, I don't know if that has any political implications there or not; there could be. They expect to get some of the camps established as early as November with a total of 40,000 men in the very near foreseeable future in these camps. Initially these camps are going to be under the Forest Service, but they expect that as the program expands that states will become contractors in carrying out the program too.

Five, the Wildlife Refuge Revenue Sharing Proposals (S. 1363 and H. R. 11008).

A. Purpose - There are various refuge revenue sharing proposals being considered. S. 1363 and H. R. 11008 provide for the payment to the country wherein lands acquired as part of the national refuge system are located, of either 3/4 of one percent of the adjusted cost or 25 percent of the net receipts from the particular lands located within each county, whichever is greater. The effect of this operational provision is that each county will receive at least as much revenue as under the present law. At the same time a more acceptable distribution will be in effect which will probably secure approval by the federal government to acquire wetlands in the duck producing areas of North Dakota and South Dakota. Under the provision previously in effect whereby 25 percent of the net proceeds was distributed to the counties, $582,467.36 was distributed to the states in fiscal year 1962. Total revenues collected in recent years have approximated $2.3-million annually. Under the new law, it is expected that payments to the counties would increase to approximately $1,077,000 based on 1963 income.

B. Status - S. 1363 was passed by the Senate on June 22, 1964. The companion bill in the House, H. R. 11008 was favorably reported by the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on June 25, 1964. The full committee is expected to act on the bill in the near future.

Six, Pesticide Bill (S. 1251 and H. R. 4487).

A. Purpose - To prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife resulting from the use of insecticides or pesticides. H. R. 4487 provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall transmit information to the Secretary of Agriculture as to how in the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides or other pesticides, injury to fish and wildlife can be prevented or minimized. The Secretary of Agriculture shall then require that such information or warnings of danger to fish and wildlife be printed on the label of each package of the poison. S. 1251 originally would require that labeling of pesticides require information on the danger to fish and wildlife and how the hazards can be minimized with the Fish and Wildlife Service accelerated research program providing the data. However, this section was omitted by the Commerce Committee on the grounds that this labeling would be required under the terms of an interagency agreement involving the Department of Agriculture, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare. The Senate Committee indicated that both the Agriculture and Interior Departments endorse this bill. S. 1251 was also amended to provide an appropriation of $3.2-million to the Fish and Wildlife Service for pesticide research in fiscal year 1965 and $5-million thereafter. The present ceiling on pesticide research by the Fish and Wildlife Service is $2,565,000.

B. Status - S. 1251 was passed by the Senate on June 22, 1964. The companion bill in the House, H. R. 4487, was approved by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on April 21, 1964. No further House action has, as yet, occurred.

Seven, the Water Pollution Control Act (S. 649 and H. R. 3166).

A. Purpose - To upgrade the Federal Water Pollution Control program and

otherwise strengthen the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. This provision would strengthen law enforcement, increase individual ceilings, and set up a procedure for controlling use of nondegradable detergents.

B. Status - S. 649 has been passed by the Senate. The House Committee on Public Works has held hearings on the House version of the bill. A committee vote is expected in late July after the recess. The vote is expected to be close as the bill is controversial.

C. Opposition - It is reported that the more controversial portion of the bill relates to upgrading all or part of the federal water pollution program out of the public health service and into status as a separate administration agency in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Administrators of many health or water pollution agencies are opposing it. They contend that the program is working well and that any change to strengthen the federal government's law is a reflection on the effectiveness of the state programs. Representatives of some industrial corporations and many state health agencies are proposing provisions in the bill which would allow the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to set standards of water quality for interstate water. Some conservation organizations have also expressed doubt about this authority feeling the standards would be set at levels too low for effective pollution control.

Eight, Federal Water Project Recreation Act (H. R. 9032).

A. Purpose - To provide uniform policies with respect to the treatment of recreation and fish and wildlife benefits and related costs in connection with federal multiple-purpose federal water resources projects. It provides that full consideration should be given to recreation and to fish and wildlife as project purposes in federal water resources projects. Enactment of the bill would establish general cost-sharing and reimbursement policy and specifically for fish and wildlife. These benefits would be taken into account in determining the economic value of projects and project costs would be allocated to these and the various other project purposes so as to insure that all purposes share equitably in the advantages of multiple-purpose construction. A formula for determining the maximum amounts or percentages of project costs which can be allocated on a nonreimbursable basis to recreation and fish and wildlife would be established. Also included are cost-sharing provisions relating to that part of recreation and fish and wildlife allocation of a project which is in excess of the nonreimbursable amount. Subsection 1 (f) places a limitation of $28-million on water resource project funds which may be expended for land acquisition to accomplish the federal government's obligations to conserve and protect migratory waterfowl. These expenditures are in addition to those made available from the Migratory Bird Conservation Fund for migratory waterfowl refuges.

B. Status - The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs submitted its favorable report on March 3, 1964, with accompanying House Report 1161.

Nine, Water Resources Planning Act (S. 1111 and H. R. 3620).

A. Purpose - Would provide for optimum development of the nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commission and by providing financial assistance to the states in order to increase state participation in public planning. A water resources council would be established to be composed of the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, Army and Health, Education, and Welfare and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. The council would maintain continual study of water requirements and review work of regional or river basin plans making recommendations to the President. Title III would authorize $5-million per year for ten years to be appropriated to the Water Resources Council for grants to the states to assist them in comprehensive water and land development. Allotments to the states would be on the basis of population, land area, need for water and related land resources planning, and financial need.

B. Status - Public hearings were held by the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in March, 1964. Various federal agencies have endorsed this bill including the Department of the Interior, Health, Education, and Welfare and the Bureau of Budget.

Ten, Youth Conservation Corps (S. 1 and H. R. 5131).

A. Purpose - S. 1 would establish a C.C.C. type program.

B. Status - S. 1 has been passed by the Senate and a similar bill, H. R. 5131, has received committee approval in the House. Thus far, the bill has not been reported out for full House consideration.

Eleven, Water Resources Research Centers Bill (S. 2).

A. Purpose - To strengthen the contribution that universities can make to water resources research and also to grants for education in water resources. The bill would authorize a water resource research grant program that provides for establishing research centers or institutes in a land grant college or another institution in each state. Each center would receive a federal grant of $75,000 in the first year of the program, $87,500 in the second, and third years, and $100,000 each year thereafter for the life of the program. The total cost of the ten-year period would be $88,450,000.

B. Status - The House passed S. 2 on June 2, 1964. It had previously been passed by the Senate on June 23, 1963. The House reviewed an amendment which would have put the research program on a state matching basis.

Twelve, Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act (S. 627).

A. Purpose - Authorized the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the states through their representative state agencies in carrying out research and development of the commercial fisheries resources of the nation. Federal funds made available under this act on a 75-25 matching

basis will be used to supplement to the extent practicable to increase the amounts of state funds that would be made available for state fisheries research and development.

B. Status - Passed by Congress and signed by the President on May 20, 1964. It is expected that Congress will appropriate funds for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1964, to carry out the provisions of this Act. Estimated federal allotments to some of the states are as follows:

Illinois	$ 30,000
Indiana	25,000
Michigan	32,300
Minnesota	25,000
Ohio	41,700
New York	210,900
Wisconsin	26,200
Pennsylvania	73,200

In conclusion I wish to thank the other members of the committee for their assistance and the council and I move the seconding of this report.

MR. SHIELDS: Do we have a second?

VOICE: Seconded.

MR. SHIELDS: It has been seconded. Is there any discussion or comments?

MR. GALE: Do I understand you correctly that your committee is recommending the passage of H. R. 9032, the cost-sharing on reservoirs?

MR. SHIELDS: Yes, that is right.

MR. GALE: We oppose this, and we have prepared a resolution in opposition. I wonder if you have looked into the specifics of this bill and the way it affects water projects in your state.

Discussion of Legislation Committee Report

MR. WALKER: I think we were protected in the language of the bill. Maybe we have misinterpreted something in it. We discussed it thoroughly at the committee meeting yesterday. Let me read some of the things we thought protected us and you can rebut it afterwards.

Enactment of the bill would establish cost-sharing and reimbursement policy and specifically for fish and wildlife. These benefits would be taken into account in determining the economic value of projects and project costs would be allocated to these and the various other project purposes so as to insure that all purposes share equitably in the advantages of multiple-purpose construction. A formula for determining the maximum amounts or percentages of project costs which can be allocated on a nonreimbursable basis to recreation and fish and wildlife would be established.

In other words, it sets up ground rules, so to speak, for what formula they will apply under the project and get it out of the realm. If you go beyond to decide what is adequate percentage that will be allowable on a nonreimbursable basis, each state would have to pay for that. I don't know what that percentage would be, but as we said 25 percent would be for a nonmatchable recreational purpose. If you got up to 30 percent, then I presume you would have to reimburse the five percent beyond the 25 percent.

Do any other members of the committee wish to talk on this subject?

VOICE: Why don't we let Mr. Gale talk.

MR. GALE: When this bill was first introduced I think all the federal agencies supported it and we received notices indicating that this would do away with so-called local contributions, which in effect means state contributions, in some 90 percent of the federal water projects. This sounded pretty good, but Senator Symington asked the Corps for a detailed explanation of how this would apply to specific projects in Missouri and both he and Clarence Cannon were quite surprised the way it came out. It turned out contrary to what we had been given to understand. There was a substantial local contribution in nearly every project and the total expenditures by the state would amount to several million dollars, much beyond our capacity. The result was that Mr. Cannon changed his earlier support of this bill and said that this was not what he had understood it to mean and he would no longer support it, and we feel that the hooker in this thing is the way the Corps allocates these costs. They can make this come out almost any way they want it to depending on what they charge to wildlife and recreation. We are certainly not in a position to pick up the tab on these reservoir projects and I don't think many state departments are. For that reason we oppose this legislation as it is interpreted by the Corps of Engineers.

MR. WALKER: I am glad to get this information.

MR. SHIELDS: I would ask then does the committee chairman wish to withdraw this one item from the report or let it stand as it is?

MR. WALKER: I am going to speak to the committee. I am going to move that this one item be withdrawn from the report. Is there support for that?

MR. SHIELDS: Is the committee ready for the question? All in favor of withdrawing this one item from the report vote "yes". Opposed (none). All said "yes". That was no. eight on the list.

We now have an amendment to the motion to adopt. Does the gentleman who seconded the original motion agree to the change?

MR. VOIGT: I will agree to the revision of the motion and I second the revised motion.

MR. SHIELDS: We have a revised motion made and seconded. Is there any further discussion on this item or other items in the report?

MR. ~~COLE~~ GALE: If this is going to appear in the record, perhaps you would want to note that item no. 11 has now been approved by both Houses of Congress. It has been cleared by the conference and perhaps as of today it has already been signed, but it is all through the legislative process and on the desk of the President at least, if not signed.

MR. SHIELDS: Any other discussion? Are you ready for the question? All those in favor of accepting the report say "aye". Opposed (none). The report is accepted. That completes our business portion.

I think we all owe a vote of thanks to the very hard working and active committees. With that I will turn the meeting back to Mr. Scott for some important announcements. Thank you for your attention.

MR. SCOTT: Thank you, Jim; you did a swell job. I appreciate it. I would like to announce there are approximately 150 registered here at the meeting so far. We expect about 140 at the banquet tonight. The list of registrants is being mimeographed. Copies will be available at the registration desk and also here at the beginning of the next meeting tomorrow.

Nothing is perfect, and I have been advised that our program for tomorrow omitted the nominating committee report. I wish you would insert that just before "new business" on tomorrow's program. Harry Ruhl is chairman of that committee and will report for the nominating committee.

Meeting adjourned.

Thank you very much.

Wednesday Morning Session, July 15, 1964

MR. SCOTT: Gentlemen, good morning. I wish to extend my sympathies to the chairman of the day because I understand he is the potential future secretary-treasurer. This is going ahead a little bit. Doug Omand from Ontario is going to be doing a lot of the work, I think, and so it is very fitting that he be here this morning to run the meeting. He is supervisor of Wildlife Management, works with Dr. Clark in Ontario and he will be our general chairman for the day.

Doug, will you take over?

MR. OMAND: Thank you, Walter. I felt a great deal of sympathy for the executive yo-yo Dr. Clark received last night. Gentlemen, I think we should proceed as expeditiously as possible with the committee reports. There are certain changes in the program. Some of the committees have been inadvertantly overlooked, but we will pick them up as we go along.

Once again we are anticipating the slate of officers which the nominating committee is undoubtedly going to present, I am afraid, and I have certainly profited greatly by the opportunity to associate with Walter Scott here as the secretary-treasurer. I will now ask Walter to present the secretary-treasurer report.

REPORT OF SECRETARY-TREASURER

MR. SCOTT: Thank you, Doug. This can be short. According to the by-laws, the officers of this organization serve until December 31, and so the new secretary-treasurer technically will take office on January 1, 1965. Shortly after that time I hope to transmit to him the official records and materials in my possession in addition to the funds in my accounts. Fortunately we are quite sure we know who the secretary-treasurer will be and he met with me while the Auditing Committee went over the books last evening and he has received some background information to help him carry out his duties.

In like manner, I was a member of the Auditing Committee in Ohio and learned some of the procedures. It would be best if Carl Mosley, Jr. could have been here to give this report for today because it is his records that have been audited and his activities as treasurer on which I must report.

As for my record, I must send out dues notices and collect $35 from each state or province and also any expenses from this meeting still must be covered before I can balance the books.

I think Carl Mosley did a fine job as treasurer and deserves a vote of appreciation. In the 1962-63 year he increased our assets almost $253.00. On January 8, 1964, I received $2,078.58 from him which I deposited in the Hilldale State Bank of Madison, Wisconsin; $1,700 on a certificate of deposit at 4 percent and the remainder of $378.58 in the checking account. It is my hope that an amount somewhat equal to this can be sent to the new treasurer after we have collected the $650 in dues from the 16 states and provinces that are members.

One suggestion I would like to make at this time in regard to the preservation of our records. About three years of correspondence was turned over to me and it doesn't seem necessary to keep any more than that of the previous year. I would like to recommend that all such material be deposited with the Conservation Library Center at Denver for safe keeping if it is more than a year old. Our treasurer's records, fortunately, go back to 1950 (when I was previously secretary-treasurer) as they are in a book transferred with the Association's funds, and this could continue to be used in this manner until the book is full, after which it could be deposited a year later after it has been audited. As our earlier records seem to have been lost except for the published Proceedings, I so move with the acceptance of this report.

Respectfully submitted, Walter E. Scott, Secretary-Treasurer.

MR. OMAND: Thank you, Walter. Are there comments or remarks or suggestions of this report, gentlemen?

MR. GALE: I was just wondering about depositing these records in Denver whether we might want to consider this new setup in Minnesota. They seem to be more accessible there than in Denver.

MR. SCOTT: I understand the new setup of the Conservation Hall of Fame in Minnesota is going to be a hall of fame and museum. I don't believe that the decision has yet been made as to who is going to take care of what, and I realize there is going to be some overlap. However, I do believe the International Association selected the Conservation Library Center in Denver. This did start first and I believe they have gotten a big number of the organizations to deposit records there. My guess would be that the Minnesota setup is not completely oriented and they will not conflict in this regard. That is why I would recommend Denver.

MR. STEEN: I am a member of the Library Committee. The one in St. Paul is, as you say, a Conservation Hall of Fame. The Denver thing is a library, and, may I say, already a very comprehensive library and is growing rapidly week by week and you shouldn't confuse the two.

MR. OMAND: Any other comments to be made on this report? Then in seeking the acceptance of the secretary-treasurer report, we are also accepting the

suggestion that the back records be deposited at Denver. This is correct. May I have a second for the record?

MR. VOIGT: I second the report, Mr. Chairman.

MR. OMAND: All those in favor of accepting the report--"ayes". On the contrary (none). Thank you.

The next item of business, gentlemen, is the report of the Auditing Committee. I will ask the chairman of that committee, Mr. Woodrow Fleming, to make this report.

REPORT OF AUDITING COMMITTEE

MR. FLEMING: I would point out as I did last year--I think I should point out, Walter would agree to this--it would be most helpful if the secretary-treasurer whose books you were auditing could be present with you when you were auditing them. We always have this lag behind and again I would urge that Walter, if some way, you can work it out and be real helpful to your boss, etc., work out a way to get to the meeting next year, I am sure the Auditing Committee would appreciate it.

MR. SCOTT: I might want to stay home after I see the expenses for this meeting.

MR. FLEMING: You may not dare face us next year. The Auditing Committee composed of Ted Shields of Minnesota and myself and with the able assistance of Mr. Walter Scott has examined the accounts of Carl Mosley of Ohio, secretary-treasurer for 1963-64. We find the financial accounting of this organization in order. All bills are on record. The cancelled checks are submitted to show that all bills are paid. All receipts and expenditures are recorded and the books are in balance.

As Mr. Scott mentioned, Mr. Mosley handled the finances so efficiently as to show an increase of more than $250. I move this Auditing Committee Report be accepted.

MR. OMAND: Are there any comments or discussions on this report? If not, may I have a second here for this motion?

MR. STEEN: I second it.

MR. OMAND: Those in favor of accepting the report--"aye". To the contrary (none). The report is accepted.

We are moving along quite briskly, gentlemen, but we may come to something that will slow us down briefly. Here is the report of the Resolutions Committee and I will ask Chairman Steen to come forward and give this report.

REPORT OF RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

MR. STEEN: Gentlemen, as you recall we have a lot of resolutions and the fact is the chairman has done something he shouldn't have done in keeping the

door open for presentation of these resolutions until the last moment. We have had them open so long, the others are downstairs being typed and I hope they get here before we conclude this report. If you have submitted a resolution and you did not hear it in those we shall consider this morning, let me say to you that it was either because the committee in screening the resolutions decided against yours or because it came in too late that we just couldn't process it.

I want to repeat something I said yesterday with respect to the resolutions on pheasant management and the representatives of the Pheasant Council are quite concerned because they were not included as resolutions. They were not included as resolutions in this report because it was a decision of the committee and in keeping with the committee I will explain the reasons why. This has nothing to do with my personal views on the subject at all. This is the majority decision of the committee, the reasons being first of all that the subjects discussed were subjects which were better presented to this body in the form of a report from the Pheasant Council on their findings, rather than in the form of resolutions directing, or just requesting, the members of this Association to adopt certain methods of management of this particular species whether or not administratively they saw fit to do so.

One resolution had to do with the maintenance of roadside cover and roadside ditches. Extremely important--if you aren't doing it in your state, you ought to be doing it if you are interested in pheasants. Across the land the protection of nesting cover is perhaps the most significant factor in the entire management picture. In other words, the inability of the hen to find protective cover which will lead to a relatively high ratio of success. As I pointed out in our state, and I think our state probably has as good nesting cover as any member state in this group, even then, 61 percent of our hens over a period of nine years failed to succeed. If it was 30 to 40 percent it would make a very great difference in pheasant hunting and pheasant hunting success.

The other one had to do with the harvest of cocks and the fact that they are not--at least a great majority of the states--are not putting enough pressure on this bird, on the male bird. The evidence is that it is utterly impossible to overharvest the pheasant roosters. Here our management is on the basis of the dissatisfied hunter, they think. The facts are the exact opposite. He doesn't get his limit because he is an inept hunter in the wrong place, doesn't use a good dog, etc. We need to put more pressure on this species. In fact, the evidence is we can all afford to harvest a considerable percent of our hens as well as a considerably higher percent of our roosters. I repeat this, and the technicians said in a number of the states they are not doing this. They are following public opinion and the opinion of the vociferous group that described a lack of satisfactory hunting success to overharvest of the bird, but in fact they don't get it because they are not in it. The fact is the birds are smarter than they are.

The resolutions that I have here I shall read, not in their entirety unless you ask me to, but in the interest of expediting this thing which will be lengthy at best, I shall tell you what they consist of, if you wish to discuss them or wish to debate them. If you will so indicate we will lay those particular resolutions aside and take them up at the end of the presentation. If there is no debate or no discussion indicated, then we can by one motion pass on perhaps three-fourths of these resolutions.

Resolution No. 1 on the subject of <u>Water Pollution Control</u>. In essence it

is a resolution which puts the Association of the Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners on record in favor of a new Federal Water Pollution Control Administration within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as provided by Senate Bill 649. I think you have all heard about that particular thing and I think practically every state in this group as an individual state supported this action so I don't imagine there will be any objection to doing it as an Association. Are there any questions?

MR. TOWELL: May I ask, does this also include H. R. 3166 in the resolution?

MR. STEEN: No. It refers only to S. 649.

MR. TOWELL: S. 649 has passed the Senate and is now before the House Public Works Subcommittee, whose chairman sent in some little details on H. R. 3166, and it is essentially the same thing in the big overall and I think it would be very appropriate for this Association to put in H. R. 3166 because the most effective place for it to be put would be to Mr. Blackwitt.

MR. STEEN: I think you're correct and if there are no objections, we will just include this bill. Is there any objection to this? We will just include H. R. 3166 in the language of this resolution.

Resolution No. 2 is on Firearms Control and I think you're all intimately acquainted with this situation and this resolution directed actually at the CBS Report on the subject and perhaps I should read it because it is quite short.

RESOLUTION 2

Firearms Control Legislation

"WHEREAS, the constitutional right of citizens to bear arms is constantly threatened; and

WHEREAS, a wave of hysteria followed the tragic assassination of President John F. Kennedy; and

WHEREAS, a recent "CBS Report" tended to further the cause of unduly restrictive firearms legislation by an overdramatic emotional appeal to the uninformed;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners that this organization opposes any infringement on the right of legitimate sportsmen to keep and use arms for hunting or target shooting without registration of said arms, and without police veto; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Association protests the emotional appeal and the slanting of facts apparent in the recent CBS Report."

Are there any objections? If no, we will pass on to the next one.

The next one is Local Contributions at Federal Reservoirs and this, I think, perhaps I better read too, because there may be some difference of opinion on the subject.

RESOLUTION

Local Contributions at Federal Reservoirs

"WHEREAS, in recent years the federal government has placed increasing emphasis on all types of recreation; and

WHEREAS, major reservoirs attract hunters and fishermen from many states in addition to those where they are situated; and

WHEREAS, recently proposed legislation (H. R. 9032) and recent policy decisions on the part of federal construction agencies would require increasingly higher local contributions for wildlife and recreation benefits in connection with federal reservoir projects, thereby causing financial hardship to agencies of the several state governments;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners that fish and wildlife and general outdoor recreation be considered primary federal water project purposes, and financed as nonreimbursable federal costs."

MR. SCOTT: May I make the suggestion that some thought might be given to where these should be sent and if the group has any directions, I would like those so we would know where to send them. Would you want to send a copy to CBS for instance?

MR. STEEN: Yes. I didn't take time to mention the resolution includes this footnote, "Copies of this resolution to be forwarded to the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Senate and House Committees on Public Works". Resolution No. 3, this is a resolution in opposition to H. R. 9032, perhaps better known as the bill which the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs introduced, primarily at the instigation of the Budget Bureau, in an effort to set up criteria or standards which would determine the amount of federal participation that should go into a federal reservoir or federal project for these purposes. There are some member states who feel that this will, as the resolution says, cause financial hardships. In fact, they feel that the burden will be so great that they can not meet it financially. There are other states who feel that we must arrive at some formula perhaps or some criteria by which the federal Congress and the federal agencies resolve these questions. The committee, your committee on resolutions, reached the conclusion they would present the resolution to you as it is for your decision. Are there any comments? Do I understand then that this body favors this resolution which is in opposition to H, R. 9032? So be it.

RESOLUTION

"Resolved that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners support the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners in the nomination of Seth Gordon and Ross Leffler for appointment to the Federal Public Lands Review Commission and urge the president to include these outstanding conservationists on the Commission to represent fish and game interests on public lands.

Be it further resolved, that our president prepare a suitable letter recommending these appointments to the President of the United States."

Perhaps it should be our old president because we concluded a new president would be a Canadian and that the President of the United States might do one of two things. He might pay more attention to a letter from the Canadian or less attention to it than he would a letter from the American citizen. We were a little at sea. We just said that our president prepare a suitable letter recommending these points to the President of the United States and I think we shall leave it up to Mr. Voigt and his successor as to who writes the letter. Are there any objections or any questions?

MR. CLARKE: If the hand-over isn't to be until Christmas or sometime, I suggest that the letter of this type should go a little sooner than that so it leaves it to Les Voigt.

MR. STEEN: We thought so; we didn't want to say so. We think a great deal of our Canadian neighbors and friends and we don't want to do anything that smacks of discrimination.

MR. CLARKE: May I say I have been through this with both the International and with this organization when my boss happened to be president and I had the job of writing letters for him and it is very easy to forget about such things when things have been formally transmitted by organizations such as this.

MR. STEEN: We have now a resolution on insecticides. Resolution No. 5 I shall read.

RESOLUTION

Agricultural Insecticides of Chlorinated Hydrocarbons

"WHEREAS, chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides marketed under a variety of trade names have been determined to be extremely toxic to many forms of animal life, particularly to aquatic species, including game fishes, and are in actuality uncontrollable because of residual and cumulative characteristics; and

WHEREAS, there are numerous other insecticides which are not nearly as dangerous; and

WHEREAS, these other pesticides are adequate to control agricultural insect pests pending the development of safer, more specific pest control measures;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners duly assembled in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 15th day of July, 1964, respectfully requests the Secretary of Agriculture to withdraw the registration for manufacture and sale of chlorinated hydrocarbons as agricultural insecticides."

This is a real hot resolution, but I think it is absolutely necessary and I think it is probably the desire of the Department of Agriculture to do it in the end anyway. Are there any questions? Fine.

MR. SPRECHER: Is there any other federal agency that gets it beside the Department of Agriculture?

MR. STEEN: It should go to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. I think it should go to the Pure Food and Drug Administration. Are they in the Department of Commerce or Department of Agriculture?

MR. VOIGT: Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

MR. STEEN: Then it would be Health, Education and Welfare and the Department of Agriculture and I think the Department of Interior too, because they have a very direct interest and say in this thing.

Resolution No. 6 which deals with Restrictive Procedures in the Administration of the Federal Aid in Fish and Wildlife Restoration Program. The committee considered this and there is a little change or two in the resolution as presented to it, but they decided to present it to you and as you recall we discussed it this morning. I will read it to you and you must decide what you want to do with it.

RESOLUTION

Restrictive Procedures in the Administration
of the Federal Aid in Fish and Wildlife Restoration Program

"WHEREAS, the Federal Aid in Fish and Wildlife Restoration Program was established to provide restoration work in the states; and

WHEREAS, this program has evolved over a period of many years and has resulted in much valuable accomplishment; and

WHEREAS, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, United States Department of Interior, in a commendable effort to make the program even more productive, has from time to time promulgated more and more detailed and restrictive regulations for the administration of the program until a point has been reached where an inordinate amount of time, effort and money is being expended on purely administrative details in submission and resubmission of project documents outlining project proposals; and

WHEREAS, most states are now spending from non-Federal Aid funds amounts far in excess of the amount available from this source on programs that if submitted, would qualify under the Federal Aid laws;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Midwest Association of Fish and Game Commissioners duly assembled in Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 17th day of July, 1964, respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Interior review the operation of the Federal Aid program with a view toward simplifying administrative procedures thereby increasing overall success in providing better hunting and fishing for the sportsmen of this nation."

I don't think that is a very compellable resolution as we decided the other day. The suggestion to the Department of Interior is that this might be a good thing to do; however, there was some difference of opinion as to whether we should resolve to the question at all. I would like an expression from the member states or anybody that might object to this resolution.

MR. ROSE (Iowa): I am just wondering what significance that clause has concerning the relative amounts that are received from Federal Aid rather than through your own resources. To me, I think it is a little unnecessary and it gives a tone to it that I don't appreciate.

MR. STEEN: Well, that could be; however, if you can consider the fact. . .

MR. ROSE: Nevertheless it is true, but why emphasize that. We are getting a half a million dollars from that source. We have received it very graciously. We are glad to get it.

MR. STEEN: But the premise is that in wildlife restoration it was assigned and intended to do just exactly that--to restore wildlife--and that the regulations and the requirements of the Department of Interior and Administration are designed to insure that this occurs. The premise here is that even though the states might do some minor thing with Federal Aid money which is not above suspicion, even if this occurred in minor things, the act has accomplished its objective, which is to help the states do a great deal more work than they ever did before the act was passed. There is no need for being so--shall we say "picayunish" about some of these things that have occurred. That is the premise.

MR. TOWELL: Is the objective here, Mel, to more clearly determine the elements of a Federal Aid program that are likeable or is it the question of administrative procedures in processing vouchers, etc.?

MR. STEEN: The extent of the resolution is that it asks the Department of Interior to review the operation of the Federal Aid program with a view toward simplifying administrative procedures thereby increasing overall success in providing better hunting and fishing for the sportsmen of this nation. In other words, it is just a feeling of the members that support this resolution, that this program has become a bit top heavy because we have got too much unnecessary--from their point of view--unnecessary requirements and regulations and stipulations. In other words, your agency is cutting the line to doing good, fine, and they don't even do that. How would this suggestion have any merit to get to this problem? If the Association or certain states that might be designated by the Association would assemble a statement that would cover some specific thing that could be considered here for some of the administrative adjustments or corrections---.

I am sure the states can do it. It is their decision. The question is before them and they are going to have to decide this morning whether they want to pass this resolution or not and I think I shall lay this one aside for further discussion.

Resolution No. 7, Predator and Rodent Control, and in essence what it does is support the study and report of March 9, 1964, by the committee on that subject. I am sure you're familiar with the report of the committee consisting of Clarence Cottam, Ira Gabrielson, etc., on this subject. This

resolution supports that report but it asks that one more item be included and I shall read the last paragraph which will give you the meat of this thing.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Midwest Association of Game and Fish Commissioners duly assembled in Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 15th day of July, 1964, approve this committee report on predator and rodent control provided the report is amended by the committee to read that the cyanide gun be eliminated from the control arsenal."

In other words, this was something that was not recommended by the report and the people who submitted this resolution feel that this cyanide gun, which holds high hazard for the destruction of hunting dogs and other animal life as well as some hazard to human life, is not a proper device to be used by the general public.

MR. MOORE (Kansas): The cyanide gun stipulation refers only to the federal program?

MR. STEEN: Let me read it to you.

RESOLUTION

Predator and Rodent Control in the U. S.

"WHEREAS, the Honorable Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, has appointed a committee to study the predator and rodent control in the United States; and

WHEREAS, this committee has completed such study and submitted a comprehensive report dated March 9, 1964, covering their findings made therein; and

WHEREAS, the Midwest Association of Game and Fish Commissioners is vitally concerned with the control and management of the wildlife resources; and

WHEREAS, the report submitted by the committee on predator and rodent control does not recommend the elimination of the cyanide gun from the control arsenal as set out on Page 11 in Paragraph 2 of said report; and

WHEREAS, it is a known fact that the use of cyanide guns endangers human lives as well as causing the loss of many valuable domestic animals and wildlife;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Midwest Association of Game and Fish Commissioners duly assembled in Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 15th day of July, 1964, approve this committee report on predator and rodent control provided the report is amended by the committee to read that the cyanide gun be eliminated from the control arsenal."

In essence what it does, it says we are in favor of what the committee reported. We suggest that they amend that report to include a recommendation against the use of cyanide guns.

MR. MOORE: I head that report at Las Vegas and it was my understanding that it was directed to the Fish and Wildlife Service program and I would infer that would---.

MR. STEEN: This doesn't go beyond that report, but it does suggest that that report should also include among its recommendations the recommendation on the cyanide gun.

MR. MOORE: Now, a thought was that I would hate to see the cyanide gun eliminated from all programs whether federal or state or local.

MR. ROSE: I am wondering why they pick on the cyanide gun. I think it is the tactics involved that are objectionable as far as I am concerned. The predator control that we have in our state has been highly objectionable and the means that are used. If it isn't cyanide, they can have other things that are just as bad too, anything that happens to hit the trigger.

MR. STEEN: The recommendation of this committee appointed by the Secretary of Interior does not suggest that the states control, or pass laws controlling, ways and means by which you control predators and rodents--it refers solely to the federal program and makes certain definite recommendations with respect to the predator and rodent control program of the Department of Interior, which as you know is an old, old program of long standing and which has been subject to a great deal of discussion and, should I say, criticism in the past. I have read the report and I can't quarrel with it. I think it is all right. The only thing this resolution does is to suggest that this report be amended to include also a recommendation against the use of cyanide guns in the federal programs.

MR. ROSE: Then by inference everything else is all right.

MR. STEEN: I don't get you.

MR. ROSE: If you're limiting the cyanide gun.

MR. STEEN: No, no. The original report makes a lot of recommendations about a lot of decisions. This thing suggests that it include more than it did originally. It expands it to include the cyanide gun rather than to limit it solely to the cyanide gun. This is simply a resolution on the report by the committee and it says--"You didn't go far enough. We think you should go far enough to also include a recommendation against the use of this particular control device, this particular device, to eliminate the cyanide gun from the control arsenal." The original report recommended the elimination of a series of methods used in the present control arsenal of the predator control branch of the Department of Interior, right, and this suggestion is that it be expanded to include the cyanide gun.

MR. BURWELL (Minnesota): Did the Western Association have a resolution on this matter to the same effect?

MR. STEEN: I am not able to inform you on that.

MR. BURWELL: They did not, because there were control problems in the West and that is where it is used the most and the control methods are different in the eastern part of the country. It was the most critical of the use of 1080 and it is far less specific and if we propose to withdraw the cyanide gun then the alternative use is the use of 1080 which we all want to control as much as possible. It is not my job to recommend to this Association, but I would recommend that since those of the Midwest outside of the Dakotas have

little experience with the program carried on in the Midwest. We would be wise to say nothing about something we know very little about.

MR. STEEN: I believe we have this resolution from the Western, but I can't say positively and I am going to try to check here. In the meantime, if I am in error and the sponsor of this resolution is in the audience, we would like to hear from him. I have what I believe to be a complete file of the resolutions passed by the Western and I do not find this particular resolution in the group so I would think, Bill, that your conclusion is correct. I frankly don't recall the origin of this resolution. I think it must have come in from one of our member states and I hoped that whoever sent it in might rise to the defense of his resolution, and getting no response I will lay it aside for special review.

We have here Resolution No. 8 which has to do with the question of--well, in essence it says Modifications in U. S. Department of Agriculture Programs Which Affect Farm Wildlife--and in essence what it says is that:

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners reaffirm the Resolutions passed by the Western Association of Game and Fish Commissioners, Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners and International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners in official meetings held in 1963."

Are there any questions? There was some question in the minds of the committee about the subject of whether or not they could be voting members in these councils, but nobody seemed to have the answer, so we passed the resolution as submitted and assumed that if this is impossible under regulations, then consideration will be given to this group being advisory rather than voting.

Number 9 is a resolution on the Wilderness Bill. I think this is something we should discuss a little bit. It says:

RESOLUTION

Wilderness Bill

"WHEREAS, the states have the right and responsibility to manage all wildlife in those portions of the wilderness system that fall within the boundaries of a state; and

WHEREAS, the present wording in H. R. 9162, Section 4 (i) could be detrimental to the best interests of the states involved.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Midwest Association of Fish and Game Commissioners requests that all of the present language of this section be deleted and that the following be inserted in its place:

SECTION 4

'(i) Hunting and fishing shall be permitted in wilderness areas designated by this Act at the discretion of the respective state agencies vested with jurisdiction over game and fish resources: Provided, that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Interior may, whenever an emergency exists, close areas to all forms of human activity for the safety and protection of the area:

and Provided further, That the Secretary of Interior may restrict hunting and fishing, per se, only on those lands where he has previously restricted hunting and fishing prior to the effective date of this Act.' "

Your committee passed the resolution and presented it to you but with the suggestion, and perhaps the warning, that the Wilderness Bill has had lots of trouble clearing the hurdles down there in the House, and we are not sure yet that it is going to make it and that a resolution of this nature, while it might be desirable, it may not be so desirable now, because it may lead to support of the opponents of this bill. In essence, of course, what this says or does is to vest in the law the unquestionable, the indisputable right of the state to determine what fishing and hunting go on in these wilderness areas other than those which are already in game management or closed areas under the direction or control of the Department of Interior. All of the rest of them, the states would decide. I think the essence of the bill as now written is that the federal agencies could make this decisions and I think perhaps--can you inform us on that?

MR. TOWELL: The bill alluded to or mentioned in the resolution is not before Congress, H. R. 9070; that language is no longer germane. There is a section in the bill now or a paragraph in the bill now as reported by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee which reads--"To the extent that it is not incompatible with wilderness preservation, the Secretary of the Interior shall in national forest areas designated by this act"--and it shall be construed as affecting the jurisdiction or the responsibility of the several states with respect to wildlife in wilderness areas.

MR. STEEN: I think there was something the Western acted on at some time; you tell us there is no longer any need for this resolution. I am going to lay it aside and you can do with it what you please when we discuss them individually.

Number 10. This has to do with the Wetlands Program or the revenue charge or flat payment in lieu of taxes. It simply supports the present legislation; as I understand it the present legislation is in the Congress--which is, I think, about to be enacted--wherein the Department of Interior and other agencies who may seek to preserve wetlands can, in lieu of taxes, pay either three-fourths of one percent within the refuge unit or pay 25 percent of the income from that land to the state and county in lieu of taxes and I think this is supported by everyone. If there are no questions, we will include it with the general group. Any questions?

Number 11. This has to do with the Small Watershed Program and the National Watershed Congress. It is a short resolution. Perhaps I should read it.

RESOLUTION

Participation in National Watershed Congress

"WHEREAS, the National Watershed Congress is organized as a forum for the discussion of all phases of soil, water, forest, wildlife, and recreational resource management and utilization through the Small Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 566 as amended; and

WHEREAS, the Small Watershed Program has not, at the field level, given due consideration to fish, wildlife, and recreation resources and has, in fact, been detrimental in far too many projects; and

WHEREAS, the subjects of fish and wildlife have not received serious consideration at the Watershed Congress and have, in fact, been ridiculed in floor discussions; and

WHEREAS, fish and game agencies have been remiss in not attending this important Congress and making their presence known by strong presentations from the floor in support of platform presentations;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners in convention assembled at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, July 12-15, 1964, strongly urges all state and federal agencies concerned with fish and game management to attend the next Watershed Congress and impress upon the Congress the importance of and strong interest in the development of fish, game, and recreational resources in watershed projects."

I don't assume that there is any objection to that. Is there any question?

MR. EVANS (Illinois): Having written the resolution, I am not objecting to it, but I did want to pass on one bit of information which I should have passed on yesterday. In referring to the desirability of game and fish agencies attending this Congress and taking an active part in it, I wanted to let you know in meeting of the participating organization on June 30 in Washington, they decided that the 12th Congress would be held in Sioux City, Iowa, on April 26, 27 and 28th, 1965, which means it is real close to home for all of the Association member states and I think here is a fine opportunity for everyone of the 14 states that belong to this Association to be there and to be represented and to make themselves heard. If we all get there from this one Association, there will be more than I have ever seen in a single Congress in all that I have attended.

The program calls for a review of the foresters and soil conservationists on the opening day, opening session. There is a tentative session planned to discuss the state financing of watershed projects and here is a place where game and state fish agencies need to get into the business of finance and we are furthermore hopeful that in another session, a symposium or a forum can be arranged for what you might call a knock-down drag-out discussion or panel between the game and fish people and the people on the other side of the fence or the other camp. We don't know if this will come about. We hope we can arrange this type of symposium. We hope the 12th Congress can be of real interest to all game and fish agencies.

MR. STEEN: Thank you for the record. Will you repeat the dates and place of the next Watershed Congress?

MR. EVANS: Sioux City, Iowa, April 26, 27, 28th, 1965. I have one other comment while I am up now. After we had discussed Resolution No. 4, the one referring to supporting of Seth Gordon and Ross Leffler to the Federal Public Review Commission. There has been some information which has come to me and it should have considerable discussion before we proceed with it and I request that it be laid aside.

MR. STEEN: Very well, sir, we shall lay it aside. Thank you, Mr. Evans. Anyone else?

MR. EVANS: I think this language is very restrictive in there. I would like to see it broadened. It says that game and fish people should attend the next Congress. I think we have to make it a practice of attending all of them.

MR. STEEN: I think that is a good suggestion. I shall amend it to attend all. Are there any objections? Very good.

We are now down to Resolution 12 which has to do with Mourning Doves and I will read it I think, if there is no objection to it.

RESOLUTION

"WHEREAS, the mourning dove is a major game species in the United States; and

WHEREAS, there is a pressing need for the maintaining and improving of annual dove population estimates and hunting mortality determinations;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners urgently recommends that each state in the Association participate fully in the establishment of randomized dove census routes in cooperation with the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife; and further

BE IT RESOLVED, that each state undertake a program of preseason (June through August) banding of adult and immature doves to provide essential information on the role of hunting as a mortality factor in doves. Those states having significant concentrations of overwintering doves are also encouraged to participate in the postseason (January 15 through March) banding program."

This is a suggestion or request that more states participate in the effort to gain data on which conclusions may be drawn and I don't assume that there is any objection to it. I should like to explain though that for the benefit of the scientists who may work on these various committees, the Resolutions Committee saw a considerable difference between this resolution on mourning doves and the ones that were submitted on pheasants, the difference being, in this case the resolution recommends that the state participate more actively in research on the subject, and on the other one the resolution indicated that a certain type of management should be adopted by all the states--the difference being that in one case we ask for cooperation in research in order to obtain facts. In the other resolution we would have more or less told you how you should run management in your state, and the committee felt very strongly that this was not a proper subject for a resolution, that this was a decision which each individual state must make itself at the proper administrative level.

Resolution No. 13. It has to do with the Channelization and Drainage of Natural Wetlands and winds up like this.

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners does hereby strongly urge, that all organizations assigned responsibility for developing preliminary watershed work plans give every possible consideration to the preservation of existing fish and wildlife habitat.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that members of this organization go on record favoring the recommendation of the 11th National Watershed Congress that the Soil Conservation Service and state game and fish departments adopt a unified report before local people are contacted and encouraged to request a project."

A project which in essence would be a channelization and drainage project. I don't think there is any objection to it. If there is, I would like to hear it.

Resolution No. 14 has to do again with land-use practices, etc. and I think if I may say so for the benefit of those concerned about taxation in soil management, if anything can be accomplished in that direction, this resolution would be of a far greater significance managementwise than in the resolutions they have submitted. I think I shall read it although it is quite long.

RESOLUTION

Coordination and Aid-to-Wildlife in Land and Water Bank Programs

"WHEREAS, agricultural land-use practices are becoming more unfavorable for pheasant and other game bird production through adverse effects on nesting and winter cover, as a result of wetland drainage, early hay cutting, or intensive farming, and

WHEREAS, the majority of land necessary for good wildlife production will remain in private ownership despite acquisition of many areas by state and federal agencies, causing future pheasant and other game bird populations to depend to a large extent on the proper management of well distributed food and cover units on private lands; and

WHEREAS, agricultural economists estimate that 50-million acres of good cropland should be converted to other uses within the next twenty years to reduce crop surpluses, a new land-conversion program of the U. S. Department of Agriculture will undoubtedly be developed to make it economically possible for landowners in highly productive agricultural areas to convert some cropland acreages to other uses; and

WHEREAS, some modifications or adjustments in currently accepted land-conversion practices are advisable and necessary in order to obtain maximum benefit for wildlife and sportsmen;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners recommends that development of new LAND-USE CONVERSION PROGRAMS by the U. S. Department of Agriculture should be coordinated with state fish and game agencies directly concerned with managing wildlife, inasmuch as the conditions affecting management practices may vary from state to state.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the following related adjustment should be made in A.S.C.S. practices for wildlife.

a. To add a new ACP Practice to Maintain Key Shallow Water Areas in the United States.

To preserve existing key water areas presently attractive to breeding waterfowl and located in cropland areas, a service payment should be provided to landowners. An annual ACP service payment should be provided, based on the numbers of acres of qualifying wetlands situated in croplands. All type 3, 4, and 5 water areas in the United States should be included.

Water Bank payments would be made to:

(1) Recognize the service the landowner is providing in maintaining water areas that produce a public resource (migratory waterfowl).

(2) Withhold soils, presently covered with water, from going into crop production. Such action would, in most cases, help decrease the burdensome surpluses of commodities."

I would like to suggest--at least in the Great Plains and I am sure in the Great Lakes area, in the area where pheasants are a game bird--that conservation research has been a godsend and without it we would have leaner days in the last eight or nine years in the pheasant field than we have had and that the conservation research will expire in 1966 and that it is most urgent that something equally as good as pheasants for small game be substituted. I do not mean to depreciate the value and significance of not mowing road ditches and harvesting more cock birds, but I point out to you that production is the all-important question and that the hundreds of thousands of acres that have been retired under these federal programs have been a godsend; at least they have been a godsend in our state, and I am sure in your state too, as far as the production of the pheasant is concerned. We should do everything we can to see that this program is perpetuated as long as possible.

Are there any comments or objections to this resolution? If not, we will go into the next one.

Here is No. 15.

RESOLUTION

Dingell-Johnson and Pittman-Robertson Programs

"WHEREAS, the Dingell-Johnson and the Pittman-Robertson programs which provide state grant-in-aid for fish and wildlife restoration activities have been largely responsible for putting the management of fish and game in the various states on a sound biological basis; and

WHEREAS, these successful programs are financed by revenue resulting from excise taxes on sport fishing equipment and lures and on sporting arms and ammunition; and

WHEREAS, the House Ways and Means Committee is currently reviewing the entire excise tax structure;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners hereby expresses its belief and conviction that the excise taxes which support these important programs should be continued; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be wired to the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee."

I am sure there is no objection to that. (Referring to last three paragraphs).

Resolution No. 16 is a resolution submitted by a member state that pointed out they were being asked to participate more and more in projects and in activities which affect fish and game, but which were not instigated at their request or necessarily with their approval. It was necessary to participate in those things or make studies, and they already had a man and a half on the job and have to put on more help, and they thought we were doing this higher than it should be--the contribution of the state was greater than it should be--and they thought the federal government should help pay the cost.

Any discussion? If not, we will pass over that one.

Now, I come down to some that have come in at the last minute. This will be 17 and this I think is a very important one I talked about yesterday and I would like to talk about it again today.

RESOLUTION

Land and Water Conservation Fund Bill

"WHEREAS, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Bill (H. R. 3846) is scheduled for debate and vote by the House of Representatives on July 22-23; and

WHEREAS, this legislation from the beginning has been proposed, written, sponsored and amended by the conservation forces of the nation as a vital and necessary addition to the federal-state grants-in-aid resource programs; and

WHEREAS, opponents in the Congress are anxious to add crippling amendments or to defeat the legislation,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners that this organization opposes any amendments to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Bill and urges its early passage by Congress."

I would add that this should be dispatched by airmail or telegram to majority and minority leaders in the House, to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and I would suggest that each member state get a copy of this resolution or, better yet, that each one of you direct or get in touch with your own congressman by any means you can.

MR. WALKER (Michigan): Yesterday as chairman of the Legislative Committee we made a recommendation that the Midwest go on record as opposing the one amendment

that would change the formula to two-fifths on the basis of area and three-fifths on the basis of need, so to speak. Following that meeting of yesterday though, I talked with Eton Underhill in Washington and he tells me there has been some erroneous information released as to the effects of that amendment. He says that the Secretary will merely have discretion, administrative discretion, as to how that three-fifths will be allocated to the various states and he said that Kraft is planning to hold a meeting of all administrators of the states to discuss the factors that should be considered in allocating three-fifths of the funds, and also to discuss the requirements of the statewide recreation plans and he urged us not to take any action that might interfere in any way with the passage of the bill as it is now amended. He said it is a touch and go proposition down there now and he is sure that it would be much better to work out any differences administratively after the bill becomes law than it would be to try to interfere with it right now. So I talked with the members of our Legislative Committee and we are unanimously agreed that we should back away from our recommendations that we urge the reconsideration of the formula distribution provisions of the act.

MR. STEEN: Well, Mr. Walker, may I say that I too got in touch with Washington in trying to clarify this. I indicated to you when you presented your resolution that I doubted that the Resolutions Committee would approve yours for the reasons you recite, and that is exactly the action they took. This resolution I have just read is substituted in lieu of your resolution, as indicated by you to me last night, and I would like to add this comment--that the original bill, as I recall it, provided that one-fifth of these funds or 60 percent of these funds which were to be grants-in-aid to the state, that one-fifth of those funds be allocated equally, that three-fifths be allocated on the basis of population and one-fifth be allocated at the discretion of the Secretary of Interior. The law was changed by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and reported that the provision of two-fifths of this money be allocated equally between the states and three-fifths be allocated at the discretion of the Secretary of Interior, but that the Secretary of Interior was to take into consideration on the allocation of these funds the amount of federal land in the states, the amount of nonresidential use of these areas and I think one or two other factors.

I wouldn't go so far personally as to say to the states that feel they may have lost something by this change and I wouldn't go as far as to say that they will necessarily regain everything they lost from the original proposal, but I would point out to you that this change is in keeping with the opinion of at least the leadership in Congress. It is an administration policy in this case and it has the further effect of bringing into the fold some congressmen and some interests in some of our states which previously have been more or less opposed to the measure and we have made some gains through this change. If we, the people who have proposed and supported this all-important measure--and I can not overemphasize the importance of this act to all of us--if we now go to the Congress objecting to the act which the committee has put on the floor, we will in effect join those who are trying to kill or cripple the act, and we have got trouble enough getting this act passed as it is and so you better leave well enough alone. Mr. Kraft has promised you will all be given a day in court and that they will work this out to the best interests of everybody and there still remains the possibility that if a change is necessary that it can easily be accomplished in the Senate, but we better not monkey with the House Bill at this stage of the game.

MR. SHIELDS (Minnesota): Mr. Chairman, I object to a certain amount of the wording. Minnesota has contacted some of its delegates in Congress. I know that some other states have, in regard to the 50-50 matching formula. The resolution as now drawn indicates this Association wants no amendments of any type to the bill. I think that this should be reworded to say "no crippling amendments", from the standpoint I know that there is the feeling of many states that a more favorable matching program or formula would be desirable and, as I say, some states have indicated this to their congressmen and if we now pass this resolution, it is in effect in opposition to what the states have done individually.

If the resolution could be amended to read that there would be no crippling amendments to the bill, then I think it would be in order.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Shields, your point is well made and I will read the resolution again. "Whereas, opponents in the Congress are anxious to add crippling amendments or to defeat the legislation. Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners that this organization opposes any amendments to the Land and Water Conservation Bill and urges its early passage by Congress." I think perhaps you have a point. We could, I think, just as well say "any crippling amendments". Do you object to that, sir?

MR. TOWELL: I object to that. I think at this stage of the game if we open this legislation to further amendment that we are playing right into the hands of the opposition of this legislation. Now, conservationists have been very active in getting the Land and Water Conservation Fund Bill amended largely to our liking. Certainly it is not perfect, nor will it ever be perfect from the standpoint of every individual state or organization, but what the opponents want right now is an opportunity to get amendments onto the floor and made to the Conservation Fund Bill and if we among ourselves are still in disagreement as to the matching formula at this stage, I am afraid we will be playing into the hands of the real opponents whose purpose is to kill the legislation itself, and I think that perhaps one word might be substituted in the resolution. As author of the resolution I would suggest instead of "crippling amendments", I would say without "further amendments" because the legislation has been radically amended since first introduced and perhaps the wording might be more clear if we say we recommend the passage without "further amendments", and I would oppose the suggestion from our good friend in Minnesota because I think this is probably too late to be fighting this issue without defeating the purpose of this whole bill.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Shields.

MR. SHIELDS: I still maintain my previous stand from this standpoint. As I understand it, the bill is going to have some opposition, that it is going to be a close fight and I personally feel that support will be increased, that the proponents of the bill will pick up votes within the House of Representatives with an amendment which would be more favorable to the states. There must be quite a few legislators that are willing to go one way or the other or don't care much about the Land-Water Conservation Bill and it seems to me a congressman can find it more palatable to vote for something that is going to give more to his home state and to his own people.

I don't think this particular amendment can hurt the bill's chances. I think this could increase the bill's chances and I don't think at this stage of the game this Association should go on record opposing some potential amendment which would actually make the bill more favorable to the member states.

MR. STEEN: Well, I can comment a little on that because I have had some personal experience in this measure. I think you are talking about the 75-25 allocation and I would like to point out that in its original form the bill was not nearly as favorable to the states as it is at the present time because it wasn't even 50-50. As I recall it was 70 percent allocated by the state and 30 percent by the federal government.

MR. TOWELL: 75-25.

MR. STEEN: The other way around, and we had to put up 75 percent of the money. And there was a big fight on this as I recall it and our member's executive committee on which I sit and Mr. Towell sits, we have gone around and around on this and the 50-50 is the best we have been able to get out of the House. Now, I think, Ted, I feel as Bill does, we are getting on thin ice when we start wanting to amend the bill in the House and I feel that if this is your position you have a much better chance in the Senate because the bill has a good chance in the Senate. It will pass without much trouble and generally speaking you can get the amendments you desire in the Senate easier than you can in the House. Of course, the Compromise Committee will then have to settle the issue.

MR. SHIELDS: I appreciate that and I don't look for any amendments in the House version. However, this Association will not be meeting again before the Senate will consider this bill so that if we pass this resolution, certainly the Senate is going to look upon this as our feelings on the matter. We will not be meeting again for a year and that is why I don't think we should stand in the way of any potential good amendments either in the House or in the Senate.

MR. STEEN: There is a point in your argument. I think perhaps we are here arguing these various resolutions when we agree we are going to argue them separately and we should perhaps lay it aside and take it up when we get to that point.

I have another here which will be number 18.

RESOLUTION

Nonmatching Grants-in-Aid for Wetlands Acquisition

"WHEREAS, the acquisition of wetlands essential to continued production of waterfowl and also of value to other forms of wildlife is moving very slowly; and

WHEREAS, some states are in good position to acquire such wetlands but do not have sufficient funds available to meet their acquisition potential;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners that attempts be initiated to secure the appropriation by Congress of funds to be allocated to waterfowl-producing states in the prairie pothole country as grants-in-aid on a nonmatching basis for the purpose of acquiring and preserving these valuable wetlands."

I notice there isn't any objection to that. Most of us don't object to that loss. I am pleased to announce that we have now reached the end of the road, except for one resolution. We have now reached the end of the road with respect to resolutions and the final one is this. I am sure everyone is entitled to this resolution. Number 19.

RESOLUTION

"WHEREAS, the State of Wisconsin has provided a well-organized program of interesting and informative activities for the 30th Anniversary Meeting of the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners; and

WHEREAS, the delegates, their wives, and families are most appreciative of the hospitality provided by Wisconsin;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners in its 30th Anniversary Meeting, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, July 12-15, 1964, expresses its gratitude and commendation to the host state, Wisconsin; and further

BE IT RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Mr. L. P. Voigt, Director, Wisconsin Conservation Department."

We have before us a series of resolutions on which no question was raised. The evidence is that we are in unanimous support of these resolutions, therefore, the chairman of the Resolutions Committee moves for adoption. Do we have a second?

MR. VOIGT: Seconded, Mr. Chairman.

MR. STEEN: Seconded by Mr. Voigt of Wisconsin. You have heard the question. Are there any questions, any discussion? The member states, their delegates will vote only one vote from each member state and province. All in favor say "aye". Opposed (none). Motion adopted.

We will now take up the resolutions on which there were questions. We have first of all Resolution No. 4, the resolution involving the nomination of Seth Gordon and Ross Leffler for appointment to the Public Land Commission and I believe you wanted to talk about it, sir.

MR. EVANS: This is a resolution which is actually a referral of resolutions adopted by the Southeastern Association and by the International Association and as Mel indicated first, the appointment of these two men to the Federal Public Lands Review Commission. At first, the implication here is that the commission is established. This, however, is not a fact, and the important point that we need to consider is this, that it has come to my attention that there are many, many serious defects in the existing interest in the legislation to be considered for the establishment of this commission and that some of the major conservation organizations are strongly opposed to the establishment of the commission on the basis on which it is now proposed. Since we do not have a copy of this legislation at hand, we are completely unfamiliar with it. I think we need to acquaint ourselves with it and see whether or not we should therefore enforce the appointment of anybody to such a commission and, I don't know, I think perhaps Bill Towell may have a little more on this. Did you want to comment on it, Bill?

MR. TOWELL: Not too much more, Tom, except that I believe that the Western Association's principal objection to this legislation was that there was no provision for adequate representation of the fish and game interests and that this suggestion of Seth Gordon and Ross Leffler's appointment to the proposed commission was an effort on the part of the Western Association to see that our interests were adequately taken care of. Now, I was present at the Southeastern Association when a similar resolution to this was adopted. The Southeastern has endorsed Ross Leffler and Seth Gordon. Since that time, however, I know from other sources that Ross Leffler is physically incapable of serving on this type of committee, so perhaps we might be making a specific recommendation here that wouldn't adquately represent our interests. I don't know the sponsor of this resolution, who is offering it here to the Midwest, but I think since perhaps it is questionable that it doesn't really accomplish a great achievement for conservation, that perhaps it might be withdrawn, Mr. Chairman. Do you know who the sponsor of the resolution is?

MR. STEEN: It came in from Arkansas and recommended by the Arkansas member who apparently had some official relation to the resolution down there, with the recommendation that we enact it also.

MR. TOWELL: In view of the fact it has no sponsorship within the Midwest and in view of the fact there is question as to the health of one of the men named and in view of the fact that the Western Association is concerned about the legislation itself, I move that the resolution be withdrawn.

VOICE: Second the motion.

MR. STEEN: I am embarrassed to no end here. I find myself overstepping my authority in this particular case. The motion we just approved should be presented by the president of this organization and not by the chairman of the Resolutions Committee. I apologize to you, Mr. Voigt, and I suggest you get up here and run your own show.

MR. VOIGT: I would be very happy to. I think you're right parlimentarily speaking. I will accept the motion that has been proposed as having been made to the chair. Now, did we have a second for that motion? Is there any discussion on the motion? Are you ready for the question? The question is whether or not Resolution No. 4 should be withdrawn inasmuch as it had no sponsor within this organization and inasmuch as further information reveals that perhaps the suggestions aren't pertinent. All those in favor of the motion signify by saying "aye". Opposed (none). The motion is carried which means that Resolution No. 4 is withdrawn. Will you proceed, Mr. Steen?

MR. STEEN: Thank you, Mr. President.

No. 6 which is the one that has to do with simplification of procedures in federal aid matters and the operation of the Federal Aid Program.

MR. FLEMING (Indiana): Yesterday morning you recall the Federal Aid Committee reported and recommended that this organization urge the International Grant-in-Aid Committee to consider the resolution which had previously been referred to them, I believe, at Las Vegas regarding the simplification of federal aid procedures, P-R and D-J. This body did approve of the committee's report and I then handed this in; as it was a resolution I handed it to Mel Steen, Chairman of the Resolutions Committee because I felt our Resolutions

Committee was the proper vehicle to transfer this to the International. Now I am on the Grant-in-Aid Committee of the International and I should have simply transferred this to Chairman Aldrich myself. It is necessary that this resolution which this group did approve yesterday as a committee report be included in the resolutions here. It would be all right if you care to, but if you simply want to transfer that as a committee report and not consider it here, I think we have discussed it. We have had a half-a-day program on it and I don't want to delay it, and my committee did not authorize me to present this as a resolution. The idea was that yours was the vehicle to get it to the International. If that is incorrect, it need not be considered here as a resolution.

MR. STEEN: One moment, sir. I understood your comments to be in the nature of a withdrawal of this motion. Is that correct, of this resolution? Do you wish to withdraw? Is that right?

MR. FLEMING: Will you clarify as to how the committee report, the Federal Aid Committee Report, which is to go to the International Association as a recommendation, what is the method of transferring that to the Grant-in-Aid Committee of the International?

MR. STEEN: Well, I think the method would be to transmit directly to the committee rather than through this Association.

MR. FLEMING: It doesn't have to come from the committee?

MR. STEEN: You can do it either way.

MR. FLEMING: I withdraw Resolution No. 6. I move that it be withdrawn.

MR. STEEN: You are a member of the International Committee?

MR. FLEMING: That is right.

MR. STEEN: And you are asking this Association to sponsor, so to speak, your resolution, the resolution of the International Committee on this subject, to sponsor it here in this convention? I think perhaps a proper appropriate way would be for you to take it directly to the International; however, this Association certainly has the right and prerogative to sponsor this resolution if they want to.

MR. SHIELDS: I would second the motion to withdraw the resolution.

MR. VOIGT: We have a motion and a second before the house that the resolution in relation to the federal aid be withdrawn. Is there any discussion on the question?

MR. MOORE: I think it is in order because this Association approved the committee report yesterday and it is doing what the resolution will do and I think it should be withdrawn.

MR. VOIGT: Any further discussion? Are you ready for the question? All those in favor signify by saying "aye". Opposed (none). Motion is carried. The resolution is withdrawn.

MR. STEEN: We have a No. 7 here which is the resolution on predator and rodent control. I rather think we concluded the discussion on this resolution

when we had it up before, but since there was a question, I laid it aside. Is there any other further discussion?

MR. STUART (North Dakota): I would like to ask for more information. Who is the sponsor of this resolution and if he is in the audience, I would like to hear his argument.

MR. STEEN: Is the sponsor of this resolution in the audience? Is Mr. Elliott of Colorado here?

MR. STUART: In view of that fact, I make a motion this resolution be withdrawn.

MR. VOIGT: We have a motion that Resolution No. 7 be withdrawn relating to predator and rodent control.

MR. STEEN: I don'tthink you should withdraw it. I think you should vote "aye" or "no" on it.

MR. STUART: I would like to have the amendment withdrawn that you made to the Leopold Report; in other words I am very much in favor of the Leopold Report, but I question the amendment.

MR. VOIGT: That particular section, Mel, reads "Approve this committee report on predator and rodent control and recommends that the report be amended by the committee to read that the cyanide gun be eliminated from the control arsenal." That is apparently the point in question. Your motion is this be stricken from the resolution. That would be the proper motion in my opinion.

MR. MOORE: I am waiting to see if you get a second.

MR. VOIGT: Is there a second for Mr. Stuart's motion?

MR. TOWELL: I will second that motion.

MR. VOIGT: The motion has been made and seconded, therefore the question is now open for discussion on the amendment to the resolution. I recognize Mr. Moore.

MR. MOORE: As I said a little while ago, I would like to see even a more restrictive program, in fact I would like to see the whole program cut off, but certainly by adding one restriction to the report of their recommendations, that is, this present rodent control report, certainly is not helping it. It would be that much better if we could get additional restrictions added later, that would be fine, so I personally feel that the resolution should be defeated.

MR. VOIGT: Any further discussion on the question of the amendment?

MR. MOORE: The amendment is what I meant should be defeated, not the resolution.

MR. VOIGT: Yes, I understand you. No further discussion? Are you ready for the question on whether or not the amendment as proposed by Mr. Stuart

and seconded by Mr. Towell striking out the restriction "cyanide gun" be passed? Are you ready for the question? All those in favor signify by saying "aye". Opposed (none). The resolution is amended.

Now it would be in order to vote on the resolution itself. I think we have to put the question first as to approving the resolution. Do you have a motion on approving the resolution?

MR. TOWELL: Second it.

MR. STEEN: The chairman moves the approval.

MR. VOIGT: All right. We have the motion that the resolution be approved as amended. I have a second. We are open for discussion of the resolution. There being no further discussion, are you ready for the question? All those in favor of the resolution signify by saying "aye". Opposed (none). The resolution is adopted.

MR. STEEN: Thank you, Mr. President. For the benefit of the secretary, I will give you the amended motion, at the conclusion of my work here.

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners duly assembled in Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 15th day of July, 1964, approves and supports this committee report on predator and rodent control."

Number 9, is the Wilderness Bill wherein you will recall I raised the question of whether or not you wish at this time to enter the arena with a proposed amendment to a bill which is having plenty of trouble. I think that someone in the group indicated that there was no present need for this bill and therefore I suppose that the thing to do would be to move that this particular resolution be disapproved accordingly. I so move.

MR. STUART: Second it.

MR. VOIGT: We have a motion and a second before the house that Resolution No. 9 relating to the Wilderness Bill be disapproved.

MR. SCOTT: Why not withdraw it?

MR. VOIGT: It would be a matter of record that it would be withdrawn. Would you like to have it disapproved rather than withdrawn?

MR. STEEN: If my committee on resolutions raises no objection, no member of that committee raises any objection, then I will amend my motion to read "withdraw".

MR. VOIGT: Does the seconder agree to the resolution then; the motion now is made and seconded that Resolution No. 9 relating to the Wilderness Bill be withdrawn rather than disapproved. Any discussion? Are you ready for the question? All those in favor signify by saying "aye". Opposed (none). Motion is carried. The resolution is withdrawn.

MR. STEEN: Thank you, Mr. President. We have finally the last one of these

that we laid aside and this is Resolution No. 17, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. You will recall we have a difference of opinion between Minnesota and Missouri on what the exact wording of this last paragraph, "Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners that this organization opposes," and I have written in here by your request, Mr. Sponsor, "any further amendments to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Bill and urges its early passage by Congress."

I think the gentleman from Minnesota would like to see that further changed to "crippling amendments" and I guess we are ready for a discussion again.

MR. TOWELL: Mr. Chairman, I think that the question can be resolved quite easily and I would like to propose an amendment to the resolution to read as follows: "Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners that this organization opposes any further amendments to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Bill by the House of Representatives and urges its early passage by that body of Congress." This amendment, Mr. Chairman, does not close the door to the amendment in the Senate. It leaves the Association on record of urging only passage without further amendment by the House of Representatives and again I repeat the statement which I made earlier. I think it is imperative, critically important at this stage of the game, that we try to get this particular legislation through the House of Representatives without amendment because there is where it faces its biggest battle and by leaving the door open for amendment in the Senate we can accomplish the purpose.

GENTLEMAN FROM MINNESOTA: I move the adoption of the amendment to the resolution.

MR. STEEN: The sponsor of the resolution says that "Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners that this organization opposes any further amendments to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Bill by the House of Representatives and urges its early passage by that body of Congress."

I am not sure it will remove all of your objections, Mr. Shields, but it will certainly remove a great part of them. Are you agreeable to going along with them?

MR. STUART: I think I second this so we can have discussion on it.

MR. SHIELDS: Just so that it is understood that either the Association in general or the states individually still may feel free to support this and still support amendments which may improve the bill when it does hit the Senate.

MR. VOIGT: Now I believe we have a motion and a second on the amendment as read by Mr. Towell. Is there any further discussion on the proposed amendment to the resolution on the Land and Water Conservation Fund Bill? If not, are you ready for the question voting on the approval of the amendment to the resolution? All those in favor signify by saying "aye". Opposed (none). The motion is carried that the resolution be amended as indicated. Now we are ready for a motion on the resolution.

MR. STEEN: I move the adoption of the resolution as amended.

MR. SPRECHER: Second.

MR. VOIGT: It has been moved and seconded that the resolution be adopted. Is there any discussion on the question? If not, are we ready for the question? All those in favor signify by saying "aye". Opposed (none). The motion is carried, the resolution is adopted. Mr. Steen, do you have any further resolutions that you would like to present at this time?

MR. STEEN: We were just talking about one right now.

MR. VOIGT: Doing your business at the last minute.

MR. STEEN: We will pass over the remainder of the report of the Resolutions Committee and I will call on the chairman of the Nominating Committee as being the next order of business to make his report.

MR. RUHL: Your Nominating Committee seriously wants to confirm the rumors that we have for President, C. H. D. Clarke (Ontario); Vice-President, George C. Moore of Kansas; Secretary-Treasurer, D. N. Omand, Ontario.

MR. VOIGT: Thank you, Mr. Ruhl for your report. You have heard the report of the Nominating Committee. What is your pleasure? I have a motion that the report of the Nominating Committee be accepted. Are there any other nominations from the floor? The nominating action requires no second. Are you ready for action? All those in favor of accepting the report of the Nominating Committee with the resultant election of officers that would be contingent upon the acceptance of the report signify by saying "aye". Opposed (none). The motion is carried. We have a new president. I, of course, can't turn the gavel over officially to Dr. Clarke until January 1 by the terms of the constitution of this organization, but I direct that Mr. Towell and Mr. Stuart escort our new president-elect to the stand and ask him to make a statement.

President-elect Clarke

MR. CLARKE: Thank you very much, gentlemen. It is a great, great pleasure to us to have the opportunity of taking our rotation and looking after the affairs of this Association and especially welcoming all of you to the next annual meeting which will be in Ontario. We somehow or other--some of the things look familiar; we had this once before when Bill Harkness was president. Then I had Walter Scott's job and I can say that Mr. Omand can look forward to the sort of a job that he is going to have at the hands of someone who has had such experience as Walter has already had. I don't know if it is going to make it easier, but it isn't all that bad and I am sure that he will carry on affairs most capably.

The previous Ontario meeting was held at our Forest Ranger School at Dorset. There, I am afraid, for the old timers looking back to it, we had a good time. There it was a much smaller group. Everything considered, I think the next meeting should actually be wonderful in Ontario and that is what we plan. Now, there may be--there seems to have been some suggestion that there may be some problems in connection with turning it over to a Canadian president and secretary. I have had some experience of this. I remember I was fairly closely associated with Mr. Lewis when he was president of the International and Bill Harkness was president and I acted as his honorary assistant when we had this organization.

Once before I had the honor of being president of the Wildlife Society. Where such things as correspondence and formal transmission of resolutions and things of that nature are concerned, it is very easy to arrive at a polite formula by which this can be done. When it comes to initiating action or even furthering it, when it enters into administrative or political fields, especially in matters of criticism in the U. S., this is hardly the thing for us to do; however, this has been met before. The vice-president always looked after it. I already spoke about this to George Moore. In the International there were people who had a more direct responsibility and I know for George's comfort that there are in this organization some people who are very, very deep in the affairs of the International who might be able to help him. Pending a look at the constitution, it might be a good idea for him to have a special committee to help him and this will, I hope, handle any problems when they might arise, when it comes to initiating action down here on the part of the Midwest Association or moving quickly and effectively on any suggestions that may be brought forth by any of the member states. The copies of this sort of thing can be sent to the president first for the benefit of the archives in Denver or wherever it is we are talking about later on. This, of course, will make the president's job easier, however, we have had already some fine suggestions for a program next year and I think we can look forward to a very good time.

All I can do now is add my appreciation and thanks and those of other visitors from Ontario to what already has been expressed formerly by the Association in appreciation of the hospitality, the wonderful hospitality that we have received here in Milwaukee and from the Wisconsin Department here.

Now, I don't know whether it is proper for me to do this, but I think we have one or two things to hear from Mel Steen before there is any adjournment and we still have some items on the agenda.

MR. STEEN: Well, as usual, all this confusion in the resolutions. I have here a resolution which the Resolutions Committee considered this morning at breakfast and I had the impression that we disapproved of it, but it seems that my committee disagrees with me and they think they did approve it, so you have been a very patient group this morning. I will have to impose on you a little bit longer here. This Resolution No. 19 has to do with the fact that under existing statutes, nonprofit hunting, fishing, conservation, shooting and similar clubs are liable for a 20 percent federal excise tax on membership dues, fees, and other assessments in excess of $10 a year; and those clubs and their members think this is not what it ought to be. They are suggesting, "Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners does hereby respectfully request that the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, in connection with its current review of the federal excise tax structure, examine the applicability of the 20 percent federal excise tax on nonprofit hunting, fishing, shooting, conservation and similar clubs with a view to determining the advisability of rescinding such tax in view of the demonstrable public benefit that can arise from the operation and maintenance of such clubs.

"Positive action by the committee to suggest the abolition of the 20 percent excise tax on nonprofit hunting, fishing, conservation, shooting and similar sporting clubs would be consistent with the findings and recommendations of the 1962 report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission."

In view of the directives to the chairman from his own committee, I move the adoption of this report.

MR. CLARKE: It would appear that we still have constitutional requirements for some sort of presidential function.

MR. EVANS: Second.

MR. CLARKE: Any discussion?

MR. STUART: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it this is in regard to excise taxes. We have already gone on record as far as federal aid is concerned, the D-J and P-R. If we opposed any fooling around with that, I wonder if we aren't leaving ourselves open a little bit on this by taking action on it.

MR. STEEN: That is a good question.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Moore.

MR. MOORE: Right at the present time I am worried. If it was for a public benefit, I think they could change it and get it for ten dollars. I question whether or not those clubs that are for private use and pleasure, I question whether or not they get a great deal of public benefit in the sense that they maintain a greater population of game or what may it be. I don't really see why they should have any special consideration. I don't see why this Association should even consider it.

MR. EVANS: This is one of the reasons it probably would be desirable to get this resolution out on the floor anyway since there was some misunderstanding whether we had approved or not approved it. I would like to point out in response to George Moore's comments that there are states in which these private clubs contribute substantially to the waterfowl and I refer specifically to Illinois where, within the Illinois Valley, these private clubs have through the years, provided far more waterfowl sanctuary areas, they have raised more fees than has the state itself and it is this type of area that I think is being considered, for which I would favor such a procedure. In other words, there are thousands and thousands of acres maintained by these private clubs up and down the Illinois River which otherwise would have been converted long ago to agricultural use and without which waterfowl would not have enjoyed the status they have in the Illinois Valley and in these cases I think the proposal is worthwhile.

Now, there is another angle to this thing. There are so-called nonprofit private hunting and fishing clubs, shooting preserves or what have you, which operate on an annual membership basis which also include considerable social activity. I think we would not put ourselves in the position of asking that an excise tax perhaps not be imposed on the social activities; they operate a bar, etc., but I think the essence of the resolution is that study be given to this and to work out an equitable means of applying such an excise tax, if any of it is being retained, just as is being done with other nonprofit organizations.

MR. MAC MULLAN: I would like to back up what Tom says. In Michigan we have some private clubs. One of the big worries about reducing bag limits on ducks is that these organizations will feel they can't perpetuate themselves and hold up and go to agricultural lands, but I would like to ask Tom--I don't have any idea of what percent of these clubs have good land; others have just shooting

areas. I would think that this certainly should be studied but you would be afraid of recommending an excise tax until we knew more about it. The better approach would be to give these clubs credit for the duck habitat they do maintain and it would put it on a sound fiscal basis for so many acres of good sanctuary rather than get into the problem of whether or not we are knocking out a good source of funds on excise and on social funds.

MR. STEEN: I was thinking as a delegate from Nebraska and not as the chairman of the Resolutions Committee and perhaps my conclusions with respect to the actions of the committee this morning is a reflection of my own thoughts on this matter. I agree with Mr. Moore that I don't think this is a good area for us to get into. First of all, because if these clubs are eligible for exemption, this can be established under the present law, under the present regulation, I believe. Secondly, it is my experience that duck clubs--we don't have many in Nebraska, but we used to have quite a few of them over in Missouri--any club that has a membership fee in excess of ten dollars is well able to pay taxes and perhaps from the point of view of the equity of the taxation and the paying of costs of the government and its activities, perhaps they should pay that.

I would go along, I repeat not as chairman of the Resolutions Committee, but as a delegate from Nebraska as to the views expressed by Mr. Moore.

MR. CLARKE: Is there any further discussion?

MR. EVANS: Just making a further comment relative to what Mac had to say, I don't know what the percent of clubs would be which we might even ourselves consider as being eligible for such an exemption. I hope--perhaps as the result of a project being undertaken even now by the Mississippi Flyway Council wherein we are going to appraise the relative importance of private versus public lands--that we might be able to come up with some answers on this thing. It could be in our appraisal of it in Illinois, for example, we could segregate these clubs as to the kinds that are contributing to the waterfowl and those which are doing nothing more than killing a portion of it, and I don't know the answer to that one.

Now, you made reference, Mel, to the fact that most of these people can well afford this tax if they can afford to pay more than a ten-dollar membership fee. I would be inclined to agree; however, the fact remains in the face of reduced waterfowl populations and restricted seasons, they are not too willing to continue their operations even though they can afford it and this is what is happening. We are finding more and more of these clubs are putting their lands up for sale and neither we nor the Bureau are in a position to buy some of these lands nor to buy very many of them and therefore they are going to pass into private hands and therefore be developed for agricultural purposes.

MR. STEEN: I would like to tell you a little story. I went hunting one time at one of these clubs in a state which I won't name. I was a guest of a member and shooting was very good and my host killed the duck and he went out and got it and he came back holding it up. It was a pintail, as I remember, and he said, "This is what a ten-thousand dollar duck looks like." I said, "How do you figure?" "Well," he said, "My membership dues in the club are $2,000 a year and it is five years since I shot a duck." I don't think 20 percent dues is going to hurt that fellow.

MR. MOORE: In view of the remark that Tom just made that the Mississippi Flyway is undertaking a study to find out what is really happening in trying to separate those that are unable to shoot, I would like to move this resolution be tabled until we get additional information, until probably next year.

MR. CLARKE: We have a motion this resolution be tabled until further information is available and Mr. Steen says he seconds it. Is there any discussion now on this? Are you ready for the question, gentlemen?

MR. VOIGT: Yes.

MR. CLARKE: It is moved and seconded this resolution be tabled until further information is available. All in favor say "aye". Contrary "no". I heard a voice, however I must declare the motion carried and this deals I think with this resolution. Have you any more?

MR. STEEN: Now, gentlemen, this concludes our performance this morning and again I want to thank you for your patience and consideration. You have been a most patient audience in this trying procedure of considering resolutions.

MR. CLARKE: I will turn this brand new gavel over to the chairman. Thank you very much.

MR. OMAND: Thank you, Mr. Clarke. The last item on the agenda for this morning is that of new business and I ask if anyone has any new business to bring before the meeting?

MR. TOWELL: I hesitate to prolong a lengthy session already, but there are two or three questions I should like to bring before this group.

First of all, it seems the rotation schedule of our meetings has been altered; as a point of inquiry I would like to find out whether we are to proceed from this point forward with Ontario being the next host, in which case Missouri would follow. It seems Kansas and Iowa have been bypassed in the normal rotation. Does anyone have the answer to the purpose of that and who is expected to issue the invitation next year?

MR. VOIGT: Perhaps Mr. Scott would have that. There was a rotation amendment bill at the request of Ohio, but I wasn't aware there had been any other since the Ohio meeting was taken out of rotation.

MR. MOORE: This came up and we took a letter to, I believe Les or Harry, and Harry brought it up earlier. We expect to invite you to Kansas in 1966.

MR. TOWELL: That answers my question.

MR. SCOTT: May I speak to the point? I would like to point out that I surveyed this question of who ought to be next because we did want to advise the committee as to the nominations committee on this subject. We found out that Manitoba and Kentucky had never had a meeting. This is something to be considered also. A committee on this subject of rotation schedule might well be selected; however, I think it was Kansas that followed Wisconsin in 1950 and inasmuch as we are at Wisconsin again and Kansas only had it once and Wisconsin had it four times, the thought was Kansas might well be asked again. That is why George Moore of Kansas was selected here as vice-president, I believe, by the Nomination

Committee. I don't know what happened in Ohio the year before in selecting Ontario. This is something that happened before I was in on the schedule making, but this is a subject that might well be considered by a committee, I think.

MR. OMAND: Well, in Ohio, the Nominations Committee have that particular type; Ontario will be host in 1965. With respect to Manitoba, we haven't discussed it at all, but a centennial of Canada is coming up in 1967 and many of the provinces are trying to attract interesting groups and generally contribute to the publicity associated with this occasion, but this is something that should be discussed with Manitoba when they are present, I think. Did you have any other questions?

MR. TOWELL: I have more new business. We had a lot of discussion on this yesterday concerning the integration of the Midwest Wildlife Conference and the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners. I would like to place the motion which was refused yesterday by moving that the president be directed to call a business meeting of the Midwest Association in conjunction with the next annual Midwest Wildlife Conference.

MR. STEEN: I would like to second that motion.

MR. OMAND: It has been moved and seconded that the president be directed to call a business meeting of the Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners in conjunction with the next Midwest Wildlife Conference. Is there any discussion to this resolution? Are you ready for the question? Those in favor say "aye". Those opposed (none). The motion is carried.

MR. SCOTT: When and where will that be?

MR. OMAND: It is in Indiana, I believe.

MR. FLEMING: The Midwest Wildlife Conference will be in Bloomington, Indiana, at the Indiana University early in December, from the 6th to the 8th. You will receive a notice. And whether or not this is an addition, let me say to this business meeting that we want to urge all of you that we possibly can and certainly that have an interest in this line to attend the Midwest Wildlife Conference in Bloomington early in December of this year. We will certainly be glad to see you.

MR. BARNES: The first notice has been sent out regarding this meeting on December 6, 7, and 8th.

MR. OMAND: Then the president will ask the Board of Directors of this Association to convene in this conjunction.

Is there any other new business?

MR. TOWELL: I hesitate to rise again, Mr. Chairman. If I may have one-half minute to point out something I feel is quite important, there is a move underfoot particularly from the southern block of states to force the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to extend this coming duck season on the basis of their request for shooting to stop at noon. It sounds plausible to Congress and there are some congressmen putting pressure on the Fish and Wildlife Service to accomplish this. Louisiana has proposed that all shooting in the Mississippi

Flyway terminate at noon and in exchange of those half-days that the season be extended by 15 days at the latter end. I make this appeal to the Mississippi Flyway members in attendance here--at your meeting in August, that you oppose this motion which is going to be made from the State of Louisiana. We all know from experience that just by stopping shooting at noon alone, without an extension of the season, will probably increase the duck harvest and by an extension of 15 days it could be detrimental, and I have been requested from unnamed sources to bring this to the attention of the Mississippi Flyway states. That is all.

MR. BARNES: I am the outgoing chairman of the Mississippi Flyway Council and Dick Ganze will be the incoming chairman.

MR. OMAND: Are there any other items of new business to be brought before this meeting, gentlemen? If not, I will ask the outgoing president, Mr. Voigt to adjourn this conference.

MR. VOIGT: There is just one announcement that Mr. Scott has asked me to make. We want to make sure we turn out a creditable set of minutes. I notice there are some people not listed on the list. If we have improper listings or omissions, we would appreciate getting corrections because we want to do a good job on the minutes.

I would like to express my appreciation to all of you for coming to Wisconsin. We enjoyed having you. I think that through your participation this was a very successful meeting. I am looking forward to next year's meeting at Toronto.

From my experience on the Great Lakes Fishery Commission and other excursions into Canada, I know with their hospitality, this will be a wonderful meeting in Canada. They always go all out. They are very wonderful people and I know we can look forward to a good meeting there.

There being no further business to discuss, I want to thank all of you for coming and wish you a safe journey home.

The meeting is adjourned.

(Meeting adjourned at noon on July 15, 1964.)

APPENDIX I

Resolutions Adopted

Resolution No. 1 - Water Pollution Control

WHEREAS, a primary conservation need in the United States is effective control of water pollution; and

WHEREAS, the pollution problem is becoming increasingly complex with the development and use of vast numbers of new chemical pesticides; and

WHEREAS, recent substantial kills of fish in the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers demonstrate a need for greater emphasis on control efforts and wider recognition of the importance of pollution control;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners that this association favors the establishment of a new Federal Water Pollution Control Administration within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as provided by S. 649, and H. R. 3166, and that the association urges the enactment of similar legislation by the House of Representatives to upgrade the status of the Federal Water Pollution Control program and strengthen the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Resolution No. 2 - Firearms Control Legislation

WHEREAS, the constitutional right of citizens to bear arms is constantly threatened; and

WHEREAS, a wave of hysteria followed the tragic assassination of President John F. Kennedy; and

WHEREAS, a recent "CBS Report" tended to further the cause of unduly restrictive firearms legislation by an overdramatic emotional appeal to the uninformed;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners that this organization opposes any infringement on the right of legitimate sportsmen to keep and use arms for hunting or target shooting without registration of said arms, and without police veto; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the association protests the emotional appeal and the slanting of facts apparent in the recent CBS Report.

Resolution No. 3 - Local Contributions at Federal Reservoirs

WHEREAS, in recent years the Federal Government has placed increasing emphasis on all types of recreation; and

WHEREAS, major reservoirs attract hunters and fishermen from many states in addition to those where they are situated; and

WHEREAS, recently proposed legislation (H. R. 9032) and recent policy decisions on the part of federal construction agencies would require increasingly higher local contributions for wildlife and recreation benefits in connection with federal reservoir projects, thereby causing financial hardship to agencies of the several state governments;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners that fish and wildlife and general outdoor recreation be considered primary federal water project purposes, and financed as nonreimbursable federal costs.

Resolution No. 4 - Agricultural Insecticides of Chlorinated Hydrocarbons

WHEREAS, chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides marketed under a variety of trade names have been determined to be extremely toxic to many forms of animal life, particularly to aquatic species, including game fishes, and are in actuality uncontrollable because of residual and cumulative characteristics; and

WHEREAS, there are numerous other insecticides which are not nearly as dangerous; and

WHEREAS, these other pesticides are adequate to control agricultural insect pests pending the development of safer, more specific pest control measures;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners duly assembled in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 15th day of July, 1964, respectfully requests the Secretary of Agriculture to withdraw the registration for manufacture and sale of chlorinated hydrocarbons as agricultural insecticides.

Resolution No. 5 - Predator and Rodent Control in the U. S.

WHEREAS, the Honorable Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, has appointed a committee to study the predator and rodent control in the United States; and

WHEREAS, this committee has completed such study and submitted a comprehensive report dated March 9, 1964, covering their findings made therein; and

WHEREAS, the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners is vitally concerned with the control and management of the wildlife resources; and

WHEREAS, the report submitted by the committee on predator and rodent control does not recommend the elimination of the cyanide gun from the control arsenal as set out on Page 11 in Paragraph 2 of said report; and

WHEREAS, it is a known fact that the use of cyanide guns endangers human lives as well as causing the loss of many valuable domestic animals and wildlife;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners duly assembled in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 15th day of July, 1964, approves and supports this committee report on predator and rodent control.

Resolution No. 6 - Modifications in U. S. Department of Agriculture Programs which Affect Farm Wildlife

WHEREAS, the greatest percent of the small game and waterfowl population depends upon lands privately-owned and private landowners, and operators hold the key to small game production of their land; and

WHEREAS, the landowner has the problem of obtaining a satisfactory return from the land which he owns and has a large investment in the surplus of certain agricultural crops at this time there is a necessity to reduce this overproduction, whereby stabilization of agricultural acreages can be affected; and

WHEREAS, the Soil Bank Act of 1956, the most beneficial piece of legislation for farm game habitat in recent years will be terminated in 1966, and there are federal programs which encourage private farm and ranch owners to manage their wildlife and wildlife lands on a business or wildlife crop basis; and

Resolution No. 6 Continued

WHEREAS, the various U. S. Department of Agriculture programs can be the most beneficial programs for farm wildlife, but are not now doing an adequate job; and

WHEREAS, the Conservation Reserve Practices to benefit wildlife received little attention and participation and all but failed in most states;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that in order to stimulate this program, the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners requests of the United States Department of Agriculture that representatives of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and of state wildlife departments be appointed as voting members of the State Administrative Committees, as well as of the County Committees.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners reaffirm the resolutions passed by the Western Association of Game and Fish Commissioners, Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners and International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners in official meetings held in 1963.

Resolution No. 7 - Pending Legislation on Wetland Preservation Program

WHEREAS, the emergency wetlands program passed by Congress in 1961, approved $105-million for acquisition of areas for waterfowl preservation in the U. S.; and

WHEREAS, the greatest need for wetlands preservation is in the pothole regions of North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Nebraska and other member states of this association; and

WHEREAS, the law requires state approval of purchases; and

WHEREAS, the present law restricts revenue sharing to 25 percent of revenue obtained from each refuge regardless of size, thus causing inequities in many counties;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners in annual meeting assembled in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 15th day of July, 1964, that it urges the passage of legislation now before Congress to permit counties to receive their revenue share payments based either on 25 percent of revenue generated or on a flat payment of three-quarters of one percent of the adjusted value of the land within a refuge unit.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Secretary of the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners is directed to forward copies of this resolution to the Chairman, House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, Chairman, Senate Committee on Commerce and other appropriate federal authorities at the earliest possible date.

Resolution No. 8 - Participation in National Watershed Congress

WHEREAS, the National Watershed Congress is organized as a forum for the discussion of all phases of soil, water, forest, wildlife, and recreational resource management and utilization through the Small Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 566 as amended; and

WHEREAS, the Small Watershed Program has not, at the field level, given due consideration to fish, wildlife, and recreation resources and has, in fact, been detrimental in far too many projects; and

WHEREAS, the subjects of fish and wildlife have not received serious consideration at the Watershed Congress and have, in fact, been ridiculed in floor discussions; and

WHEREAS, fish and game agencies have been remiss in not attending this important Congress and making their presence known by strong presentations from the floor in support of platform presentations;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners in convention assembled at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, July 12-15, 1964, strongly urges all state and federal agencies concerned with fish and game management to attend the next Watershed Congress and impress upon the Congress the importance of and strong interest in the development of fish, game, and recreational resources in watershed projects.

Resolution No. 9

WHEREAS, the mourning dove is a major game species in the United States; and

WHEREAS, there is a pressing need for the maintaining and improving of annual dove population estimates and hunting mortality determinations,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners urgently recommends that each state in the association participate fully in the establishment of randomized dove census routes in cooperation with the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife; and

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED that each state undertake a program of preseason (June through August) banding of adult and immature doves to provide essential information on the role of hunting as a mortality factor in doves. Those states having significant concentrations of overwintering doves are also encouraged to participate in the post-season (January 15 through March) banding program.

Resolution No. 10

WHEREAS, channelization and drainage of natural wetlands cuts deeper into an already diminished and still dwindling wildlife habitat supply; and

WHEREAS, attempts to retain the water as close to the area where it falls is in greater public interest at the local level as well as at the state and national levels than rushing it off through straightened channels and drainage ditches; and

WHEREAS, the rapidly growing demands for outdoor recreation are becoming more and more difficult and expensive to supply, the ever-increasing importance and value of these remaining habitats precludes the expense of their destruction; and

WHEREAS, considerable amounts are being expended to preserve our remaining wetlands and to create wilderness areas and at the same time existing fish and game resources are being sacrificed for the questionable benefits resulting from drainage and stream channelization which creates additional agricultural production.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners does hereby strongly urge, that all organizations assigned responsibility for developing preliminary watershed work plans give every possible consideration to the preservation of existing fish and wildlife habitat.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that members of this organization go on record favoring the recommendation of the 11th National Watershed Congress that the Soil Conservation Service and state game and fish departments adopt a unified report before local people are contacted and encouraged to request a project.

Resolution No. 11 - Coordination and Aid-to-Wildlife in Land and Water Bank Programs

WHEREAS, agricultural land-use practices are becoming more unfavorable for pheasant and other game bird production through adverse effects on nesting and winter cover, as a result of wetland drainage, early hay cutting, or intensive farming; and

WHEREAS, the majority of land necessary for good wildlife production will remain in private ownership despite acquisition of many areas by state and federal agencies, causing future pheasant and other game bird populations to depend to a large extent on the proper management of well distributed food and cover units on private lands; and

Resolution No. 11 Continued

WHEREAS, agricultural economists estimate that 50-million acres of good cropland should be converted to other uses within the next twenty years to reduce crop surpluses, a new land-conversion program of the U. S. Department of Agriculture will undoubtedly be developed to make it economically possible for landowners in highly productive agricultural areas to convert some cropland acreages to other uses; and

WHEREAS, some modifications or adjustments in currently accepted land-conversion practices are advisable and necessary in order to obtain maximum benefit for wildlife and sportsmen;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners recommends that development of new LAND-USE CONVERSION PROGRAMS by the U. S. Department of Agriculture should be coordinated with state fish and game agencies directly concerned with managing wildlife, inasmuch as the conditions affecting management practices may vary from state to state.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the following related adjustment should be made in A.S.C.S. practices for wildlife:

a. To add a new ACP Practice to Maintain Key Shallow Water Areas in the United States.

To preserve existing key water areas presently attractive to breeding waterfowl and located in cropland areas, a service payment should be provided to landowners. An annual ACP service payment should be provided, based on the numbers of acres of qualifying wetlands situated in croplands. All type 3, 4, and 5 water areas in the United States should be included.

Water Bank payments would be made to:

(1) Recognize the service the landowner is providing in maintaining water areas that produce a public resource (migratory waterfowl).

(2) Withhold soils, presently covered with water, from going into crop production. Such action would, in most cases, help decrease the burdensome surpluses of commodities.

Resolution No. 12 - Dingell-Johnson and Pittman-Robertson Programs

WHEREAS, the Dingell-Johnson and the Pittman-Robertson programs which provide state grant-in-aid for fish and wildlife restoration activities have been largely responsible for putting the management of fish and game in the various states on a sound biological basis; and

Resolution No. 12 Continued

WHEREAS, these successful programs are financed by revenue resulting from excise taxes on sport fishing equipment and lures and on sporting arms and ammunition; and

WHEREAS, the House Ways and Means Committee is currently reviewing the entire excise tax structure;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners hereby expresses its belief and conviction that the excise taxes which support these important programs should be continued; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be wired to the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Resolution No. 13 - Federal Aid Assistance on State Development Projects

WHEREAS, the Federal Government is involved in an increasing number of projects not requested by the members of the association; and

WHEREAS, effective cooperation with the Federal Government in the development of such projects requires increased participation by state personnel; and

WHEREAS, such increased participation by state personnel is essential to the proper development of such projects;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners urge that wherever possible, federal funds be made available to the states to cover the cost of such necessary state participation.

Resolution No. 14 - Land and Water Conservation Fund Bill

WHEREAS, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Bill (H. R. 3846) is scheduled for debate and vote by the House of Representatives on July 22-23; and

WHEREAS, this legislation from the beginning has been proposed, written, sponsored and amended by the conservation forces of the nation as a vital and necessary addition to the federal-state grants-in-aid resource programs; and

Resolution No. 14 Continued

WHEREAS, opponents in the Congress are anxious to add crippling amendments or to defeat the legislation;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners that this organization opposes any amendments to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Bill and urges its early passage by Congress.

Resolution No. 15 - Nonmatching Grants-in-Aid for Wetlands Acquisition

WHEREAS, the acquisition of wetlands essential to continued production of waterfowl and also of value to other forms of wildlife is moving very slowly; and

WHEREAS, some states are in good position to acquire such wetlands but do not have sufficient funds available to meet their acquisition potential;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners that attempts be initiated to secure the appropriation by Congress of funds to be allocated to waterfowl-producing states in the prairie pothole country as grants-in-aid on a nonmatching basis for the purpose of acquiring and preserving these valuable wetlands.

Resolution No. 16

WHEREAS, the State of Wisconsin has provided a well-organized program of interesting and informative activities for the 30th Anniversary Meeting of the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners; and

WHEREAS, the delegates, their wives, and families are most appreciative of the hospitality provided by Wisconsin;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners in its 30th Anniversary Meeting, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, July 12-15, 1964, expresses its gratitude and commendation to the host state, Wisconsin; and

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Mr. L. P. Voigt, Director, Wisconsin Conservation Department.

Resolutions Not Adopted
(Listed by Original Numbers)

Resolution (Original No. 4)
Membership - Public Lands Review Commission

RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners support the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners in the nomination of Seth Gordon and Ross Leffler for appointment to the Federal Public Lands Review Commission and urge the President to include these outstanding conservationists on the Commission to represent fish and game interests on public lands.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that our president prepare a suitable letter recommending these appointments to the President of the United States.

Resolution (Original No. 6)
Restrictive Procedures in the Administration of the Federal Aid in Fish and Wildlife Restoration Program

WHEREAS, the Federal Aid in Fish and Wildlife Restoration Program was established to provide restoration work in the states; and

WHEREAS, this program has evolved over a period of many years and has resulted in much valuable accomplishment; and

WHEREAS, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, United States Department of Interior, in a commendable effort to make the program even more productive, has from time to time promulgated more and more detailed and restrictive regulations for the administration of the program until a point has been reached where an inordinate amount of time, effort and money is being expended on purely administrative details in submission and resubmission of project documents outlining project proposals; and

WHEREAS, most states are now spending from non-Federal Aid funds amounts far in excess of the amount available from this source on programs that if submitted would qualify under the Federal Aid laws;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Midwest Association of Fish and Game Commissioners duly assembled in Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 17th day of July, 1964 respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Interior review the operation of the Federal Aid program with a view toward simplifying administrative procedures thereby increasing overall success in providing better hunting and fishing for the sportsmen of this nation.

Resolution (Original No. 9)
Wilderness Bill

WHEREAS, the states have the right and responsibility to manage all wildlife in those portions of the wilderness system that fall within the boundaries of a state; and

WHEREAS, the present wording in H. R. 9162, Section 4 (i) could be detrimental to the best interests of the states involved.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Midwest Association of Fish and Game Commissioners requests that all of the present language of this section be deleted and that the following be inserted in its place.

SECTION 4

"(i) Hunting and fishing shall be permitted in wilderness areas designated by this Act at the discretion of the respective state agencies vested with jurisdiction over game and fish resources: Provided, That the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Interior may, whenever an emergency exists, close areas to all forms of human activity for the safety and protection of the area: and Provided further, That the Secretary of Interior may restrict hunting and fishing, per se, only on those lands where he has previously restricted hunting and fishing prior to the effective date of this Act."

Resolution (Original No. 19)
Shooting Club Excise Taxes

WHEREAS, under existing statutes, nonprofit hunting, fishing, conservation, shooting and similar clubs are liable for a 20 percent federal excise tax on membership dues, fees, and other assessments in excess of $10 a year; and

WHEREAS, nonprofit swimming and skating clubs have been exempted administratively from this excise tax on the grounds that their facilities are available to youngsters and family groups on a local basis; and

WHEREAS, many nonprofit hunting, fishing, conservation, shooting and similar clubs provide recreational opportunities for the families of their members and still others open their facilities for youth instruction in nature study, hunting and fishing, as well as for picnicking, swimming and other recreational pursuits; and

WHEREAS, the properties of some clubs provide and maintain essential habitat for waterfowl and other forms of valuable wildlife; and

Resolution No. 19 Continued

WHEREAS, the existing 20 percent federal excise tax appears to conflict with the purposes of new programs, particularly those of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, to encourage civic, church, youth, sportsmen's and other groups to enter into agreements with landowners as a means of developing needed outdoor recreational opportunities on the nation's farms while at the same time taking land out of crop production and providing a means of reducing crop surpluses and stabilizing farm incomes, as well as with the urgency of wetlands preservation.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners does hereby respectfully request that the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, in connection with its current review of the federal excise tax structure, examine the applicability of the 20-percent federal excise tax on nonprofit hunting, fishing, shooting, conservation and similar clubs with a view to determining the advisability of rescinding such tax in view of the demonstrable public benefit that can arise from the operation and maintenance of such clubs.

"Positive action by the committee to suggest the abolition of the 20-percent excise tax on nonprofit hunting, fishing, conservation, shooting and similar sporting clubs would be consistent with the findings and recommendations of the 1962 report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission."

APPENDIX II

Report of the Secretary-Treasurer - AMFGC, July 15, 1964

According to the By-Laws, the officers of this organization serve until December 31, and so the new Secretary-Treasurer technically will take office on January 1, 1965. Shortly after that time, I hope to transmit to him the official records and materials in my possession in addition to the funds in my accounts. Fortunately we are quite sure who the new Secretary-Treasurer will be and he met with me while the Auditing Committee went over the books last evening so he has received some background information which will be helpful in carrying out his duties.

In like manner, I was a member of the Auditing Committee the previous year in Ohio and thereby learned some of the procedures. However, it would be best if Carl Mosley, Jr. of Ohio could have been here to give this report today, for it is his records which have been audited and his activities as Treasurer on which I must report. As for my work, I still must send out dues notices and collect $35.00 from each state. Also, many of the expenses from this meeting and for preparation of the Proceedings still must be covered before I can balance my books.

I think Carl Mosley did a fine job as Treasurer and he deserves a vote of appreciation. By frugal operations in the 1962-63 year he increased our assets almost $253.00. On January 8, 1964, I received $2,078.58 from him which I deposited in the Hilldale State Bank of Madison, Wisconsin - $1,700 on a certificate of deposit at 4 percent and the remainder of $378.58 in a checking account. It is my hope that an amount somewhat equal to this can be sent on to the new Treasurer after we have collected the $650.00 in dues from our 16 member states and provinces.

One suggestion I'd like to make at this time is in regard to preservation of our records. (About three years of correspondence was turned over to me and it doesn't seem necessary to keep any more than that of the previous year.) I'd like to recommend that all such material be deposited with the Conservation Library Center at Denver for safekeeping if over a year old. Our Treasurer's records, fortunately, go back to 1950 (when I previously was Secretary-Treasurer) as they are in a book transferred with the association funds, and this could continue to be used in this manner until the book is full--after which it could be deposited a year later after it has been audited. As our earlier records seem to have been lost--except for published Proceedings, I so move with the acceptance of this report.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Walter E. Scott

Walter E. Scott
Secretary-Treasurer

APPENDIX III

Bill Review for Legislative Report
Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners' Meeting

By Chairman Gaylord A. Walker (Michigan)

1. Land and Water Conservation Fund (H. R. 3846 and Senate 859)

   A. The overall purpose of the bill is to provide a means whereby the states and the various federal agencies will be able to meet the needs

of an expanding population for outdoor recreation. The bill provides for the financing of federal recreation land acquisition and further provides for a state grant-in-aid program.

It is specified that 60 percent of the appropriations will be for state purposes and 40 percent for federal purposes. These percentages may be varied during the first five years of the program up to a maximum of 15 percentage points. The life of the fund would be limited to 25 years.

The measure is expected to provide a continuing fund estimated to be $180-million annually. Advance appropriations up to $60-million per year are authorized during the first three years of the program. The revenue would come from three sources: The sale of federal surplus real property and related personal property; the existing four cents per gallon federal tax on fuels used in motorboats; and from recreation user fees and charges at federal areas. This last source of revenue appears to be the most controversial part of the bill. It has been modified in response to this opposition. As now being considered, the bill would permit user fees to be collected only on those areas which are "administered primarily for scenic, scientific, historical, cultural, recreational or wilderness purposes" and at which "recreational facilities or services are provided at federal expense". This means that access to undeveloped Forest Service, BLM, Wildlife Refuge, and other areas will continue to be free. The proposed generalized apportionment formula calls for two-fifths of all funds made available to the states to be allotted equally among the 50 states. The remaining three-fifths will be allotted on the basis of the states' needs as determined by population, nonresident use of outdoor recreation facilities, and the extent of federal outdoor recreation programs within the state. No state may receive more than seven percent of the total allotment to all states in any given year.

Grants to the states from the Land and Water Conservation Fund will be available for three types of outdoor recreation projects. They are:

1. Statewide comprehensive planning
2. Land acquisition
3. Development

Fund matching will be on a 50-50 basis. Acquisition and development projects must be in accord with a comprehensive plan submitted by the applicant state and approved by the Secretary of Interior. It is expected that planning projects will receive the major emphasis in most states during the first few years of the program. As the comprehensive planning phase is completed, land acquisition projects will then receive top consideration.

B. Present Status - H. R. 3846 has been favorably reported by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and also by the House Rules Committee. The House leadership has scheduled floor debate on this important bill to begin on July 22. It is expected that the bill will be voted upon on July 23.

C. Opposition

(1) Some opposition registered on the Senate side over the proposed change in the apportionment formula to the states. This change would benefit the sparsely populated western states and would adversely affect the more heavily populated states in the Midwest and East.

(2) The waterway associations and lumbering interests have actively opposed this bill.

(3) A few representatives have opposed this bill because of alleged diversion of funds from the highway fund and so-called back door financing.

2. Public Works Acceleration Act (H. R. 10805 and S. 1856)

A. Purpose - To combat unemployment and underemployment with beneficial public works projects. This bill would continue to enlarge the $900-million program started in 1962. S. 1856 would provide for an additional $1.5-billion in APW projects. H. R. 10805 would authorize an additional $900-million for APW projects.

B. Status - H. R. 10805 has been referred to the House Committee on Public Works for hearings. S. 1856 was approved by the Senate Public Works Subcommittee on May 15, 1964. The bill was reported favorably with an amendment on June 1, 1964, by the full Senate Committee for Public Works.

3. Wilderness Preservation Bill (S. 4 and H. R. 9070)

A. Purpose - Approximately 8.9 million acres of national forest wilderness would be incorporated into a national wilderness preservation system. Primitive areas in national forests and some roadless portions of national parks and national wildlife refuges would be later added to the system by affirmative action of the Congress.

B. Status - S. 4 was passed by the Senate on April 9, 1963. H. R. 9070, one of 23 wilderness bills before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, received almost unanimous approval by this committee on June 18, 1964. Final floor action is expected in late July after House Rules Committee action.

C. Opposition - It is believed that many of the former objections are resolved as a result of 32 amendments attached to H. R. 9070 by the Public Lands Subcommittee. The Department of the Interior had previously endorsed S. 4 and had subsequently expressed the view that H. R. 9162, the so-called Dingell Bill, or Administration Bill, represents an acceptable solution to the various questions. The proposed bill, H. R. 9070, contains most of the basic features encompassed by H. R. 9162. Although several additional amendments were adopted by the House Interior Committee, the bill remains substantially as reported by the Public Lands Subcommittee.

(Items 4-12 appear in body of Proceedings.)

APPENDIX IV

Federal-State Relations Committee
of
Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners

Survey Report Prepared by Gordon Charles (South Dakota)

A mail survey of the 50 states brought a perfect response, with all 50 states answering their questionnaire. This indicates that every state is interested in the serious problem of losing technically-trained personnel from the states to the various federal agencies.

Due to the brief nature of the survey, only one solid conclusion can be drawn--federal agencies are definitely luring away the cream of the crop from state game and fish agencies. This is being done through higher salaries, and to a lesser degree, the promise of better retirement benefits.

The recent federal pay raise will undoubtedly increase state problems along these lines. Many states have been struggling to match federal pay scales and just when they have managed to make ends meet "somebody moved the ends again".

Adding up all of the questionnaires from the 50 states, here are the totals:

QUESTION #1: "How many technically-trained people have you lost to federal agencies since January 1, 1962?"

ANSWER: Nine states lost no personnel. The other 41 lost a total of 177. There were undoubtedly variations between states in just who was considered "technically-trained". Some states included all department personnel, some eliminated law enforcement and others eliminated forestry and parks people in their totals.

QUESTION #2: "What percentage of your normal technically-trained staff does this represent?"

ANSWER: Here again there was a variation in identification of personnel. Totals ranged from a high of 33-1/3 percent down to one percent. The 41 states which lost personnel lost an average of 4.3 persons during the period checked.

QUESTION #3: "List type of personnel and federal agencies to which lost."

ANSWER: 92 to U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service; 12 to U. S. Forest Service; 4 to Bureau of Commercial Fisheries; 5 to Army Corps of Engineers; 8 to Public Health Service; 5 to Bureau of Land Management; 5 to Bureau of Outdoor Recreation; 4 to National Park Service; and the remainder to the Soil Conservation Service, Federal Housing Administration, National Guard, Federal Power Commission, FBI, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Tennessee Valley Authority, and the U. S. State Department. Some states failed to answer this portion.

QUESTION #4: "Check reasons why your technical people left for federal jobs."

ANSWER: Higher salary, 40. Better retirement, 4. Five said it was also due to better promotional opportunities and new work experiences. One state said reasons why personnel left for federal service were not known.

QUESTION #5: "Has your state game and fish department hired any former federal employees within this same period?"

ANSWER: Thirteen states hired 21 former federal employees. Included was one state worker who had left for federal work and returned to the same state after 1½-years.

Of the 41 states reporting losses of technical personnel to the Feds since January 1, 1962, the following reported these actual losses:

		Percentage
CALIFORNIA	13	2%
WISCONSIN	12	5%
IOWA	11	16%
SOUTH DAKOTA	9	12%
OHIO	9	25%
MONTANA	8	8%
WEST VIRGINIA	8	10%
ARIZONA	8	12%
MICHIGAN	7	2%

While some states lost relatively few technical people, it amounted to a substantial percentage of their technically-trained staff. For example, Rhode Island only lost three people but it amounted to one-third of their technical staff.

Ohio and Florida lost 25%; Colorado 19%; Iowa 16%; North Carolina 13%; South Dakota, New Hampshire, Indiana, Arizona, all 12%; Alabama 11½%; Tennessee 11%; and Georgia, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Carolina, West Virginia, all 10%.

States Reporting No Losses:

Connecticut
Delaware
Hawaii
Kansas
Kentucky
Maryland
Minnesota
Pennsylvania
Vermont

COMMENTS FROM SURVEY

ALABAMA: "It was necessary to raise biologists' salaries recently to prevent loss of three additional men to USFWS."

IOWA: "A total of 11 men have been employed by the Feds in past two years from our entire commission staff (includes Fish, Game, Parks and Waters). Of the 11, one assistant director, 2 chiefs of divisions, 2 biologists and 4 game wardens, Piracy!"

LOUISIANA: "The Louisiana Department of Civil Service has established a new pay scale which now makes us competitive with federal service on most job levels."

MISSISSIPPI: "Since 1950 we have had the equivalent to a complete turnover of technically-trained employees lost to federal employment, based on our present staff of 14 game and fish biologists. We have lost a total of 13 during this period."

PENNSYLVANIA: "Had this period begun December 1, 1961, we would have reported two men having gone to USFWS when their jobs were closed out because of reduced revenue."

SOUTH CAROLINA: "If you had requested information since 1960 we would have had a higher percentage lost to the Feds, including Forest Service, USFWS and SCS."

TENNESSEE: "A junior biologist left us for USFWS employment in 1962 but returned after about 1½-years employment."

ALASKA: "Some left, no doubt, because of higher salary, others for a variety of reasons, including change of climate, teaching opportunity."

Survey compiled by:

Gordon Charles
Chief, Information & Education
Department of Game, Fish and Parks
Pierre, South Dakota

July 9, 1964

State	No. Lost	Percentage	Federal Agencies	No. Feds Hired
Alabama	3	11.5	1 SCS; 1 USFWS; 1 TVA	None
Alaska	5	5	2 USFS; 1 ARMY ENG.; 2 USFWS	3
Arizona	8	12	Not Given	None
Arkansas	1	5	1 BC FISH.	None
California	13	2	8 USFWS; 2 USFS; 1 PHS; 1 STATE DEPT.; 1 BC FISH.	2
Colorado	3	19	3 USFWS	None

State	No. Lost	Percentage	Federal Agencies.	No. Feds Hired
Connecticut	None	--	-----	None
Delaware	None	--	-----	None
Florida	8	25	8 USFWS	2
Georgia	2	10	2 USFS; 1 USFWS	None
Hawaii	None	--	-----	1
Idaho	6	6	2 USFWS; 1 INTER. REV.; 1 FBI; 1 BLM; 1 FPC	1
Illinois	1	1	1 USFWS	None
Indiana	6	12	5 USFWS; 1 SCS	None
Iowa	11	16	-----	None
Kansas	None	--	-----	1
Kentucky	None	--	-----	
Louisiana	5	--	4 USFWS; 1 PHS	None
Maine	3	9	2 USFWS; 1 USNG	2
Maryland	None	--	-----	None
Massachusetts	1	5	1 USFWS	None
Michigan	7	2	5 USFWS; 1 BIA; 1 NPS	None
Minnesota	None	--	-----	None
Mississippi	1	6		None
Missouri	2	7	2 USFWS	None
Montana	8	8	4 USFWS; 1 BC FISH.; 1 ARMY ENG.; 1 BLM; 1 NPS	None
Nebraska	3	5.7	1 USFS; 1 USFWS; 1 NPS	3
Nevada	2	8	2 USFWS	None
New Hampshire	2	12	2 USFWS	None
New Jersey	2	9	1 BOR; 1 BC FISH.	None
New Mexico	3	10	3 USFWS	1
New York	1	1	1 USFWS	None
North Carolina	4	13	3 USFWS; 1 PHS	None
North Dakota	3	10	3 USFWS	
Ohio	9	25	6 USFWS; 2 PHS; 1 BOR	1
Oklahoma	3	10	2 USFWS; 1 ARMY ENG.	None
Oregon	2	3	1 USFWS; 1 SCS	None
Pennsylvania	None	--	-----	None
Rhode Island	3	33-1/3	2 USFWS; 1 PHS	None
South Carolina	1	10	1 USFWS	None
South Dakota	9	12	1 USFS; 2 PHS; 4 USFWS; 1 BOR; 1 BIA	None
Tennessee	2	11	2 USFWS	1 (Ret.)
Texas	4	5	4 USFWS	None
Utah	5	6	2 USFS; 1 BLM; 1 USFWS; 1 FBI; 1 FHA	1
Vermont	None	--	-----	None
Virginia	4	3	2 USFWS; 2 USFS	2
Washington	3	5	1 ARMY ENG.; 1 BIA	None
West Virginia	8	10	2 USFWS; 1 BLM; 2 USFS; 1 PHS; 1 CFA ENG.; 1 ARMY ENG.	
Wisconsin	12	5	6 USFWS; 3 BOR; 1 BLM; 1 NPS; 1 BIA	None
Wyoming	2	4	2 Hatchery Biologists (USFWS)	None

APPENDIX V

Report on Lead Poisoning in Waterfowl

By Arthur S. Hawkins, Mississippi Flyway Representative
(July 24, 1964)

Every year in all four flyways, thousands of waterfowl die from or are incapacitated by lead poisoning. This loss could be greatly reduced immediately, and, over a period of time, eliminated almost entirely if waterfowl hunters used shells having nontoxic shot. They are unable to apply this conservation measure at present because such shells are not on the market.

Before this wastage can be eliminated, a shot must be found which not only is nontoxic, but also has certain other qualities. Its manufacture must not add substantially to present ammunition costs. It must compare favorably with lead in its ability to kill. It must not damage gun barrels.

A substitute for lead shot which meets all these requirements does not exist at present but a sincere effort is being made to find one. The attack on the problem is three-pronged including investigations on: (1) lead alloys which disintegrate rapidly on contact with water, (2) plastic coatings over lead which will not wear through in a duck's gizzard and (3) iron or steel shot instead of lead.

Large industries are playing an important role in the investigations. Dow Chemical has zeroed in on the alloy approach; Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company on the plastic coating approach; and Wheelabrator Corporation on the iron/steel approach. Olin Mathieson Chemical Corporation and Remington Arms and Ammunition Company are working closely with them as well as on their own. With a team of this calibre involved, chances for a break-through appear good although the problem is admittedly difficult.

Why are large industries interested in this problem? The stakes are higher than most people realize. If a suitable shot is found, in all likelihood it would become compulsory to use it while hunting waterfowl. The tonnage itself is quite impressive--upwards to 6,000 tons deposited over waterfowl hunting areas per year. But it goes beyond that. Whoever finds the answer has made a major contribution to wildlife conservation. Hence, there is a public relations value involved which is very high. Humanitarianism is involved, too. The business world contains some of our most dedicated conservationists. The business world also contains some of our most skilled scientists. They react positively toward a real challenge and are quick to admit that the lead poisoning problem falls into that category.

Meanwhile the wildlife specialists are not standing idly by. The Mississippi Flyway Council singled out lead poisoning as its special project during the past year and has assigned segments of the problem to its Planning Committee and Technical Section.

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife spearheaded a nationwide survey of the problem and collected information from more than 300 state, federal and private waterfowl experts. At Patuxent Wildlife Research Center a committee is preparing a job outline on a long-range research study of this subject and has commenced some of the laboratory work.

Project W-59 at Utah State University is a study of "the settlement, oxidation, and general availability of lead shot". An excellent report on the incidence of ingested lead shot among waterfowl utilizing the Sauvie Island Game Management Area was completed July 3, 1964, by a technician of the Oregon State Game Commission.

The Wildlife Management Institute has participated in a liaison capacity between the wildlife people and industry. The Illinois Natural History Survey is again making available the hard-earned knowledge gained over many years of investigations on this subject.

In short, interest in solving the lead poisoning problem is at an all-time high. There is general agreement that we can't afford the waste and there is an air of optimism that this time it can be solved.

APPENDIX VI

The Pheasant and Cover Requirements - A Plan for Wildlife Benefits Under Federal Farm Programs

(Actual Text of Prepared Statement)

Roy Melendy
Northeast Colorado Pheasant Cover Committee
Sterling, Colorado

Let's build a home for the "Queen" that she will "populate the earth" so each sportsman may "fill his bag".

White sweet clover with a light mixture of grasses on a three-year rotation, stands out best adapted to fill all requirements for the "high plains-summer fallow area".

1. It gives protection to our birds under severe blizzard conditions and against the ravages of hawks and owls.

2. It furnishes nesting and rearing habitat near food.

3. It lends itself to harvesting by affording heavy cover which tends to bunch the birds.

4. It is easy for the farmer to obtain a stand and requires the minimum of attention in management.

5. It is one of our best soil builders in that it implants free nitrogen from the air into the soil.

After many meetings over northeast Colorado with farmers, we came out with this definite practice because it would serve our pheasants and land well and would be a practice we felt the farmer would "buy" and "live with". We felt we needed a definite program.

America has 50 million more farm acres than are necessary to produce needed food and fiber. We want our share of those acres to put to the useful purpose of free recreation for everyone. This recreation practice could come to us as a bonus or added use to the land removed from crop production.

You Commissioners and Directors outside the high plains should bestir yourselves to use your share of these excess acres to the practice which will best fit the needs of your wildlife, always keeping in mind you are dealing with private land and the owners best interest is a "must". This is a cooperative movement and all must recognize the farmer will be reluctant to go along unless it is a good practice and he has control of trespass and management other than the practice itself.

We have gone to Washington with our program and received a very favorable cooperative reception. We met with the Colorado State ASC Committee and received their approval and at their suggestion, called together the presidents of the five county ASC chairmen, the Game, Fish and Parks, and the Northeast Colorado Farmers' Pheasant Committee, and with the help of the state office, we drew up a sample docket and asked that it be put into handbook as a practice in our five-county pilot program. This we have now done and the docket is now printed and being mailed to the Secretary of Agriculture and all Colorado representation in Washington. (Copies of this docket are on the table and will be given to those interested at the close of this program.)

We need a team composed of Game Commissioners and Directors, farmers, and sportsmen to implement these 50-million acres into realistic wildlife cover and at the same time build these acres into improved productive acres, should the nation need added production.

We might ask, "How can that be brought about?"

If the Game Commissioners and Directors will come up with a program and get the farmers to back it, as their own, in each state, the right start will be made.

The next appeal should be to the Secretary of Agriculture with a copy of this appeal to the legislators of the state in question.

Letters of endorsement can also be secured by such clubs as Kiwanis, Lions, Rotary, and Farmers' organizations on a nonpartisan basis. An endorsement by city and country people will give a united front for Washington consideration.

You people have no idea how much support you can get for this program if you get the right people to spearhead it.

Let's take this "recreation tide" while it serves.

Will we use these 50 million acres? It is up to you.

ACP - 1965 - Colorado June 22, 1964

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service

PILOT 1965 WILDLIFE CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Section 1 - APPLICABLE REGULATIONS AND PROVISIONS

The 1965 ACP regulations and the following provisions constitute the 1965 Pilot Wildlife Conservation Program for Colorado.

Section 2 - APPLICABLE COUNTIES

The 1965 Pilot Wildlife Conservation Program is applicable to approved practices in Logan, Phillips, Sedgwick, Washington and Yuma Counties.

Section 3 - GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

A. ADJUSTMENT PAYMENT RATES

For designated acreage qualifying for payment the approved adjustment rate per acre will be the same as the applicable feed grain or wheat diversion rate, whichever is higher, determined for the farm. Adjustment payment will be forfeited if pastured or if harvested for hay or seed.

B. MAXIMUM ADJUSTMENT PAYMENT

The maximum adjustment payment to per person with respect to the farm under the agreement shall be $2,500 per year.

C. WHEN TO RECEIVE PAYMENT

Each person signing the agreement may choose to receive his share of the adjustment payment in the program year in which the agreement becomes effective or in equal annual payments for each year of the agreement.

D. PARTICIPATION

Any producer may participate in the Wildlife Conservation Program by agreeing to devote cropland acres to an approved wildlife cover crop practice for a period of three years. All or a portion of the designated acres may be seeded in any one of the three years.

E. ELIGIBLE LAND

The basic purpose of the Wildlife Conservation Program is to encourage farmers to devote a portion of their cropland to pheasant nesting and feeding grounds and at the same time preserve and improve the soil. On farms participating in the Wheat or Feed Grain Program land designated as conserving acreage is eligible. On farms participating in the Conservation Reserve Program any cropland other than designated conservation reserve land is eligible. On farms not participating in the aforementioned programs any cropland is eligible which has not been retired from production. Eligible acres entered in program shall not exceed 30 percent of the cropland on farm.

Section 4 - APPROVED PRACTICES

G-1 ESTABLISHMENT OF VEGETATIVE COVER PROVIDING WILDLIFE FOOD PLOTS AND HABITAT

APPROVED FOR: Logan, Phillips, Sedgwick, Washington, Yuma

APPLICABILITY: Cropland

MAXIMUM FEDERAL COST-SHARE

a. 80 percent of the cost of seed, not to exceed $4.80 per acre.

b. 80 percent of the cost of drilling, not to exceed $1.12 per acre.

c. 80 percent of the cost, not to exceed $2.40 per rod of permanent fence constructed in accordance with the specifications under Practice B-9 as needed to protect the seeded areas from grazing by domestic livestock, excluding boundary and road fences.

This practice is to encourage desirable forms of wildlife by the establishment of choice food and cover. This practice is applicable only to cropland which is to be established in grasses, or legumes to provide food or habitat for wildlife. No crop may be harvested from the land as pasture, hay, grain, silage or seed. Plantings must be protected from destructive fire at all times and placed so that the species of game to be encouraged will have ready access to them. Cost may be shared for the reseeding as determined by the county committee.

Eligible Legumes and Seeding Rates. Cost may be shared for planting a minimum of three to five pounds of white blossom sweet clover (Meliolotus alba) for wildlife food and habitat. Seeding rates for mixtures of other grasses with clover will be determined by the county committee, as for A-2 and specified in the County ACP Handbook.

Quality Standards for Seed. Seed eligible for cost-sharing must conform to the requirements of the State Seed Law. The county committee shall require good quality seed. All spring seeded sweet clover seed must have been scarified. All seed eligible for cost-share must have a seed laboratory test regardless of the seed origin. The county committee shall require the farmer to furnish either a seed tag showing the laboratory analysis or a report of such analysis in support of practice performance. The tag or report must show both germination and purity in order to determine the quantity of pure live seed eligible for cost-share.

Technical Responsibility. Determination of need and practicability, site selection, layout work, supervision of installation, and certification of performance shall be the responsibility of the county committee. The county committee may utilize assistance to the extent available from the Colorado State Game, Fish and Parks Department in carrying out the technical responsibilities of this practice.

Very respectfully,

Lloyd Hodges
Walter Ahnstedt
Robert Saylor
Roy L. Melendy
Pheasant Cover Committee

APPENDIX VII

Midwest Mourning Dove Committee Report No. 2
Submitted By Kenneth C. Sadler, Chairman
June, 1964

The Membership of the
Midwest Technical Dove Committee

MISSOURI -- Kenneth C. Sadler, Chairman, Missouri Conservation Commission, Bouchelle and William Streets, Columbia, Missouri

NORTH DAKOTA -- Lloyd Oldenberg, Secretary, North Dakota Game and Fish Department, Oakes, North Dakota

COLORADO -- Jack Grebe, Colorado Department of Game and Fish, 317 West Prospect Street, Fort Collins, Colorado

ILLINOIS -- Thomas Evans, Illinois Department of Conservation, State Office Building, Springfield, Illinois

INDIANA -- John Allen, Indiana Department of Conservation, Box 117, West Newton, Indiana

IOWA -- Dr. Eugene Klonglan, Iowa Conservation Commission, 3019 Northwood Drive, Ames, Iowa

KANSAS -- Oliver J. Gasswint, Kansas Forestry, Fish and Game Commission, Pratt, Kansas

MICHIGAN -- Donald W. Douglas, Michigan Department of Conservation, Lansing, Michigan

MINNESOTA -- Maynard Nelson, Minnesota Departments of Conservation, Game Research Center, Madelia, Minnesota

NEBRASKA -- Kenneth L. Johnson, Nebraska Game Commission, Lincoln, Nebraska

OHIO -- Kenneth R. Russell, Olentangy Wildlife Experimental Station, Route 1, Ashley, Ohio

SOUTH DAKOTA -- Fred Priewert, South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks, State Office Buildings, Pierre, South Dakota

WISCONSIN -- James B. Hale, Wisconsin Conservation Department, R. R. 2, Madison, Wisconsin

MANITOBA -- Eugene F. Bossenmaier, Manitoba Department of Mines and Natural Resources, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife Personnel

Dr. Thomas S. Baskett, Wildlife Research Unit, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri

Howard Wight, Migratory Bird Populations Station, Patuxent Wildlife Research, Laurel, Maryland

Dr. Arnold Hausen, Wildlife Research Unit, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa

Wildlife Management Institute

Leonard Foote, 701 Mape Avenue, Marietta, Georgia

TO: The Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners

FROM: Midwest Technical Dove Committee

SUBJECT: Mourning Dove Committee Report - 1964

Establishment of the Midwest Technical Dove Committee in 1961 has served several important dove research needs. Probably the most important has been the providing of a forum where plans and problems of committee members, as well as federally coordinated programs could be discussed. Prior to the formation of the committee, dove researchers at the state, university and federal levels relied on chance meetings at regional and national wildlife conferences to discuss research and management projects of mutual interest. Biologists in neighboring states with common interests in dove research were often unaware of the other's projects. Coordination of research and management efforts under this disunited approach was difficult at best, and often virtually impossible. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife coordinated dove projects were made more difficult, too, because of the lack of opportunity to meet and counsel with a region-wide group of dove workers.

It would be inaccurate to say that the formation of the committee has solved all of our dove research and management problems in the Midwest. The formation of the committee with its annual meetings has, however, provided the opportunity for advancing a well coordinated regional dove research program for a better understanding, and wiser use, of our valuable dove resource.

The Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners is to be commended for its role in establishing and supporting this committee.

It has been the purpose of the committee to focus interest and encourage action by the member states on three primary points of dove research, these are:

1. Utilization by all states of a standardized system of determining annual breeding dove population levels.

2. To expand participation in a program of preseason and postseason dove banding as a means of better assessing the role of hunting as a mortality factor in doves.

3. To encourage participation by member states in a study of the distribution and virulence of the disease trichomoniasis in doves.

This report summarizes the results of work on the studies during the past year. Additional projects of a specialized nature, conducted at the Wildlife Research Units at the State Universities in Missouri and Iowa are also contained in this report.

This report was made possible by reports to the committee from the member states and from Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife personnel. The cooperation of these state and federal agencies in the preparation of this report is acknowledged with gratitude.

Note: The information contained in this report may NOT be used for publication without written permission from the contributing agency, or the committee chairman.

One of the programs adopted by the Midwest Dove Committee soon after the committee was formed was to press for the randomization of all call-count routes in the region. While there has been a standardized procedure followed in the taking of the census since it was begun, the locations of the census routes within each state were selected by the state personnel. As a consequence, the result of the census could not be directly compared between states. By following a procedure of sampling the larger ecological land units across the continent, in a truly randomized way, more meaningful data would be available.

Following is a tabulation of the progress made thus far in the randomization of call-count routes in the Midwest.

STATE	RANDOMIZED	YEAR
Colorado	Yes	1964
Illinois	Yes	1964
Indiana	No	----
Iowa	Yes	1964
Kansas	Yes	1963
Michigan	No	----
Minnesota	Yes	1963
Missouri	Yes	1963
Nebraska	Yes	1963
North Dakota	No	----
Ohio	Yes	1964
South Dakota	?	----
Wisconsin	Yes	1963
Manitoba	No	----
Ontario	?	----

Mourning Dove Breeding Population Status 1964

By Howard M. Wight and Earl B. Baysinger
Section of Migratory Upland Game Bird Studies

ABSTRACT

The 1964 mourning dove breeding population index was established from call-count survey data from 786 comparable routes in the United States. Trends in the breeding-population indexes from 1963 to 1964 are as follows:

Eastern Unit up 10%
Central Unit up 4%
Western Unit up 21%

For the entire United States, the index was up 8 percent.

A reversal of general declines in the dove breeding population since 1960 is indicated by 1964 data. Routes in the Western Unit indicate a major

increase in the breeding population in 1964, which places that Unit's index close to the 1959 peak.

A comparison of the 1964 breeding-population indexes with the 11-year average (1953-1963) shows that in the Eastern Unit the 1964 index is 7 percent higher, the Central Unit is 2 percent lower, and the Western Unit is 17 percent above the 11-year average. For the entire United States, the breeding population is 4 percent above the 11-year average index.

INTRODUCTION

An annual survey of the breeding population of mourning doves by a system of call-count routes provides an index to the status of the population in the United States. Through the cooperation of state, bureau, and independent observers, call-count routes were widely established by 1953. The hundreds of cooperators who participate in the call-count survey have contributed the data that form the basis for this report.

The call-count survey period is May 20 - June 10; a period during which dove calling activity is relatively stable, as indicated by intensive studies in eastern United States (Special Scientific Report--Wildlife No. 17). Because hunting regulations must be published 30 days prior to the hunting season, the Dove Regulations Committee can meet no later than the latter part of June. Status statistics must be summarized for consideration by this committee. This preliminary version of the 1964 Status Report serves this purpose.

PROCEDURE

The Call-Count Method

Call-count routes were established after field investigations in 1950-51 demonstrated the feasibility of the technique. These investigations were reported by Foote, Peters, McGowan, Kerley, Duvall, Robbins, and Wagner (1952). Doves heard calling and doves seen are recorded on a route 20 miles in length with listening stations one mile apart. Call-counts begin one-half hour before sunrise and continue for two hours. Information on the call-count method and procedures for randomly selecting call-count routes was presented by Foote, Peters, and Finkner (1958).

The call-count survey provides the only population index for doves currently available on a national and international scale. It has limitations and possible biases that require consideration and evaluation through further study. It is an index to the breeding population only and does not indicate production. This is an important limitation because a high percentage of an average fall population is composed of young of the year. In calculating trends in the breeding population, doves heard calling has been a less variable index than doves seen. Additional research is needed to understand the relationship of doves heard calling and doves seen to the actual population in various portions of the mourning dove breeding range.

TRENDS IN THE BREEDING-POPULATION INDEX-1964*

Table 1. Trends in Doves Heard Calling on Call-Count Routes in the Midwest, 1963 to 1964

HUNTING STATES

State	Est. Dove Habitat (sq. mi.)	Comparable Routes	Average Heard Per Route & Indices** 1963 Heard	1963 Index	1964 Heard	1964 Index	Percent Change
Colo.	72,777	16	12.5	910	14.9	1,084	+19.2
Ill.	55,947	29	30.0	1,678	27.0	1,511	-10.0
Kans.	92,113	22	56.5	5,204	60.2	5,545	+ 6.5
Mo.	69,270	18	36.2	2,507	39.7	2,750	+ 9.7
N. Dak.	70,054	23	33.1	2,319	33.4	2,340	+ 0.9
	360,161	108		12,618		13,230	+ 4.8

Table 2. Trends in Doves Heard Calling on Call-Routes in the Midwest, 1963 to 1964

NONHUNTING STATES

Ind.	36,205	8	28.6	1,035	29.6	1,072	+ 3.5
Iowa	55,986	15	72.2	4,044	75.1	4,205	+ 4.0
Mich.	28,511	9	33.8	964	38.6	1,101	+14.2
Minn.	60,007	13	25.1	1,506	31.6	1,896	+25.9
Nebr.	76,653	21	43.9	3,367	49.4	3,787	+12.5
Ohio	41,122	15	21.1	868	20.3	835	- 3.8
S. Dak.	73,475	11	29.7	2,180	26.2	1,925	-11.8
Wisc.	38,300	20	27.5	1,053	29.7	1,138	+ 8.0
	410,259	112		15,017		15,959	+ 6.3

* Changes have been made by the report editor to include only data for the states represented by the Dove Committee.

**From a base year, average doves heard calling per route for each state has been adjusted annually according to the percentage change from the preceding year on comparable routes. The index, expressed in thousands, is the product of the adjusted average doves heard per route and the estimated area of dove habitat.

Table 3. Trends in the Breeding-Population Indices in the Midwest, 1957 to 1964

HUNTING STATES

State	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964
Colo.	4,192	3,377	1,732	2,540	1,223	1,223	910	1,084
Ill.	1,695	1,835	1,857	1,768	2,014	1,639	1,678	1,511
Kans.	3,952	3,952	4,624	5,683	5,775	5,877	5,204	5,545
Mo.	4,225	3,651	3,214	3,429	3,089	2,916	2,507	2,750
N. Dak.							2,319	2,340
TOTALS	14,064	12,815	11,427	13,420	12,101	11,655	10,299	13,230
ANNUAL							(12,618)	
FLUCTUATIONS		-8.9%	-10.8%	+17.4%	-9.8%	-3.7%	-11.6%	+4.8%

Table 4. Trends in the Breeding-Population Indices in the Midwest, 1957 to 1964

NONHUNTING STATES

State	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964
Ind.	1,188	1,231	1,282	970	1,093	905	1,035	1,072
Iowa	3,225	2,833	4,624	3,695	4,619	4,479	4,044	4,205
Mich.	630	707	858	775	821	653	964	1,101
Minn.	1,986	1,734	1,446	1,404	1,806	1,494	1,506	1,896
Nebr.	4,109	2,691	5,626	6,270	5,082	4,009	3,367	3,787
Ohio	831	999	835	732	888	1,060	868	835
N. Dak.	1,730	2,123	2,319	2,452	2,585	2,326		
S. Dak.	5,459	3,806	3,453	2,160	2,608	2,013	2,180	1,925
Wisc.	1,452	1,314	1,210	1,379	1,367	958	1,053	1,138
TOTALS	20,610	17,438	21,653	19,837	20,869	17,897	15,017	15,959
ANNUAL						(15,571)		
FLUCTUATIONS		-15.4%	+24.2%	-8.4%	+5.2%	-14.2%	-3.5%	+6.3%

Despite the fact that most states and the Federal Government regard mourning doves as excellent game birds, some states still deny their hunters the opportunity to hunt them. This denial of hunting opportunity is presumably based on the assumption that doves are being protected. Interestingly, the Annual Fluctuations section of Tables 3 and 4 offer little support for the view that nonhunting states have favorably influenced their dove populations by having closed seasons. The restriction of hunting seems only to deprive hunters of recreation, and has no visible effect on the nonhunting states' annual dove population.

Mourning doves are legally harvested in 31 of the 48 contiguous states. Unfortunately, 8 of the remaining 17 nonhunting states are within the region represented by the Midwest Dove Committee.

During the past year progress was made in one state, North Dakota. In 1963, through the action of Governor William L. Guy, North Dakota hunters enjoyed their first dove hunting in 40 years. Although it was an abbreviated season, with a September 21 opening, it was a start, hopefully, with a long tradition.

Wisconsin too, made some progress, or sorts. Efforts to "permanently" give mourning doves songbird status in the Badger State were defeated in the State Assembly. Here too, the Governor played a key role by vetoing an earlier measure. Governor Reynolds' veto was sustained in the Assembly.

Introduction of dove hunting legislation is planned for 1965 in Nebraska and Ohio. The prospects for enabling legislation in the remaining nonhunting states in the near future do not seem bright.

Pre- and Post-Season Banding of Mourning Doves

By Howard M. Wight
Chief, Section of Migratory Upland Game Bird Studies
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife

The pre- and post-season banding of mourning doves is a national program of dove research. Its purpose is to aid in the determination of the importance of hunting as a mortality factor in doves. It is the logical follow-up of the national program of banding nestling doves which was designed to provide information on studies of migrational movements and to determine the relationships of production areas to harvest areas in dove populations in the United States.

The objectives of the pre- and post-season mourning dove banding program are to band sufficient numbers of mourning doves (that have reached the flying stage) in all geographic areas to allow calculations of mortality rates for dove populations by state and geographic areas. More specifically, the program is designed to measure that portion of the mortality that occurs during the hunting season. The latter can be accomplished by comparing the first year recovery rates of birds banded in the post-season period with the second year recovery rates of those banded in the preseason period.

The preseason banding period is defined as that period from June through August, and the post-season period is from January 15 through March.

This method is based on the assumption that if all birds banded during the preseason period had survived to the post-season period, the recovery rate of the two groups would be the same. A difference in the two recovery rates, therefore, can be assigned to the mortality that occurred during the hunting period between the two banding periods. This method does not determine the gun mortality alone, since we cannot assume that all mortality occurring in the hunting period is the result of gun mortality. With good samples of banding in various parts of the dove range, however, it will be possible to compare mortality rates from area to area within the hunting season months, as well as to make year-to-year comparisons between areas. Furthermore, additional bandings are needed in many regions of the United States for the computation of mortality rates. Proper sex and age identification will enable further subdivision of mortality measurements by the various age and sex components of the mourning dove population.

It is proposed that a quota of 2,000 doves per year will be banded preseason per state. This banding will be a joint effort between state and Bureau personnel. The program will run for three years beginning in 1964 and terminating at the end of the post-season period on March 31, 1967. Post-season bandings will be conducted on winter dove concentrations in all states where feasible. Although it is difficult to establish quotas for the post-season banding, since not all states have an equal opportunity to band mourning doves post-season, it is recommended that all states with significant wintering populations attempt to band a minimum of 2,000 doves annually.

Overall mortality estimates and estimates of mortality that occurs during the hunting period will be prepared by the Migratory Bird Populations Station of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

In the banding analysis that is currently being completed at the Migratory Bird Populations Station, statistically significant differences have been noted in the distributional patterns of birds banded as locals and immatures as contrasted with those of adults. Furthermore, significant differences in the mortality rates between locals, immatures, and adults have also been noted. Differences have also been noted between the mortality rates of adult males and adult females. Because these differences occur both in distribution and mortality, it is imperative that age identification be made whenever possible among adults. Birds banded post-season will be classed as adults. Sex identification of adults is most important since at present, insufficient banding data of sexed adults are available from which to calculate mortality rates by sex among populations of doves in most regions of the United States.

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, through its Regional Office, has already mailed instructions for the banding of mourning doves in conjunction with the pre- and post-season banding program to Bureau personnel. The emphasis of this banding program is placed on the banding of doves that have reached flight stages and the nesting banding program is considered terminated.

In the absence of a nationwide measurement of dove kill, the pre- and post-season banding program represents our best approach to measuring the place of sport hunting in the total mortality of the mourning dove.

Table 5. Preseason Bandings and Recoveries of Adult Doves from Midwest States 1949-1962

HUNTING STATES

State	Bandings	Direct Shot Recoveries	Total Shot Recoveries	Direct Recovery Rate
Colorado	308	3	5	.97
Illinois	190	11	13	5.78
Kansas	112	0	2	.00
Missouri	4,883	95	180	1.94
N. Dakota	134	1	3	.74
	5,627	110	203	1.95

NONHUNTING STATES

Indiana	1,142	1	2	.08
Iowa	34	1	1	2.94
Michigan	402	4	5	.99
Minnesota	438	7	12	1.59
Nebraska	188	1	2	.53
Ohio	1,536	7	13	.45
So. Dakota	67	1	1	1.49
Wisconsin	262	1	4	.38
	4,039	23	40	.56

Table 6. Preseason Bandings and Recoveries of Immature Doves from Midwest States 1949-1962

HUNTING STATES

Colorado	172	3	6	1.74
Illinois	255	5	6	1.96
Kansas	215	5	6	2.32
Missouri	1,173	18	30	1.53
N. Dakota	160	2	4	1.25
	1,975	33	52	1.67

Table 6. Continued

NONHUNTING STATES

States	Bandings	Direct Shot Recoveries	Total Shot Recoveries	Direct Recovery Rate
Indiana	2,718	20	21	.73
Iowa	58	0	1	.00
Michigan	147	1	1	.68
Minnesota	96	1	1	1.04
Nebraska	97	2	4	2.06
Ohio	1,194	18	25	1.50
So. Dakota	35	1	1	2.85
Wisconsin	113	5	6	4.42
	4,458	48	60	1.07

Table 7. Preseason Bandings and Recoveries of Local Doves from Midwest States 1949-1962

HUNTING STATES

Colorado	1,354	14	22	1.03
Illinois	7,785	156	201	2.00
Kansas	5,667	63	107	1.11
Missouri	4,311	85	125	1.97
N. Dakota	9,635	59	111	.61
	28,752	377	566	1.31

NONHUNTING STATES

Indiana	6,728	33	39	.49
Iowa	5,046	34	54	.67
Michigan	2,018	33	45	1.63
Minnesota	4,926	33	51	.66
Nebraska	6,704	42	72	.62
Ohio	11,867	92	134	.77
So. Dakota	5,015	31	54	.61
Wisconsin	1,477	26	38	1.76
	43,781	324	487	.74

The Preseason Banding Program, ie. The banding of immatures and adults, not nestlings or locals, will receive a boost in 1964 with the operation of many additional banding sites by state and federal personnel. Following is a list of the personnel participating in this program:

APPENDIX VIII

Report of Midwest Pheasant Council Activities
to the
Midwest Association of Fish and Game Commissioners

By Victor S. Janson
Immediate Past Chairman, Midwest Pheasant Council

The Midwest Pheasant Council, authorized by your Association in 1957, held their annual meeting in Aberdeen, South Dakota, April 7-9, 1964. A good cross section of the states has now been visited during these annual meetings: Minnesota, Ohio, Nebraska, Wisconsin, Colorado, Michigan, and South Dakota. Members of the Midwest Pheasant Council have thus had the opportunity to observe pheasant habitat in much of the Midwest pheasant range. These field trips, which have included discussions of management problems relative to each area, have added to our knowledge of pheasant requirements in the Midwest. We feel these trips afield to get firsthand views of pheasant range in areas other than the states in which we work are an important feature of the pheasant council group.

A list of Midwest Pheasant Council reports was submitted to you during the past year by our secretary, Dr. Eugene Klonglan (Iowa). A total of 26 reports was completed at that time. Four additional reports have been submitted during the past year. These include information regarding 1963 spring breeding populations and 1963 fall populations of pheasants in the Midwest. Reports on pheasant population status were begun in 1961 by Besadny (Wisconsin). In 1962, both spring and fall status reports were prepared so that administrators would have the latest information on how the Midwest pheasant situation was progressing.

The report entitled "A Summary of Current Pheasant Research in the Midwest", by Janson (Michigan) was prepared in July, 1963, particularly with administrators in mind. It briefly outlines 54 current research projects in the Midwest area and we believe should be a handy reference for administrators. If more detailed information on any of these studies is desired, it can be obtained from the state or province initiating the work.

Harold Swope (Colorado), reported on his committee's findings regarding Pesticide-Pheasant Investigations. He presented information compiled from a number of states and from federal research centers. A 1962 California study was conducted to determine residue levels of DDT and dieldrin in wild pheasant populations. Results showed high concentrations of DDT in pheasant hens where the birds had been submitted to DDT and dieldrin, but little differences were noted in dieldrin residues in pheasants from the pesticide-treated and control areas. Also, there were no significant differences in average clutch size and egg fertility. The greatest difference in pheasant production was in the survival of young. The mortality of young from hatching to six weeks of age was 46 percent in the pesticide-treated area and only 27 percent in the control area. In addition, 25 percent of the young from the pesticide-treated area were crippled as compared to 13 percent from the control area. It was found in the

1962 study that the main source of contamination of pheasants was seed rice which contained large amounts of DDT. The agricultural practice of applying seed rice with DDT has been declared illegal in California. Additional efforts were made in 1963 to determine public health implications. An analysis of 250 pheasant samples indicated pheasants were safe to eat.

Other pesticide investigations were conducted in Colorado and Michigan. Both studies are summarized in Mr. Swope's report (copies available from secretary of Midwest Pheasant Council).

The Council meeting in April was well attended and included personnel from all but three of the 15 member states and provinces. In addition, the State of Pennsylvania was represented.

Each state reported at the annual meeting on the 1963 hunting season success and current pheasant population trends. Most states reported an open winter with populations and harvests up or down only slightly. Notable exceptions included Illinois with a record kill of over a million pheasants and Iowa with a 42 percent increase last fall in the western one-third of the state.

South Dakota's Game, Fish and Parks Director, Walter J. Fillmore, officially welcomed the Pheasant Council to South Dakota. He discussed the problem of dwindling pheasant habitat and pointed to the recent loss of one million acres of prime habitat along the Missouri River as the result of water impoundment projects.

Mr. Dell Dawson, Commissioner for the South Dakota Fish and Game Commission, also spoke to us briefly. He commended our work and suggested that if the Council could eliminate duplication in pheasant research (one of our stated objectives), this alone would justify our existence. It was Commissioner Dawson's feeling that appointment of a member of the Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners to act as coordinator of Midwest pheasant research efforts would give needed direction toward cooperative research projects.

The Council decided to resubmit a resolution for consideration by the Resolutions Committee of the Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners concerning pheasant hunting season recommendations. Although a similar document was presented a year ago, it was not in proper resolution form and, therefore, was not considered at that time. We also are presenting a resolution concerning the treatment of roadside cover to improve pheasant production. This resolution was drawn up in preliminary form by Richard Nomsen (Iowa). It was studied and revised by our Resolutions Committee, and then approved by the official delegates to the Midwest Pheasant Council.

A report was made by Glenn Chambers (Missouri) on the progress and results to date in Missouri's attempt to establish pheasants south of their present range by trying various strains and crosses. Repeated attempts to extend the pheasant range thereby releasing game farm strains of ring-necked pheasants have failed. It is reasoned that their failures have resulted from the inability of these birds to establish nests, or of the eggs to withstand the high ground temperatures associated with the nesting period in Missouri. The western black-necked pheasant, Phasianas colchicus talischensis, crossed with the ringneck, has been tried extensively. These birds have disappeared

in some areas but are maintaining fair populations in other areas. The pure-strain Korean pheasant, P. c. karpowi, appears to be most resistant to high temperatures and environmental stresses and is currently being stocked in large numbers.

Another subject discussed at our April meeting was a report on the food habits and nutrition of the ring-necked pheasant by Korschgen (Missouri). Emphasis of this study was on ascertaining whether a calcium deficiency limited pheasant abundance and distribution in Missouri. Collections of both male and female wild pheasants in Missouri and other midwestern states from January to July demonstrated that female pheasants had a definite ability to select calcium-rich foods during the production period, April through June. Calcium levels in the hen diets were 1.44 percent in April, 4.59 percent in May, and 2.71 percent in June. These amounts were, respectively, 6, 14, and 10 times the amounts for male birds during the same months. Because of the natural abundance of snails, availability of limestone resulting from surfacing of county roads, and agricultural liming applications, lack of calcium is not considered the limiting factor to pheasant distribution in Missouri.

Bob Dahlgren (South Dakota) discussed a study on the relationship between eye lens weight and age of pheasants. He found lens growth in juveniles to be 95 percent complete by seven or eight months--with growth complete by the end of a year. He concluded from the data obtained that this method of aging had no practical application.

Dahlgren also reported on a South Dakota winter mortality study. He stated that blizzard losses were sustained an average of every other year and that starvation losses occur three years out of every 17. Starvation weights were found to be 44 percent of normal in both male and female pheasants. The occurrence of fat and conformation of the breast tissues were more reliable criteria of body condition than weight.

A report on pheasant movements in North Dakota in an area surrounding a known winter concentration point was made by Lloyd Oldenburg. Pheasants captured, banded, and retrapped moved an average of 2.5 miles to get to winter cover.

Paul Vohs (Iowa State University Wildlife Research Unit) discussed studies underway at the Iowa research unit. One important study now underway is to identify heritable blood group factors of pheasants, which may provide information relating to survival of wild pheasant populations. Knowledge of blood types of pheasants will allow introduction of genetic markers into natural populations. By this method, it would be possible to tell if introduced birds successfully mated with native birds. Offspring of introduced birds could be identified (impossible with present techniques) soon after hatching and throughout their life.

Part of the time at the meeting was spent in four discussion groups. These groups wrestled with problems pertaining to pheasant habitat, behavior sex and age ratio sampling, and inventory techniques. Examination of these broad subjects was quite an eye-opener for most of us and indicated much was still unknown in the field of pheasant biology.

It was felt that a definite need exists to standardize some of our game inventory techniques (such as crowing counts and brood surveys) on a Midwest pheasant range basis. Many states conduct crowing surveys, but different methods are involved. Some have 20 stop routes, others only 10. Some start the route 50 minutes before sunrise, others 30. Pheasant brood surveys are conducted by biologists in some states and by rural mail carriers in others. Counts are made only on mornings with heavy to moderate dewfall in some states and no regard is given to dewfall in other states. The Council plans to determine the best methods presently being used in the various surveys and then make adjustments (where practical) so the surveys will be more uniform, resulting in more reliable data for the Midwest pheasant range.

Two committees were appointed and will be active during the year. The Pesticide-Pheasant Investigations Committee is composed of chairman Harold Swope (Colorado) and Carl Wolfe (Nebraska). The Resolutions Committee chairman will be Eugene Klonglan (Iowa) with help from C. D. Besadny (Wisconsin) and Maynard Nelson (Minnesota).

Carl Trautman (South Dakota) is the new Midwest Pheasant Council chairman; William Morris (Ontario) is vice-chairman; John Weigand (Nebraska) will serve as secretary. The next annual meeting is scheduled for Ontario sometime in April, 1965. Council members are convinced that worthwhile research and spread of information continues to be forthcoming from our pheasant group. We invite your constructive criticism and suggestions in helping to make the Midwest Pheasant Council a better contributor toward your needs.

MIDWEST PHEASANT COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS
ADAPTED FROM
"PHEASANT HUNTING SEASON RECOMMENDATIONS"

Unanimously adopted by the
Midwest Pheasant Council
A technical study committee of the
Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners
June 4, 1964

WHEREAS, the pheasant is the most important game bird in most of the Midwest, being pursued by millions of hunters every year, and

WHEREAS, opportunities to effectively utilize existing game resources are sometimes overlooked, as evidenced by the underharvest of cock pheasants in nearly every area of the Midwest, and

WHEREAS, liberal hunting regulations and bag limits are inexpensive management tools which can result in an increased cock harvest and additional recreation for pheasant hunters, and

WHEREAS, maximum pheasant productivity can be maintained when a high percentage of the cock population is harvested,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners recommends that the following points be considered in the setting of pheasant hunting seasons, recognizing at the same time that the several concepts presented are applicable to midwestern pheasant areas in varying degrees and that season recommendations for specific areas are the direct responsibility of each state or province:

1. That liberal bag limits, both daily and possession, are important tools in effecting an adequate harvest of surplus roosters; and, further, that egg fertility and hen productivity have remained high in areas where a high proportion of cocks has been harvested - even in areas with post-season sex ratios of 10 or more hens per cock;

2. That hunting opportunity may be needlessly reduced by restrictive shooting hours; and, further, that:
   (a) Liberal shooting hours will result not only in an increased cock harvest but also in increased recreation, being particularly favorable to those whose working hours permit only limited hunting opportunity,
   (b) Liberal shooting hours will result in a better distribution of hunter pressure, as hunting effort will be spread over more hours of the day,
   (c) Early morning and late afternoon shooting hours are conducive to an increased cock harvest, as the behavior of the birds makes them more vulnerable during these hours,
   (d) Early and late hours are most important to dog owners since dogs are most effective then; dogs add enjoyment to the hunt, increase the harvest, and lessen the waste of lost birds;

3. That both adult and juvenile pheasants die from natural causes at a relatively rapid rate during late summer and fall, and, therefore, it is advisable to start the hunt as early in the fall as possible, providing due consideration has been given to other factors - such as the abundance of standing agricultural crops and natural cover, and the ease of distinguishing between the sexes in young pheasants;

4. That post-hunting season surveys have invariably shown that surplus roosters are still available to support a longer season;

5. That opposition to liberalizing hunting regulations cannot be justified because of hens that are illegally shot, since the increased take of cocks should outweigh the small associated hen kill; and, further, that the illegal hen kill from both deliberate and accidental shooting is usually less than 1/6 of the total annual hen mortality, and this has not been shown to be detrimental to breeding-population levels the following year;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Association recommends that, in view of the continued surplus of pheasant cocks each year, research and management efforts should be intensified to solve specific problems relating to this surplus;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that since the Midwest Pheasant Council, a technical committee of this Association, presently recommends that hen seasons be established only if they are part of a well-conceived experimental research program designed to determine both the immediate and long-range effects, and since some states are currently investigating the feasibility of legalized hen shooting, this Association strongly encourages the continuation of these studies and the initiation of related research.

"TREATMENT OF ROADSIDE COVER FOR PHEASANTS"

Adopted by the
Midwest Pheasant Council
A technical study committee of the
Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners
June 15, 1964

WHEREAS, the pheasant is the number one game bird in most of the Midwest, and is pursued by millions of sportsmen each year, and

WHEREAS, intensified agricultural land-use practices are having an increasingly unfavorable influence on pheasant production, particularly through adverse effects on nesting cover as shown by the steady trend toward more row crops and subsequent decline in small grains and other grassy cover types essential for nesting, as well as the trend toward earlier hay mowing and the continued drainage of wetlands, and

WHEREAS, roadside nesting cover constitutes a sizeable and well distributed type of pheasant production habitat, which is especially important in the areas of most intensive farming, and

WHEREAS, pheasant production would be substantially improved by certain changes in the treatment of roadsides aimed at providing better nesting cover and allowing sufficient time for the majority of nests to hatch,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners recommends that the following points be considered by those responsible for the maintenance of roadsides along primary and secondary roads in each of the member states and provinces:

1. Roadside vegetation should be left undisturbed whenever such vegetation is compatible with traffic needs and land use on adjacent property;

2. When mowing of roadsides is deemed necessary, it should be delayed until after the peak of the hatching season;

3. If early mowing is believed necessary, consideration should be given to mowing only the road shoulder, with further thought being given to limiting all mowing to this part of the roadside;

4. Spot spraying with herbicides should be encouraged as a substitute for mowing whenever control of scattered patches of noxious weeds is deemed necessary;

5. If the entire roadside is to be sprayed, this operation should be delayed until after the peak of the hatching season;

6. Burning, cutting for hay and grazing of roadsides should be discouraged at all times;

7. Improving roadside cover by seeding plant species beneficial to pheasant nesting and weed control, particularly low-growing species that do not have to be mowed, should be emphasized.

8. The roadside maintenance program should be coordinated with the individual agency responsible for wildlife management in each state or province to provide maximum benefits for pheasants and other ground nesting species.

APPENDIX IX

CONSTITUTION

Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners
(Revised Draft July 8, 1964)

PREAMBLE

The name of this organization shall be the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners. The object of the Association shall be to foster and promote uniform game laws and regulations of the member states and provinces; to gather and disseminate information, exchange ideas and lend helpful cooperation in all matters of research and investigation pertinent to the conservation of wildlife and general outdoor recreation; to lend its support to the United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, and Dominion Wildlife Service, in an extension program beneficial to game, migratory waterfowl, and fisheries; to cooperate in the establishment and creation of federal and dominion migratory bird sanctuaries, refuges and shooting areas, and to submit authentic

information upon which the Fish and Wildlife Service and Dominion Wildlife Service may base conclusions in prescribing regulations for the annual take of waterfowl; to cooperate with the Divisions of Fisheries in their programs and to encourage and assist sportsmen's and conservationists' organizations so that the fullest measure of cooperation may be secured from our citizenry in the protection, preservation and restoration of our wildlife resources.

ARTICLE I

OFFICERS

Section I. The officers of the Association shall be President, Vice-President, Secretary-Treasurer and a Board of Directors composed of the President, Vice-President, and Secretary-Treasurer of the Association, and one representative from each state and province except those represented by the officers of the Association.

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

ARTICLE II

MEMBERSHIP

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

BY-LAWS

Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners

ARTICLE I

DUTIES OF OFFICERS
(Including changes of July 8, 1954, and July 19, 1960)

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

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

Section III. The Secretary-Treasurer shall keep a record of all transactions of the meetings of the Association, as well as meetings of the Board of Directors, shall notify members of the time and place of meetings, be custodian of all funds of the Association and draw all warrants for the payment of claims properly presented, and perform such other duties as are naturally incumbent upon the office. He shall bill the several members and collect the annual dues. The incumbent Secretary of each year shall record the proceedings of that year and shall prepare and forward five copies to each member in good standing, the cost to be paid out of the Association's fund.

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

Section V. The tenure of the succeeding officers of the Association will be from January 1 of each year through December 31.

ARTICLE II

MEETINGS

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

ARTICLE III

VOTING

Voting shall be by states and provinces, as units. Each state and province shall have one vote.

ARTICLE IV

DUES

Annual dues shall be $35.00, payable in advance, at, or before each annual meeting.

ARTICLE V

QUORUM

A majority of all member states and provinces in good standing shall constitute a quorum.

ARTICLE VI

AMENDMENT

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

APPENDIX X

HISTORY OF THE
ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND GAME COMMISSIONERS

By Walter E. Scott, Secretary-Treasurer
Wisconsin Conservation Department
(June, 1950 and Revised April, 1965)

As there has been a definite need of a brief history of the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, and as Wisconsin had available a fairly complete set of proceedings of various meetings to complement those in the Association's files, your secretary has attempted this historical summary. It is not absolutely complete. It may not be absolutely accurate. Proceedings for several meetings during the war years were not prepared and were unavailable. Even the list of officers during certain years is subject to question. Where there is such a question it is so indicated: (?). Possibly this survey will help locate some of these records and facts for the Association's files.

All participating states have received "reprint" copies of the proceedings of the first two meetings so little will be said about the purpose or founding of this organization on October 28, 1934 at Des Moines, Iowa. It is evident, however, that I. T. Bode, then Director in Iowa, was one of the men who did most to develop the idea for this group and instigate its formation. He was ably assisted by H. W. MacKenzie (Wisconsin), Oscar Johnson (South Dakota),

E. V. Willard (Minnesota) and other administrators from the eight original states of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota and Wisconsin.

To the credit of the Association is the fact that it never failed to hold its annual meeting in spite of "hell and high water" (we are thinking of Winnipeg in 1950) and the following chart gives the location and available facts on such meetings of which three each have been held to date in the states of Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, and South Dakota. The 1964 meeting was Wisconsin's fourth. None have been held to date in Kentucky or Manitoba.

NO.	PLACE	CITY AND STATE	DATE	APPROX. ATTEND.	PROCEEDINGS
1.	Savery Hotel	Des Moines, Ia.	Oct. 28, '34	24	10 p.
2.	Hotel Lowery	St. Paul, Minn.	June 29-30, '35	25	30 p.
3.	State Capitol	Madison, Wis.	June 16-17, '36	54	96 p.
4.	Carpenter Hotel	Sioux Falls, S. D.	June 11-13, '37	49	*139 p.
5.	Paxton Hotel	Omaha, Nebr.	June 8-9, '38	30	*107 p.
6.	State Capitol	Madison, Wis.	June 12-13, '39	51	*98 p.
7.	Hotel Hanford	Mason City, Ia.	June 17-18, '40	51	110 p.
8.	Statler Hotel	St. Louis, Mo.	June 4-5, '41	23	132 p.
9.	Hotel Duluth	Duluth, Minn.	June 25-26, '42	35	69 p.
10.	Cons. Trg. Sch.	Fox Lake, Ill.	Sept. 21, '43	-	*no file
11.	Prince Hotel	Bismarck, N. D.	Oct. 3-4, '44	-	* "
12.	Claypool Hotel	Indianapolis, Ind.	July 31-Aug 1, '45	-	* "
13.	--	Rapid City, S. D.	- 1946	-	* "
14.	Cons. Trg. Sch.	Roscommon, Mich.	July 14-16, '47	28	*112 p.
15.	Cons. Trg. Sch.	Put-in-Bay, Ohio	July 16-17, '48	-	*198 p.
16.	Cornhusker Hotel	Lincoln, Nebr.	Oct. 3-4, '49	67	129 p.
17.	Hotel Wisconsin	Milwaukee, Wis.	July 24-26, '50	198	161 p.
18.	Broadview Hotel	Wichita, Kan.	Aug. 18-19, '51	-	115 p.
19.	Ft. Des Moines Hotel	Des Moines, Ia.	Aug. 15-16, '52	60	122 p.
20.	Ont. Forest Rang. Sch.	Dorset, Ont.	Aug. 14-15, '53	-	321 p.
21.	Statler Hotel	St. Louis, Mo.	July 8, '54	-	99 p.
22.	Stanley Hotel	Estes Park, Colo.	July 18-20, '55	-	87 p.
23.	St. Nicholas Hotel	Springfield, Ill.	July 9-11, '56	-	168 p.
24.	Itasca St. Pk.	Park Rapid, Minn.	July 10-12, '57	-	98 p.
25.	Provident Life Ins. Building	Bismarck, N. D.	July 10-12, '58	-	116 p.
26.	Memorial Center Purdue Univ.	W. Lafayette, Ind.	July 9-10, '59	72	153 p.
27.	Sheraton Johnson Hotel	Rapid City, S. D.	July 18-19, '60	81	114 p.
28.	Cons. Trg. Sch.	Higgins Lake, Mich.	July 10-11, '61	66	136 p.
29.	Paxton Hotel	Omaha, Nebr.	June 28-30, '62	95	92 p.
30.	Neil House	Columbus, Ohio	July 8-9, '63	70	79 p.
31.	Milwaukee Inn	Milwaukee, Wis.	July 12-15, '64	162	-

Note: The Secretary will be pleased to add missing facts on the master file copy. Association files need copies of proceedings of all meetings marked with asterisk.

Although the Association started with eight original states, the constitution and by-laws never outlined any specific states included. Membership of states and provinces is reflected by the fact that they were assigned a Director on the Board and paid dues. As well as can be determined in the absence of complete records of business sessions, the additional seven states and provinces became members in the following years: Kansas (1940); Indiana (1942); Michigan (1943); Ohio (1945); Ontario and Manitoba (1948); Colorado (1949); and Kentucky (1956). General procedure has been (with exceptions) that the vice-president becomes President the following year and the annual meeting is held in the President's home state or province. Of recent years, for better administration, the secretary-treasurer has also been selected from the President's state or province. Following is a list of officers since the Association started, indicating their names with the annual meeting at which they were selected.

MEETING	PRESIDENT	VICE-PRESIDENT	SECRETARY-TREASURER
1.	John Foley (Minn.)	Frank O'Connell (Nebr.)	I. T. Bode (Ia.)
2.	H. W. MacKenzie (Wis.)	Oscar Johnson (S. D.)	Frank O'Connell (Nebr.)
3.	Oscar Johnson (S. D.)	Frank O'Connell (Nebr.)	John Foley (Minn.)
4.	Frank O'Connell (Nebr.)	Ernest Swift (Wis.)	Charles McFarlane (Minn.)
5.	Ernest Swift (Wis.)	M. L. Hutton (Ia.)	George Walters (S. D.)
6.	M. L. Hutton (Ia.)	George Weaver (Minn.)	E. G. Adams (S. D.)
7.	I. T. Bode (Mo.)	Lewis Martin (Ill.)	Fred Schwob (Ia.)
8.	W. L. Strunk (Minn.)	Wm. J. Lowe (N. D.)	J. W. Cluett (S. D.)
9.	Livingston Osborne (Ill.)	Wm. J. Lowe (N. D.)	H. F. Mosbaugh (Ind.)
10.	Wm. J. Lowe (N. D.)	H. F. Mosbaugh (Ind.)	Paul Gilbert (Nebr.)
11.	H. F. Mosbaugh (Ind.)	Dave Leahy (Kan.)	Fred Schwob (Ia.)*
12.	Elmer Peterson (S. D.)	H. D. Ruhl (Mich.)(?)	Ernest Swift (Wis.)
13.	H. D. Ruhl (Mich.)	Dave Leahy (Kan.)	Robt. Sparks (Ill.)
14.	H. A. Rider (Ohio)	Clark Wilson (Nebr.)	E. L. Wickliff (Ohio)
15.	Paul Gilbert (Nebr.)	Ernest Swift (Wis.)	Lloyd Vance (Nebr.)
16.	Ernest Swift (Wis.)	Dave Leahy (Kan.)	Walter Scott (Wis.)
17.	Dave Leahy (Kan.)	B. F. Stiles (Ia.)	H. Lutz (Kan.)
18.	B. F. Stiles (Ia.)	W. J. K. Harkness (Ont.)	L. F. Faber (Ia.)
19.	W. J. K. Harkness (Ont.)	I. T. Bode (Mo.)	C. H. D. Clarke (Ont.)
20.	I. T. Bode (Mo.)	Thomas Kimball (Colo.)	M. O. Steen (Mo.)
21.	Thomas Kimball (Colo.)	Chester Wilson (Minn.)	J. D. Hart (Colo.)
22.	Glen Palmer (Ill.)	James Kimball (Minn.)	Sam Parr (Ill.)
23.	James Kimball (Minn.)	H. R. Morgan (N. D.)	Gordon Wollan (Minn.)
24.	I. G. Bue (N. D.)	William Barnes (Ind.)	Wilbur Boldt (N. D.)
25.	William Barnes (Ind.)	Harry Woodward (S. D.)	John Allen (Ind.)
26.	Harry Woodward (S. D.)	Gerald Eddy (Mich.)	Edward Johnson (S. D.)
27.	Gerald Eddy (Mich.)	Mel Steen (Nebr.)	S. C. Whitlock (Mich.)
28.	Mel Steen (Nebr.)	Hayden Olds (Ohio)	Phil Agee (Nebr.)
29.	Hayden Olds (Ohio)	L. P. Voigt (Wis.)	Carl Mosley, Jr. (Ohio)
30.	L. P. Voigt (Wis.)	C. H. D. Clarke (Ont.)	Walter Scott (Wis.)
31.	C. H. D. Clarke (Ont.)	George Moore (Kan.)	D. N. Omand (Ont.)

*Due to illness, Fred Schwob may have been replaced this year by someone from Kansas but this is not known definitely.

According to the constitution, each state or province is represented by a member on the Board of Directors either by one of the officers listed on the previous page or a delegate named by the state or province. These representatives over the years (when known from available records and other than officers) were named at the following meetings:

Colorado: C. N. Feast, 1949, 1950, 1951; Thomas L. Kimball-1952, 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956; Absent-1957, 1958, 1959; Thomas L. Kimball-1960; Robert Elliott-1961; Harry Woodward-1962; Robert L. Evans-1963; Robert Elliott-1964

Illinois: C. F. Thompson-1934, 1935, 1936, 1937; Thomas Lynch-1938; Lewis Martin-1939; Livingston E. Osborne-1941, 1948; (?), 1943, 1944, and 1945; Robert C. Sparks-1947; Leonard Schwartz-1949, 1950; Absent-1951, 1952, 1953; J. B. Davidson-1954; Glen Palmer-1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960; William Lodge-1961, 1962, 1963, 1964

Indiana: (?), 1945; D. R. Hughes-1946, 1947, 1948; Kenneth M. Kunkel-1949; H. P. Cottingham-1950; Absent-1951; M. L. Davis-1952; Harley Hook-1953; William Barnes-1954; Harley Hook-1955; William Barnes-1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960; Woodrow Fleming-1961, 1962, 1963; Donald Foltz-1964

Iowa: Mrs. Margo K. Frankel-1935, 1936; Layton Blizzard-1937; F. T. Schwob-1941, 1942; (?), 1943 and 1945; Bruce Stiles-1946, 1948, 1949; A. L. Ziemer-1947; Bruce Stiles-1950; Ray Beckman-1951; Bruce Stiles-1952, 1953, 1954, 1955; Ray Beckman-1956; Paul Leaverton-1957; Frank Heidelbauer-1958; Paul Leaverton-1959; Glen Powers-1960, 1961, 1962; E. B. Speaker-1963, 1964

Kansas: Guy Josserand-1940, 1941, 1942; (?), 1943 and 1945; Dave Leahy-1947, 1948, 1950, 1951, 1952; Harry Lutz-1953; Dave Leahy-1954; Harry Lutz-1955; Absent-1956; Fred Warder-1957, 1958, 1959; Dave Leahy-1960; Absent-1961; George Moore-1962, 1963, 1964

Kentucky: Minor Clark-1959; Arnold Mitchell-1960; Dan Russell-1961; Arnold Mitchell-1962; Absent-1963; Arnold Mitchell-1964

Manitoba: C. W. Malaher-1949, 1950; Absent-1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957; Albert Hockbaum-1958; Absent-1959; Eugene Bossenmaier-1960; Absent-1961, 1962, 1963, 1964

Michigan: (?)-1943, 1944 and possibly 1945; H. D. Ruhl-1947, 1948, 1949; P. J. Hoffmaster-1950; Tucker ?-1951; H. D. Ruhl-1952, 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956; Justin Leonard-1957, 1958; Absent-1959; Gerald Eddy-1960, 1961, 1962, 1963; Ralph MacMullan-1964

Minnesota: John R. Foley-1935; H. C. Wenzil-1938; W. L. Strunk-1940, 1942; (?) 1943, 1944, and 1945; Frank Blair-1946, 1947; Chester Wilson-1948, 1949, 1950; H D. Ruhl-1951; Chester Wilson-1952; E. F. Willard-1953; Frank D. Blair-1954; James Kimball-1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962; D. H. Ledin-1963; Wayne Olson-1964

Missouri: Wilbur C. Bulford-1934, 1935, 1936, 1937; I. T. Bode-1938, 1939, 1941, 1942; (?)-1943, 1944, 1945; Melvin O. Steen-1946, 1947, 1948, 1949; I. T. Bode-1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956; William Towell-1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964

Nebraska: M. M. Sullivan-1938, 1939; J. B. Douglas-1940; W. H. Lytle-1941, 1942; (?)-1944, 1945; Paul T. Gilbert-1946, 1947, 1949, 1950; Lloyd Vance-1951; Paul Gilbert-1952; Absent-1953; Jack Strain-1954; Paul Gilbert-1955; Melvin Steen-1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962; Willard R. Barbee-1963; Melvin Steen-1964

North Dakota: Thoralf Swenson-1934; Arthur Peterson-1935, 1936; D. W. Hulterstrom-1937, 1938; Wm. J. Lowe-1939, 1940, 1946, 1947; (?) 1944, 1945; H. R. Morgan-1948, 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952; Absent-1953; H. R. Morgan-1954, 1955, 1956, 1957; I. G. Bue-1958, 1959, 1960; Absent-1961; Russell Stuart-1962; Wilbur Boldt-1963; Russell Stuart-1964

Ohio: (?)-1945; Lester Bailey-1946; H. A. Rider-1948, 1949, replaced by A. W. Marion to complete 1949 term, E. D. Martin-1950; A. W. Marion-1951; Charles Dambach-1952, 1953, 1954, 1955; Hayden Olds-1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961; Kermit Morse-1962; Hayden Olds-1963; Fred Morr-1964

Ontario: W. J. K. Harkness-1949, 1950, 1951; C. H. D. Clarke-1952; W. J. K. Harkness-1953; C. H. D. Clarke-1954; Absent-1955; W. J. K. Harkness-1956; C. H D. Clarke-1957, 1958, 1959; Alex Cringan-1960; D. N. Omand-1961; R. C. Passman-1962; D. N. Omand-1963; C. H. D. Clarke-1964

South Dakota: Frank Cundill-1934; George Walters-1937; J. W. Cluett-1940; Elmer Peterson-1941, 1942, 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949; (?) 1943, 1944; N. E. McEachron-1950; Absent-1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957; Harry Woodward-1958, 1959, 1960; Absent-1961; Walter Fillmore-1962; Les Berner-1963; Gordon Charles-1964

Wisconsin: H. W. MacKenzie-1934, 1936, 1941; Ernest Swift-1939, 1940, 1942, 1946, 1947; (?)-1943, 1944; Ernest Swift-1950; W. E. Scott?-1951; Ernest Swift-1952; G. E. Sprecher-1953; C. Kabat-1954; L. P. Voigt-1955; 1956, 1957; G. E. Sprecher-1958; L. P. Voigt-1959; C. Kabat-1960; W. E. Scott-1961; L. P. Voigt-1962, 1963, 1964

Constitution and Actions

The original constitution and by-laws approved at the founder's meeting of 1936 evidently were not changed until the 1942 meeting when the requirement of attendance by a majority of commissioners was dropped, a single vote per state was allowed and time was specified for publicizing amendments to the constitution and by-laws. Another change was made at the 1944 meeting when the annual dues of member states was increased to $10.00 from $5.00 (although this formal change may not have been made until later). Major and final revision was accomplished at the 1949 meeting when organization titles were brought up to date: the word "Province" was included where "States" are mentioned; the vice-president was included in the Board and duties of the secretary-treasurer were revised slightly. Changes made on July 8, 1954 and July 19, 1960 increased the

annual membership dues to $35.00. Changed the tenure of officers to a calendar year basis and more clearly spelled out the duties of the secretary-treasurer. The present constitution and by-laws, as reproduced July 8, 1964, is published in this Proceedings.

Because dues for the first ten years were only $5.00 for eight or nine states, and because dues frequently were not levied (and sometimes not paid) the treasury of May 29, 1939 totaled $39.59; June 13, 1939, $30.29; June 5, 1941, $.30; July 15, 1947, $90.00 plus a possible South Dakota bank account of $45.00; October 9, 1948, $292.50 and on February 7, 1950, $433.50. By January, 1964, Association funds were $2,078.58 for an all-time high with all bills paid. Money from dues has been used to pay postage, print stationery, rent meeting rooms, and help defray the cost of preparing the proceedings of annual meetings. The proceedings of 1944 meeting probably were not prepared because of lack of funds in the treasury. Frequently, states have taken care of all or most of these expenses so there was no drain on the Association's funds for ordinary operation costs of the annual meetings.

The first two years of the Association each member state was assigned a study project for the following meeting as a committee. These included such subjects as federal legislation, waterfowl, public hunting grounds and sanctuaries, federal fisheries programs, interstate cooperation, federal jurisdication over game and fish on U. S. lands, economic value of the pheasant, soil conservation in relation to fish life and the restoration of shallow water lakes. Throughout the first nine years of the Association's life one of its primary functions was the making of recommendations for the waterfowl season in an advisory capacity to the Biological Survey and U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Meetings always were then held in June, but in recent years they have come as late as October. Waterfowl always has been a major subject for discussion along with state's rights, federal legislation and game and fish management administration. The general meeting procedure has been the presentation of several papers or talks which led to discussion. However, several meetings, such as those at Missouri, Ohio and Nebraska (1949) successfully used discussion leaders on major topics without formal papers. A survey of 29 of the 31 meetings held to date reveals the following subjects have been given major discussion or covered by papers:

Administration

- Federal legislation - 29
- General problems (fish and game) - 6
- Federal aid (P-R) - 15
- Game management in federal forests and U. S. controls in states - 6
- Relation of law enforcement to wildlife management - 5
- Interstate cooperation in regulations - 2
- Wildlife research cooperation and application - 4
- Cooperation in war effort and post-war plans - 2
- Federal fisheries program and state cooperation - 4
- Simplifying P-R and D-J - 1
- In-service training - 9 (wardens specifically - 2)
- Reciprocal licenses and nonresidents - 5
- Federal military lands to states - 1
- Finances and licenses - 4
- Trapping regulations - 2
- Civil Service laws and personnel problems - 4
- AAA wildlife values - 1
- Resettlement administration land acquisition - 1
- Radio in conservation work - 1
- Federal aid to fisheries - 3

Public Relations and Education

Conservation education (youth), etc. - 3
Farmer-sportsmen relationships - 6
Conservation publicity - 4
Wisconsin Conservation Congress - 1
Sportsmen's club cooperation - 3

Soils, Forests and Waters

Soil conservation and wildlife - 5
Reservoirs, dams and flood control - 8 (Mississippi River - 2)
Federal legislation on pollution control - 2
River basin surveys - 3
Zoning and forest recreation - 2

Game Management

Waterfowl - 21, including regulations (11), management (4), census (1)
Nesting - (2), refuges (2), feeding and baiting (3), zoning (2),
spring flight (1) and botulism (1)
(Many subjects overlap titles here given)
Public hunting grounds and refuges - 6
Pheasant management and trends - 6
Wild turkey - 1
Game production on private lands - 3
Game farms (pheasants and chukar) - 5
Predator (bounty systems) and rodent control - 3
Crow control - 1
Furbearers - 2 (beaver - 2)
Deer - 2
Mourning dove - 5
Game census - 1
Game habitat development - 4
Rabies in animals - 1

Fish Management

Aeration of lakes in winter - 1
Rough fish removal, etc. - 5
Population studies in lake (Ind.) - 1
Farm ponds - 3
Propagation - fish hatcheries and ponds - 5
Lake and stream habitat improvement - 5
Artificial propagation vs. natural production - 2
Great Lakes commercial fisheries - 3

Miscellaneous

Mississippi Valley Parkway - 1
History of Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners (Swift) - 1

Note: Many additional subjects brought in by the resolutions committees were given considerable discussion.

Business action of the Association has been brief except for consideration of resolutions. By way of other business, the group voted unanimously for a closed season on waterfowl in 1935 and again for a closed season in 1936 by a 4 to 3 tally. As this was not unanimous, the resolution on that subject was

"tempered" for greater support. In 1942 it was agreed to exchange P-R Quarterly Reports and in 1949 a committee for coordination between the states and provinces was formed.

As the resolutions passed probably best show the tradition of the Association, a study of the following summary for ten meetings in the first 16 years should be of interest.

Favored:

Closed waterfowl season in 1935
Seasons on waterfowl no less restricted than 1935 in 1936 and 1937
Waterfowl seasons planned were approved - 3
Better carp control by Federal Bureau of Fisheries - 3
Distribution of excise taxes for fisheries (Buck & Dingell Bills) - 4
P-R full allotments and extension service permission - 4
For state's rights and to rescind U. S. Forest regulation G-20-A-2
CCC lake and stream improvement - 1
Closure of more fire lanes in federal forests - 1
Passage federal legislation on pollution control (Mundt Bill) - 2
U. S. Forest regulation W-2-1
Adequate wildlife appropriations to federal agencies - 1
Increased duck stamp cost - 2
Second class mailing privilege for conservation bulletins - 1
Maintenance of Mississippi River pool levels - 1
Quetico - Superior Wilderness - 1
Federal waterfowl hearings - 1
Conservation Radio Communications Association - 1
Transfer of federal military lands to states - 1
Contact with U.S.F.W. Service liaison with armed forces - 1
Affirmed principal of public land use - 1
Resolutions passed by International Association - 1

Opposed:

Hope Bill on consolidation of federal agencies - 1
Bill on flyway management - 1
Bill to revamp U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service - 1
Bill on "free permits" - 1
Leasing of public lands to private individuals - 1

Resolutions of Appreciation were passed naming Ding Darling (1934), Sam G. Anderson (deceased) (1935), Oscar Johnson and Ira Gabrielson (1939), M. L. Hutton (deceased) (1941) and Aldo Leopold (deceased) (1949).

Note: It is of interest that resolutions of early meetings were more critical of the policies of federal agencies but that this criticism frequently changed to support with the federal agency's change in policy.

It should be stated that attendance at these meetings by member states and provinces has been good as seldom were delegates absent from more than three states. During the first four years Missouri did not have a representative at the meetings although it was a member. The first federal service personnel attended the 1935 meeting when Ray C. Steele was present. Since that time observers from federal agencies have been present at every meeting and frequently have participated in the discussions or program of papers. These included (in the first 16 years) Lyle F. Watts and H. L. Shantz of the U. S. Forest Service; Bernie Manvek, Thomas Schroeder, C. F. Culler, Floyd H. Davis,

Daniel Janzen, Rudolph Dieffenbach, Oscar Johnson, S. E. Jorgensen, Al Day, and H. F. Mosbaugh of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service; Verne Davison and Wallace Anderson of the U. S. Soil Conservation Service and others. The record indicates that these individuals have made an important contribution to the Association programs in the information they have been able to furnish on controversial subjects of interest to the members represented.

All states should check this summary to see if they can clarify any questionable items for the secretary. If your files contain an extra copy of any proceedings which the Association files lack, the secretary would appreciate a copy. It also would be desirable if Illinois, Indiana and South Dakota would check their files for the original copy of proceedings for the meeting held in their respective state. These should be in the Association's files which now have been deposited in the Conservation Library Center at Denver for safe-keeping. According to a letter from H. F. Mosbaugh dated July 26, 1945 when he was with the Indiana department, he also had the original minutes of the 1944 North Dakota meeting. They would be valuable if they could be found. These proceedings someday will be an important source of material for any history of conservation in the Midwest.

The purposes of this Association as outlined in the Preamble to the Constitution are still worthy of every effort made in behalf of this organization. It has today even greater potential for doing good service in the conservation cause than it had sixteen years ago. With unified thinking and support of every forward step in International as well as National projects, this vital segment of our continent can lead the way toward better appreciation and management of our fish and wildlife resources and the habitat which is imperative to their existence.

APPENDIX XI

REPORT OF THE TREASURER FOR CALENDAR YEAR 1964

On January 13, 1964 I received the funds of the Association from past Secretary-Treasurer Carl L. Mosley, Jr. of Ohio, in two checks totaling $2,078.58, along with other related files. Of this, $1,700 was deposited in a Savings Certificate at 4% interest and the remaining $378.58 was placed in a checking account. On February 10, 1965 I transmitted a check for $1,957.81 to the new Secretary-Treasurer, D. N. Omand of Ontario, indicating that total Association funds had been reduced by $120.77 during my term of office. This primarily was due to the fact that the 1964 gathering at Milwaukee was the 30th Anniversary meeting and many guests were invited and special activities scheduled.

The Treasurer's record book contains a detailed balance of receipts and disbursements which are backed up by returned checks, receipted bills, and similar reference material transmitted to the new Treasurer with this

report. These details will not be reported here except for the following summation:

Total Income for the Year was: $1,446.00
(Other than past Treas. balance)

Income Sources

16 members dues at $35.00 each	$ 560.00
129 meeting registrations at $2.00 each	258.00
112 banquet dinners at $5.00 each.....	560.00
Interest on Savings Account	68.00
Total	$1,446.00

Total Expenditure for the Year was: $1,566.77
(Not including transfer to new Treasurer)

Major Expenses

123 banquet dinners at $5.00 (incl. guests)....	$ 615.00
Other Annual meeting expenses.....	537.40
Recording and Printing Proceedings.....	413.65
Checking account costs.....	.72
Total	$1,566.77

The Association's books were balanced, all records organized and the Treasurer's book brought up to date for shipment to Treasurer Omand on March 8, 1965. Besides managing to spend more than was received, the retiring Treasurer succeeded in getting U. S. government income tax exemption for the AMFGC after complying with their demand for considerable information. Our "Determination Letter" MIL-EO-65-26 still requires us to file an "information return" on Form 990 annually, on or before the 15th day of the month after the close of our annual accounting period on December 31. I recommend that this be done by the new 1966 Treasurer in Kansas as soon as possible after he gets organized that year.

Respectfully submitted,

Walter E. Scott

W. E. Scott
Secretary-Treasurer, 1964
March 8, 1965

APPENDIX XII

MINUTES OF SPECIAL BUSINESS MEETING
OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS

Bloomington, Indiana, December 7, 1964

Present: L. P. Voigt, Walter E. Scott, Edward Schneberger, Wisconsin; Dr. Douglass, Charles D. Harris, Michigan; William E. Towell, Missouri; Russell Stuart, North Dakota; Woodrow Fleming, Donald E. Foltz, William Barnes, Indiana; C. H. D. Clarke, Ontario; Robert Bushong, South Dakota; William Cloe, Illinois; Dale Whitesell, Ohio; Hayden Olds, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation

The meeting opened by call of President L. P. Voigt at 3:33 p.m., EST, at the same meeting place as the Midwest Wildlife Conference with which it was jointly held. Nine states and provinces were represented by the membership listed above. President Voigt explained that the purpose of the meeting was to consider the matter of joint meetings of the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners and the Midwest Wildlife Conference, and he called on Mr. Towell to explain his recommendations for such joint meetings. He explained the way this was done in the Southeastern and Western Asscciations and said he felt the administrators were losing out on a lot of good information by not attending the Wildlife Conferences each year. It was his belief that the Association could have a business meeting in winter and that it would be best not to continue the practice of splitting our forces, but rather that we should combine forces.

Dr. Schneberger stated that there was some fear that when forces were combined there would be a drop in attendance and the meeting might be taken over by the administrators. Mr. Voigt explained that he was not sure whether Wisconsin could send as many as 20 people in the future because there was a need to get approval from the Governor for travel out of state. Mr. Towell answered this by stating that in both the Southeastern and Western Associations they evidently have been able to get permission to attend the meetings. He also pointed out that in a joint program the administrators could have time for their part of the program too. Dr. Clarke explained that the Northeastern meetings also, are very large sessions. Mr. Voigt was of the opinion that the same results might be stimulated by simply holding an executive session at the Midwest Wildlife Conference such as the one being held at this meeting because he felt it would take some time and effort to bring the two groups together in any other way.

Mr. Towell felt that it would be the wrong direction to ask technicians to come to meetings of the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners. There was considerable discussion by many individuals during which several such as Dr. Clarke and Mr. Bushong, indicated that they felt the technicians and administrators both could get to the meeting and would benefit from each other's influence. Mr. Voigt felt that a December meeting was not best for the administrators and that it was best to creep first before running, so Board meetings of this kind might be well to promote for the first several years. Mr. Towell said that he thought there should be a gradual shift of the administrators meetings to December and then hold the summer meetings just for a business session, for the Asscciation. He felt that administrative and

legislative matters should be gotten before the Wildlife Conference to help integrate the Wildlife people with the administrators as is done elsewhere in the country. Dr. Schneberger said he had attended a Western Association meeting with about 700 people present. He also stated that the history of the Midwest Wildlife Conference indicated a plan to keep this in a more or less unorganized manner rather than one that is highly organized and he pointed out that there were about 400 people registered at the meeting this year. Mr. Stuart felt that because the Midwest Wildlife Conference had no Board of Directors of by-laws the manner of integration should be much easier. It was pointed out that the area covered by the two Associations was not identical although it might possibly be worked out to do this.

President Voigt again recommended there be a continuation of these Board meetings with the Midwest and that it might be best not to disrupt the July meeting scheduled for Toronto the coming year. Mr. Towell felt this was a good suggestion and agreed with it. It was pointed out that the Time and Place meeting scheduled for the Midwest Association that very evening, was planning two years in advance. Mr. Fleming stated that he would hate to see the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners be so changed that there would be no chance to speak of administrative problems. He also was afraid that it would no longer be small and personal as it has been in the past. Mr. Towell answered that in both the Southeastern and Western Association they have small meetings of their group six months apart in which they do work in addition to the larger meetings with their Wildlife people. President Voigt asked President-elect Clarke to call on Mr. Towell to report on the Bloomington meeting at the annual meeting in Ontario this coming summer. Mr. Voigt offered to serve on the committee with him on this subject and it was so ordered.

President Voigt then called on each state to give a summation of the results of their waterfowl season during the fall of 1964 and the following individuals reported for their state: Scott, Stuart, Barnes, Cloe, Whitesell, Harris, Clarke, Towell, and Bushong. Mr. Barnes then commented on the fact that nothing more had been heard about the experimental season on blue-winged teal which supposedly was planned for the next year. Mr. Stuart stated that the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service had not decided who would handle it but it still was in the plans. He suggested the possibility of asking them for further information and a motion by Mr. Barnes was seconded and passed. President Voigt was requested to contact Director John Gottschalk, asking them of their plans.

There was then discussion of both the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the Economic Opportunity Act and Hayden Olds of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation explained details on the former while Mr. Foltz, Harris, and Scott pointed out what was going ahead in their states on the latter. Mr. Stuart then brought up a new problem of lack of coordination on grazing fees set up on federal lands in North and South Dakota and he questioned whether this was something that the Leopold Committee should consider. After some discussion, President Voigt suggested that this matter could be brought up at the forthcoming meeting at Washington, D. C., on December 10-11. The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Walter E. Scott

Walter E. Scott
Secretary-Treasurer

5-65

ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND GAME COMMISSIONERS

COMMITTEES FOR 1964

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEES

Program

Ralph A. MacMullan, Chairman
William Barnes
C. H. D. Clarke
G. E. Sprecher
William E. Towell

Resolutions

Melvin O. Steen, Chairman
Thomas R. Evans
Larry R. Gale
D. N. Omand
Frank Phipps

Auditing

Woodrow Fleming, Chairman
David B. Vesall

Nominations

H. D. Ruhl, Chairman
G. W. Malaher
J. R. Smith

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Federal-State Relations

Wayne Olson, Chairman
William Barnes
Gordon Charles
Larry R. Gale
Earl T. Rose
H. D. Ruhl

Legislation

Gaylord Walker, Chairman
William T. Lodge
George C. Moore
Russell Stuart
Harry R. Woodward
Fred E. Morr

Federal Aid

Woodrow Fleming, Chairman
Wilbur Boldt
James T. Shields
Everett B. Speaker
William E. Towell

Federal Farm Program

Glen G. Powers, Chairman
Willard Barbee
Walter J. Fillmore
Frank King
Robert Eversole

Wetlands

Thomas R. Evans, Chairman
G. W. Malaher
John B. Moyle
Earl T. Rose
J. R. Smith

