

Environment—here today, gone tomorrow.

PROCEEDINGS

17th Annual Meeting
Association of Midwest
Fish and Game Commissioners



Snowmass-
at-Aspen,
Colorado
July 19-23, 1971

Midwest Association Committees

1971

Awards

Russell Stuart, Chairman, North Dakota
Kenneth Doan, Vice-chairman, Manitoba
Les Voigt, Wisconsin

Public Land Law Review

Willard Barbee, Chairman, Nebraska
Everett Speaker, Vice-chairman, Iowa
Robert Hoover, Colorado
Joseph Stephansky, Michigan
Farrell Copelin, Oklahoma

Reorganization-Federal Government

Ralph MacMullan, Chairman, Michigan
Willard Barbee, Vice-chairman, Nebraska
Dan Armbruster, Ohio
Eugene Cook, Colorado
Larry Gale, Missouri

Snowmobiles and All-Terrain Vehicles

Richard Wettersten, Chairman, Minnesota
A. O. Jardine, Vice-chairman, Manitoba
John Anquillm, Michigan
Arthur B. Eustis, Minnesota
J. R. Smith, Wisconsin
Russell Stuart, North Dakota
Robert Evans, Colorado

Liaison With Pheasant Council

Les Voigt, Wisconsin

Program

Robert Elliott, Chairman, Colorado
A. O. Jardine, Vice-chairman, Manitoba
Orris Scherschlicht, South Dakota
James Keefe, Missouri
Donald Douglass, Michigan

Nominating, Time and Place

George Moore, Chairman, Kansas
Kenneth Doan, Vice-chairman, Manitoba
Carl Noren, Missouri

Auditing

Robert Hodgins, Chairman, South Dakota
Walter Scott, Vice-chairman, Wisconsin
George Moore, Kansas

Legislation

Carl Noren, Chairman, Missouri
Gene Gazlay, Vice-chairman, Michigan
Richard Wettersten, Minnesota
Fred Prievert, Iowa
Wilbur Boldt, North Dakota
John Beale, Wisconsin
Minor Clark, Kentucky

Resolutions

Arnold Mitchell, Chairman, Kentucky
Walter Scott, Vice-chairman, Wisconsin
David Vesall, Minnesota
Paul T. Barrows, Colorado
John Popowski, South Dakota
Wilbur Boldt, North Dakota
Ken Doan, Manitoba
George Moore, Kansas
Larry Gale, Missouri
Dan Armbruster, Ohio
James Helfrich, Illinois
Fred Prievert, Iowa
Richard Spadey, Nebraska
Frank Walden, Ontario
Chuck Harris, Michigan
Gene Bass, Indiana

Wetlands (Migratory Birds Policy)

Russel Stuart, Chairman, North Dakota
A. O. Jardine, Vice-chairman, Manitoba
Robert Webb, Manitoba
Don Douglass, Michigan
R. Withers Cool, Colorado

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
38th ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND GAME COMMISSIONERS
IN JOINT MEETING WITH THE WESTERN ASSOCIATION
OF STATE GAME AND FISH COMMISSIONERS
AT
SNOWMASS-AT-ASPEN, COLORADO
JULY 19 - 23, 1971

THEME: "The Environment -- Here Today, Gone Tomorrow"

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Midwest Association Items Only)

Dedication of Proceedings in Honor of EVERETT B. SPEAKER i

Business Session - Wednesday, July 21, 1971, 8:30 a.m.

Call to Order by President	1
Roll Call of Members	1
Secretary-Treasurer's Report	2
Ratification of Oklahoma as a Member State	5
Auditing Committee Report	5
Public Land Law Review Committee Report	6
Snowmobiles and All-Terrain Vehicles Committee Report	7
Reorganization of Federal Government Committee Report	8
Liaison with Midwest Pheasant Council-Committee Report	14
Wetlands Committee Report	16
Legislative Committee Report	19
Report on S. 244 Re: Surplus Property	24
Endangered Species Legislation	25
Resolutions Committee Report	27
Old and New Business	44
Nominating, Time and Place Committee Report	48
Remarks by President-elect, Richard Wettersten	48
Awards by President Harry Woodward	50
Adjournment	51

Lists of Registrations

Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners	52
"Other" Registrants	54
Colorado Game, Fish and Parks Personnel	55
Family Registration (includes Western and Midwest)	56

DEDICATED TO



EVERETT B. SPEAKER

The proceedings of the 38th Annual Meeting of the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners are dedicated in memory of Everett B. Speaker. Born January 17, 1907, a native of Lake View, Iowa, Everett Bates Speaker died April 16, 1971, of cancer following a prolonged period of illness.

A graduate of Iowa State University, Everett began his 40-year career with the Iowa Conservation Commission as a fisheries technician at Spirit Lake. He later became superintendent of fisheries, and served as chief of the biology section for 15 years. His brilliant career was climaxed by serving as director of the commission for six years.

Everett held many offices and was accorded many honors during his long period of service in the wildlife profession. He was elected an honorary life member of the American Fisheries Society at its 100th anniversary meeting in New York City in 1970. He also served as secretary and treasurer of the Society from 1953 to 1957. Everett was instrumental in the formation of the Upper Mississippi River Conservation Committee and served both as chairman and secretary of this group. He was secretary of the Mississippi Flyway Council and served also as the governor's representative to the Public Land Law Review Commission.

In 1967, Everett very capably performed as president of the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners. His friendly and sincere guidance was appreciated by many persons who worked with him in the Association.

The Iowa Conservation Commission at its May 1971 meeting honored Everett Speaker with the passage of the following resolution:

"The Iowa Conservation Commission by this resolution makes known its sincere regret at the passing of Everett Bates Speaker who in 40 years with the Commission had made significant contributions to conservation in Iowa. His dedicated service, sincere interest, gentlemanly bearing and courteous manner will always be remembered. "

Upon learning of Everett's death, the Midwest Association officers sent a letter to his family expressing condolences. The family replied, "Conservation and his friends in conservation meant everything to Everett. All members of the Midwest Association join in paying tribute to Everett and say "It is a cherished honor and privilege to have been your friend and associate. "

PROCEEDINGS OF 38TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
ASSOCIATION OF MIDWEST FISH AND GAME COMMISSIONERS
STONEBRIDGE INN - SNOWMASS-AT-ASPEN, COLORADO

July 19-23, 1971

8:30 a. m.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD, COLORADO: I'll now call the 38th Annual Meeting of the business session of the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners to order. I would like to start with the roll call. Let me say that we have set up the official positions for each one of you and whoever is the official representative of your state or province, we would like to have you seated at that location. This will facilitate our keeping records and noting who the official voting delegate is. Let's call the roll and I would like to have you answer here with your name so that the secretary can have a proper recording of who is representing each member.

Illinois	
Indiana	
Iowa	
Kansas	George Moore
Kentucky	
Manitoba	Ken Doan
Michigan	Chuck Harris
Minnesota	Dick Wettersten
Missouri	Carl Noren
Nebraska	Willard Barbee
North Dakota	Russ Stuart
Ohio	
Ontario	
South Dakota	Bob Hodgins
Wisconsin	Walter Scott

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: As I mentioned to you we will conduct the business meeting in this manner with the official state and province representatives doing the voting, the rest of the audience is entitled to participate in any of our sessions in any way they see fit. This is an open and democratic business meeting so we hope to hear from all of you. We have a lot of business to conduct this morning so we'll try to keep it moving along as rapidly as we can.

Our first order of business is to have a report from the Secretary-Treasurer who is, as you know, Bob Elliott, and it is his responsibility to carry on all the work of the Association which he has done very ably this last year. Bob?

R. ELLIOTT, COLORADO: Thank you Mr. President. Ladies and gentlemen, if my voice fails you can blame it on the Auditing Committee. George Moore was trying to find a \$20.00 shortage in the books last night and I had to shout him down. This is a brief report.

The State of Oklahoma through its Wildlife Conservation Commission requested membership in the Association in August 1970. A review of the constitution and bylaws revealed no instructions nor information concerning admission of new members, in fact there is no list of which states and provinces make up the Association membership. The member states and provinces were polled and a majority expressed no objection to having Oklahoma join. This action was taken somewhat unofficially inasmuch as the present president and secretary-treasurer were in positions "elect" at that time. There should be some official action taken at this business meeting to ratify Oklahoma's membership. Hopefully, action will be taken to amend and update the constitution and bylaws.

It was with great sadness we learned of Everett B. Speaker's death on April 16, 1971, in Des Moines, Iowa, after a prolonged bout with cancer. Acting in behalf of the Association, President Harry Woodward sent \$20.00 to the American Cancer Society as a memorial contribution in memory of Everett. Woodward was subsequently reimbursed from Association funds. As secretary-treasurer of this organization, I recommend that the Association in this 1971 business meeting pay further tribute to Everett Speaker by dedicating a special section of the 1971 printed proceedings to his accomplishments and contribution to wildlife conservation.

Fiscal transactions made as of July 14, 1971:

5/19/71	Received \$1,200 check from Alex Drobot of Manitoba, Secretary-Treasurer for 1970.	\$1,200.00
5/25/71	Deposited in regular checking account #0119685 with First National Bank of Westminster, Colo. \$.50 charge for cashing Canadian check.	\$.50
6/7/71	Check No. 1 to Harry Woodward - reimbursement for Ass'n. contribution to American Cancer Society for Everett B. Speaker of Iowa.	20.00

7/7/71	Check No. 2 to George Feltner for ledger and rubber name stamp.	\$ 5.55
7/12/71	Received dues from Oklahoma and Kentucky.	70.00
	Total receipts -	\$1,270.00
	Total expenditures -	<u>26.05</u>
	Balance	\$1,243.95

All of the funds and records have not as of this date (July 14, 1971) been received from the 1970 secretary-treasurer. This might cause some problems for the Auditing Committee. As reported to each member state and province in letter of June 23, 1971, I strongly recommend that serious consideration be given to authorizing a permanent secretary-treasurer under the constitution and bylaws. The reasons for this are readily apparent-- better methods of handling fiscal matters, including auditing; eliminate yearly transfer of records, funds and all the attendant correspondence; provide for disposition of old records and permanent depository for records to be kept; more efficient handling of current affairs, etc., etc.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Any comments or questions on the treasurer's report?

W. SCOTT, WISCONSIN: I think a comment might be made on the idea of a permanent secretary. I think this is a splendid idea but it is very difficult to accomplish without funds unless there could be a way of reimbursing some retired person who might take it over for a period of years or something like this. I recommend that Bob Elliott explore the possibilities of doing it.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: I think that Bob might be relating to you from the experience that the Western Association has had and that the Western Association, according to their bylaws, elects a Secretary-Treasurer who serves until he is replaced or resigns. I think in the last 20 years or more they have only had three and this has been voluntary work, however. Ben Glading of California was for many, many years and then John McKean took it for a couple of years, and then Bob Salter has it now and will probably continue. It does make for better continuity but it does require someone who is dedicated and willing to accept it on a voluntary basis. I would agree with you, Walter, that our funding doesn't permit us to think about any sort of permanent secretary.

G. MOORE, KANSAS: Mr. President, it seems to me that we could afford to give somebody \$100.00 or so to hire a little help if he needs it. I don't think we need to hire a permanent man because we don't have that much work.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: The whole point that Bob made is the transferring of funds every year and jumping all over the landscape to do this and closing out accounts. This sort of thing is not really very practical. I think this is a subject that should require some further exploration, perhaps on the part of the Bylaws Committee. I think there will be some discussion later by the Bylaws Committee and perhaps it can be developed along those lines.

C. NOREN, MISSOURI: Mr. Chairman, when this was first brought to my attention, I questioned it. I wondered about imposing this duty on someone permanently. If someone voluntarily wants to do this, it has a lot more merit than if we have to go out and pay a substantial amount of money for someone to do the work. I would be opposed to moving in that direction.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: By the same token, the only way you could do this would be on a purely voluntary type of thing. I don't think that any of us as Directors would want to put this out as an order to one of our employees that they are going to have to take this on as an additional duty. It is going to have to be handled in that way, a voluntary thing, but these other associations have had pretty good luck at this. Perhaps we can come up with an answer.

B. HODGINS, SOUTH DAKOTA: Mr. Chairman, is there a problem of having the Secretary-Treasurer remote from the President?

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: Mr. Chairman, maybe we should think of divorcing the two and having a secretary that goes with the President and having a treasurer on a permanent basis.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: That is another approach. I think the financial end of it is the real problem, it isn't the secretarial part of it.

We'll be having some discussion on bylaws later and I hope we can further explore this when we talk about that.

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Secretary-Treasurer's report be accepted.

C. NOREN, MISSOURI: I second.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Motion carried. If it is in order, I would like

to entertain a motion that ratifies the action regarding membership of the State of Oklahoma in the Association.

C. NOREN, MISSOURI: I move the membership of the State of Oklahoma be accepted.

G. MOORE, KANSAS: I second.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Motion carried. Bob, do you feel you would like some action in regard to your suggestion on Everett Speaker?

R. ELLIOTT, COLORADO: Yes, I would like to have the membership to recognize further what Everett has done. He was a long time member of this Association. I felt further recognition should be made in Everett's memory, other than just have a cash contribution to the American Cancer Society.

G. MOORE, KANSAS: Why don't we dedicate this particular issue to him and have a picture with an obituary giving his accomplishments, in fact I'll make that motion.

W. BARBEE, NEBRASKA: I second.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Motion carried. We have on the official agenda here a further discussion of the constitution and bylaws. I would like to delay the discussion here because I think there are some other things going to be discussed that relate to this and I'll come back to a further report on constitution and bylaws a little later.

At this time I would like to call on Bob Hodgins to give us the Auditing Report.

B. HODGINS, SOUTH DAKOTA: Thank you Mr. President.

Besides myself, members of the Auditing Committee are George Moore of Kansas, and Walter Scott of Wisconsin. We met with Secretary-Treasurer Bob Elliott on the evening of July 20, 1971, and examined the Midwest Association's books and financial records for the calendar year 1970. Expenditures primarily represented cost for the 37th Annual Meeting at Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

We found that the books balanced and that all records were in good order. However, there was a \$20.00 difference which we assume was caused by the exchange from Canadian to U. S. dollars. The total balance received from the former Secretary-Treasurer Alex Drobot was \$3,233.35 of which \$2,033.35 has been placed in term deposit in the Colorado State Bank in

Denver by the new Secretary-Treasurer and the remainder is held in checking account at the First National Bank of Westminster, Colorado.

We recommend that a Committee on Constitution and Bylaws revision be appointed to consider the possibility of going on a fiscal year basis and also that the audit cover income and expenditures from one meeting to another.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Are there any comments or suggestions on this report?

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: I move to accept the Auditing Report.

C. HARRIS, MICHIGAN: I second.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Motion carried. The next committee report we have is on Public Land Law Review by Chairman Willard Barbee.

W. BARBEE, NEBRASKA: Resolution #19 of the 37th Annual Meeting of the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners strongly urges the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners to continue its surveillance and leadership on Public Land Law Review matters and that the State Associations assist the International Association in reviewing the recommendations contained in the PLLR Commission's final report and in publishing a document which analyzes the major and subrecommendations of the PLLR Commission.

To that end a January meeting was held in Denver, Colorado, to develop a procedure for analyzing those PLLRC recommendations of concern to the state fish and game agencies and to circulate the position papers among the states for review, revision and input from which will come the International Association policy.

The Committee recognizes the outstanding work done by Robert Hoover, Colorado; Charles Homolka, Nebraska; and Bruce Marker, Wyoming, for their untiring efforts in distilling from the state inputs a position that a majority of the states can support.

Also recognized is the wise counsel rendered by Paul Lenzini and his unusual editing ability to express a position in a clear concise manner.

Mr. Chairman, this constitutes the report of the Public Land Law Review Committee.

W. BARBEE, NEBRASKA: I move to adopt the Public Land Law Review Committee report.

G. MOORE, KANSAS: I second.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Motion carried. We have another new and special committee appointed this last year to study a growing problem that we are all well aware of and Dick Wettersten of Minnesota is Chairman of the Snowmobiles and All-Terrain Vehicles Committee. Dick?

D. WETTERSTEN, MINNESOTA: Mr. Chairman and members of the Association, the Snowmobile and ATV Committee was formed as a result of Resolution #12 passed by this Association in Winnipeg a year ago. An endless legislative session and other things have prevented your chairman from doing much on this committee, so I will make a few comments that are not necessarily representative of the total committee's thinking. They are not all at this meeting.

The resolution was aimed primarily at looking into research with regard to the effect and impact of ATV's and snowmobiles on fish and wildlife resources. It is my impression that research is only getting underway throughout the country in very formative stages and very little being done. Further, vehicles research will be a long time coming unless there are decisions made by administrators, such as ourselves, to get into this field. I would like to mention one thing that we are doing, you may have heard Bob Herbst's report at the previous sessions regarding our program. We are going to devote during the coming bi-annual \$50,000 for snowmobile research. This is an increase from \$10,000 during the past bi-ennium. This will be oriented primarily toward the impact of snowmobile activity on deer habits. Just zeroing in on one narrow field. It is our opinion that this machine and its use will continue to accelerate faster than research programs. The burden will be on each of us in the states as well as on federal agencies to find solutions to problems as rapidly as possible, recognizing, however, that the machine use will probably keep ahead of us.

In time it is our opinion that we will find that ATV problems are really land use problems. Land use problems perhaps just as we have looked at it at Snowmass, Colorado, here. It's a little different height, but still problems that necessitate a hard look at land use planning and perhaps zoning in our respective states. With this thought in mind, I would hope that in the future this Association will make strong efforts in land use and land management in the states and this will include use of machines as well as building. That concludes my report.

C. HARRIS, MICHIGAN: I move to accept the report.

F. COPELIN, OKLAHOMA: I second.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Motion carried. We have a committee report on Reorganization of Federal Government, which I believe Chuck Harris is prepared to give for Ralph MacMullan.

C. HARRIS, MICHIGAN: Mac expresses his regrets. He is on his way but he will be in Denver this noon and will not arrive until late this afternoon. With permission from Vice Chairman Willard Barbee, he delegated me to give the report for the Association's Special Committee on Reorganization of the Federal Government.

The members of this committee are Ralph MacMullan, Chairman; Willard Barbee, Vice Chairman, Nebraska; Dan Armbruster, Ohio; Eugene Cook, Colorado; and Larry Gale, Missouri. I want to say quote from the beginning of this report because Mac has in his briefcase some slides that he is going to use to illustrate the organization as he has been able to analyze it from studying the various legislation that has been introduced. He has the slides with him so I have had to revamp his report a little bit to get around the need for slides to illustrate the talk.

When I started (all of a month ago) to come up with a report for this moment, it occurred to me that Nat Reed might cover my whole talk, and then some, two days earlier.

My committee is called Reorganization--Federal Government (a substitute for State-Federal Relations). I assume I'm to talk about what has actually been proposed, rather than to indulge in any wishful thinking of my own.

On January 22, 1971, President Nixon in his State of the Union Message briefly outlined a proposal for a major reorganization of the executive branch of the federal government. On March 25, he presented a more detailed account of his plan. He proposed that of the 12 established departments four (State, Treasury, Defense, and Justice) should remain virtually "intact." He added that a fifth, the Post Office Department, "will soon become an independent corporation."

The remaining seven would be coalesced into four new departments. The seven are Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, H. E. W., H. U. D. and Transportation.

The four new ones would be Natural Resources, Community Development, Human Resources, and Economic Affairs.

I shall confine my discussion to the origins and development of the Natural Resources Department, as proposed in administration bills S. 1431.

H. R. 6963, and H. R. 6959 (identical bills, I believe).

The following organization chart is largely derived from a careful reading of the President's message, the administration bills, and various statements in the Federal Register, and from "a usually reliable source" that my aides have not revealed to me, "to protect the innocent." It was my intention to have all the details put in a single, simple slide, but our draftsman, who has been well instructed in visuals, put his foot down. So, I have a separate slide for each of the five administrations, showing, by the color code, what current agency each component came from. (I have available some black-and-white charts putting everything on one sheet, but I have to admit it would make an awfully "busy" slide.)

Among the highlights of the shifts involved in creating the new Department of Natural Resources I would include:

Transfer of all of Interior's functions (but some important changes because of the way they are assigned among the five administrations).

Transfer of the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service from Agriculture.

Transfer from Commerce of N. O. A. A. , which includes the old Bureau of Commercial Fisheries functions. Thus all fish matters are back in the same department.

The bringing-in of certain functions of A. E. C.

The bringing-in of certain functions of the Corps of Engineers.

Purpose of the total reorganization is to increase efficiency (or at least, effectiveness) of the government; to bring it closer to the people (by regionalization); and in the case of the Department of Natural Resources, as stated by the President, to bring together environment-related agencies, particularly in view of the growing public awareness of ecology. According to the Declaration of Purpose in the bill itself, "The Congress hereby declares that the general Welfare of the Nation requires that its limited natural resources, including energy sources, be conserved, managed, and utilized so as to help achieve the highest practicable environmental quality, harmony between man and nature, economic and community development, individual fulfillment, and security of the American people of this and future generations." It's hard to find any fault with that!

It's hard to find any serious shortcomings in the proposed reassignment of functions. "On paper it looks good."

Why then should I have an uneasy feeling about it all ... a sort of vague sensing that somebody may have salted my coffee and sugared my steak?

Is it that I don't understand from the organization chart how the Under Secretary for Policy and the Under Secretary for Management and the Assistant Secretary for Research and Development operate, since they are not in the direct line of command? They are, no doubt, staff advisory, but it appears to me the Secretary and Deputy Secretary, with five administrators and all the regional directors reporting directly to them, may be needing more direct administrative assistance and less advice.

Is it that in spite of the fine, high-minded language of the Declaration of Purpose and other parts of the first three pages of the Bill, I have looked in vain through the last 33 pages for any further reference to environmental quality, ecology, or broad conservation principles?

Somehow, in looking at the organizational set-up of the new administration, I get the feeling that use and development were foremost in the mind of the architect, rather than environmental quality and ecological integrity.

As a former wildlife man I guess I have thought of the Department of the Interior as consisting largely of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, an outfit I have generally respected and been able to cooperate with. Their ranks have included some very able ecologists who have long been working to head off many of the environmental crises that most people never heard of until a year or so ago. Naturally, then, I sort of imagined that with reorganization to improve our handling of the environment the Bureau would assume an increasingly important role in guiding the course of the new Department. But on looking at the chart, I really wonder!

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife will be joined with the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and the National Park Service to form the "Recreation Component" of the Land and Recreation Resources Administration, the Land Component of which will include the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, plus a couple of other services from U. S. D. A. The chances of finally burying the "Bureau" as I have known it seem altogether good, though I've no doubt its predator and rodent control functions will somehow come through as an essential part of Land Administration.

In my own State of Michigan we've had trouble keeping the resource management functions of our Fisheries and Wildlife Divisions viable since the budget-makers decreed that they were simply a part of Recreation (regardless of our department organization plan).

But if the ecological concerns of the old Bureau are buried under the landslide of Recreation where will they reappear? Let us look at the other Administrations.

I see no great hope in the Water Resources Administration and still less in the Energy and Mineral Resources Administration, both of which seem oriented toward increased utilization.

The Oceanic, Atmospheric, and Earth Sciences Administration might prove to be an essentially ecological agency, but I can't forget that an important segment of it is the Geological Survey of Interior and the other is N. O. A. A., to be transferred out of Commerce. For conservationists generally there was only controlled enthusiasm for the creation of N. O. A. A. last year. I believe that this Association and I know that the International resolved against Reorganization Plan No. 4 which created it. I think we would have to have some major changes in its basic policy before we could expect N. O. A. A. to become the leader of our national fight for a better environment. Admittedly, the return of N. O. A. A. to Natural Resources is in accordance with the views most of us expressed last year, opposing Reorganization Plan No. 4 and favoring a Department of Natural Resources much like the one contemplated now.

It may be that in seeking to pin down the locus of the government's environmental conscience I am missing the point: It will not be in the Department of Natural Resources at all (in spite of the lovely declaration of purpose), but will rest with the Council on Environmental Quality and the Environmental Protection Agency, which will remain apart. I'm not at all sure that it is desirable to perpetuate this schism. Certainly, if we were to have all environmental agencies under one roof E. P. A. would have to be joined with D. N. R.

At this point I probably should mention that on March 1, Senator Moss of Utah introduced a bill (S1025) to establish a Department of Natural Resources and Environment, which would transfer E. P. A. functions to the new Department. Senator Moss believes that the monitoring and protection functions regarding the environment should be in the same Department that plans for utilization and development. Otherwise it appears that Senator Moss' bill is rather similar to President Nixon's current proposals. Many people, of course, believe that monitoring and protection functions should be outside the development and promotional agency. It's probably not so efficient, but it makes for more protection.

In the final analysis, I conclude that whether or not the proposed Department of Natural Resources would be a good thing would depend chiefly on the environmental savvy, integrity, and administrative skill of the top appointees. If they qualified, the new organizational set-up would give them

a chance to accomplish much, but they would have some hefty internal problems on their hands to solve before they could win many battles on the outside.

I'd feel better if one of the Under Secretaries had been specifically assigned the responsibility of riding herd on Environmental Quality throughout the Department.

As to the chances for passage of legislation to implement either the Nixon plan or the Moss plan, I can't say with much authority. There seems to be plenty of outside enthusiasm for sweeping changes in the government setup. Numerous editorials and articles supporting broad reorganization and specifically the changes proposed in S1431 have appeared in the Congressional Record this year. The Reader's Digest for July, 1971, carries an article generally supporting the President's total plan, although pointing out that much opposition to the plan exists, particularly from special interest groups that will cease to have a clearcut agency to appeal to. Labor objects to the loss of the Department of Labor; farm groups oppose the dismemberment of the Department of Agriculture, etc. Congress itself tends to frown on any drastic changes that would upset the pattern of committee organization and prestige. Dick Stroud, in the Sport Fishing Institute bulletin for June, 1971, strongly supports the President's proposal for a comprehensive Department of Natural Resources.

When I get to where I should come out with a final judgment I'm forced to sidestep, because there are too many unknowns as to the details. We have been shown the top of the iceberg, but we don't know what lies under the surface. To shift metaphors, we've seen the painted picture of the landscaped building, but we haven't had a look at the blueprints. To shift again, we're asked to buy a pig in a poke. It's a pretty poke, but I'd like to be able to examine and weigh the pig. Is it a prize porker, a leathery razorback, or a warthog on the loose?

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: There is a tremendous amount of meat in this last report that needs our careful consideration.

G. MOORE, KANSAS: I move to accept the report.

D. WETTERSTEN, MINNESOTA: I second.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Motion carried. I would have to observe that we are going to have to continue this committee and we are certainly going to have to continue our attention to this subject matter. Like any other discussion of reorganization, you can be reorganized out of the picture by a simple stroke of the pen. We had better be in a position to take some strong stands. Perhaps legislation will come up with some thoughts in this regard.

W. BARBEE, NEBRASKA: I don't know what your regional office of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation is doing; I assume it is the same as ours. They are directing more and more of their attention to urban and inter-city areas to spend Land and Water Conservation money and throwing the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in with them as a group. I think this would further deemphasize the functions of the BSW.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: I am sure that ours is doing the same thing. They are even challenging proposed expenditures that are within ten miles of the urban area but they are looking right down in the core city where it is a matter of slum clearing and that sort of thing which doesn't fit into fish and wildlife.

C. NOREN, MISSOURI: Mr. Chairman, each state has different ways of administering its outdoor recreation funding program. At the last meeting I tried to get some action out of the council to resist this moving and interruption and I got no support from the council. Since I was unsuccessful in Missouri, I would hope that you other states would make similar efforts and would try to initiate some movement.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: There is some opportunity to oppose some legislation in the administration bills in this regard. I hope this is going to be covered in our legislative report because some of this could virtually direct the Land and Water money into strictly urban areas. It would also be changing the definition of outdoor recreation to allow money to be used on buildings and once this gets started, they will be building basketball courts, arenas, etc.

C. NOREN, MISSOURI: We already have a large diversion into swimming pools. I don't think it is damaging.

G. MOORE, KANSAS: There is a lot going into golf courses too. This is rather limited group use.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: There is a real effort to try to change the definition to virtually indoor recreation by having enclosed facilities in buildings. I hope this group will oppose such a step. Any further questions?

F. COPELIN, OKLAHOMA: Mr. Chairman, I don't understand with regard to the Corps of Engineers what functions would be transferred into this water section.

C. HARRIS, MICHIGAN: As I understand it, sir, flood control, drainage and those functions.

F. COPELIN, OKLAHOMA: It would be the planning and development operations. All the civil functions.

W. SCOTT, WISCONSIN: Mr. President, it occurred to me that this sort of thing possibly should be considered in a resolution and I wasn't in on the Resolution Committee until the very end. Do we have a resolution on this subject? Are we going to bypass the opportunity to make some recommendations in regard to legislation on this matter?

D. SPADY, NEBRASKA: We have no resolution on this subject.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Perhaps someone may wish to be giving this some thought during the course of the meeting here and compose something for the floor.

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: Since Michigan has done such a great amount of work on this, maybe Chuck can come up with a resolution for the floor.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Our next report is Liaison with the Pheasant Council. Walter Scott is giving this report for Les Voigt.

W. SCOTT, WISCONSIN: Mr. President, members of the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners. Les Voigt is very sorry he can't be here with you today. We have budget problems at this very moment in Wisconsin and I think he is in a place where he needs to be. This Liaison with the Pheasant Council is an important function in this respect that the Midwest Pheasant Council is directly tied in with the Association. Their constitution and bylaws urges them to make a report to this body within 60 days after the close of their meeting and I have a report here that was prepared by Les Voigt and submitted to President Woodward shortly after their meeting.

The Midwest Pheasant Council held its 14th Annual meeting in Bismarck, North Dakota, on April 5-8, 1971. All member states and one Canadian province were represented at the meeting which was formally opened by Russell W. Stuart, Commissioner, North Dakota Fish and Game Department.

Council members reviewed the 1970 pheasant hunting season, winter conditions and prospects for the 1971 breeding season. While the meeting agenda was packed with important papers on pheasant population biology and habitat management, special emphasis of the meeting was given to papers on predator-prey relationships, mercury contamination, and federal and state programs affecting wildlife populations. Highlights of these and other papers will be summarized in the annual report to the Association of Midwest Fish

and Game Commissioners.

Several committees were appointed for the new program year. Of special interest are committees assigned to update the pheasant range map, evaluate the introduction of new exotic game birds in pheasant range, and develop a compendium on pheasant stocking successes and failures. A special committee was appointed by Council President Jim Norman (Kansas) to review the purpose and function of the Midwest Pheasant Council as stated in the constitution and bylaws in relation to current environmental concerns. Recommendations for bylaws changes will be made to the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners.

As has been the custom over the years, Council members viewed the pheasant range in the host state in a series of field trips.

The State of Iowa will host the Midwest Pheasant Council in 1972. Lowell Tripp (North Dakota) was elevated to the position of Council President and Eugene Klonglan (Iowa) was elected Vice-President. Dr. Klonglan is soliciting suggestions for the 1972 program and Midwest Commissioners are urged to send in suggestions.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Thank you Walter. Is there any discussion of the report?

D. WETTERSTEN, MINNESOTA: I move to accept the committee report.

W. BARBEE, NEBRASKA: I second.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Just let me emphasize to you that this is a satellite of the Association and a rather important one. The work of the Pheasant Council, in my opinion, has been most meaningful through its existence. Any further discussion?

W. SCOTT, WISCONSIN: I think it is an excellent report and I like the suggestion made in the report that the various directors and commissioners have an input and something to say about the direction this is going to take.

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: I think we should be rather careful in watching the Pheasant Council in this respect. It was set up primarily at the instigation of the Fish and Game Commissioners but these organizations have a tendency to grow. I think we should confine the organization to the midwest states.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: I think your point could be expanded to the fact that in organizing the Council in the first place, it was because the adminis-

trators needed better information. There needs to be a very close liaison with the administrators if the Council is to be effective. Motion carried.

The next report we have is Wetlands and it will be given by Russ Stuart.

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: The committee membership consists of:

Robert Webb, Manitoba - Chairman
Russell Stuart, North Dakota - Vice Chairman
Donald Douglass, Michigan
Withers Cool, Colorado

Mr. Webb had been named Chairman of this Committee, but accepted a different position about two months ago. The new position precluded him from continuing as chairman, and accounts for my presenting this report.

The committee has been relatively inactive, as it was agreed at the meeting in Portland, Oregon, that we would await the action of the Migratory Birds Committee of the International and assist them whenever possible.

A brief resume of the meeting in Portland may be appropriate. It was agreed that the proposed Policy Statement submitted to the International at New Orleans in 1969 would be used as a basis for discussion, although this draft does not include the Canadian view. Points discussed are listed as follows:

- (a) Although a great deal of thought has already gone into the present draft, it was the view of the group that further input by the governmental agencies involved would be necessary in order to make this an internationally acceptable document.
- (b) In particular, the point was made that this proposal would need to be discussed at the upcoming Provincial-Federal wildlife conference in Canada, before items of National and International concern could be proposed by individual agencies of the International Association.
- (c) In regard to the section on equity of opportunity to utilize species, it was pointed out that any consideration of this subject between agencies of different countries might not be proper but might have to be made at an official treaty level.
- (d) The point was also raised that if a document is to be created which could serve as a guide in managing the North American waterfowl resource, then such a document should provide for a

formal plan that could be budgeted and programmed and for which performance could be measured.

- (e) Adoption of a formal plan, among other considerations, would include the need to program necessary research and cost-sharing and perhaps to initiate a PPB System approach.
- (f) The need to determine habitat goals at some particular level was also mentioned as an important consideration, as was the need to define species population goals on some basis other than simply an average of a particular period of time.

The committee appointed for the year 1972 should remain in contact with the International committee.

Insofar as wetlands activities are concerned, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife is moving ahead with the acquisition program without any major problems except the rise in land values. The Bureau has a court case pending in North Dakota against a group of landowners who violated their easement contract by draining their wetlands after selling an easement to the Bureau. An unfavorable decision in the case would mean that several millions of dollars and much precious time in the attempt to save wetlands will have been lost.

There is one encouraging aspect in the fight to save wetlands, and that is the full funding of the Water Bank Act for fiscal year 1972.

C. NOREN, MISSOURI: I move to accept the report.

F. COPELIN, OKLAHOMA: I second.

C. NOREN, MISSOURI: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Mr. Stuart what the prospects are of the people winning this suit since draining their wetlands? Are they pretty well sewed up?

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: This is a Federal court and I would think there would perhaps be a conviction. However, the thing that bothers me is in such an agricultural state like North Dakota, that the penalty will be extremely light. In other words, it won't be severe enough that it will preclude other people from doing it. I am extremely worried about this.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Any other questions?

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: I want to make one more comment. In my report to the International last September I was very much for the International

incoming chairman seeing fit to retain the same Wetlands Migratory Birds Committee that is now acting, because it is going to take at least another year for this committee to come up with a policy that is acceptable to both Canada and the United States. John Woodworth of Idaho is the present chairman of that committee. They have been working but I am positive that they cannot possibly come up with a policy by this September.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Motion carried. I would add to what Russ has said. Having followed this very closely in the International operations, we must pursue this. We have to keep the pressure on to get this job done and it is going to require that we try to keep continuity in that committee in particular. This thing got a little ahead of us several years ago and we were developing a policy that did not have adequate Canadian input. Any further discussion on this item, gentlemen?

K. DOAN, MANITOBA: Mr. Chairman, do you see the successful conclusion being a management agency of an international type, an International Waterfowl Commission?

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: This was what I suggested to you in my report yesterday. Perhaps that is speculative but we have to look for something of this nature in my opinion. How do you feel about it?

K. DOAN, MANITOBA: Yes, I think the talk on the Canadian side is that sort of thing too, but the various states and provinces can talk all they like for years and years but never get into agreement until it is at a pretty high level like the International level.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Our efforts seem to be dissipated at the present time. We have our Flyway Councils and we have a National Council, but the National Council hasn't been as effective as it might have been. Our efforts have been just a shotgun type.

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: That is why I feel it is so important that this committee continue because now we are getting a little input from the Canadian provinces. The problem has been that many of the Canadian provinces do not belong to the Western or Midwest or the International, with the result that they still have a stake in the resources but they have not had any voice in the matter.

D. WETTERSTEN, MINNESOTA: I am under the impression that through all these years of work on an international policy, the efforts were made by the individuals to develop a final policy. The thought occurred to me with your comments yesterday, Harry, that perhaps rather than look for a finished policy, we should be looking towards a type of international joint commission.

with them having the responsibility of developing the policy in counsel with the various regional flyway organizations. We could develop a very fine working document perhaps over a period of years then have the international group formed which might not like it.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: What you're saying too, is policy is great but it doesn't necessarily represent action. We need some sort of action program.

Our next report is from the Legislative Committee by Carl Noren. Carl?

C. NOREN, MISSOURI: The committee membership consists of:

Carl R. Noren, Missouri - Chairman
Gene Gazlay, Michigan - Vice Chairman
Wilbur Boldt, North Dakota
Minor Clark, Kentucky (retired)
Fred Prierwert, Iowa
Richard Wettersten, Minnesota
John Beale, Wisconsin

Last year the report of the Federal-State Relations Committee mentioned the duplication between its functions and those of the Legislation Committee, and recommended a more specific delineation of assignments or a combination of the two committees. Our president followed through by eliminating the Federal-State Relations Committee and assigning its former chairman as chairman of the Legislation Committee.

The Legislation Committee conducted its work by telephone and mail, assigning each subject to a committee member for analysis and reporting. All members were cooperative, but some were unable to provide requested information by the short deadline. The following legislation was deemed important and of interest to the Association:

1. Ocean Mammal Protection Act - President Chester F. Phelps of the International Association notified the states in May of a misguided effort to extend complete protection to all seals and whales, walrus, manatee, sea otter, sea lion, polar bear, porpoise or dolphin within United States jurisdiction and to terminate United States participation in the North Pacific Fur Seal Convention. Bills to accomplish this include S. 1315, H.R. 6554, H.R. 6558, H.R. 6801, H.R. 7229, H.R. 9041, H.R. 9409 and H.R. 9356. Although some ocean mammals undoubtedly need more protection, especially on the open seas, we do not believe that emotion is a good substitute for scientific management, especially in the case of the fur seal which has responded well to a closely controlled harvest. The bills have been assigned to

the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Senate and House Committees on Commerce.

2. Increased Price of Duck Stamp - H. R. 701 would amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act to authorize the Secretary of Interior to establish a fee between \$3 and \$5. The bill was referred to the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Hearings were held last week and Interior testified in favor of the \$5.00 stamp. Prospects for passage are favorable in the House but doubtful in the Senate. Possibly the Association should poll its membership on this question.

3. Federal Permit for Migratory Birds - H. R. 694 would require a federal permit for hunting migratory birds other than waterfowl. The permit would cost \$1.00 and receipts would be spent for research, management, land acquisition and law enforcement with up to 50 percent of the net receipts authorized for state research and management contracts. There have been no hearings in the House and there is no companion bill in the Senate. Many states oppose any further federal licensing of hunters. We understand that a resolution is proposed which will clarify the Association's position on this question.

4. Public Law 566 - The problem of channelization in small watershed projects (P. L. 566) has been brought to the attention of Congress by Congressman Henry Reuss of Wisconsin. Congressman Reuss attempted to place a one-year moratorium on channelization by introducing an amendment to the Agricultural Appropriations bill, which would have prohibited the use of Department of Agriculture funds for channelization. The amendment was defeated, 279 - 129.

The small watershed program is not included in the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act. Congressman Ben Blackburn of Georgia has introduced H. R. 200. The bill would include in the Coordination Act all projects with federal financial or technical assistance. It would also require that federal and state wildlife agencies be brought into the picture at the planning stage and that the project would fund the cost of investigations. The bill is now bottled up in the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and it is unlikely that it will be heard this session.

5. U. S. Forest Service Wildlife Management Funding - In addition to the regional forest wildlife management budget request, some problems and opportunities have been further defined and presented to the House and Senate Appropriations Committee as line items to support special wildlife management program needs for the fiscal year 1972.

These programs are being supported by conservation groups. Examples of this support include Missouri House and Senate Joint Resolution supporting national forest programs on the Clark National Forest. Also, a resolution prepared at the International Association of Game and Fish Commissioners meeting last year supported additional funding of wildlife management programs on the National Forest.

Specific line items in the 1972 budget request for Forest Service programs in this region were:

- A. In Missouri, intensified wildlife-timber coordination and wildlife habitat management programs on the Clark National Forest.
- B. In Illinois, funds for expansion of Oak Wood Bottoms-Green Tree Reservoir (waterfowl management) on the Shawnee National Forest.
- C. In Michigan, funds for fisheries management for the Ottawa National Forest, and funds for management of greater sandhill crane habitat on the Hiawatha National Forest.
- D. In addition, wildlife management opportunities are being defined as part of the Chief's (Forest Service) effort to obtain a balanced resource program.

We urge full support of these measures.

6. Other Federal Forestry Legislation - Two other forestry bills are worthy of mention. These are S. 350, the American Forestry Act, by Senator Hatfield of Oregon, and S. 1734, the Forest Lands Restoration and Protection Act, by Senator Metcalf of Montana. Both direct further attention to multiple use consideration in forest management. S. 350 directs the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to require those involved in timber operations to reduce unfavorable environmental impacts. S. 1734 requires that "...timber harvesting operations shall, to the fullest extent possible, not impair the multiple-use values relating to water quality, recreation, ... wildlife..." and directs the Secretary to not permit timber harvesting until effective measures are developed to prevent such impairment, and are reviewed by the public.

Hearings on these two bills are scheduled on July 23 in Atlanta; on August 9 in Portland, Oregon; and on September 24 in Syracuse, New York. Senator Frank Church, Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands, will conduct the hearings.

7. Public Law 91-646 - Public Law 91-646, the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 is already law, but implementing regulations have not yet been adopted. Perhaps many of us, certainly including me, did not fully realize the impact this law could have on state agency land acquisition procedures, but it appears this may be great. If the law applies to conservation agencies, and the proposed regulations of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife indicate that it will, acquisition costs will certainly be higher, and acquisition procedures will become even more cumbersome.

The Bureau's interim regulations appeared in the Federal Register of April 16, 1971, and comment is invited until November 1, 1971. I urge the Directors here to study the interim regulations carefully, and to comment critically where you see opportunities for improvement in them. I understand the Association's Resolutions Committee also is considering a resolution about P. L. 91-646.

8. Land and Water Conservation Fund - Amendments to the act are proposed in H. R. 4705, H. R. 5599 and H. R. 6581. The amendments would extend coverage of the act to indoor recreation to increase benefits to urban areas. The apportionment formula would be changed to give the Executive Branch more discretion in handling funds. The proposed amendments are opposed by many conservationists, who feel that further emphasis on urban projects would be contrary to the original intent of the act. Hearings were held by the House Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation in May.

9. Public Land Law Review Commission - The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on July 26 will begin hearings on H. R. 7211, implementing recommendations of the P. L. L. R. C. and other land use policy legislation. A major purpose is to establish statutory guidelines and administrative procedures for the direction of the land management agencies. It would retain most public lands in federal ownership for management under principles of multiple use and sustained yield.

10. State Control of Wildlife - H. R. 393 would determine the policy of Congress with respect to the primary authority of the states to control, manage and regulate fish and wildlife within their boundaries. The bill was referred to the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Prospects for action seem poor.

There are numerous other legislative proposals which we have not covered because of time limitations, lack of recent information or probability of coverage in other reports. At this time we acknowledge the very helpful "Conservation Report" published by the National Wildlife Federation. Without it, few of us would be even vaguely aware of the vast numbers of

bills affecting all sorts of conservation interests. We also commend the Wildlife Management Institute and the International Association for calling to our attention at critical times those legislative matters needing fast action.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Thank you Carl. Is there a motion to accept the report?

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: I move to accept the report.

W. BARBEE, NEBRASKA: I second.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Is there any discussion?

D. WETTERSTEN, MINNESOTA: For a point of information, Harry, the International's Grants-in-Aid Committee is looking at the Reorganization Act and may be contacting a number of the states between now and September for impressions for a more detailed analysis of it and will probably be reporting on it in September.

F. COPELIN, OKLAHOMA: Question. What species is covered under this Migratory Bird Stamp?

C. NOREN, MISSOURI: Rails, doves, woodcock, snipe, gallinule; everything that is migratory.

F. COPELIN, OKLAHOMA: What is expected revenue from it?

C. NOREN, MISSOURI: \$1,800,000 I am told. That is net.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Further discussion? I would like to editorialize a little bit in relation to some of the things I said yesterday about merging with the International. I am deeply concerned in the area of federal legislation. We are not really zeroing-in on these hearings and there are many times that hearings are held and the issue passes by and our viewpoints have not been expressed. I think this is the most important issue that we have to be concerned with in this Association in relation to the International, is to see to it that we get a better enunciation of our position. Time after time these hearings come up and you and I hear about them on the day the hearing is held or afterwards. We don't really know if someone else has testified or not. Virtually every day in Washington there is a committee meeting that relates to our business. I certainly hope that this increasing staffing and development of a plan of the International is going to put us on a day-to-day basis of following this legislation.

G. MOORE, KANSAS: Mr. Chairman, Bud Phelps brought to my attention a few weeks ago a bill. It is a forest planning bill and I don't have the number and I thought maybe it might be brought up, apparently very few people know about it. That is the most vicious bill I ever saw in my life, and I guarantee you ought to look into it carefully.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: What was it again?

G. MOORE, KANSAS: It is a forest plan bill. I don't think the Forest Service is pushing it but it would establish a system of forest planning to be implemented through Federal Aid and it would be a state plan. If the state did not do it then the Secretary of Agriculture could come in and do it. It would put every single piece of forest land that was classified. They would classify the whole state as forest land. If you had a 40-acre tract of land back up on the hill and it was classified according to this forest plan and you want to let a tree mature and have a few knotholes in it, you couldn't do it. If you wanted to let one die and fall to make moss, you couldn't do it. If you bought a lot up here and it was not a classified forest and built a home and there was two oaks and two walnuts that you want to get rid of, because you have to build the house, you could not sell them in the commercial manner. In other words, you couldn't sell a Christmas tree from your place in a commercial manner. The penalty was a year in jail and \$10,000 for the first offense.

C. HARRIS, MICHIGAN: This is Dingell's bill. You classify all the forest lands as commercial forest. Manage the land as to whatever happens to be beneficial.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Any further discussion? Motion carried.

I placed on your desk this morning a copy of S. 244 which is a pretty short bill and perhaps some of you have not seen it yet. I have some rather close communications with some of the people in the Surplus Property offices around the country. They have an Association of Surplus Property Officers. We are in a position to elicit a certain amount of support from them and they advise me that this S. 244 is one that we might be able to push and get enacted. I think we have an issue that we ought to pursue. This will be money in your bank account if this property can be made available. There are a few states that have broad responsibilities including forestry that have been able to take advantage of this. Most of the rest of us have not. I would like to have your reaction or comment on trying to pursue this surplus property matter.

W. BARBEE, NEBRASKA: Mr. President, I would point out here that represented in the Midwest Association there are nine states that have a responsibility for recreational watercraft. This surplus property has been a subject

of discussion in their national and regional meetings for quite some time and I have consistently reminded them of our action on surplus property and suggested that the committee working on that approach Fish and Game Commissioners. I think if we could enlist the support of those senators and congressmen that have a deep interest in our coastal waters as far as recreation equipment is concerned and the fact that the 1972 Safe Boating Act is going to be passed and it will involve more activities in the area of education etc. I would strongly urge that those states -- Illinois, Iowa, Ohio, Wisconsin, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, South Dakota, and Nebraska and Colorado in this Association, that have a responsibility in this area. There are some real good boats, radio communication equipment, etc., that can be used in boating safety as well as in the patrol of our lakes for fishing.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: We have never been forceful enough on this issue, in my opinion. I think with the concern on environment and with the responsibilities that we have, we ought to be able to make our cases known and recognized in Congress.

W. SCOTT, WISCONSIN: Mr. President can't we have a motion to support the bill?

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: This would be fine.

W. SCOTT, WISCONSIN: I move to support S. 244.

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: I second

P. LENZINI, WASHINGTON, D. C.: Mr. President, I would like to say that the problem is not particularly in Congress but in the Office of Management and Budget. They have taken a strong position that they do not desire to see the beneficiaries under this surplus property expanded in any way at all. They want to keep it frozen. If we have any leverage with the Office of Management and Budget, that is the place where we should put it.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: He suggests that we expand our efforts beyond just our senators and congressmen. I certainly agree. Motion carried

I would like to call on Paul Lenzini to briefly discuss a matter of legislation regarding endangered species.

P. LENZINI, WASHINGTON, D. C.: Very briefly, about September of 1970, New York passed a statute called the Mason Law and also a statute called the Harris Law. This had to do with endangered species. It designated in the statute certain species that can no longer be possessed or purchased in the State of New York. The Department of Natural Resources in New York

was opposed to the bill and it was expected that the Governor would veto but at the last minute there was a campaign in the press and he could not see his way clear to veto. In any event, it went to the courts and was upheld by the highest court in New York and later the Supreme Court refused to consider it. This listed a number of species, particularly the alligator, and it said that all alligators should be considered endangered species. There are some sub-species that are not. After it survived the court test, some people in New York City connected with the Audubon Society, but not authorized by the Audubon, apparently sent out copies of New York laws to other states urging that they be enacted in these other states. At that point Interior received some requests for help from states like Texas and Ohio and also Maryland where it looked like this legislation might prevail. The Solicitor's Office at Interior decided they should draft an alternative measure and they contacted me and as a result of that contact, Mich Takata's Committee on Rare and Endangered Species in the International took upon itself the task of trying to prepare a model state law to be considered by all the states which would provide an alternative to the kind of legislation that was being proposed by the Audubon people. This would in essence adopt in the states the Federal list on native endangered species and also the Federal list on worldwide endangered species on the date of enactment of state legislation. It would also set up a third list of statewide endangered species. Species that could not meet the requirements of being on the Federal list but which might well be endangered locally. The Canada Lynx is an example of a species that is endangered in Wisconsin but not elsewhere in the country.

In any event, I wanted to bring this to your attention that Takata's committee is in the final process of drafting this model law. It will be sent out to the 50 states and any states that are now facing similar problems will soon have an alternative which I think a reasonable alternative because it sets forth decisional criteria upon which a species can be placed on an endangered species list as opposed to a mere declaration by a state legislature.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Thank you, Paul. I am sure we are all going to be concerned with this sooner or later and it is well that we are getting some model legislation drafted. Dick?

D. WETTERSTEN, MINNESOTA: Just had a comment, Harry, that we appreciate Paul's correspondence on this the past six months or so. Unfortunately this bill did pass our Minnesota legislature on the day the correspondence was received. We were successful in deleting some of the named species from the bill, polar bears and things like that. We were not successful in deleting all of them. It is hoped that we can amend this bill in future legislative sessions perhaps easier than we can stand up and fight against protection of endangered species. We have some indication that forthcoming legislative sessions can do this. By the same token, we have used this bill in one instance by authorizing our department to take certain management measures on the timber wolf. It provided a nice vehicle for us to come in on management. We don't like the basic bill. It is poorly done in general.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Is it your observation there that the rest of us would be better off to get this model legislation and try to get it on a positive basis rather than to be in a position to fight some of this other?

D. WETTERSTEN, MINNESOTA: Without a doubt. I think the model bill the individual directors could support would be very helpful in dealing with the author of the original bill and telling him the original bill is no good. I appreciate Paul's working on this.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Is there further discussion on legislation? If not, I would like to go to the next committee report. Just a few days ago Arnold Mitchell called me and advised that conditions were such that he was not going to be able to attend this meeting. Walter Scott was Vice Chairman of the Resolutions Committee and in discussing with Walter, he has some rather deep involvement with the International as you well know, so I turned to Dick Spady of Nebraska and asked him to carry the Chairmanship of the Resolutions Committee which is always the most difficult job at any one of these sessions. At this time I'll call on Dick Spady for resolutions.

D. SPADY, NEBRASKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The members of the Resolutions Committee are as follows: Arnold Mitchell, Chairman; Walter Scott, Vice Chairman; David Vesall; Paul T. Barrows; John Popowski; Wilbur Boldt; Ken Doan; George Moore; Larry Gale; Dan Armbruster; James Helfrich; Fred Prierwert; Richard Spady; Frank Walden; Chuck Harris; and Gene Bass.

RESOLUTION NO. 1

FEDERAL WATER PROJECT RECREATION ACT

WHEREAS, the Federal Water Project Recreation Act (P. L. 89-72), requires that full consideration be given to recreation enhancement as a purpose of federal water projects and that project construction agencies shall encourage non-Federal public bodies to assume responsibility for management in project areas and facilities; and

WHEREAS, the Act further provides that the non-Federal public body administering a project execute an agreement before construction to administer land and water areas for recreation enhancement and to repay all costs of operation, maintenance and replacement of facilities, and share in the cost of at least one-half of all facilities and project modifications which are specifically allocated to recreational uses; and

WHEREAS, fiscal limitations would prevent adequate administration of the areas, and impose inequitable cost-sharing responsibilities on state

and local political subdivisions who rarely have adequate moneys to meet cost-sharing obligations;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, assembled at its 38th Annual Meeting this 21st day of July, 1971, at Snowmass-at-Aspen, Colorado, that the Federal Water Project Recreation Act be amended so that recreational capital development features will be totally funded by the construction agency, and that the annual operation, maintenance and replacement costs be subsidized to the extent requisite to preclude any undue hardship on the non-Federal public body.

W. BARBEE, NEBRASKA: I move to accept Resolution No. 1.

D. WETTERSTEN, MINNESOTA: I second.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Motion carried.

RESOLUTION NO. 2

STREAM ALTERATION PROGRAM

WHEREAS, publicly constructed and subsidized stream alteration programs for flood control, irrigation, power generation, drainage, municipal and industrial use, and other purposes, often result in the destruction of fish and wildlife habitat; and

WHEREAS, these programs cause irreparable damage to waterways and related land resources; and

WHEREAS, compensatory measures, if any, for fish and wildlife are either lacking or inadequate;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest fish and Game Commissioners, assembled at its 38th Annual Meeting, this 21st day of July 1971, at Snowmass-at-Aspen, Colorado, vigorously oppose publicly funded stream alteration programs, both existing and proposed, until natural resources values and recreational opportunities are comprehensively evaluated and resource replacement in kind is included as an integral part of the project cost, except where replacement of a different kind is specifically approved by the State Fish and Game Agency; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Midwest Association encourage and support administrative directives and legislative programs which would ensure the protection and enhancement of fish and wildlife resources, as is provided in H. R. 200, 92nd Congress.

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: I move to accept Resolution No. 2, with the change to read "as provided in H. R. 200".

W. SCOTT, WISCONSIN, I second.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD, Motion carried.

RESOLUTION NO. 3

REALLOCATION OF FEDERAL SHARE OF LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUNDS

WHEREAS, the public lands managed by the U. S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife meet a significant portion of the recreational needs of the nation; and

WHEREAS, there remain holdings which should be acquired by the U. S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife if they are to adequately serve recreational demands, and protect the surrounding resources; and

WHEREAS, heretofore these agencies have not shared in the proceeds of the Land and Water Conservation Fund commensurate with their responsibility for meeting recreational needs;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, assembled at its 38th Annual Meeting this 21st day of July 1971, at Snowmass-at-Aspen, Colorado, that the President and the Congress be urged to substantially increase allocations from the Federal share of the Land and Water Conservation Fund for these agencies, commensurate with their responsibilities to meet outdoor recreation demands.

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: I hope this won't be at the expense of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

G. MOORE, KANSAS: Mr. Chairman, this was discussed yesterday and I think it might be worthy of pointing out that there is a possibility of a backfire. According to Red Arnold the present law makes provision of a 60-40 split between the feds and the state. Because the National Parks historically have been the main recreational agency, the National Park Service has been getting the bulk of that share. The share has been near 75-25 state-federal. Now the two things that could backfire; if we encourage more to go to the BLM and Forest Service, it is going to not necessarily add to the total fund. It may be at the expense of the National Park Service or it may reduce our share back down to about 60 percent. It could possibly backfire. I am not necessarily opposed. My comment had been maybe we ought to increase the total allotment and maybe not get into who it should go to.

W. SCOTT, WISCONSIN: I think at our meeting it was also brought out that the Bureau of Budget people were of a mind possibly to actually cut back the amount of money that would be made available unless there was some indication of this need.

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: I have just been advised that the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife have been advised by the Office of Management and Budget that \$1.5 million out of this has been frozen for fiscal year 1972.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Would it be appropriate for this group to add the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to make this three agencies rather than just the two that are listed. What this does, this indicates our basic interest in the allocation of the Federal portion of the funds. Otherwise it might be misinterpreted. As far as we are concerned if those three agencies are taken care of, this is our basic concern.

C. HARRIS, MICHIGAN: I move to add Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to Resolution No. 3.

F. COPELIN, OKLAHOMA: I second.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Motion carried.

RESOLUTION NO. 4

OPPOSITION TO H. R. 694

WHEREAS, H. R. 694, 92nd Congress, which would require a federal permit for hunting of migratory game birds other than waterfowl is vaguely worded as to allocation of funds and distribution of permits; and

WHEREAS, H. R. 694 as presently written moves the federal government into licensing of hunters, traditionally a state prerogative, and imposes further licensing burdens on hunters;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwestern Fish and Game Commissioners, assembled at its 38th Annual Meeting this 21st day of July, 1971, at Snowmass-at-Aspen, Colorado, oppose H. R. 694 as presently written, and recommend that the National Program Planning Committee for Shore and Upland Migratory Birds draft a model bill to meet these objections for future consideration by this Association.

D. WETTERSTEN, MINNESOTA: A point of information. I believe that the eastern and central management units of both supported the bill that is in. If we are to adopt this resolution, which I favor personally, I think we should all advise our delegates of our position on it. Sometimes I feel we have a

communications gap between ourselves and our representatives at other meetings.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Any further discussion?

D. WETTERSTEN, MINNESOTA: I move to accept Resolution No. 4.

F. COPELIN, OKLAHOMA: I second.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Motion carried.

RESOLUTION NO. 5

AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 91-646

WHEREAS, provisions of Public Law 91-646, the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, would result in increased costs and delays if applied to acquisition of lands by conservation, natural resource and outdoor recreation agencies; and

WHEREAS, Public Law 91-646 was apparently intended to apply primarily to acquisition of lands in congested areas, such as urban renewal and highway construction programs; and

WHEREAS, the announced application of the Act would require adherence to all provisions, even in a willing seller-willing buyer situation where condemnation is not contemplated;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, assembled at its 38th Annual Meeting this 21st day of July, 1971, at Snowmass-at-Aspen, Colorado, petition the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners to seek amendments to Public Law 91-646, or to the implementing regulations, to specifically exempt Fish and Wildlife Agencies from provisions of this Act where lands are purchased from a willing seller in a non-urban area.

F. COPELIN, OKLAHOMA: Would it be helpful or appropriate to ask the central and eastern management councils to enter into this?

W. SANDFORT, COLORADO: I think they approve it in concept. The Central Technical Committee which we just mentioned would approve this un-animously in Denver and also the Northeast Technical Committee would. We thought that if this resolution were adopted by the Midwest here that we would certainly involve all five of the technical committees for their input.

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: In other words, you do not want to exclude counties and local entities of government.

D. SPADY, NEBRASKA: Actually, Russ, as we look at this we have some question whether it would work anyway, because of the possibility of forcing the states and political subdivisions into condemnation if you don't provide for relocation costs. Our feeling was that we are only dealing with the states here anyway and if this thing goes through, it applies to all.

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: That is what I am saying. When you say state you limit it to state agencies. For example, we will have a project, say a small reservoir, funded by BOR and local participation. We are now insisting that the local Water Management Board pick up the land. Heretofore, we have been picking it up. So I would say if it is alright with the group, that you say non-federal.

VOICE: Why limit it at all? For example, the Fish and Wildlife Service has problems with this law in their acquisition of small wetlands. Why not exempt it to federal and state and local too.

VOICE: There may be some merit to some restriction on some of the federal agencies which more regularly employ condemnation.

VOICE: This applies anywhere lands are purchased from a willing seller.

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: The thing, of course, is the Bureau requiring wetlands and they are doing this on a willing seller basis. Why should they have to comply with this action. In other words, here is a program that we are supporting. Still it is a federal agency that is acquiring the land. I am fully in accord with this so far as the Highway Departments are concerned, Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation, but assure I am in accord with putting more of a burden on the Bureau in their land acquisition program.

W. BARBEE, NEBRASKA: I think we have a difference here in some states that have power of eminent domain, in other states they don't. In our state we don't have power of eminent domain at the state level. In our state we have a law that requires us to do it anyway.

B. BAILEY, NEBRASKA: I think I can further clarify this. We do have the authority for certain condemnations. What it would do is force you into court procedures opposed to negotiations with those landowners. I think it is going to force you into court procedures where you do have the authority for condemnation.

D. SPADY, NEBRASKA: This won't affect any of your state laws or any of your procedures at that level. This only intends to amend the federal law.

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: I want to point out one thing. Say we are buying some land from a willing seller, wetlands for example. According to this act, we have to go out and make an appraisal. We cannot pay him less than that appraisal value. In other words, we are limited on negotiation. For example, here is land that we have appraised at \$50.00 per acre. I go out and say I'll give you \$35.00 an acre. This is the way we horsetrade up there. If the fellow says fine, I'll take it, we buy it for \$35.00 an acre. Under this act we would have to pay at least \$50.00 an acre for it.

D. SPADY, NEBRASKA: Let me point out that this came through committee without the insertion of state in it. The only reason I had made a note here suggesting we put state in there is perhaps that is what we meant. Along with it would eliminate any problems as relates to political subdivisions other than states, but it did come through committee without that.

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: Keep in mind that it applies to any entity of government that is using federal funds in the acquisition of land regardless of what it is.

D. WETTERSTEN, MINNESOTA: May I ask the source of this resolution?

D. SPADY, NEBRASKA: It was proposed by Missouri.

D. WETTERSTEN, MINNESOTA: The reason I asked was because other states have indicated concern over this. I would make a suggestion to move this along that the word state be eliminated.

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: I'll go along with Harris' suggestion that we just spell out Fish and Wildlife agencies.

D. WETTERSTEN, MINNESOTA: I move to accept the amendments to Resolution No. 5.

B. HODGINS, SOUTH DAKOTA: I second.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Motion carried.

RESOLUTION NO. 6

OBJECTION TO H. R. 5821 PROVIDING FOR THE PROTECTION OF HAWKS AND OWLS NOW ACCORDED TO BALD AND GOLDEN EAGLES

The resolution was tabled for further discussion.

RESOLUTION NO. 7

HUNTER SAFETY RECIPROACITY

WHEREAS, the issuance of hunting licenses in many states and provinces requires that the applicant has first completed a hunter training course; and

WHEREAS, many hunters will travel to other states and provinces to engage in hunting;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, assembled at its 38th Annual Meeting, this 21st day of July, 1971, at Snowmass-at-Aspen, Colorado, that it is the policy of this body to encourage the reciprocity of hunter training certification between states and provinces; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that states requiring hunter training as a prerequisite to the purchase of a hunting license include a clause in their laws essentially as follows: "holders of hunter training certificates issued by another state or province and meeting the standards of the National Rifle Association shall be accepted as meeting the requirements of this state."

No further questions or discussion.

RESOLUTION NO. 8

WATER BANK APPROPRIATION

WHEREAS, the Water Bank Act, P.L. 91-599, authorized payments of \$10,000,000 annually for the Water Bank Program; and

WHEREAS, no money has been budgeted and it has been proposed the money be made available to the states through the revenue sharing program;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, assembled at its 38th Annual Meeting, this 21st day of July, 1971, at Snowmass-at-Aspen, Colorado, recommend that \$10,000,000 be made available annually starting F. Y. 1972 and that it be used only for the purposes authorized; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a Water Bank Advisory Committee be set up by the Department of Agriculture to help formulate regulations for administration of the Water Bank Program.

No further questions or discussion.

RESOLUTION NO. 9

POSITION RELATIVE TO RECOMMENDATIONS IN PUBLIC LAND LAW
REVIEW COMMISSION REPORT (ONE THIRD OF THE NATION'S LAND)

WHEREAS, the future use of the public lands is of vital importance to fish and wildlife conservation and management; and

WHEREAS, the PLLRC presented its completed report (One Third of the Nation's Land) to the President and to Congress in June of 1970; and

WHEREAS, the PLLRC Report has been thoroughly reviewed by the Public Land Law Review Committee of the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, as well as by the total membership of this Association; and

WHEREAS, the PLLR Committee of the Midwest Association has collaborated with the PLLR Committees of the International to determine and compile statements of positions relative to recommendations in the PLLRC Report that best represent the views and interests of fish and wildlife conservation and management;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, assembled at its 38th Annual Meeting, this 21st day of July, 1971, at Snowmass-at-Aspen, Colorado, fully endorse and actively support the position statements relative to recommendations in the Public Land Law Review Commission Report prepared by the Public Land Law Review Committee of the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners in March, 1971.

No further questions or discussion.

RESOLUTION NO. 10

PROTECTIVE COVER CROPS ON SET-ASIDE FEED-GRAIN ACRES

WHEREAS, millions of acres are annually diverted from agricultural production under the Set Aside Feed Grain Program; and

WHEREAS, the absence of protective cover on these acres is an invitation to soil and water erosion and leaves them unproductive of wildlife; and

WHEREAS, good conservation practices dictate that these acres are in need of protective cover crops;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, assembled at its 38th Annual Meeting, this 21st day of July, 1971, at Snowmass-at-Aspen, Colorado, urges the Secretary of the U. S. Department of Agriculture to hereafter require the establishment of cover crops on Set Aside Feed Grain Acres; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Secretary is encouraged to provide cost-sharing incentive for the establishment of such cover crops and wildlife food plots as recommended by the state fish and game agencies and that such provisions be adequately funded to make them generally applicable to all acreages contracted under the Set Aside program.

No further questions or discussion.

RESOLUTION NO. 11

SUPPORT OF H. R. 761

WHEREAS, the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Program, financed by sportsmen through manufacturers' excise taxes on sporting firearms, handguns, and ammunition, has contributed greatly to state wildlife conservation programs; and

WHEREAS, archers have benefitted equally with other sportsmen in the productive results of the Federal Aid Program;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, assembled at its 38th Annual Meeting, this 21st day of July, 1971, at Snowmass-at-Aspen, Colorado, hereby express its support for H. R. 761, 92nd Congress, a bill to amend the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act so as to impose an 11 percent manufacturers' excise tax on specified items of archery gear; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Association go on record as favoring a division of the receipts of said tax, not less than one-half to be used for the purposes of the regular Federal Aid Wildlife Restoration Program, and not more than one-half may be used for the conduct of archery safety programs, and for the purchase, development, and operation of public archery ranges.

C. NOREN, MISSOURI: Should adjust language on Federal Aid program or will have half of money in limbo.

No further questions or discussion.

RESOLUTION NO. 12

COST SHARING RATES FOR REAP

WHEREAS, the Rural Environmental Assistance Program (REAP) of the U. S. Department of Agriculture has as its purpose, the preservation and enrichment of our rural environment; and

WHEREAS, the Wildlife Practices ("G" Practices) under REAP are currently cost-shared at the rate of only 50 percent; and

WHEREAS, cost-sharing rates make no allowance for land ownership or rental costs but deal solely with other costs of establishing the Practice; and

WHEREAS, Wildlife Practices are typically of broad social value and of only limited value to the producer; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Agriculture has the authority to increase cost-sharing rates on such Practices;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, assembled at its 38th Annual Meeting, this 21st day of July, 1971, at Snowmass-at-Aspen, Colorado, strongly urge the Secretary of Agriculture to increase cost-sharing rates for Wildlife Practices under REAP to 80 percent of the cost of their establishment.

No further questions or discussion.

RESOLUTION NO. 13

SUPPORT FOR FEDERAL LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE
TO STATES IN THE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
OF NONGAME WILDLIFE AND WILDLIFE ENVIRONMENTS

WHEREAS, many of the wildlife species are not hunted, trapped, caught by hook and line or taken into possession by other methods for recreation purposes; and

WHEREAS, this wildlife resource provides a highly important source of pleasure and enjoyment for many people of all ages through a wide variety of nonconsumptive activities; and

WHEREAS, these nonconsumptive activities and associated interests are resulting in increasing public demands for the preservation, protection, restoration and improvement of nongame wildlife populations and their environments; and

WHEREAS, an appropriate source of revenue derived from the broad category base of nonconsumptive uses, rather than from the historical source provided by hunters, fishermen, trappers, and other sportsmen, is needed to initiate and conduct programs which enhance nongame wildlife management; and

WHEREAS, an effective and appropriate approach for obtaining needed revenue and initiating management programs involves procedures, centrally administered, and equal but optional in nature, where all states potentially would benefit;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, assembled at its 38th Annual Meeting, this 21st day of July, 1971, at Snowmass-at-Aspen, Colorado, give support for the enactment of legislation by the Congress which provides for Federal Aid in nongame wildlife and habitat improvement programs, utilizing general tax revenue; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that such legislation: incorporate provisions for a minimum of 75 percent federal funding for nongame wildlife programs of the states; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this program be administered by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife under provisions of the Federal Aid and Wildlife Restoration Act.

No further questions or discussion.

RESOLUTION NO. 14

MERGER OF MIDWEST, WESTERN, NORTHEASTERN AND SOUTHEASTERN ASSOCIATIONS WITH THE INTERNATIONAL

WHEREAS, the states must continually become more actively involved in assuming authority and seeking funding to protect resource values; and

WHEREAS, certain economic efficiencies and organizational advantages result from consolidation of like functions; and

WHEREAS, the legislative effectiveness of a single unified affiliation would be substantially greater than that of the various associations acting separately; and

WHEREAS, the various associations through the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners are presently participating in development of the framework necessary to operation of a strong and effective office in Washington, D. C.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, assembled at its 38th Annual Meeting, this 21st day of July, 1971, at Snowmass-at-Aspen, Colorado, hereby suggests to the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners that a Committee of the International be charged with investigation and study of the merits and possibilities for affiliation of the various regional associations with the International, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners pledges its cooperation to the International Association in undertaking such a study.

G. MOORE, KANSAS: Maybe the best approach would be to suggest the International take the approach and let them appoint committees from all of the associations.

B. HODGINS, SOUTH DAKOTA: Perhaps if we become affiliated with the International they will no longer pay any attention to us.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: My purpose in mentioning this is that by being an affiliate of the International, this is going to stimulate the Midwest and the other regional associations to make more statements and coordinate decisions.

C. NOREN, MISSOURI: If there is a full-time Executive Secretary for the International by formal affiliation, perhaps we could more competently handle hearings in Washington, D. C.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: You could request the Executive Secretary to represent the Midwest Association at a hearing in Washington. You haven't done anything until you amend your own bylaws and constitution anyway, other than support the concept.

C. HARRIS, MICHIGAN: Isn't the purpose here now to explore the pros and cons?

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: I suggest that we ask the International to set up a committee of people representing the four regional associations.

W. SCOTT, WISCONSIN: I believe the International will have to have another committee to amend the constitution and bylaws. This is not a part of their constitution and bylaws either. I think it is very logical that we ask the International to consider this in the revision of their constitution. I favor this general idea but I think Hodgins is right, it very well should be explored a little bit more in depth by all the organizations. After all, we just got the idea and a little more thought on this wouldn't hurt a bit.

D. SPADY, NEBRASKA: If we amend this resolution to approach the International and recommend that it consider the possibility of affiliation of the regional associations with the International drawing upon the representatives from those associations within the International. Would this be the approach you want to take?

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: I think you will have accomplished all of your purposes if you just ask the International to consider this concept and I think they can take it from there.

W. SCOTT, WISCONSIN: I so move.

W. BARBEE, NEBRASKA: I second.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Motion carried.

RESOLUTION NO. 15

ACTION ON RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

WHEREAS, the Resolution Committee has made a number of recommendations in connection with pending bills on conservation measures and these and other proposals for natural resource management have been approved by the Association; and

WHEREAS, prompt action is needed to publicize all resolutions adopted;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, assembled at its 38th Annual Meeting, this 21st day of July, 1971, at Snowmass-at-Aspen, Colorado, direct the Secretary to follow through on actions taken by advising the Chairman of concerned Congressional Committees (and other members, groups, or individuals if so indicated or desirable) of the Association's resolutions with letters prepared for the President's signature. Also, at least one complete set of

resolutions is to be sent to each state and province in the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners and to members of the Resolutions Committee of the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners.

No further questions or discussion.

RESOLUTION NO. 16

APPRECIATION FOR COLORADO'S HOSPITALITY AND GOOD PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the Colorado Department of Natural Resources, Division of Game Fish and Parks has provided an especially well organized meeting and an excellent program for the 38th Annual Meeting of the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners; and

WHEREAS, both delegates and guests are most appreciative of the hospitality and courtesy extended by our hosts and scenic Snowmass-at-Aspen; and

WHEREAS, Colorado continues to be a leader in the conservation movement in the midwest and the nation; and

WHEREAS, Harry R. Woodward as President of the International, Western and Midwest Associations, has been especially instrumental in combining the efforts of these associations towards accomplishing common goals;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, assembled at its 38th Annual Meeting this 21st day of July, 1971, at Snowmass-at-Aspen, Colorado, expresses its gratitude and appreciation to the state of Colorado, to its Division of Game, Fish and Parks its special appreciation to Director Harry R. Woodward and his staff, the management at Snowmass-at-Aspen and other cooperating individuals and organizations; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that copies of this resolution be sent by the Secretary to each of the individuals and organizations named.

No further questions or discussion.

RESOLUTION NO. 6

OBJECTION TO H. R. 5821 PROVIDING FOR
THE PROTECTION OF HAWKS AND OWLS NOW ACCORDED
TO BALD AND GOLDEN EAGLES

WHEREAS, hawks and owls, procured by individuals holding proper raptor licenses or permits, provide recreational opportunity and enjoyment, including the ancient art of falconry, for an increasing number of individuals; and

WHEREAS, the provision for proper protection of these raptors is, or can be, provided through established procedures for the enactment of Federal and State regulations; and

WHEREAS, H. R. 5821, 92nd Congress, would eliminate the live capture of hawks and owls by properly licensed and authorized falconers, breeders and researchers; and

WHEREAS, the jurisdiction for the protection of hawks and owls is a state responsibility;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, assembled at its 38th Annual Meeting, this 21st day of July, 1971, at Snowmass-at-Aspen, Colorado, strongly oppose H. R. 5821.

W. SCOTT, WISCONSIN: I wasn't there at the time the resolutions committee discussed this and looking at my original resolutions I find that Mr. Homolka of Nebraska recommended that instead of opposing this outright that we instead recommend that this H. R. 5821 be amended. The way we worded it -- so as to allow closely regulated use of hawks and owls by properly licensed falconers, breeders and researchers. In thinking about this I worded the statement like this: That the Association recommends that H. R. 5821 be amended so as to allow closely regulated use of hawks and owls by properly licensed falconers, breeders and researchers and I added the words "except for species on the Federal endangered species list which should be available only to qualified researchers under federal and state permits." Now my point in arguing this way is that at a time when there is a great national push to give more protection for these species, we are coming out against this effort by many people with nothing but straight opposition. No indication at all that we have any concern whatsoever and I would rather see this thing dropped and killed and not put on our record or else I would rather see it qualified. If we can't go along with the idea that these things will be controlled under permit, which in Wisconsin we surely do, then I don't think we are being very wise in passing this resolution, and I personally would have to oppose it.

C. HARRIS, MICHIGAN: I would have to ask on the basis of that recommendation, would you eliminate the fourth Whereas?

G. MOORE, KANSAS: I would go the other way. The whole concept in both of them yesterday to the other way. They opposed this mainly because many

are not protecting hawks and owls. Many states do. We protect them all, but I don't want the federal government to come along and tell me I have got to issue some falcon permits. It was based strictly on leaving the jurisdiction in the states and I am opposed to taking that out, Chuck and Walt.

W. SCOTT, WISCONSIN: If you leave it in then we should say instead of the federal permits, we want state permits. That is alright with me. We have state permits.

D. WETTERSTEN, MINNESOTA: I would have to agree with what George has to say on this. I think that fourth Whereas is an important one. I further am not aware myself of documentation indicating the taking of hawks and owls by guns or any other means is the primary thing responsible for declining in these bird populations. It may be in specific areas at specific times, but I think this is a type of bill that is based primarily on emotion, and we should give careful consideration before we endorse it in any way.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: The reason Colorado submitted it is the fact that we feel strongly that it is a state jurisdictional matter. We have taken it upon ourselves to see that we get proper raptor legislation and we are in the position of employing a raptor specialist on our staff who will spend 100 percent of his time working in this field. We certainly don't want the Federal Government to try and move in here and take over this responsibility from us.

W. SCOTT, WISCONSIN: Why don't we say that in the resolution, that we oppose this because it is a state jurisdictional matter. I don't object to that. We are not saying that. We are inferring that we are all for taking the birds off the flyway and allowing people to have fun with them in spite of the fact that they might be scarce.

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: Mr. Chairman, I think that we are playing into the hands of the opponents of hunting if we don't oppose this. Just another something they can rely on to come in two years, four years or 10 years to put some more species under this same jurisdiction. I think that we should be careful about supporting it.

W. BARBEE, NEBRASKA: I move to accept all the resolutions with appropriate amendments except Resolution No. 6 and Resolution No. 8.

B. HODGINS, SOUTH DAKOTA: I second.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Motion carried.

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: I move to adopt Resolution No. 6 as written. (previously printed)

C. HARRIS, MICHIGAN: I second.

ROLL CALL VOTE:	Wisconsin	No
	Nebraska	No
	Manitoba	Abstain
	Kansas	Yes
	Illinois	
	Minnesota	Yes
	Missouri	No
	North Dakota	Yes
	Ohio	
	Iowa	
	Oklahoma	Yes
	South Dakota	Yes
	Colorado	Yes

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Motion carried.

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: I move to adopt Resolution No. 8 as written.
(previously printed)

G. MOORE, KANSAS: I second.

ROLL CALL VOTE:	Kansas	Yes
	Manitoba	Abstain
	Michigan	Yes
	Minnesota	Yes
	Missouri	Yes
	Oklahoma	Yes
	Nebraska	Yes
	North Dakota	Yes
	South Dakota	No
	Wisconsin	Yes
	Colorado	Yes

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Motion carried.

B. ELLIOTT, COLORADO: Rather than discuss these things that I brought up to each member state by letter of June 23, why don't we take action to ask the new President to appoint a Constitution and Bylaws Review Committee to work on this rather than get into any discussion at this point.

G. MOORE, KANSAS: I move that a committee be appointed.

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: I second.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Motion carried.

G. MOORE, KANSAS: Mr. Reed, in his speech, stated that he was going to select the best man possible as Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and would do so within a few weeks. To assure closest cooperation between the states, the Department of Interior and its many objectives, I recommend that the President of this organization or anyone he should appoint, write a letter to Secretary Morton and Secretary Reed requesting that the Secretary appoint a well qualified and trained man who has had considerable state experience and is presently active in a State Fish and Game agency. This is a motion that I am making.

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: I second.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Motion carried.

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: Mr. Reed brought up the matter of predator control programs. I would like to point out that there are some real paradoxes in the program of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in regard to this. The Branch of Special Services is charged with the responsibility of work on rare and endangered species. They protect certain groups and then there is another organization protecting different species. The whole program should be reviewed.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Secretary Morton has appointed a blue ribbon committee. I recommend that this Association write a letter to Dr. Cain who is chairman, asking him to solicit the views of all the states on the predator program.

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: I so move.

G. MOORE, KANSAS: I second.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: The committee appointed by Secretary Morton must submit a report by October. Motion carried.

I have a question about the relationship between the Association and the Midwest Wildlife Conference. My question is how much supervision or guidance does this Association give to that or is this just kind of a group of free lancing biologists and employees of ours that run the conference.

G. MOORE, KANSAS: Mr. Chairman, I have been into this years ago up to my ears. Mel Steen and Bill Towell and I made a strong recommendation back along 1963 that they combine and let this organization have their business meetings, limited to strictly business with one day if necessary two,

sometime in the meeting. Then the technical part be also a Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners meeting and it would be a technical meeting. It would then be run by the Fish Society, Wildlife Society, etc. This was discussed quite a bit. What finally happened, they set up a panel for discussion at their next meeting. Bill Towell was the discussion leader for it and Ed Schneberger was against it. It finally was killed because of the fact that they did not want to have anything to do with us. The only thing came out of it was they felt we should work closer together, so what to do is join us and come to our meetings. The next year Doug Clark was President of the Midwest and I suggested that we get together at that meeting. The only one who showed up was Doug Clark and I.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Is there any feeling in the groups that we want to have a little more control and jurisdiction over this?

G. MOORE, KANSAS: I had the same feeling ten years ago that we ought to coordinate better.

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: I was working very closely with Bill Towell on this several years ago and you run into problems in that the Midwest is ramrodded pretty much by your academic people from your universities. We attempted to attend their meetings. We were welcome. We have had no impact on this group at all. After several years, I am convinced that perhaps we should let the thing go as it has been because we are not going to change it. We will just be spinning our wheels. I think each individual director can cover as far as his own state is concerned by authorizing as many or as few out-of-state travel authorizations as he sees fit.

K. DOAN, MANITOBA: Last December the Midwest Wildlife Conference met in Manitoba and I asked the general chairman to explore again this idea of relationships with the commissioners. He came back and told me they had a little meeting and all those researchers, biologists and professors don't want to meet with the commissioners. They still feel independent.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Willard?

W. BARBEE, NEBRASKA: If we do not put our house in order our government will do it for us. I would always rather arrange it myself rather than have the government do it.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Dick?

D. WETTERSTEN, MINNESOTA: I think the Midwest is a real fine place for biologists and academic types to get together and exchange information. My concern is the apparent growing problem for out-of-state travel for various states. I think perhaps we could review areas that we could have

input. I refer specifically here to the many specific organizations that we have. I would suggest maybe we could think of having our people participate in these specific organizations; purposely schedule their meetings in conjunction with the Midwest and this might be a start in cutting down on out-of-state travel, perhaps doubling up on meetings somewhat. I am not in favor of restricting participation of staff in conferences. I think they are good and technical conferences are good for them. I do feel that we would be better off if we kept our meetings smaller and restricted to our particular needs.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: In bringing the subject up to you it wasn't my intention that it had to be confined to this meeting. I wondered if we were satisfied with the production of the wildlife conferences and if they were developing the type of technical dialogue that we felt was important.

G. MOORE, KANSAS: I am not and mainly because I do not get, and it is pretty difficult to get, the material that they furnish at those meetings. The person that gets the information is the ones who attend the meetings.

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: Mr. Chairman, I have to concur with Carl Noren. I think this Association should confine itself to matters of policy and administration. We have all we can handle at one of these conferences without attempting to steer the direction of a technical session.

G. MOORE, KANSAS: I still think we can meet within and let them have the floor. We can take up our businesses and if we need another day, fine. I would say we ought to do one of two things. If they are associated with us, we ought to get a little more control, if not, somebody ought to change the name.

C. NOREN, MISSOURI: George, the only control we have, I think, are those people we employ. If we want to hear from certain people, we just tell them to be here. I don't think we need to involve every academic group and every splinter group in these meetings in order to accomplish it. We are wasting our energy on the development of big meetings. That should be kept on a small basis.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: We have another matter of business. Chuck Harris was going to give us something on that reorganization.

C. HARRIS, MICHIGAN: I have something very rough. I had a resolution but think I can do it by a motion. I would move that the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners strongly endorse and support the principle of the proposed creation of the comprehensive new Federal Department of Natural Resources by bringing together the principal federal resource

conservation and development agencies and recommend that the International Association be urged to give this proposal immediate attention to make certain that the fine structure of this new agency gives proper emphasis to include all environmental and natural resource programs properly belonging to a comprehensive natural resource agency and that each element be given its proper place to assure the maintaining of a quality environment.

W. SCOTT, WISCONSIN: I second.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Motion carried. Is there any further discussion?

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: Mr. Chairman, a point of information on my part. On Item 8 - Position regarding PLLRC matters. In reading that report this concept that they are promoting -- dominant use -- what is the attitude of the Western on this?

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: We are opposed to this. Isn't this right Willard?

W. BARBEE, NEBRASKA: Yes.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Is there any further business before I call for a report from the Time and Place Committee? If not I'll call upon George Moore to give us a report on Nominating, Time and Place.

G. MOORE, KANSAS: This is something a couple of us have been looking forward to for a year now. Dick Wettersten as President for 1972 with Secretary Fred Warders and the meeting to be held in Kansas; Russ Stuart as Vice President.

B. HODGINS, SOUTH DAKOTA: I move to accept the report.

C. NOREN, MISSOURI: I second.

K. DOAN, MANITOBA: I move that the nominations close.

C. HARRIS, MICHIGAN: I second.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Motion carried.

George Moore, Chairman of the Nominating, Time and Place Committee escorted the President for 1972 to the podium to accept the gavel.

D. WETTERSTEN, MINNESOTA: I want to express appreciation to all the members of the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, to the state of Colorado, to Harry Woodward specifically, Bob Elliott, the entire staff of the Game, Fish and Parks Department of Colorado for the outstanding job here.

We are looking forward to the next year's meeting. I am glad that Harry clarified the place. Based on Harry's recent experience, I put in long distance calls to the airport to find out the condition of their runways. I understand they will be adequate, but you never know I guess. We have reserved tentatively the week of July 25 to 28, 1972, for next year's meeting.

As in the past, and taking a few prerogatives starting some work now, some important work we feel should be done. Most of this relates to items that have been on our agenda this morning.

First, we discussed the need for a look at the Bylaws of the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners. We should consider the official transferring of the gavel at the end of this meeting rather than on January 1st. We have heard the suggestion that there be an affiliation with the International Association. With this in mind, we are announcing now the appointment of a Bylaws Committee. We will ask that this committee be chaired by Carl Noren of Missouri; Harry R. Woodward, Vice Chairman; Dr. Ken Doan and Chuck Harris to work on this important committee. We would ask this committee to do two things; (1) Look at our bylaws with an eye toward necessary updating and revision and report back in 1972; and (2) this committee would serve as liaison with any similar group that might be appointed by the International following action that might result from the resolution discussed earlier. I believe that talk of bringing the two organizations together will necessitate dovetailing the Bylaws Committee work.

Secondly, we will be working with the Program Committee immediately. We will have a member of our Kansas staff to share this committee. I would like to announce the members of this committee now from this organization, namely Bob Elliott who has done such an able job during this past year; George Moore and Russ Stuart. We would like to give this committee a few guidelines. Again, according to some of the discussions that have come out of this meeting. First, consider the deemphasizing of specific technical papers at the meeting. There is apparently some ample opportunity for these at the Midwest and other technical sessions. Secondly, emphasize land use management, formulate possible approaches to problems, problems such as we see pictured on the cover of this excellent program. Thirdly, emphasize water project policy. I suggest from now on we will want to check progress made on the river basin study which was very ably reported on at the special session held here last Monday.

The third important committee that we want to get activated at the earliest opportunity is one for lack of better name, we will call the Pro-Hunting Committee. For this I am asking Willard Barbee to chair. I would like to work with Willard on getting additional members to serve on that committee. I think this is most important. We have been distressed over

the years and have much discussed the anti-hunting sentiment. I think the time has come that we should perhaps take offensive action. I would suggest that this committee look at two areas of work: (1) Develop a positive pro-hunting format that most of us in our individual agencies, states, organizations can use, concepts that might be considered over changing agency names from game to wildlife, use of mass media, etc., and right along with this, perhaps this committee could work to design a monitoring program so that we could provide a voice for quick and rapid responses to the "Say Good-bye" type of propaganda that is prevalent today.

The fourth committee will be appointed representing a splitting of one of our existing committees, the Wetlands. We would like to have a Water Resources Committee following up on previously mentioned work and we would like Farrell Copelin chair that. We would also, in line with recommendations made, like to have a Special Waterfowl Policy Committee to pursue the work which Russ Stuart reported on and for a change we would like for the Chairman of this committee to be from the Canadian side. We will try to prevail on Mr. Gene Bossenmaier to take the chairmanship of that committee. I would ask each of you to send to me during the next couple of weeks, any specific recommendations that you have for further committee appointments, either for yourself, your staff or others. Secondly, I would ask you to give me any of your comments regarding the program that you would like to have during 1972. As I indicated, we will endeavor to provide more time for the administrators of our various organizations to sit down and have a session such as we had this morning. That Mr. Chairman, concludes my remarks. Again, I appreciate the opportunity to serve as your President next year and look forward to a fine meeting. Hope all of you can make it. Thank you.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Thank you Dick. Before I officially close the meeting, I have a couple of things I wish to do in recognizing work that people do as a labor of love in an organization like this. As I mentioned to you before, there will be some awards given at the banquet this evening relating to the Commissioner of the Year and also a President's Award to the person who has done an outstanding job of some type that is unique to the Association.

At this time I want to recognize the past President of this Association because of the work that he did during his term and hopefully give him a little memento of what he did during the past year that may serve as some reward for the time he put in. I would like to have Ken Doan come up. I want to present to Ken a plaque for his service as President of the Association in 1970. Ken?

K. DOAN, MANITOBA: Thank you very much. This is a great surprise, Harry, I was almost going to bring in one of these impeachment type things George did last year because I detected this as being a different gavel from

the one that I handed over last year. Thank you.

R. STUART, NORTH DAKOTA: Harry, one thing just came to my mind and that is in regard to S. 244. Len Springer says that this doesn't go far enough. In other words, it doesn't provide for such things as aircraft, etc. He also informed me that Tor Marston has drafted his bill. I think it would be appropriate for the new Chairman to write Tor and get a copy of that bill and perhaps fire it to the President of the International so that maybe this could be acted upon at the International.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Very good. Thank you, Russ. One additional presentation I would like to make and as you fellows all know that when you are serving in a capacity like this there is always someone who does most all the work. In this Association I am sure you recognize the Secretary-Treasurer as the guy that really carries the ball and during this term of mine, Bob Elliott has been carrying the ball for me. I want to make a presentation to Bob of a similar plaque to the one that Ken Doan just got.

B. ELLIOTT, COLORADO: Thank you Harry. Thank you gentlemen.

PRESIDENT WOODWARD: Is there anything further to come before the Association? I therefore declare this 38th Annual Meeting adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 12:40 p. m.

REGISTRATION

Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners

<u>Name</u>	<u>State</u>
Agee, Phil	Nebraska
Allen, Wm.	Arkansas
Armbruster, Dan	Ohio
Arnold, Maurice	Colorado
Bailey, Bill	Nebraska
Barbee, Willard	Nebraska
Barnickol, P. G.	Missouri
Berryman, Jack	Washington D.C.
Blair, Jim	Missouri
Beldt, Wilbur	North Dakota
Brohn, Allen	Missouri
Buss, Keen	Pennsylvania
Cady, Jim	Minnesota
Casey, Mike	Minnesota
Cliff, Edward	Washington D.C.
Compton, Lawrence	Washington D.C.
Cool, R. W.	Colorado
Copelin, Farrell	Oklahoma
Cowgill, Bruce	Nebraska
Davis, Wallace	South Dakota
DeBolt, Harry	Wyoming
Delaney, Robert	Missouri
Doan, Ken	Manitoba
Doman, Everett	Virginia
Duncan, Mike	Colorado
Edwards, Harold	Nebraska
Elliott, Bob	Colorado
Evans, David	Iowa
Evans, Robert	Colorado
Gardner, George	Washington D.C.
Glasser, Edwin	Missouri
Gore, Horace	Oklahoma
Griffith, Chuck	Minnesota
Hammit, Curt	Virginia
Hammond, Jack	Michigan
Hamor, Wade	Nebraska
Harger, Elsworth	Michigan
Harris, Charles	Michigan
Helland, Peter	Wisconsin
Herbst, Robert	Minnesota
Hodgins, R. A.	South Dakota
Hicks, Kenneth	Missouri
Hoefelman, A. C.	Missouri
Hogue, Jack	Colorado

<u>Name</u>	<u>State</u>
Homolka, Charles	Nebraska
Hood, Shyrl	Pennsylvania
Hunt, James	Washington D.C.
Jardine, Archie	Manitoba
Kakee, Ken	Iowa
Kalb, Bob	Idaho
Keefe, James	Missouri
Kimball, Thomas	Washington D.C.
Klonglan, Eugene	Iowa
Kozicky, Ed	Illinois
Kulp, Charles	Iowa
Laitala, E. M.	Michigan
Langenbach, John	Minnesota
LaPoints, Donald	Minnesota
Lenzini, Paul	Washington D.C.
MacMullan, Ralph	Michigan
Marston, M. A.	Virginia
Mateer, Chuck	South Dakota
Mensingler, Gary	Oklahoma
Miller, Wm.	Illinois
Moore, George	Kansas
McBroom, James	Virginia
Nord, Warren	Minnesota
Noren, Carl	Missouri
Petoskey, M. L.	Michigan
Pippin, Lonnie	Colorado
Poole, Daniel	Washington D.C.
Priewert, Fred	Iowa
Purkett, Charles	Missouri
Radouski, Gil	Missouri
Randall, Robert	North Dakota
Riordan, Laurence	Colorado
Ruckel, James	West Virginia
Scholle, August	Michigan
Scott, Walter	Wisconsin
Sears, Fred	Kansas
Shapton, Warren	Michigan
Smith, Spencer	Washington D.C.
Spady, Dick	Nebraska
Springer, L. M.	Minnesota
Stafford, Wm.	West Virginia
Strong, Ford	Colorado
Stuart, Russell	North Dakota
Stutzman, Karl	Washington D.C.
Suttle, Dean	Colorado
Swope, Harold	Colorado
Teeter, James	Nebraska
Trautman, Carl	South Dakota
Vaughn, Ray	Minnesota
Vogtman, Don	Minnesota
Wettersten, Dick	Minnesota
Willoughby, Harvey	Washington D.C.
Zelinske, Walter	Wisconsin

REGISTRATION

Registered as "other" -- no affiliation or commercial

<u>NAME</u>	<u>STATE</u>
Borell, Adrey E.	Colorado
Dils, Eugene W., Jr.	Washington
Eustis, George P.	Colorado
Feast, C. H.	Colorado
Hill, Ralph R.	Colorado
Hogan, Pat	Texas
Hoover, Phil	Colorado
Lynn, Otto	Idaho
Morrow, Cliff	Washington, D. C.
Norton, Frank R.	Colorado
Reetz, Bill	Colorado
Reid, David A., II	Colorado
Ryland, Errol E.	Colorado
Saile, Bob	Colorado
Tesitor, Don	Colorado
Winn, Roberta	Colorado

REGISTRATION

Colorado Game, Fish & Parks Personnel on Work and Support Assignments

<u>NAME</u>	<u>NAME</u>
Andrews, Arch	Maxon, Kenneth
Bailey, Bertie	Mefford, Elizabeth R.
Baker, Iola	Merkle, Velma
Becker, Joyce M.	Myers, Gary T.
Bennett, Lyle	Miller, Jim
Boyd, Gail	Mink, William W.
Boyd, Ray	Moser, Cliff
Braun, Clait E.	Moser, Kris
Bray, Harvey	McFarland, Jim
Brown, Gary L.	Nolting, Beverly
Brown, Lillian	Ogilvie, Stan
Cook, Eugene	Olson, Perry D.
Cook, Helen M.	Penafior, Frances
Crane, Don	Reed, Dale F.
Dado, Maureen A.	Reichert, Charles W.
Dailey, Mary	Reynolds, Bob
Domenick, Don	Rogers, Glenn E.
Elliot, Dick	Roland, William I.
Feltner, George	Roper, Laren A.
Finch, Dwayne	Sandfort, Wayne W.
Foresman, Miles	Schaub, Paul J.
Foster, Chuck	Schultz, Herman, Sr.
Franklin, Oliver W.	Sealing, Clee
Gardner, Charlotte	Sigler, Bruce
Gerrans, Joe	Smith, Bud
Gilbert, Paul F.	Smith, Marvin W.
Gill, R. Bruce	Steele, George E.
Glaviano, Stella C.	Steinert, Steve F.
Goettl, John P., Jr.	Stiehm, Howie
Gore, Clarence	Stone, Mike
Green, Larry	Striegnitz, Phyllis J.
Gresh, Arthur I.	Swaigood, Geraldine
Hackett, Naydene R.	Till, Smoky
Hansson, Peter	Tully, Robert V.
Hess, Richard W.	Vidakovich, Louis D.
Hewitt, Betty	Vuksinich, Lucille M.
Houston, Jim	Walker, Julia
Johnson, Elizabeth A.	Welsh, Carl R.
Kleinschnitz, Ferd C.	Wescoatt, Ivan
Knisley, Wayne E.	West, Don
Knight, Gene	Wetherill, Clayton
Lanning, H.	Wilson, Bob
Lines, Thomas E.	Whitaker, Allen F.
Lowry, Roger B.	White, Claude E.
Mason, Philip	Woodward, Chuck
Mason, Russ	Young, Judith L.

FAMILY REGISTRATION

Both Associations

<u>Name</u>	<u>State</u>
Laura Alvard	Idaho
Margaret Anderson	New Mexico
Howard Baker	Colorado
Pat Barnet	Washington
Mrs. P. G. Barnickol	Missouri
Joan Barrows	Colorado
Mrs. Albert Black	New Mexico
Mrs. Marjorie Black	Oregon
Myrna Blair	Missouri
Marguerite Borell	Colorado
Emily Brohn	Missouri
Mildren Broman	New Mexico
Marie Brown	New Mexico
Walter Brown	Colorado
Sharon Burt	New Mexico
Sue Burt	Colorado
June Campbell	Oregon
Mrs. Era Cloyd	California
Erminie Compton	Washington D. C.
Lee Cook	Colorado
Nancy Corsi	Wyoming
Barbara Cowgill	Nebraska
Joseph Dado	Colorado
Bea Doan	Manitoba
Gay Doman	Virginia
Connie Dorian	Nevada
Deidre Duncan	Colorado
Charlotte Edgerton	California
Nell Elliott	Colorado
Vonnie Elliott	Colorado
Joy Eoff	Oregon
Trudy Evans	Colorado
Dorothy Faist	California
Opal Feast	Colorado
Anne Findlay	Oregon
Patricia Finnell	Colorado
Mrs. Peter Fletcher	California
Ruth Franklin	Colorado
Pat Fullerton	California
Margaret Gilbert	Colorado
Missy Goettl	Colorado
Marge Gordon	New Mexico
Marilyn Greene	Colorado
Retha Grieb	Colorado
Geraldine Griess	Colorado

<u>Name</u>	<u>State</u>
Dorothy Groves	Nevada
Morna Harger	Michigan
Shirley Harris	Michigan
Mrs. Peter Helland	Wisconsin
Ruth Hemphill	Oregon
Bertha Hicks	Missouri
Margaret Houston	Colorado
Ruth Humbird	Idaho
Bo Jantzen	Arizona
Marie Jardine	Manitoba
Lois Jones	New Mexico
Mrs. Willis Jones	Montana
Fran Kaminski	Wyoming
Mrs. James Keefe	Missouri
Donna Kimball	Utah
Bernie Kirch	Nevada
Mrs. Wm. Krueger	Wyoming
Anne Kruse	Oregon
Syble Kryger	Arizona
Mrs. "Skip" Langenbach	Minnesota
Janet Larson	Washington
Charlotte Lauckhart	Washington
Sylvia Leete	Montana
Virginia Luman	Oregon
Zola Lynn	Idaho
Claire Mankin	Wyoming
Donna Marker	Wyoming
Diana Martinez	Colorado
Suzanne Mason	Colorado
Retha Maxon	Colorado
Mary Mayo	Washington
Joanne Mensinger	Oklahoma
Polly Metke	Oregon
Beryle Mickelson	Utah
Mrs. Frank Moore	Oregon
Colleen Mumma	New Mexico
Barbara McIntosh	Montana
Connie Nelson	Wyoming
Jo Ellen Nelson	New Mexico
Mrs. Lenore Nielson	Utah
Dorothy Noel	Utah
Mrs. Wallace Noerenberg	Alaska
Estella Peay	Utah
June Peterson	Idaho
Carlana Phelps	Utah
Veva Pippin	Colorado
Charlotte Post	Colorado
Phyllis Powell	Colorado
Travis Pressey	Oregon
Lyn Psikla	Alberta

<u>Name</u>	<u>State</u>
Gail Rasouski	Missouri
Peg Rayner	Oregon
Debbie Richardson	Utah
Mrs. Arnold Rieder	Montana
Sue Riordan	Colorado
Mrs. T. S. Roberts	Minnesota
Lucy Rogers	Colorado
Jean Ryland	Colorado
Virginia Seaman	Colorado
Sally Shanklin	Oregon
Ernestine Shapton	Michigan
Ruth Simmons	Oregon
Juliana Simpson	New Mexico
Cleo Smith	Utah
Eleanor Smith	California
Grace Smith	Utah
Joyce Smith	Utah
Lillian Smith	Oregon
Virginia Springer	Minnesota
Kathleen Starostka	Utah
JoAnne Stringham	Utah
Iris Stuart	North Dakota
Peach Stuart	North Dakota
Louise Suttle	Colorado
Paula Swaner	Utah
Anne Sweeney	Oregon
Marjorie Swope	Colorado
Irene Tesitor	Colorado
Arvada Todd	New Mexico
Mona Tully	Colorado
Annette Vaughn	Minnesota
Dora von Limbach	Wyoming
Sue Weber	Colorado
Jan Welch	New Mexico
Lois Williams	New Mexico
Mrs. James Whittaker	Oregon
Barbara Woldstad	Alaska
Theone Woodward	Colorado
Barbara Woodsworth	Idaho
Virginia Young	Utah
Betty Zelinske	Wisconsin